

Table S.1: Comparison SUMMARY of Resource Effects by Alternative

Table S.1 has been prepared as a comparison summary of potential resource effects by alternative. The reader needs to realize that this is only a summary and is not the complete analysis. The complete analysis can be found in Chapter 4.

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
AIR QUALITY (See Section 4.2 for the Full Discussion of Effects)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential to emit between 350 and 700 tons of particulates per year from wildland fires. - Emissions from mining would be proportional to the number of operations. - Emissions from authorized land uses would be proportional to the number of uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emissions from prescribed fires less than Alternative A. - Emissions from wildland fires would likely be greater than Alternative A. - No emissions from mining operations. - Emissions from authorized land uses for maintenance/public health/safety would be proportional to the number of uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emissions from prescribed and wildland fires would likely be greater than Alternative A. - Emissions from mining operations would not occur. - Emissions from authorized land uses would be proportional to the number of uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emissions from prescribed and wildland fires would likely be greater than Alternative A. - Emissions from mining operations would be proportional to the number of operations. - Emissions from authorized land uses would be proportional to the number of uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emissions from prescribed and wildland fires would likely be greater than Alternative A. - Emissions from mining operations would be proportional to the number of operations. - Emissions from authorized land uses would be proportional to the number of uses.
WATER RESOURCES (See Section 4.3 for the Full Discussion of Effects)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water resources would continue to be maintained or improved through implementation of BMPs. - WQRPs would be developed and implemented on CWA 303(d) listed waters that establish specific objectives and management resulting in improved water quality and delisting of water body. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water resources would be maintained or improved through implementation of BMPs that maintain or restore riparian condition to an advanced ecological status. - As in Alternative A, WQRPs would be developed; however, development and implementation would be generally guided by a stream/watershed prioritization schedule. - Identification and management of cold water refuges would help maintain or improve water quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As in Alternative B, BMPs would be implemented to maintain or restore riparian condition to an advanced ecological status. - As in Alternative B, WQRPs would be generally guided by stream/watershed prioritization. - Active restoration would lead to improved riparian community structure, thereby maintaining or improving water quality and quantity at a faster rate than Alternative B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As in Alternatives A, B and C, water resources would be maintained or improved through implementation of BMPs. - As in Alternatives B and C, cold water refuges would be identified and protected. - Management of CWA 303(d) listed waters and development of WQRPs would have similar effects as Alternatives B and C through maintaining or restoring an appropriate riparian ecological status to attain water quality standards or other surrogate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As in all Alternatives, water resources would be maintained or improved through implementation of BMPs. - As in Alternative A, WQRPs would be developed and implemented on CWA 303(d) listed waters that establish specific objectives and management resulting in improved conditions and delisting the water body. However, development and implementation of WQRPs would be generally guided by

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
	through site specific protection of cold water species' habitat.		measures. - As in Alternative C, active restoration would lead to improved riparian community structure.	stream/watershed prioritization as in the Proposed RMP and Alternatives B and C.

SOILS AND BIOLOGICAL SOIL CRUSTS (See Section 4.4 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Current management practices would continue to reduce soil erosion.	- There would be no direct effects.	- There would be no direct effects.	- Effects on soils and biological soil crusts from increases in disturbances would be greater than Alternatives A, B, or C, and less than Alternative E. - Management emphasis to rehabilitate soils and other resources would be greater than alternatives A, B, and E. - An increase in new projects where activities disturb or compact biological soil crusts could cause an effect on soils.	- More activities that affect soils and biological soil crusts would occur under this alternative. - Any activities that remove the vegetation cover and increase the erosion rate would affect soils and other resource values. - The greatest effect on biological soil crusts would be under this alternative.
---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	---

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
--	---	--	---	--

VEGETATION (Section 4.5)

RIPARIAN AND WETLANDS (See Section 4.5.1 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Riparian/wetland vegetation (composition, distribution and structure) would be maintained or improved to achieve a level of PFC, or higher perceived ecological status established through site/reach specific objectives.	- Riparian/wetland vegetation would be maintained or improved to achieve an advanced ecological status primarily relying on natural processes.	- As in Alternative B, riparian/wetland vegetation would be maintained or improved to achieve an advanced ecological status. However, incorporation of active restoration would improve or restore riparian vegetation at a faster rate and increase the likelihood of meeting site/reach specific objectives.	- Riparian/wetland vegetation would be maintained or restored at a range of ecological conditions depending on site/reach specific objectives. Objectives would include maintaining or achieving PFC at a minimum, and higher ecological status associated with CWA 303(d) listed waters, WSRs and wilderness. - As in Alternative C, active restoration would be incorporated as appropriate to progress towards meeting site/reach specific objectives.	- Same as the Proposed RMP.
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

WOODLANDS (See Section 4.5.2 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Older juniper trees would be exposed to greater levels of competition from younger trees. - Wildfire intensity and severity would be greater. - A larger number of older trees would be lost due to the potential for larger fires. - Replacement of ancient trees would be limited if most of the younger trees are removed. - Mechanical removal of western juniper would release resources for quaking aspen and mountain mahogany growth.	- Post settlement western juniper trees would continue to establish and grow in the old growth stands increasing the risk for a severe wildfire. - Cover and density of western juniper would increase throughout range. - Mortality rates of ancient trees would increase. - The amount of standing and dead woody material would increase. - Acreage burned and number of ancient trees lost to fire would be	- Post settlement western juniper trees would be cut in old growth stands, but up to ten percent of these trees would be left to replace dead and dying trees. - Cover and density of understory plants would increase, reducing the size and extent of bare ground patches. - Direct effects of Alternative C would be similar to Alternative A with the following exceptions: wildland fires would be evaluated for threats to firefighter safety, public safety, and private lands;	- Direct effects would be similar to Alternative C except development of markets for byproducts of mechanical treatments would help boost the economy of Harney County. - Direct effects of western juniper cutting and prescribed burning would be similar to Alternative A and the effects of utilizing wildfire for resource benefits would be similar to Alternative B. - Utilization of cut western juniper would reduce the fuel loading in quaking aspen and mountain	- Direct effects of mechanical treatments would be the same as in Alternative A. - Direct effects of fire management would be similar to Alternative C except areas burned in old growth stands would be seeded to plant species that maximize forage production. - Direct and indirect effects of market development of byproducts from mechanical treatments would be the same as the Proposed RMP.
---	---	--	--	---

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seedling establishment of mountain mahogany would be encouraged. - Herbaceous and other woody understory would increase. - Quaking aspen suckering would be greatly favored by burning. However, some conditions may reduce suckering. - Burning in mountain mahogany stands would kill mature trees. 	<p>greatest in this alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Western juniper would continue to increase cover and density in the lower elevation mountain big sagebrush, quaking aspen and mountain mahogany stands causing aspen, mountain mahogany and associated understory plants to decline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and fires that do not pose threats to firefighters, public, or private land would be managed for resource benefits. - Post-fire plant community would be similar to Alternative A. - The direct effects of cutting of western juniper would be similar to Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mahogany. - Fire intensity and severity would be lower in wildfires than if slash were left on site. 	
WILDLANDS JUNIPER MANAGEMENT AREA (See Section 4.5.3 for the Full Discussion of Effects)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inventory of biological communities present in the WJMA would help provide information on past, current, and future management actions in the western juniper zone. - Data would provide a baseline for future comparison. - Signs would provide for the dissemination of information related to western juniper management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects would be similar to Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects would be similar to Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects would be similar to Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects would be similar to Alternative A.
RANGELANDS (See Section 4.5.4 for the Full Discussion of Effects)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nonnative seedlings would be managed or manipulated to meet S&Gs. Vegetation characteristics in areas where management or manipulations were applied would probably be altered. - Interseeding of only 200 acres would have no appreciable effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas burned by naturally- and human-ignited fires would subsequently support early successional vegetation communities. - Limitations on methods available for management and restoration could limit or preclude 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interseeding of 20,000 acres of nonnative seedlings could result in increases of native vegetation diversity and cover. - The inclusion of nonnative species may reduce the degree to which an increase in native plant species diversity and cover would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects would be very similar to those under Alternative C. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vegetation cover would be increased. - The emphasis on vegetation biomass and species selection for commodity production would result in lower diversity of native species. - Establishment of new nonnative

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>on vegetation in the context of wildlife habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mechanical methods of decreasing shrub biomass would generally have the effect of increasing the relative cover and biomass of herbaceous species. 	<p>the likelihood of achieving Goal 1, Objectives 2 and 3.</p>	<p>be realized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally, the emphasis on use of native species for rehabilitation could result in higher species, community, and structural diversity. - Interseeding native species on 20,000 acres of nonnative seedings on the north and west side of Steens Mountain, would increase the diversity of rangeland vegetation. - Seeding of native species along with desired nonnative species would increase rangeland vegetation diversity. - Provisions for allowing natural processes and naturally-ignited wildland fire would also increase rangeland vegetation community and structural diversity. 		<p>seedings would reduce native species diversity, community diversity, and structural diversity.</p>
NOXIOUS WEEDS (See Section 4.5.5 for the Full Discussion of Effects)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated management on noxious weeds should effectively eliminate the smaller, more easily eradicated infestations. - Larger infestations could be contained given enough of the most effective tools. - Drought conditions may cause an increase in the number of new infestations and the growth rate of existing infestations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public education could reduce the effects caused by noxious weed distribution. - Inventories would be increased, which could reduce the effects caused by noxious weeds if control efforts also increase. - The change of priority to treat high quality resource lands for noxious weeds may allow for the establishment and spread of noxious weeds in other parts of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The effects would be the same as Alternative B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public education would be expanded to include areas outside Harney County. - Coordination with local, county, state, and federal interests would help to reduce negative effects on resource values from noxious weed infestations. - Control of the introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds would be emphasized on disturbed areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated management would be applied for the control of noxious weeds the same as the Proposed RMP. - Inventories would be increased to detect new infestations that may have adverse effects on commodity reserves. - Control of introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds would be emphasized on disturbed areas.

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
	the Planning Area.		- BMPs would be implemented to emphasize preventive measures to minimize weed spread.	- Noxious weed infestation would continue to affect vegetation resources, control would be emphasized to protect commodity resources.

FISH AND WILDLIFE (See Section 4.6 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Single species oriented management would be emphasized in most habitats. - Opportunities would be identified and undertaken for improvement or restoration of other fish and wildlife habitat. - Seed drilling, aerial reseeding, or other methods could be used to reseed approximately 9,000 acres of deer winter range. - This management action would contribute to increased habitat suitability for wildlife adapted to natural rangeland conditions. - Forage for wildlife would be allocated at management objective levels. - Wildlife populations would be allowed to expand naturally or through limited transplants. - Wildlife could establish populations outside their historic range. - Transplants would be conducted by the ODFW in accordance with current species-specific management plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emphasis would be on managing self-sustaining native species. - Aerial reseeding would be used for approximately 9,000 acres of deer winter range. - Only sagebrush would be reseeded. - Opportunities would be identified and undertaken for improvement and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat. - Forage would be allocated for wildlife above management objective levels. - Wildlife populations would be allowed to expand naturally. - Some wildlife species could establish populations outside their historic range. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approximately 20,000 acres of nonnative seedings and all native vegetation with low vegetative species diversity in deer winter range would be interseeded to establish native plant species. - A variety of methods could be used to accomplish the interseeding, allowing the selection of the best method for a given location. - Wildlife habitat quality and quantity would be improved across a large expanse of the Planning Area and could contribute to increases in populations of some wildlife species. - Opportunities would be identified and undertaken to improve or restore fish and wildlife habitat. - Forage would be allocated for wildlife above management objective levels. - In coordination with the ODFW, wildlife populations would be allowed to expand naturally or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10,000 acres or more of nonnative seedings and most of the native vegetation with low vegetative species diversity in deer winter range would be interseeded to establish native plant species. This would improve forage productivity and availability. - To the extent that sagebrush were successfully reestablished, suitable habitat for wildlife would improve. - Opportunities for improvement and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat would be identified and implemented. - As with alternative A, forage for wildlife would be allocated at management objective levels. - Wildlife populations would be allowed to expand naturally or through limited transplants in coordination with the ODFW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5,000 acres of nonnative seedings and some native vegetation with low species diversity in deer winter range would be interseeded to establish native and other desirable nonnative plant species. This action would improve forage productivity and availability for wildlife. - Minor effects to game species would occur where increased emphasis on desirable vegetation was compatible with forage that game species would use. The potential effects of this management action would be similar to those described for the Proposed RMP. - As with the Proposed RMP, opportunities to improve and restore fish and wildlife habitat would be identified and implemented. - In addition to fish and wildlife habitat, the improvements would also benefit livestock, and could thereby increase forage
---	--	--	---	--

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
		through limited transplants.		competition between wildlife and livestock. - Forage for wildlife would be allocated at management objective levels. - Wildlife populations would be allowed to expand naturally or through limited transplants in coordination with the ODFW. - Forage allocations for wildlife would be increased concurrent with improved range conditions and other improvements.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (See Section 4.7 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

SPECIAL STATUS PLANTS (See Section 4.7.1 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Special status plant species and habitat would be protected in order to prevent listing as threatened or endangered.	- Special status plant species and habitat would be protected in order to prevent listing as threatened or endangered. - Management emphasizing natural processes to determine rangeland conditions could benefit special status plant species in the short term. - In the long term, management could potentially increase effects such as habitat degradation for special interest plant species.	- Special status plant species and habitat would be protected in order to prevent listing as threatened or endangered.	- Special status plant species and habitat would be protected in order to prevent listing as threatened or endangered. - Emphasis on the development of new projects would cause more ground disturbance than Alternatives A, B, and C.	- Special status plant species and habitat would be protected in order to prevent listing as threatened or endangered. - The development of new projects would cause more ground disturbance than the Proposed RMP or Alternatives A, B, and C.
--	---	--	--	--

SPECIAL STATUS ANIMALS (See Section 4.7.2 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Bat colonies would be protected. - Sagebrush habitat management would target sites most in need of structural improvement or most	- Effects to bats would be similar or provide greater protection than Alternative A. - To the extent that habitat for	- The effects of bat gate installation would be the same as those described for Alternative B. - The effects of Big sage brush	- Effects of management on bats would be similar to Alternatives B and C except specific crucial sites would be considered for	- The effects of bat gate installation would be the same as those described for Alternative A. - Big sagebrush would be
--	--	---	--	--

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>likely to increase habitat suitability for sagebrush dependent special status species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sage-grouse management would result in better survival of fledglings by minimizing the effects of actions that could cause mortality, and would require other resources to be managed so that identified goals and objectives for sage-grouse would be met and long-term range conditions would improve. - Habitat improvements prior to reintroduction of Columbia sharp-tailed grouse, mountain quail, and other species would increase the likelihood of establishing successful self-sustaining populations. - Actions would maintain healthy viable herds of bighorn sheep populations. Poor quality habitat in historic bighorn sheep range would be improved, thereby enabling bighorn sheep that naturally expand into historic habitat to be more successful in establishing viable herds. - Domestic sheep and goats in native wild sheep habitats would be kept from mixing with wild sheep, thereby avoiding the chance of disease transmission. - Development of water sources 	<p>sage-grouse would be considered a significant resource value, fires would be suppressed in those areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects of sage-grouse management would be similar to Alternative A except that the reliance on passive methods could limit the ability to achieve the Management Guideline's goals. - No identification of implementation of habitat would be conducted prior to reintroduction of Columbia sharp-tailed grouse, mountain quail, and other species. This would reduce the chances of establishing successful self-sustaining populations of these special status species. - Natural processes would be allowed to determine the natural range expansion of bighorn sheep populations. Poor quality habitat in historic bighorn sheep range would be improved. - No additional introductions of bighorn sheep and/or transplants would be conducted into identified historic range. - Development of water sources would increase the likelihood of viable herds in historic habitat. 	<p>habitat management would be similar to those described for Alternative A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The effects of management actions for the reintroduction of Columbia sharp-tailed grouse, mountain quail, and other species would be similar to those described for Alternative A. - Effects of some management actions for bighorn sheep would be similar to those described for Alternative A. No habitat improvements in historic bighorn range would be conducted. This could reduce the likelihood of establishing viable herds in these transplant and reintroduction locations as well as the areas bighorn sheep naturally expand. - Domestic sheep and goats in native wild sheep habitats would be kept from mixing with wild sheep, thereby avoiding the chance of disease transmission. 	<p>withdrawal from mineral entry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Big sagebrush habitat management would be coordinated across agency boundaries, which would increase the likelihood of successfully accomplishing goals and objectives relating to sage-grouse and other special status species. - Sage-grouse management would result in better survival of fledglings by minimizing the effects of actions that could cause mortality, and would require other resources and uses to be managed so that identified goals and objectives for sage-grouse would be met, improving long-term range conditions. - The effects of management actions for the reintroduction of Columbia sharp-tailed grouse, mountain quail, and other species would be similar to those described for Alternative A. - The effects of management actions associated with transplants, reintroductions, and natural expansion of bighorn sheep populations; habitat improvements in historic range; and trapping by the ODFW when bighorn numbers exceed management objectives, would be the same as for Alternative A. 	<p>reestablished where economically important special status species would be present. This could indirectly create habitat conditions suitable for other special status species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sage-grouse management would occur to the extent practicable. - Habitat improvements prior to reintroductions of Columbia sharp-tailed grouse, mountain quail, and other species would increase the likelihood of establishing successful, self-sustaining populations of these special status species. Introductions would not occur in areas where economic effects would be demonstrated. This could potentially limit the number of suitable locations for reintroductions. - The effects of management actions associated with bighorn sheep transplants, reintroductions, and natural expansion of populations; habitat improvements in historic range; and trapping by the ODFW, when they determine that excess animals were available, would be the same as for Alternative A. - Domestic sheep and goats in native wild sheep habitats would

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
would increase the likelihood of viable bighorn sheep herds becoming established in historic habitat.			- Domestic sheep and goats in native wild sheep habitats would be kept from mixing with wild sheep, thereby avoiding the chance of disease transmission. - The effects from the development of water guzzlers would be similar to those described for Alternative A.	be kept from mixing with wild sheep, thereby avoiding the chance of disease transmission. - The effects from the development of water guzzlers would be similar to those described for Alternative A.

SPECIAL STATUS FISH (See Section 4.7.3 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Special status species habitat would be managed for conservation or recovery. - Additional management actions may be developed and implemented through activity plans to promote habitat conditions in support of special status fish.	- Except for critical habitat, natural processes would be allowed to define special status species habitat. This management may not promote conservation or recovery. - Improvement of habitat conditions may occur, although improvements may be slower than in alternatives where active restoration occurs. - The Borax Lake chub would likely be eligible for downlisting to "threatened" or delisted under the ESA upon implementation of permanent protection of critical habitat.	- As in Alternative A, special status species habitat would be managed for conservation or recovery. - Implementation of active or passive management to promote maintenance or improvement of habitat would contribute to conservation of special status species. - As in Alternative B, the Borax Lake chub would likely be eligible for downlisting to "threatened" or delisted under the ESA.	- As in Alternative A, special status species' habitat would be managed for conservation or recovery. - As in Alternative C, implementation of active or passive management to promote maintenance or improvement of habitat would contribute to conservation of special status species. - As in Alternatives B and C, the Borax Lake chub would likely be eligible for downlisting to "threatened" or delisted under the ESA.	- Special status species habitat would be managed with an emphasis on game species. This would have similar effects to Alternative A.
---	--	---	--	---

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
REDBAND TROUT RESERVE (See Section 4.7.4 for the Full Discussion of Effects)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The boundaries of the RTR would be delineated independent of this RMP through coordination among the BLM, ODFW and SMAC. - Riparian and aquatic habitats would be managed to maintain or progress toward PFC, water quality standards, and fish habitat values through existing management. Management for PFC in the context of wilderness and WSR designation would allow for ecological progression of riparian vegetation that would promote increased fish habitat values such as cover and instream complexity. - Managing the RTR in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the WSR Act may preclude some active restoration activities. - Complete removal of the Page Springs gauging weir would increase redband trout migration opportunity. However, this would increase opportunity for colonization by nonnative competing or predatory fish species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The RTR would consist of public lands on the Donner und Blitzen River and its tributaries upstream of the confluence with Fish Creek to the longitudinal extent of current and future redband trout distribution. - Riparian and aquatic habitats would be managed for an advanced ecological status, promoting maintenance or improvement of fish habitat values such as cover and instream complexity. - As in all Alternatives, the RTR would be managed in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the WSR Act with the same effects. - Coordinated assessment and implementation to modify (or remove) the Page Springs gauging weir would improve redband trout migration while limiting potential colonization by nonnative competing or predatory fish species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The boundaries of the RTR would be the same as in Alternative B. - As in Alternative B, riparian and aquatic habitats would be managed for an advanced ecological status, with the same effects. - As in all Alternatives, the RTR would be managed in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the WSR Act, with the same effects. - As in Alternative B, fish migration associated with the Page Springs gauging weir would be addressed, with the same effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The boundaries of the RTR would be the same as in Alternatives B and C. - As in Alternatives Band C, riparian and aquatic habitats would be managed for an advanced ecological status, with the same effects. - As in all Alternatives, the RTR would be managed in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the WSR Act, with the same effects. - As in Alternatives B and C, fish migration associated with the Page Springs gauging weir would be addressed, with the same effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The RTR would consist of public lands on the mainstem Donner und Blitzen River upstream of the confluence with Fish Creek, a lesser extent of the redband trout distribution than the Proposed RMP and Alternatives B and C. - Riparian and aquatic habitats would be managed for a diversity of fish habitat values, with the same effects as the other Alternatives. - As in all Alternatives, the RTR would be managed in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the WSR Act, with the same effects. - As in the Proposed RMP and Alternatives B and C, fish migration associated with the Page Springs gauging weir would be addressed, with the same effects.

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (See Section 4.8 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model to locate paleontological localities would not be created. - The associated sample inventory would not be implemented. - Research could include surface collection of fossils, cumulative surface ground disturbance of up to 200 square meters, and deeper excavation blocks of up to 100 square meters. - On-site and off-site interpretive facilities could be constructed. - Result in construction of road pull-outs, kiosks or sign bases, and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model would be implemented in areas of intensive recreation use. - The associated sample inventory would be implemented only in these target areas. - Research could include surface collection of fossils, cumulative surface ground disturbance of up to 20 square meters, and deeper excavation blocks of up to ten square meters. - Only off-site interpretative displays and other products would be created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model would be created for the entire Planning Area. - A sample inventory would be implemented. - Research could include surface collection of fossils, cumulative surface ground disturbance of up to 100 square meters, and deeper excavation blocks of up to 50 square meters. - Off-site interpretive facilities would be constructed and self-guided walking tour brochures would be created. - Result in construction of road pullouts, kiosks or sign bases, and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model would be created for the entire Planning Area. - A sample inventory would be implemented. - Research could include surface collection of fossils, cumulative surface ground disturbance of up to 200 square meters, and deeper excavation blocks of up to 100 square meters. - Off and on-site interpretive facilities would be constructed and self-guided walking tour brochures would be created. - Result in construction of road pullouts, kiosks or sign bases, and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model would be created for the entire Planning Area. - A sample inventory would be implemented. - Sample inventories would be increased. - Research could include surface collection of fossils, cumulative surface ground disturbance of greater than 400 square meters, and deeper excavation blocks of greater than 200 square meters to support increased natural history tourism. - On-site and off-site interpretive facilities would be constructed and self-guided walking tour brochures would be created. - Result in construction of road pullouts, kiosks or sign bases, and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area.
--	--	---	---	---

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
--	---	--	---	--

CULTURAL RESOURCES (See Section 4.9 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model to locate significant sites would be created. - Proactive inventories would occur at a rate of no less than 500 acres per year. - Research could consist of numerous 50 by 50 centimeter test excavations, excavation blocks of up to 100 square meters in extent, and backhoe trenches measuring up to 20 meters long and four meters deep. - No physical protection measures other than a caretaker and restricted access at Riddle Brothers Ranch National Historic District would be implemented. - Law enforcement surveillance and monitoring of certain significant sites and within wildland fire areas would occur. - A land trade to acquire a private portion of a regionally significant site in Catlow Valley is in the initial stages. - Stabilization, restoration, reconstruction and maintenance of structures within the Riddle Brothers Ranch National Historic District, and inventory and assessment of other historic structures would occur. - On-site and off-site interpretation could be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model to locate significant sites would be limited to recreation use areas in the Planning Area. - Proactive inventories would occur at a rate of no less than 500 acres per year. - The type/size of research disturbance would be similar to Alternative A; however, it would be implemented on a limited basis. - No physical protection measures would be implemented at significant sites. - Law enforcement surveillance and monitoring certain significant sites and within wildland fire areas would occur. - Land acquisitions to bring significant sites into public ownership would be pursued. - Maintenance of structures within the Riddle Brothers Ranch National Historic District, and inventory and assessment of other historic structures would occur. - On-site interpretation and interpretive facilities construction would not be implemented. Only off-site interpretive displays would be created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model to locate significant sites would be created. - A sample inventory to test the model and locate sites would be implemented. - Proactive inventories would occur at a rate of no less than 500 acres per year. - The type/size of research disturbance would be similar to Alternative A. This type of research would be focused on significant cultural sites where other resource conflicts occur. - Physical protection measures would be implemented at significant sites. - Law enforcement surveillance and monitoring certain significant sites and within wildland fire areas would occur. - Land acquisitions to bring significant sites into public ownership would be pursued. - Stabilization, restoration, reconstruction and maintenance of structures within the Riddle Brothers Ranch National Historic District, and inventory and assessment of other historic structures would occur. - On-site and off-site interpretation could be implemented and could result in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model to locate significant sites would be implemented throughout the Planning Area. - A sample inventory to test the model and locate sites would be implemented. - Proactive inventory would occur at a rate of no less than 500 acres per year. - The type/size of research disturbance would be similar to Alternative A. This type of research would be focused on significant cultural sites where other resource conflicts occur. - Physical protection measures would be implemented at significant sites. - Law enforcement surveillance and monitoring certain significant sites and within wildland fire areas would occur. - Land acquisitions to bring significant sites into public ownership would be pursued. - Stabilization, restoration, reconstruction and maintenance of structures within the Riddle Brothers Ranch National Historic District, and inventory and assessment of other historic structures would occur. - On-site and off-site interpretation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A predictive model would be implemented the same as under the Proposed RMP. - A sample inventory would be implemented the same as under the Proposed RMP. - Sample inventory acreage would be increased to account for increased commodity use. - The type/size of research disturbance would be similar to Alternative A. This type of research would be increased at significant cultural sites in order to support increased heritage tourism. - Physical protection measures would be implemented at significant sites. - Law enforcement surveillance and monitoring of certain significant sites and within wildland fire areas would occur. - Land acquisitions to bring significant sites into public ownership would not be pursued. - Stabilization, restoration, reconstruction and maintenance of structures within the Riddle Brothers Ranch National Historic District, and inventory and assessment of other historic structures would occur. - On-site and off-site
--	--	---	---	---

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
implemented and could result in construction of road pullouts, kiosks or sign bases, and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area.		construction of road pullouts, kiosks or sign bases and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area.	could be implemented and could result in the same effects as Alternative C.	interpretation would be increased under this alternative and could result in construction of road pullouts, kiosks or sign bases, and placement of interpretive signs at various locations in the Planning Area.

NATIVE AMERICAN TRADITIONAL PRACTICES (See Section 4.10 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The BLM would continue active consultation/coordination with the Burns Paiute Tribe and other tribes. - Traditional Cultural Properties would be nominated or found eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and known burial sites would be monitored and protected. - Plants of cultural, traditional, and economic importance would be inventoried. - The Burns Paiute Tribe and other tribes would be consulted on vegetative management projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Same as Alternative A except the amount of active consultation/coordination and inventory could decrease because of decreased commodity use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Same as Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Same as Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Same as Alternative A except the amount of active consultation/coordination and inventory would increase because of increased commodity use.
---	--	--	--	--

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
--	---	--	---	--

VISUAL RESOURCES (See Section 4.11 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management actions could affect existing visual resources, depending on the VRM class. - Landscapes in WSAs, wild WSRs, wilderness, and the Steens Mountain ACEC would be preserved and protected. - Moderate and major landscape modifications would be allowed in some areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The landscape would appear more natural as the signs of management activities become less obvious. - Landscapes in WSAs, wild WSRs, and wilderness would be preserved and protected. - Management actions would be allowed if VRM Class II objectives would be met. - Moderate and major landscape modifications would not be allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscapes in WSAs, wild WSRs, wilderness, and the Steens Mountain ACEC would be preserved and protected. - Visual resources and naturalness of the four parcels found to have wilderness characteristics would be protected. - The existing landscape character would be retained in some areas, while moderate changes would be allowed in others. - Major landscape modifications would not be allowed. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moderate landscape changes would be allowed in the WJMA. - In the remainder of the CMPA the existing landscape would be retained. Only small, nonevident management changes would be allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing landscape character would be retained in some areas, while moderate changes would be allowed in others. - Landscapes in WSAs, wild WSRs, and wilderness would be preserved and protected. - Major landscape modifications would be allowed in VRM Class IV areas. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moderate landscape changes would be allowed in the WJMA within one half mile of the Steens Loop Road. - Major landscape modifications would be allowed in the remainder of the WJMA. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A variety of management actions would be allowed that could or would result in form, line, color, or texture contrasts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management actions that could or would affect existing visual resources would be allowed. - Landscapes in WSAs, wild WSRs, and wilderness would be preserved and protected. - Moderate and major landscape modifications would be allowed in some areas. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Major modification of the landscape would be allowed in the WJMA. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing landscape character would be retained in the Trout Creek Mountains and around Denio Creek.

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC VALUES (See Section 4.12 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contracts for services and sale of products would continue to be available to local residents as need and conditions permit. - Public and private partnerships to achieve shared economic objectives would continue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commodity production on public land within the Planning Area curtailed. - Most social and economic values would cease to be viable. - Tourism and recreation dollars targeted for local businesses would be minimal. - Potential loss of revenues from mining, energy, agricultural production, and disposal of lands; decline in revenues from recreation and tourism. - Local contracts and employment would decline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commodity use allowed at levels maintained through time and that contribute to the stability of the local livestock and mining industries. - Restrictions on commodity production when natural resources threatened. - Alternative attempts to maintain stability in local economy; however, it would still have effect on commodity production, realty use authorizations, land tenure, renewable energy, and recreation, thereby resulting in a decline of revenues. - Emphasis on targeting local contracts would benefit local economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable commodity use and resource protection that promotes tourism encouraged. - Emphasis placed on local cooperative, collaborative processes and cooperative agreements involving services and products available locally. - Economy would be stable and result in long-term economic viability for regional populace. - Would be effects on the natural environment such as soils, vegetation, water resources, and wildlife. - Some effects to commodity production, realty use authorizations, land tenure, and renewable energy, which may benefit the local economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commodity production, local contracts, and tourism emphasized. - This alternative least restrictive on commodity uses and would have effects on the natural environment such as soils, vegetation, water resources, and wildlife. - Minimal limiting effects on commodity production, land authorizations, land tenure, renewable energy, and recreation. - Contracts targeted for local businesses and individuals to the extent possible. - Tourism and recreation would be managed to bring in maximum dollars. - Industries that would increase the regional economy would be courted.
---	---	--	--	---

ENERGY AND MINERALS (See Section 4.13 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All 28 percent of the Planning Area that is available for designation as open or closed would be open to locatable and leasable mineral exploration and development and open to consideration for salable mineral materials development on a case-by-case basis. - 72 percent of the Planning Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The entire Planning Area would be closed to mineral exploration and development except where required by law or where essential to protect human safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 13 percent of the Planning Area would be open to locatable and leasable mineral exploration and development and open to consideration for salable mineral materials development on a case-by-case basis. Areas open to leasing would be open under standard stipulations. - 15 percent of the Planning Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 27 percent of the Planning Area would be open to locatable mineral exploration and development and 1 percent would be closed. - 28 percent of the Planning Area would be open to leasable mineral exploration and development with no acres closed, 9,355 acres open with NSO, 241,683 acres open with seasonal or other special 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minerals management would be conducted the same as under Alternative A; therefore, the effects would be the same.
---	--	---	---	---

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
is Not Available due to Congressional withdrawal or the WSA IMP, including the nonimpairment criteria.		would be closed to locatable, leasable, and saleable mineral exploration and development. - 72 percent of the Planning Area is Not Available due to Congressional withdrawal or the WSA IMP, including the nonimpairment criteria.	stipulations or both, and 216,793 acres open with standard stipulations. - 27 percent of the Planning Area would be open to consideration for salable mineral materials development on a case-by-case basis and 1 percent would be closed. - 72 percent of the Planning Area is Not Available due to Congressional withdrawal or the WSA IMP, including the nonimpairment criteria.	

WILD HORSES AND BURROS (See Section 4.14 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- The Alvord-Tule Springs HMA would not be combined with the Coyote Lake HMA. The two HMAs would continue to be managed separately. - The current AMLs would be retained for all HMAs. - Forage needs of wild horses would be met under current management strategies. - Drought might require temporary adjustments in horse numbers in order to meet other resource objectives. - If vegetation management objectives would not be met, permanent adjustments in AMLs might be necessary. - As wild horses increase in	- Combining the current 343,201 acre Alvord-Tule Springs HMA with the Coyote Lake HMA would result in the 588,420 acre newly named Alvord-Tule Springs-Coyote Lake HMA. - The Kiger HMA would be reduced from its current 38,359 acres to 26,873 acres. The South Steens HMA would be reduced from its current 127,838 acres to 102,342 acres. - Kiger Herd Area would be created. - An adjustment in the South Steens Herd Area would be necessary. The existing Herd Area would be increased to reflect the decreased size of the HMA.	- Effects would be the same as those described for Alternative B.	- The effect of boundary and acreage adjustments for Objective 1 would be the same as for Alternative B, with the following exception: the South Steens HMA would be reduced in acreage from its current 127,838 acres to 126,732 acres. - Kiger Herd Area would be created, depicting the loss of public lands resulting from the Steens land exchanges. - An adjustment in the South Steens Herd Area would be necessary in response to changes in the HMA. The existing Herd Area would be increased. - Effects of all other management actions would be the same as	- The effect of boundary and acreage adjustments for Objective 1 would be the same as those described for Alternative B, with the following exception: The South Steens HMA would be increased in acreage from its current 127,838 acres to 182,485 acres. - Effects of all other management actions would be the same as Alternative B. - Since management emphasizes commodity production, differences in preference mean that any excess forage could be allocated to livestock and/or economically important wildlife rather than to wild horses.
---	---	---	--	---

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>number above AMLs with no corresponding reduction in livestock numbers, key areas can become overgrazed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Horses would be gathered every three to four years. - Current public lands water sources would be maintained. - Legal access to critical private water sources currently used by wild horses, other than those identified in existing herd management plans, would not be pursued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current AMLs and wild horse forage allocations would be retained in all HMAs. - The effects of any adjustments in AML on gathering frequency would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. - The decreased size of the Kiger and South Steens HMAs would warrant consideration of downward adjustments in the AMLs and forage allocations. - The addition of herd health as one of the measures to consider before initiating herd gathering would provide greater management flexibility than actions provided by alternative A. - Besides gathering, other approved methods of population control would be allowed. - The management action to "normally" reduce herd numbers to the low end of the AML would provide more options for herd management than would occur under alternative A. - Gathering excess horses would continue, but the time period between gatherings could potentially be increased. - The option to modify the male/female sex ratio from 50:50 to 60:40 could increase the time between gatherings due to a 		<p>Alternative B. However, the management emphasis on balanced uses and cooperative management practices means that wild horses would not be given preference over other uses for increasing forage allocations, and thus AMLs. Horses might need to be gathered more often in order to meet the objectives for other resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vegetation treatments would benefit livestock and wildlife more than wild horses. - Competition for available forage would be increased. - Permanent adjustments in AMLs may be necessary, as more emphasis would be placed on forage use by livestock. - The effects of Objective 5 would be the same as those for Alternative B with the following exception. Management actions to acquire legal access to critical private water sources would not be conducted.

<p>Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.</p>	<p>Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.</p>	<p>Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.</p>	<p>Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.</p>	<p>Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.</p>
<p>slower annual population growth rate than the average of 20 percent. - Allowing for the introduction of horses from outside the HMA could help to improve herd health by increasing genome diversity.</p>				

GRAZING MANAGEMENT (See Section 4.15 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<p>- The authorization of TNR grazing use during years of favorable growing conditions would provide additional forage for use by livestock.</p>	<p>- Grazing use would be discontinued in the Planning Area. This would preclude the achievement of Objective 1.</p>	<p>- Grazing use would be reduced in the CMPA and AMU to "minimal sustainable," a level lower than Alternative A, while still allowing livestock grazing operations to continue and be economically viable. - TNR grazing use would not be authorized. - Forage quality could decline in nonnative seedings in areas where livestock utilization is measured at 40 percent or less. - Grazing use would not exceed the amount of permitted use in any allotment within the Planning Area.</p>	<p>- Management actions relating to the application of livestock management practices, administrative solutions, and rangeland projects would provide more flexibility in the use of available grazing resources than under Alternatives A, B, and C, and would therefore be expected to increase the utilization of available grazing resources.</p>	<p>- The amount of livestock grazing on public land would be maximized, creating more revenue from grazing fees and more income for grazing permittees. - More range improvements would be constructed, creating more jobs for contractors.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
--	---	--	---	--

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (See Section 4.16 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suppression of all wildfires would maximize short-term public safety, as well as protection of private lands and areas with important resource values. - Short-term firefighter safety would be increased. - Areas burned by wildfire would be minimized. - Long-term firefighter and public safety could be compromised. - Continued suppression of all wildfires would continue to allow accumulation of fuels throughout the Planning Area. - Wildfires that escape initial attack would have a greater potential to burn larger areas at high intensities, causing severe alterations to plant and animal communities in and adjacent to the burned area. - Average fire size in the drier Wyoming big sagebrush plant communities would decrease from current levels. - Fuels treatments may have little effect on the average fire size in the higher elevation plant communities because of the aggressive suppression action. Prescribed fire activity in these plant communities would reintroduce fire into the system, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only fires that directly threaten firefighter or public safety, private property or areas of significant resource values would be suppressed. Other fires would be evaluated for resource benefits and managed accordingly. - Fire rehabilitation actions could be greater because of the reduced suppression activity and potentially larger fire size. - Reliance on native plant species would increase the cost of rehabilitation treatments. - The rate of recovery in areas where native seedings would be used may be longer compared to desirable introduced perennial plants. - Prioritization of suppression efforts would help assure that firefighting resources would be properly and effectively assigned to fires. - Development of a plan to manage wildfires for resource benefits would also help to prioritize firefighting efforts. - Partnerships and cooperative agreements with adjacent private and public land owners would be sought to more effectively manage wildland fires for resource benefits. Cooperation with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects would be the same as Alternative A in the WUI. - Without mechanical fuels treatments or prescribed fire, fuels would continue to accumulate in the WUI. Fuels accumulation within this area would increase the risk to human life and private property. - Designation of the WUI would occur in the same manner as in Alternative B. - Direct effects of fire management activity outside of the WUI would be the same as alternative B. - Techniques used to stabilize and rehabilitate areas following wildfire would be the same as Alternative A. Only native plant species would be utilized in the rehabilitation efforts. The effects of using native species would be the same as Alternative B with some possible exceptions. Mechanical seeding equipment may allow for better establishment and survival of seeded species in some cases. Germination and growth following drilling may be better than by broadcast methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This Alternative would exhibit a combination of effects from Alternatives A, B, C, and E. Firefighter and public safety would be the highest priority in fire management decision making. However, fire would be reintroduced into the ecosystem through prescribed fire and wildland fire use for resource benefit. Fires that do not pose a significant risk to firefighter safety, public safety, or private land would be evaluated for wildland fire use. - Areas burned by wildfires would be evaluated for the need for rehabilitation. The greatest priority in the fire rehabilitation projects would be to protect the soil resources. - Rehabilitation projects would occur on sites with low potential for natural recovery. - Desirable introduced plant communities would be established following wildfire in areas dominated by undesirable introduced plants (e.g., cheatgrass) or in areas where the potential for recovery of native plants, residual or seeded, would be low. - Cooperative projects would be developed with adjacent public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The effects of this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative A, except that greater emphasis would be directed toward contract firefighting resources to support suppression actions and local economics.
--	--	---	--	--

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>and overall acreage burned would increase over current levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fire management under this alternative would have little direct effect on undesirable introduced plant species, especially cheatgrass. - The emphasis on suppression would help to reduce the area burned in locations dominated by introduced annuals. However, the emphasis on suppression may lead to an increase in the amount of ground disturbed through suppression actions. - Equipment may potentially transport undesirable plant seeds to these disturbed areas, increasing the risk of weed establishment. - Fuels reduction treatments would reduce the influence of woody vegetation on the associated herbaceous understory. - Herbaceous plant cover and density would increase after fuels treatment. 	<p>neighbors would increase the likelihood of utilizing natural barriers and reduce the need for large scale suppression efforts if the fire threatens the management area boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Woody vegetation may increase at the expense of associated understory plants and modify the habitat of many wildlife species. As woody vegetation dominates the sites, understory species may be lost from the plant community or suppressed to the point that the plants could not recover following fire. The dominance of woody vegetation also would increase the intensity of the fire, making suppression difficult if action must be taken. 		<p>and private land owners. These projects would increase the efficiency of fuels treatments and work to treat fuels on a landscape scale instead of by geopolitical boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of fire suppression should be lowest in this alternative. - The number of acres burned or converted to a herbaceous plant dominated community would be less than in Alternatives B and C, but more than in Alternative A. 	

LANDS AND REALTY (See Section 4.17 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>
- Land tenure adjustment would be limited to land identified for sale or exchange in the existing land use plans which have not already been conveyed.	- All lands would be protected from commodity-producing activities likely to occur if conveyed out of public ownership.	- All lands in Zone 1, 1A, and 1B would be retained in public ownership and would be protected from disposal, precluding commodity-producing activities.	- Lands in Zone 1A would be protected from any form of disposal.	- Maximized disposal opportunities may result in the potential for loss of some lands with natural or public values, or conflicts with existing uses and
	- There would be no exchanges,		- There would be flexibility in Zone 1 to exchange public lands	

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lands in Zone 1 containing important public values would be protected from disposal, but there would be no flexibility in this zone to exchange or sell public lands; therefore, opportunity and ability would be limited for acquisition of lands with high public values and to resolve long-term inadvertent and unauthorized uses, survey errors or hiatuses. - Land sales and other disposals in Zone 3 would be considered only after the possibilities for exchange have been exhausted, further limiting disposal opportunity and expediency. - Lands may be acquired in any zone on a case-by-case basis. This policy has the potential of wasting valuable acquisition funding and effort in areas containing little public land and resources, as there would be no focus or priority for acquisition. - The historical trend of a net loss of tax exempt public lands in Harney County in favor of taxable private ownership (See Cumulative Impacts) would be expected to continue into the future. This trend would be expected to diminish somewhat as public lands would be disposed of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thereby limiting the opportunity and ability to acquire lands with natural values. - With no zones to provide basic direction, special resource values would be the only factor focusing and prioritizing acquisition. - There would be a net gain of public lands in the Planning Area resulting in a loss of county tax revenues from private land acquisition. More conversion and development of existing private lands may be expected, resulting in higher assessed values on those lands. - Overall, there would be some consolidation of public lands by fee purchases, but no such opportunity for private lands due to the prohibition on disposals and the inflexibility of this alternative. - The protection of natural values places a prohibition on land disposal actions, commodity withdrawals, and realty use authorizations; therefore, the opportunity to abate an unauthorized use by these means or to provide lands for community expansion and public purposes would not be available. - Implementation of this alternative would not meet management goal objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There would be no flexibility in these zones to exchange or sell public lands, thereby limiting the opportunity and ability to acquire lands with important natural values and to resolve long-term, inadvertent unauthorized uses, survey errors, or hiatuses, or to provide lands for community expansion and public purposes. Disposals opportunities may result in loss of some lands with natural or public values. - Acquisition of less than fee interests would be further focused to Zones 1, 1A, and 1B by prohibition of less than fee acquisitions in Zones 2 and 3. - Most known special resource values would be included in the retention zones (Zone 1, 1A and 1B). - Large blocks of public lands without special values were also zoned for retention (Zone 1). Thus, without flexibility, Zones 1 and 1A provide absolute constraints on land disposal actions. - Constraints on land exchanges by other resource values would be somewhat less in Zone 1B where flexibility to exchange lands would be provided by the Steens Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for a specific set of public resource values. - More lands would be available for exchanges in Zones 2 and 3, providing additional opportunity for exchanges outside the CMPA. Additional disposal flexibility and opportunity may result in losses of some lands with natural or public values. - Restricting R&PP disposals in Zone 2A to ten acres per transaction will conserve limited public lands in this zone while still accommodating essential community facilities such as small schools, fire stations, and community halls. This acreage restriction may also reduce the possibility of development of R&PP conveyed lands for purposes not authorized by the R&PP Act. - Most known special resource values would be included in the retention zones (Zones 1, 1A, and 1B). The constraints of special resource values in Zone 1 and 1B would be relaxed by the flexibility included in this alternative. - In the case of exchanges, special resource values may be vulnerable to disposal in most zones, but would be weighed against the resource values to be gained in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> values. - In the case of exchanges, special resource values may be vulnerable to disposal in most zones, but would be weighed against the commodity-producing values to be gained in the exchange. - Acquisition opportunities would be focused only in Zones 1, 1A, and 1B and only by exchange. - Although relative acreages in Zones 1, 1A, and 1B would generally remain constant, there would be the potential for an overall net loss of public lands in the Planning Area due to liberalized disposal possibilities with a corresponding increase in county the tax base and conversion of lands to commodity production resulting in increased tax revenues. - Overall, there would be a high opportunity for land disposal, consolidation of private lands, and facilitating of commodity production. - Lands containing public values could be lost and some areas of public lands could potentially be fragmented. - Designated avoidance/exclusion zones would be limited to key special areas under this

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>over time; thus, fewer lands and opportunities would be available. The overall effect would be a slight net loss of public lands in the Planning Area over the life of the plan, though not as much as during the last 20 years, resulting in a corresponding increase in county tax revenues. Some of these conveyed public lands would be converted to alfalfa, crested wheatgrass, or other development that would not have occurred under public ownership resulting in a higher assessed value on the land, further improving county tax revenues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most known special resource values would be included in the retention zone (Zone 1), and would therefore be protected from disposal actions. - In the case of exchanges, special resource values in these zones may be vulnerable to disposal, but would be weighed against the resource values to be gained in the exchange. - The long-term effects of corridor designation would be the centralizing of facilities, which would confine surface and visual disturbance, as well as other effects, to existing corridors and ROWs; however, this could make 	<p>relative to ROWs and realty uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The most likely effect of this alternative would be an increase in unauthorized use and illegal activities because the public would be unable to utilize public lands through legal means. Without some level of control, these uses could potentially damage sensitive resource values. - All unauthorized uses would be terminated and none would be made to accommodate any uses. Therefore, no flexibility would be provided for options to resolve situations. - Facilities and structures would be removed, but restoration of lands would otherwise be by natural processes unless resource degradation necessitates active restoration. This may result in slow restoration of the lands with possible resource degradation in some areas. In most cases, however, natural values would be promoted by this alternative. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disallowing leasing and reopening of the Fields airstrip may force aviators to land in unsafe, undeveloped areas, thereby causing new resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the case of exchanges, special resource values may be vulnerable to disposal in some zones, but would be weighed against the resource values to be gained in the exchange. - There would be a slight net gain of public lands in the Planning Area with a corresponding loss in county tax revenues, since private lands and values acquired would exceed the values of public lands being disposed. - Overall, there would be some opportunity for consolidation of both public and private lands, although somewhat limited by the availability of disposal lands and inflexibility of this alternative. - Generally, areas where the most demand exists for this type of authorization (i.e., areas of existing human influences and activity) would remain open or would be in avoidance areas where authorizations would be possible but would be heavily mitigated if alternative locations were not available. - Generally, the primary effect of this alternative would be to allow basic infrastructure and necessities such as residential roads and driveways, a rural airstrip, utility distribution 	<p>exchange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquisition effort and funding would be focused primarily at Zones 1, 1A, and 1B. - Acquisition of less than fee interests would be further focused to Zones 1A and 1B by prohibition of less than fee acquisitions in Zones 1, 2, and 3. - Generally, over the long term there would be no expected change in the ratio of public lands to private lands in the Planning Area due to a balanced variety of land tenure actions including both acquisitions and disposals. - Due to additional public land disposals in neighboring planning areas, an overall net loss of public lands in Harney County would continue consistent with the historical trend. Disposal of public lands, some of which would be converted to commodity production under private ownership, should result in higher assessed values on those lands. For these reasons, county tax revenues would be expected to increase. - Overall, there would be balanced opportunity for consolidation of both public and private lands while protecting, acquiring, and promoting important public values. - Generally, the primary effect of 	<p>alternative, which provides fewer constraints to realty land use activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The emphasis on access for commodity production would allow for management, extraction, or use of commodity resources. - Opportunities to provide access to public land with high public resource values would be forgone. - This alternative has the potential to affect resource values and promote trespassing. - Generally, the primary effect of this alternative would be that most ROWs, realty land uses, and renewable energy development would be allowable and accepted, while only the most critical sensitive resources and areas would be protected and in some cases affected by this type of development. Large scale projects and activities such as major transmission lines, energy development, and military maneuvers would not only be possible, but encouraged outside of corridors and avoidance and exclusion areas. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Corridor designations would be

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>critical energy and communications facilities more vulnerable to destruction through terrorist activities or natural disasters.</p> <p>- Implementation of this alternative would promote access for BLM administrative purposes, but efforts to secure public access would be limited.</p> <p>- No prioritization or identification of access needs would be provided in existing planning documents. Therefore, little focus or direction would be provided to proactively acquire access.</p> <p>- This alternative provides flexibility in most cases to terminate or authorize the use, except for conveyances of land, to resolve an unauthorized use.</p>	<p>damage and creating safety hazards such as landings on public roads and highways. Without a legal airstrip, fewer aircraft may be in the area, thereby minimizing noise and other effects. Rejecting the lease proposal would also minimize any potential liabilities to the United States associated with operation and maintenance of the airstrip.</p>	<p>service, filming, and short-term storage sites, while limiting large scale projects and activities outside of corridors such as major transmission lines, energy development, and military maneuvers would be limited.</p> <p>- Demand for realty use authorizations would decline under this alternative since commodity production such as mining, tourism, and other development.</p> <p>- The actions and effects of this alternative regarding legal access acquisition would be to actively reclaim closed roads, thereby speeding recovery and stabilization of the land affected by road disturbances.</p> <p>- Where an exchange conforms with the land tenure provisions of this alternative a limited option exists to resolve agricultural or occupancy trespass. This option, in limited circumstances, could promote acquisition and protection of natural values. However, sensitive resource values could possibly be lost in such an exchange.</p> <p><i>AMU</i></p> <p>- The unoccupied PP&L corridor would not be designated. This</p>	<p>this alternative would be that many ROWs, realty land uses, and renewable energy projects would be allowable and accepted in open areas while protecting sensitive resources and areas where they exist. Large scale projects and activities such as major transmission lines, energy development, and military maneuvers would be possible outside of corridors and avoidance and exclusion areas, but may be limited or restricted, depending upon location and nature of the proposal.</p> <p>- Designated avoidance/exclusion zones would be limited to key special areas under this alternative, which provides fewer constraints to realty land use activity.</p> <p>- If necessary to secure access, construction of roads around private lands would be an available option, but would be limited to areas where critical access needs have been identified.</p> <p>- This alternative provides proactive direction and emphasizes use of land tenure actions to secure and maintain access.</p> <p>- This alternative provides a variety of options to resolve unauthorized use, with some limitations. This flexibility could</p>	<p>maximized in this alternative to provide a variety of different route alternatives and would have an increased width to provide additional siting flexibility within the corridors.</p> <p>- Leasing the Fields airstrip would provide aviators a safer, more centralized place to land and take off. It could also improve public safety and limit resource damage by reducing aircraft operations in undeveloped areas. Reopening and improving the airstrip could also result in increased aircraft traffic and related visitation to the area. It would have local effects such and increased noise, soil and vegetative disturbance, and possible fuel or pesticide spills from aircraft spraying operations. Since the lands would be identified for disposal, the lessee could be assured of definitive tenure if the lands would be conveyed to him for that purpose through an Airport Conveyance or other disposal. Also, since the lands would be identified for immediate disposal, the United States' liabilities associated with operation and maintenance of the airstrip would be minimized.</p>

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
		<p>would leave two alternative north-south corridors and a single east-west option through the Planning Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requiring major facilities to locate in corridors may involve costly route changes in adjacent planning areas to align a facility with the designated corridor in the Planning Area. These reroutes could also result in additional surface disturbance, effects to visual resources, and proliferation of separate ROWs. - Leasing the Fields airstrip would provide aviators a safer, more centralized place to land and take off. It could also improve public safety and limit resource damage by reducing aircraft operations in undeveloped areas but also could result in increased aircraft traffic and related visitation to the area. It would have local effects such as increased noise, soil and vegetative disturbance, and possible fuel or pesticide spills from aircraft spraying operations. Since the airstrip would be in a retention zone, the airstrip and the effects of leasing would continue indefinitely. It could also expose the United States to hazardous materials, safety and other liabilities associated with 	<p>result in effects to sensitive resource values. It may also have some potential to promote trespass when the trespasser knows that the use may be ultimately authorized. The higher costs of trespassing versus legal authorization may deter most trespassers, thereby limiting this potential.</p> <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This alternative is in keeping with BLM policy, which encourages proponents of large scale facilities to locate in a corridor when possible. - This alternative would provide aviators a safer, more centralized place to land and take off. It could also improve public safety and limit resource damage by reducing aircraft operations in undeveloped areas but could also result in increased aircraft traffic and related visitation to the area and have local effects such as increased noise, soil and vegetative disturbance, and possible fuel or pesticide spills from aircraft spraying operations. Since the lands would be identified for disposal by airport conveyance or exchange, the lessee could be assured of definitive tenure if the lands would be conveyed to him 	

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
		long-term operation of such a facility on its lands.	for that purpose. Also, since the lands would be identified for immediate disposal, the United States' liabilities associated with operation and maintenance of the airstrip would be minimized. - Effects to bighorn sheep from communications development would continue at Buckskin Mountain but would be minimized by a road closure to the site. Additional development of the site may result in additional effects to bighorn sheep. Further, depending upon the proposed use, co-location of new communications uses in existing facilities may be possible, thereby reducing surface disturbance and frequency of visits to the site.	

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.

TRANSPORTATION AND ROADS (See Section 4.18 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- There would be no new effects on maintenance or degree of access.	- Road closures and decreased maintenance would reduce motorized access to public lands. - Approximately 157 miles of routes within the CMPA are proposed to be closed. - Decreased road maintenance would result in lower maintenance costs.	- Twenty-six miles of motorized routes would be closed, reducing motorized access to public lands. - Road closures and decreased maintenance would result in decreased maintenance costs.	- Six miles of routes would be closed, reducing access to public lands. - Expanded winter access for motorized uses and motorized access to dispersed campsites would increase public access.	- No route closures would be proposed for this alternative. - Increased access and road maintenance combined with less restrictive management could increase use of the road system as well as maintenance costs. - Expanded winter access and motorized access to dispersed campsites would also increase use of the road system.
---	---	--	--	--

OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES (OHVs) (See Section 4.19 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>
- Maintaining the existing OHV designations and the seasonal closure on the Steens and surrounding lands would not affect OHV and mechanized vehicle use.	- OHV and mechanized vehicle use would be concentrated on the open routes, resulting in congestion and reduced recreation quality. - OHV and mechanized vehicle use could be displaced to areas and routes outside of the Planning Area.	- OHV and mechanized vehicle play (open) areas would not be available, but most roads and ways would be open. - Designation of the four parcels found to have wilderness characteristics as limited to designated roads would protect the naturalness and opportunities of solitude in the parcels.	- Opportunities for OHV and mechanized vehicle use would generally be available, including one open, play area.	- OHV and mechanized vehicle use and play opportunities would be maximized.
<i>CMPA</i> - Closing the Steens Mountain Wilderness eliminates OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Eliminating cross-country travel restricts all OHV and mechanized vehicle use to designated routes.	<i>CMPA</i> - Closing the Steens Mountain Wilderness eliminates OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Eliminating cross-country travel restricts all OHV and mechanized vehicle use to designated routes.	<i>CMPA</i> - Closing the Steens Mountain Wilderness eliminates OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Eliminating cross-country travel restricts all OHV and mechanized vehicle use to designated routes.	<i>CMPA</i> - Closing the Steens Mountain Wilderness eliminates OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Eliminating cross-country travel restricts all OHV and mechanized vehicle use to designated routes. - Closing six miles of roads in the CMPA would not affect OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Seasonally closing the core of the CMPA to OHV and mechanized vehicle users could displace them to other areas. - Seeking cooperative agreements	<i>CMPA</i> - Closing the Steens Mountain Wilderness eliminates OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Eliminating cross-country travel restricts all OHV and mechanized vehicle use to designated routes. - OHV and mechanized vehicle use would not be affected by road closures. - Seasonally closing the upper Steens Mountain area would also not affect motorized or mechanized use.
<i>AMU</i> - The Pueblo and Trout Creek Mountains would not be closed seasonally.	- Closing the Steens Loop Road would reduce access and the routes available for use.	- Closing the Rooster Comb to motorized vehicles only would		<i>AMU</i>

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seasonally closing the entire CMPA would eliminate all motorized and mechanized use during the winter and spring and would displace users (especially snowmobilers). <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closing the Alvord Desert playa would displace OHVs and mechanized vehicles to similar areas in adjacent states. - Seasonally closing the Pueblo and Trout Creek Mountains would minimally affect OHV and mechanized vehicle users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> close the Steens Loop Road to through traffic. Closing other roads in the CMPA would reduce the routes available for OHV and mechanized vehicle use. - Seasonally closing the core of the CMPA to OHV and mechanized vehicle users would displace them to other areas. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closing the Alvord Desert playa would displace OHVs and mechanized vehicles to similar areas in adjacent states. - Seasonally closing the Pueblo and Trout Creek Mountains would minimally affect OHV and mechanized vehicle users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> with OHV and mechanized vehicle clubs may decrease resource degradation and user conflicts. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seasonally closing the Pueblo and Trout Creek Mountains would minimally affect OHV and mechanized vehicle users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunities for OHV and mechanized vehicle use would be maintained or improved. - The Pueblo and Trout Creek Mountains would not be closed seasonally.

RECREATION (See Section 4.20 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Planning Area</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADA access would be improved. - Current management would not affect recreation. - Existing developed sites, campgrounds, and facilities would be maintained. - Continuing current BCB management would not increase or decrease recreation opportunities. - Continuing current High Desert Trail management and the Desert Trail Association MOU would not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADA access would be improved. - SRMAs would not be designated. - Developed recreation opportunities would be reduced, while dispersed recreation opportunities may be either increased or decreased. - Existing developed sites, campgrounds, and facilities would be maintained. - Eliminating the BCBs would reduce tourism and visitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADA access would be improved. - The CMPA, Pueblo Mountains, and Trout Creek Mountains would be intensively managed for recreation. - Sites where recreation use affects resource values would be rehabilitated or closed. - Both developed and dispersed recreation would be affected by increasing some opportunities and limiting others. - Existing developed sites, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADA access would be improved. - The CMPA, the Pueblo Mountains, and Trout Creek Mountains would be managed intensively for recreation. - Developed recreation opportunities could increase, while dispersed recreation would be either increased or decreased depending on whether increased recreation and tourism promotes dispersed use or whether effects to naturalness and solitude would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADA access would be improved. - The CMPA, Pueblo Mountains, and Trout Creek Mountains would be managed intensively for recreation. - Developed recreation would be promoted and increased while dispersed recreation may either increase or decrease, depending on whether new facilities and opportunities encourage dispersed use or whether effects

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>increase or decrease recreation opportunities.</p> <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CMPA would be intensively managed for recreation. - The current resource damage and site problems at Mann Lake Recreation Site would continue and the anticipated increased use would not be addressed. - Retaining the existing horse trailhead facilities in the South Steens Campground area would require Little Blitzen parking area expansion to reduce South Steens Loop Road safety concerns and South Steens Campground equestrian side congestion. - Not installing a toilet on the North Steens Loop Road would increase vehicle traffic through Fish Lake Campground and would not address sanitation concerns. - Not developing a group camping area would require groups to stay in the campgrounds, causing crowding and reducing the number of sites available. Groups would not be separated from the general public. - Maintaining Lily Lake as a dispersed recreation site would allow the existing uses and resource and health concerns to 	<p>based on these designations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of the High Desert Trail would decrease. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current resource damage and site problems at Mann Lake Recreation Site would continue and the anticipated increased use would not be addressed. - Retaining the existing horse trailhead facilities in the South Steens Campground area would require Little Blitzen parking area expansion to reduce South Steens Loop Road safety concerns and South Steens Campground equestrian side congestion. - Not installing a toilet on the North Steens Loop Road would increase vehicle traffic through Fish Lake Campground and would not address sanitation. - Not developing a group camping area would require groups to stay in the campgrounds, causing crowding and reducing the number of sites available. Groups would not be separated from the general public. - Designating Lily Lake as a day use area would address resource concerns. - Hiking, nonmotorized vehicle use, and educational opportunities 	<p>campgrounds, and facilities would be maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group size limits would be implemented to protect natural and cultural values. - The effects from managing BCBs and the High Desert Trail would be the same as Alternative A. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current resource damage and site problems at Mann Lake Recreation Site would continue and the anticipated increased use would not be addressed. - Retaining the existing horse trailhead facilities in the South Steens Campground area would require Little Blitzen parking area expansion to reduce South Steens Loop Road safety concerns and South Steens Campground equestrian side congestion. - Installing a toilet on the North Steens Loop Road would provide needed facilities, reduce vehicle traffic through Fish Lake Campground, and address sanitation concerns. - Developing a group camping area within an existing campground could lead to crowding and would reduce the number of sites. Groups would 	<p>deter dispersed recreation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing developed sites, campgrounds, and facilities would be maintained. - Managing existing and creating new BCBs would promote tourism and recreation. - The effects of managing High Desert Trail would be the same as Alternative A. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of a variety of projects and actions would be delayed until a comprehensive recreation plan for the CMPA is completed. - Visitors to the overlooks would not be constrained by the presence of camps, litter would be reduced, and rock rings eliminated. - Restricting parking and stopping on the Rooster Comb would increase public safety and decrease driving hazards. - Providing safe pullouts or parking areas at either end of the Rooster Comb would safely accommodate public viewing of Big Indian. - Visitor use at the overlooks would not be affected. - Increased permitted use could lead to crowding at popular sites and areas. If needed, an allocation system would be implemented to 	<p>to naturalness and solitude deter dispersed recreation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing developed sites, campgrounds, and facilities would be maintained. - Managing existing and developing new BCBs would promote tourism and recreation. - The effects of managing High Desert Trail would be the same as Alternative A. <p><i>CMPA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upgrading the Mann Lake Recreation Site would increase developed camping opportunities and would accommodate the anticipated increased use. Other users could be displaced to other nearby areas. - Developing a new horse trailhead facility in the South Steens Campground area would reduce safety concerns and limit resource damage. However, this facility has the potential to attract additional horse users to the area. - Installing toilets at the three main overlooks would provide needed facilities and would protect human health. - Developing a group camping area on private land would help accommodate existing group use, provide a needed facility,

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>continue and would reduce educational opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hiking, nonmotorized vehicle use, and educational opportunities would be reduced. - Camping locations would not be restricted. - Visitors could be constrained by camps at overlooks and along the Steens Loop Road. Litter, rock rings, and ashes would be common. - Public safety and driving hazards would continue on the Rooster Comb. - Current winter recreation opportunities would not be affected. Cooperative management and snowmobiling opportunities would be lost. - Nonmotorized boating on the mainstem Blitzen River would be limited to those few times when flows are adequate and the gate is open. - Visitor use at the overlooks would not be affected. - The number of new commercial, competitive, and organized group SRPs would not be affected. - Resource damage would continue to occur at heavily used pullouts and other locations along the Steens Loop Road because vehicles could be parked 	<p>would be reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Camping would be restricted to developed campgrounds, limiting overnight use and increasing day use. - Visitors would not be constrained by camps at overlooks and along the Steens Loop Road. The trash, rock rings, and ashes would be eliminated. Dispersed campers would be displaced to the campgrounds or locations outside the CMPA, causing heavier campground use and increased crowding. - The Steens Loop Road from the Kiger Gorge Overlook to west of Blitzen Crossing would be closed so there would be no need to restrict parking or stopping on the Rooster Comb or intensively manage use at the East Rim and Wildhorse Overlooks. South Steens Campground would only be accessible to hikers and horseback riders. - Winter recreation opportunities would be greatly reduced. Cooperative management and snowmobiling opportunities would be lost Nonmotorized winter recreation would not be affected. - Nonmotorized boating on the mainstem Blitzen River would not 	<p>not be separated from the general public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Designating Lily Lake as a day use area and installing interpretive signs would address resource concerns and would provide an educational opportunity. - Hiking, nonmotorized vehicle use, and educational opportunities would be slightly increased. - Camping would be restricted to developed campgrounds and designated dispersed sites outside the Steens Mountain Wilderness, constraining visitors' choices. - Visitors would not be constrained by camps along the Steens Loop Road and at overlooks. The trash, rock rings, and ashes would be eliminated. Campers would be displaced to the campgrounds and designated dispersed sites, causing heavier campground and dispersed site use and crowding. - The Rooster Comb would be closed to motorized vehicles, so there would be no need to restrict parking or stopping. - Winter recreation opportunities would be reduced. Cooperative management and snowmobiling opportunities would be lost. Nonmotorized winter recreation could be improved. 	<p>reduce resource impacts, improve visitor experiences, and support existing commercial recreation operations.</p> <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of a variety of projects would be delayed until Recreation Project Plans are completed and EAs are written. Possible project plans could be written for the Frog Springs area, Pike Creek, the Penland Road, other dispersed campsites, and mountain bike trails. - Closing the RNAs and Mickey Hot Springs to camping would protect the relevant and important values and would reduce safety concerns at Mickey Hot Springs. - SRPs would be issued for all areas. An allocation system would be developed and implemented, if needed, to protect cultural and natural resources. 	<p>separate groups from the general public, and foster cooperative management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Installation of a toilet at Lily Lake would increase both day and overnight use, but would address health concerns. - Hiking, nonmotorized vehicle use, and educational opportunities would be increased. - Camping locations would not be restricted. Visitors could be constrained by camps at overlooks and along the Steens Loop Road. Litter, rock rings, and ashes would be common. - Restricting parking or stopping on the Rooster Comb would increase public safety and decrease driving hazards. - Winter recreation opportunities would be increased but could affect the experiences of nonmotorized winter recreationists. - Nonmotorized boating opportunities would be increased. - Visitor use at the overlooks would not be affected. - Increased permitted use could lead to crowding at popular sites and areas. - Regularly spaced pullouts along the Steens Loop Road could spread out use, but could also

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
<p>anywhere.</p> <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heavily used dispersed campsites would continue be affected by vegetation loss, erosion, and sanitation concerns. - Developing a Wildhorse Canyon parking area would increase access, but could affect naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. - Camping in ACECs/RNAs could affect the relevant and important values. - Camping at Mickey Hot Springs presents safety concerns because of the geothermal features. - The opportunity to develop mountain bike trails, if public interest develops, would be lost. - SRPs would not be affected. 	<p>be allowed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visitor use at Kiger Overlook would increase and would require intensive management. - Requiring permits for all CMPA users would deter some users and decrease use of the area, as would closing most of the Steens Loop Road. - Only the existing, long-term SRPs would be retained, which could result in increased business for the existing permittees, but their activities would also be constrained by the road closures and use restrictions. Many commercial tours and organized groups would not visit the area. - Resource damage would occur at heavily used locations and new areas between Jackman Park and Kiger Overlook because most of the Steens Loop Road would be closed. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heavily used dispersed campsites would continue to be affected by vegetation loss and erosion, but requiring dispersed users to pack out all solid human waste would abate the sanitation concerns. - Access to the east side of the Steens would decrease. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nonmotorized boating on the mainstem Blitzen River would be limited to those few times when flows are adequate and the gate is open. - Restricting visitors to designated trails at the overlooks would constrain their activities and sense of adventure. - Requiring permits for all Steens Loop Road users could deter some users and decrease use of the Steens Loop Road. - Commercial, competitive, and organized group opportunities and activities would be maintained through the issuance of SRPs. - The SRP program would be managed intensively and an allocation system would be implemented to reduce resource impacts, improve visitor experiences, and support existing commercial recreation operations. - Resource damage would continue to occur at heavily used pullouts and other locations along the Steens Loop Road because vehicles could be parked anywhere. <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heavily used dispersed campsites would continue to be affected by vegetation loss, 		<p>concentrate use at areas that may not be suitable for heavy visitor use.</p> <p><i>AMU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of a campground in the Frog Springs area would reduce dispersed camping and its effects, but could result in heavier use of the area. - Installation of toilets at Pike Creek and other dispersed campsites would reduce sanitation concerns, but could also result in heavier use of the sites. - Encouraging dispersed users to pack out all solid human waste would reduce site-specific sanitation concerns, if users comply with the recommendation. - Access to the east side of the Steens would increase, but could affect naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. - Closing Mickey Hot Springs to camping would reduce safety concerns. - The opportunity to develop mountain bike trails, if public interest develops, would be available.

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closing Mickey Hot Springs to camping would alleviate the safety concerns associated with the geothermal features. - The opportunity to develop mountain bike trails, if public interest develops, would be lost. - No SRPs would be issued, which would eliminate all existing and future opportunities for commercial, competitive, and organized group recreation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> erosion, and sanitation concerns, except at Pike Creek and Frog Spring. Encouraging dispersed users to pack out all solid human waste would reduce site specific sanitation concerns, if users comply with the recommendation. - Access to the east side of the Steens would increase, but could affect naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. - Closing the ACECs/RNAs to camping would protect the relevant and important values and would reduce safety concerns at Mickey Hot Springs. - The opportunity to develop mountain bike trails, if public interest develops, would be lost. - SRPs would be issued for all areas, except the Alvord Desert playa. An allocation system would be developed and implemented, if needed, to protect cultural and natural resources. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRPs would be issued, which would lead to increased use and effects.

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (See Section 4.21 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- No new ACECs would be designated and the 15 existing ACECs, totaling 132,112 acres, would be retained.	- All 15 existing ACEC designations would be revoked and one proposed ACEC, Mickey Hot Springs, would be designated for a total of 42 acres.	- All 15 existing ACECs would be retained and six proposed ACECs would be designated for a total of 143,426 acres.	- 12 of the 15 existing ACECs would be retained while the designation on three of the existing ACECs (Alvord Peak, Pickett Rim and Steens Mountain) would be revoked. Five proposed ACECs	- All 15 existing ACEC designations would be revoked and one new ACEC, Mickey Hot Springs, would be designated for a total of 42 acres.
--	--	--	---	---

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
			would be designated for a total of 66,870 acres.	
<i>WILDERNESS (See Section 4.22 for the Full Discussion of Effects)</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wilderness classified as a single unit without Management Areas. - Management would not restrict party size, camping, or recreational stock use; trail conditions, campsites and surrounding areas; naturalness and solitude would be effected. - Minimal maintenance of trails may lead to trail damage and increased use and degradation. - Unrestricted campfire use may lead to an increase of campfires, fire rings, damage to campsite areas, expansion of the barren ground area, increases in user created trails, and damage to vegetation. - Issuing additional outfitter/guide permits could lead to increased use and effect trail and campsite conditions and solitude and naturalness. - Livestock permittee grazing access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. - Inholder access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wilderness classified into two Management Areas: Gorges and Uplands. - Party size limit of six people and nine head of stock would lead to increased naturalness. - Camping not allowed at Wildhorse Lake or in any RNA. - Three day length-of-stay would promote solitude and naturalness and minimize effects to campsites and trails. - Recreational stock use allowed at Wildhorse Lake or any RNA on a limited basis; no pack stock grazing allowed. - No trail maintenance or reclamation; may promote protection and rehabilitation of natural resources but could lead to degradation of the trails and adjacent resources. - Campfires not allowed, increasing naturalness and fire potential. - No commercial outfitter/guide services allowed. - No commercial livestock grazing allowed. - Inholder access would be managed according to EA and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wilderness classified into two Management Areas; Gorges and Uplands. - Party size limit of nine people and 12 head of stock. - No camping allowed at Wildhorse Lake or any RNA. - A five day length-of-stay would have similar effects as Alternative B. - Recreational stock use at Wildhorse Lake or any RNA same as Alternative B; effects would be the same. - Minimal trail maintenance , no new trails constructed, inappropriate user trails and selected roads would be reclaimed; actions would promote protection and rehabilitation of natural resources and wilderness values. - Outfitter/guide services allowed at current levels; no change in current trail or campsite conditions or levels of solitude. - Livestock permittee grazing access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wilderness classified into two Management Areas; Gorges and Uplands; management actions initiated separately in each of the Gorges and the Uplands . - Party size limit of 12 people and 18 head of stock; exceptions for historic permitted and Native American use; increased effects on naturalness and solitude. -14-day length of stay limit would have effects on trail and campsite conditions; naturalness and solitude would be effected. - No camping allowed at Little Wildhorse RNA, no overnight recreational stock use at Wildhorse Lake; actions allow for increased naturalness and solitude and lesser effects on campsites and trails. - Grazing of recreational stock would be allowed with some effects on naturalness. - Minimal trail maintenance; new trails constructed if needed to protect wilderness resources and values and inappropriate user trails reclaimed; beneficial effects on naturalness. - New proposals for outfitter/guide services considered; increase may 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wilderness classified as a single unit without Management Areas. - No party size limits, these activities would affect trail conditions, campsites, and surrounding areas as well as naturalness and solitude. - A 14-day length-of-stay limit would be encouraged; affecting solitude and increasing primitive campsites. - Minimal trail maintenance; new trails constructed as visitor use increases; effecting naturalness and solitude and trail and campsite conditions. - New proposals for outfitter/guide services considered; increase may effect trail and campsite conditions and naturalness and solitude. - Livestock permittee grazing access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. - Inholder access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. - Monitoring of the wilderness

Alternative A -	Alternative B -	Alternative C -	Proposed RMP -	Alternative E -
No action. Continues present management.	Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
naturalness and solitude. - Monitoring of the Wilderness conducted and management options implemented to maintain or restore desired conditions.	Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. - Monitoring of the Wilderness would be conducted and management options implemented to maintain or restore desired conditions.	- Inholder access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. - Monitoring of the Wilderness would be conducted and management options implemented to maintain or restore desired conditions.	effect trail and campsite conditions and naturalness and solitude. - Livestock permittee grazing access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude. - Inholder access would be managed according to EA and Decision Record; effects on naturalness and solitude.	would be conducted and management options implemented to maintain or restore desired conditions.
<i>WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS and PARCELS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS (See Section 4.23 for the Full Discussion of Effects)</i>				
<i>WSAs</i> - Wilderness values in WSAs would continue to be protected through management under the WSA IMP.	<i>WSAs</i> - Wilderness values in WSAs would continue to be protected through management under the WSA IMP.	<i>WSAs</i> - Wilderness values in WSAs would continue to be protected through management under the WSA IMP.	<i>WSAs</i> - Wilderness values in WSAs would continue to be protected through management under the WSA IMP.	<i>WSAs</i> - Wilderness values in WSAs would continue to be protected through management under the WSA IMP.
<i>Parcels with Wilderness Characteristics</i> - Parcels found to have wilderness characteristics would be managed according to the MFP, which could allow uses to affect naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation.	<i>Parcels with Wilderness Characteristics</i> - The four parcels found to have wilderness characteristics would be protected through the exclusion of commodity uses and other restrictive designations.	<i>Parcels with Wilderness Characteristics</i> - The four parcels found to have wilderness characteristics would be protected through various designations.	<i>Parcels with Wilderness Characteristics</i> - The four parcels found to have wilderness characteristics would be managed according to the Proposed RMP, which could affect naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation.	<i>Parcels with Wilderness Characteristics</i> - The four parcels found to have wilderness characteristics would be managed according to management actions in Alternative E, which could affect naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation.

Alternative A - No action. Continues present management.	Alternative B - Excludes commodity production and limits other uses; maximizes natural processes.	Alternative C - Emphasizes protection of natural values.	Proposed RMP - Balances cultural, economic, ecological, and social health in a manner that encourages cooperative management practices.	Alternative E - Emphasizes commodity production and public uses.
--	---	--	---	--

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS (See Section 4.24 for the Full Discussion of Effects)

- Identified ORVs for each eligible river would be afforded adequate protection. - Management may include restrictions on grazing management, recreational use, and mineral or energy development.	- Recommending the ten river segments as not suitable for inclusion in the WSR system would not affect the identified ORVs. - Grazing would not affect the ORVs because no grazing would be permitted in this alternative.	- All suitable rivers would be administered in such a manner as to protect and enhance their ORVs. - Management may include restrictions on grazing management, recreational use, and mineral or energy development within the river corridor boundary.	- Recommending the ten river segments as not suitable for inclusion in the WSR system would not affect the identified ORVs. - Grazing would continue along those creeks and sections of creeks outside of the No Livestock Grazing Area, but the ORVs should not be affected.	- Effects would be the same as the Proposed RMP.
---	---	--	--	--