

# Chapter 2

## Alternatives

### INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and compares the three alternatives, including the proposed action, considered for the project. These alternatives were developed in response to issues identified during the scoping process. Each alternative either wholly or partially fulfills the purpose and need (described in Chapter 1) for this project. This chapter describes the alternatives, discusses monitoring and mitigation requirements, and provides a comparison of the effects of implementing each of the alternatives.

Chapter 2 is intended to present the alternatives in comparative form, sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for the decision maker to make a choice. Some of the information in this chapter is summarized from Chapter 4, “Environmental Consequences.” Chapter 4 provides the scientific basis for establishing baselines and measuring the potential environmental consequences of each of the alternatives.

### DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

Each alternative presented in this EIS provides a different response to the key issues for the project. Each alternative represents a site-specific proposal developed through intensive interdisciplinary team evaluation of livestock grazing. The team made use of topographic maps and aerial photos, and a large quantity of resource data available in geographic information system (GIS) format.

The ID Team used information from the analysis of scoping comments, in conjunction with data verified in the field or gathered in the field. Preliminary analysis, management direction, and the Upper Green Landscape Assessment were used further to refine the alternatives described here for the project.

### ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations state that alternatives, including the proposed action, shall be considered in environmental analyses. Alternative B reflects the proposed action for this project. Two alternatives to the proposed action were also

# 2 Alternatives

considered: Alternative A (the no-action alternative) and Alternative C (the no-grazing alternative).

## Alternative A: Grazing as Currently Permitted (No Action)

Approximately 46,100 AUM's of domestic cattle grazing will continue to be authorized in the project area under this alternative. Although AMP's will be prepared or updated for each of the six allotments, the grazing management practices specified for the allotments with existing AMP's will not be changed. The Upper Green River and Roaring Fork allotments will continue to operate under the guidelines specified in AMP's that are over 25 years old, and season-long grazing (which does not comply with Forest Plan rotational grazing requirements) will persist in the Badger Creek and Beaver-Twin Creeks allotments. In addition, no new utilization standards will be initiated to move existing resource conditions in the project area toward the desired future conditions (DFC's) specified in the Forest Plan. The Forest Plan forage utilization standards for wildlife, livestock, and recreational stock will remain in effect. (Table 2-3, under "Standards and Guidelines" later in this chapter, displays these utilization standards.) Table 2-1 shows livestock grazing that will be authorized in the project area under Alternative A. As Alternative A proposes no action, the information in this table also represents current grazing use in the project area.

**Table 2-1**  
**Alternative A: Livestock Grazing Currently Authorized in the Project Area**

Allotment Name	Total Acres	Grazing Season	Permitted AUM's	Grazing Management System
Badger Creek	7,300	July 1 <sup>st</sup> – September 30 <sup>th</sup>	622	Season-long
Beaver-Twin Creeks	22,300	July 15 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	2772	Season-long
Noble Pastures	760	June 14 <sup>th</sup> – September 20 <sup>th</sup>	1605	Deferred Rotation
Roaring Fork	8,300	June 16 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	898	Season-long*
Upper Green River: Mud Lake/Fish Creek Mosquito Lake Pastures Tepee/Tosi /Kinky S Moose/Gypsum Kinky Creek N	130,100	June 16 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	40,107	Deferred Rotation Rest Rotation Deferred Rotation Deferred Rotation
Wagon Creek	240	July 15 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	103	Deferred On/off
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>169,000</b>		<b>46,107</b>	

\*Rotational grazing is often accomplished in this allotment through the annual operation instructions (AOI); however, no formal grazing rotation has been specified to date.

## **Alternative B: Grazing with Management Modification (Proposed Action and Preferred Alternative)**

Alternative B specifies additional grazing management to improve resource conditions and sustain current livestock operations. Approximately 46,100 AUM's of domestic cattle grazing will continue to be authorized in the project area under this alternative. AMP's will be prepared or updated for each of the six allotments. The AMP's will list specific objectives and management practices needed to move resource conditions toward goals and DFC's described by the Forest Plan and ID Team. Outdated AMP's for the Upper Green and Roaring Fork allotments will be revised, and new AMP's will be completed for the Badger Creek, Beaver-Twin Creeks, Noble Pastures, and Wagon Creek allotments. Rotational grazing systems will be incorporated in the Badger Creek and Beaver-Twin Creeks allotments and modified, using adaptive management, to achieve DFC's in the remaining allotments.

More detailed forage utilization standards will be implemented under Alternative B to meet site-specific objectives and improve overall resource conditions in the project area. (See Appendix 1 for a complete list of the prescriptions and range improvements proposed under this alternative.) Specific objectives and action plans will be incorporated into AMP's for allotments where resource objectives and DFC's are not being achieved under current grazing management prescriptions. (The general Forest Plan forage utilization guidelines are shown in Table 2-3 under "Standards and Guidelines" later in this chapter.)

Table 2-2 displays livestock grazing proposed in the project area under Alternative B. The specific prescriptions and range improvements proposed under Alternative B are listed in Appendix 1.

# 2 Alternatives

<b>Allotment Name</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Grazing Season</b>	<b>Permitted AUM's</b>	<b>Grazing Management System</b>
Badger Creek	7,300	July 1 <sup>st</sup> – September 30 <sup>th</sup>	622	Deferred Rotation
Beaver-Twin Creeks	22,300	July 15 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	2772	Deferred Rotation
Noble Pastures	760	June 14 <sup>th</sup> – September 20 <sup>th</sup>	1605	Deferred Rotation
Roaring Fork	8,300	June 16 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	898	Rotation
Upper Green River: Mud Lake/Fish Creek Mosquito Lake Pastures Tepee/Tosi /Kinky S Moose/Gypsum Kinky Creek N	130,100	June 16 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	40,107	Deferred Rotation Rest Rotation Deferred Rotation Deferred Rotation Rest Rotation
Wagon Creek	240	July 15 <sup>th</sup> – October 15 <sup>th</sup>	103	Deferred On/off
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>169,000</b>		<b>46,107</b>	

## **Alternative C: No Grazing by Domestic Livestock**

Alternative C will eliminate livestock grazing in the project area. This demonstrates the effects that eliminating domestic cattle grazing will have on the environment and more clearly illustrates the potential effects of implementing either Alternative A or Alternative B. Under this alternative, domestic livestock grazing in all six allotments of the project area will be phased out over several years as existing grazing permits expire. Selection of Alternative C will reduce the number of AUM's authorized in the project area by approximately 46,100. Forest Plan livestock grazing standards and guidelines will no longer be applicable in the project area after grazing permits expired; however, Forest Plan forage utilization standards will still apply to wildlife and recreational stock.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL**

No additional alternatives were considered due to: the ability of the alternatives to meet the purpose and need and objectives for the project, the scope and intensity of the grazing authorization proposed, and other analysis that has occurred within the project area supporting livestock grazing. Examples include the Upper Green Landscape Assessment and past grazing analysis.

## ITEMS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

The Forest Service uses mitigation and preventive measures in the planning and implementation of land management activities. The application of these measures begins during the planning and design phases of a project. These measures come from, or link to, the Forest Plan and continue through all phases of subsequent management related to the project. The following items are listed to highlight key standards and guidelines and monitoring processes common to all three alternatives.

### **Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines**

Forest-wide standards and guidelines apply to all areas of the National Forest outside of Congressionally designated Wilderness. These standards and guidelines are often more general in nature than the desired future conditions (DFC's) outlined in Chapter 1 (Table 1-2) of this document. Standards are intended to be closely adhered to during implementation, while the guidelines are intended to be more flexible, establishing parameters rather than rigid requirements. Following is a list of the applicable Forest-wide standards and guidelines for rangelands. The Forest-wide standards and guidelines for all resources are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 of the Forest Plan (121-145).

**Allotment Planning Standard** - All livestock grazing use will be managed under the direction of an allotment management plan (AMP).

**Allotment Management Plan (AMP) Standard** - The needs of fisheries, riparian habitats, and Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species will be addressed in AMP's. Findings from big-game winter range evaluations will be incorporated into allotment management plans as wildlife habitat objectives and management procedures. AMP's will identify the amount and kind of streamside vegetation needed to maintain or improve riparian areas.

**Livestock Movement Standard** - The AMP will identify roads and trails needed to facilitate trucking and trailing. Trucking of some stock will be required to prevent other resource damage.

**Livestock Grazing of Riparian Areas Standard** - Livestock grazing in riparian areas will be managed to protect stream banks. This may be achieved through the use of gravel crossings, tree-debris barriers, fencing riparian pastures, development of alternate watering sites out of the riparian areas, longer allotment rests, or improved livestock distribution.

**Forage Improvement Standard** - Range in less than satisfactory condition will be improved. Disturbed areas will be stabilized or regenerated prior to resuming grazing use.

**Structural Improvement Standard** - Structural improvements will be designed to allow big-game movement and avoid or reduce hazards to other wildlife species.

**Forage Utilization Standard** - The following utilization standards (displayed in Table 2-3) will be the maximum utilization levels allowed for all herbivores on key vegetative species.

# 2 Alternatives

<b>Range Site (Location)</b>	<b>Condition</b>	<b>Grazing System</b>	<b>Maximum Utilization</b>
<b>Upland</b>	Satisfactory	*Season-long	50 percent
		Rotational	60 percent
	Unsatisfactory	*Season-long	40 percent
		Rotational	50 percent
<b>Riparian</b>	Satisfactory	*Season-long	55 percent
		Rotational	65 percent
	Unsatisfactory	*Season-long	45 percent
		Rotational	55 percent

\* Season-long grazing only exists on a few allotments and will be changed to rotational grazing as AMP's are revised.

- During AMP revision, the ID Team and livestock permittees will prescribe site-specific utilization levels needed to meet Forest Plan objectives.
- The maximum forage utilization guidelines apply to all types of grazing use, including wildlife, livestock, and recreational stock.
- During monitoring and evaluation a Utilization Guideline may be changed if the prescribed level is not accomplishing planned objectives.
- Site-specific utilization levels of key wildlife ranges will be established by an ID Team.
- ID Team will prescribe other proper-use standards to achieve site-specific objectives for the rangeland being managed. The standards will be a combination of forage utilization, ground cover, plant vigor, soil disturbance, or streambank stability.

### **Fish, Wildlife, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species Standard**

Range improvements, management activities, and trailing will be coordinated with, and designed to help meet, fish and wildlife habitat needs, especially on key habitat areas (such as crucial winter range, seasonal calving areas, riparian areas, sage grouse leks, and nesting sites). Special emphasis will be placed on helping to meet the needs of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species.

**Sensitive Species Management Standard** - Quantifiable objectives will be developed to identify and improve the status of Sensitive species and eliminate the need for listing. Crucial habitats of priority I, II, and III species, as listed by Wyoming Game and Fish and the Intermountain Region Sensitive Species List, will be protected and maintained. The Forest Service will cooperate with the Wyoming Game and Fish on management programs when

## Alternatives 2

needed to maintain population objectives of these species, especially with species that have been identified as needing immediate attention and active management to ensure a significant decline in breeding populations do not occur. Information collection and interpretive programs will promote the conservation of these species and their habitats. National Forest managers will participate in species and habitat surveys and monitoring programs needed to gain necessary data to determine population status.

### **FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE**

**Fisheries and Wildlife Prescription** - The Bridger-Teton National Forest provides habitat adequate to meet the needs of dependant fish and wildlife population, including those of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species. If a decision to reestablish is made, the Bridger-Teton participates in implementation of the gray wolf recovery plan and formulation of guidelines for the management of the gray wolf in the Greater Yellowstone Area.

**Security Area Standard** - Non-activity areas-security areas-will be maintained adjacent to concentrated human activity areas.

**Habitat Effectiveness Standard** - To provide for habitat effectiveness established for each Management Area, non-motorized and motorized vehicle assess will be regulated either seasonally or year-round to protect such important big game habitat components as primary feeding areas, crucial winter range, calving/fawning/lambing areas, big-game rearing areas, rutting complexes and big game migration corridors.

**Big-Game Winter Range Standard** - Human activity and disturbance in crucial big-game winter range will be restricted from November 15 to April 30 if big-game are present in the area. Stipulations restricting oil and gas development will be applied to crucial big-game winter range as identified and agreed upon by the Forest Service and Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

**Elk Calving Area Standard** - Human activity and disturbance will be restricted in elk calving areas from May 15 to June 30, if elk are present in the area. Fences in elk calving areas will be designed so they do not create movement barriers to elk calves. Timing-Limitations stipulations will be applied to elk calving areas.

**Fencing Riparian Area Guideline** - New or rebuilt fences across riparian areas or uplands areas adjacent to riparian areas should be built using a wooden top pole or other state-of-the-art marking technique to increase visibility of the fence and reduce possible collision of cranes and waterfowl.

### **VEGETATION: RANGE**

**Vegetation: Range Prescription** - Forage is provided on a sustained-yield basis that protects rangeland values, wildlife habitat, and meets other resource needs. All practices available can be used to improve forage supplies and quality.

**Allotment Management Plan Standard** - Fisheries; riparian habitats; and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species' needs will be addressed in allotment management plans.

## 2 Alternatives

Findings from big-game winter range evaluations will be incorporated into allotment management plans as wildlife habitat objectives and management procedures. Plans will identify the amount and kind of streamside vegetation needed to maintain or improve riparian areas.

**Forage Utilization Standard** - During AMP revision, the Interdisciplinary (ID) Team and livestock permittees will prescribe site-specific utilization levels need to meet Forest Plan Objectives.

The maximum forage utilization guidelines apply to all types of grazing use including wildlife, livestock and recreation stock

During monitoring and evaluation a Utilization Guideline may be changed if the prescribed level is not accomplishing planned objectives.

Site-specific utilization levels on key wildlife ranges will be established by an ID team.

ID teams will prescribe other proper-use standards to achieve site-specific objectives for the rangeland being managed. The standards will be a combination of forage utilization, ground cover, plant vigor, or streambank stability. For example, on domestic sheep range, an objective of minimizing soil disturbance will be more important than forage utilization.

**Fish; Wildlife; and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species Standard** - Range improvements, management activities and trailing will be coordinated with and designed to help meet fish and wildlife habitat needs, especially on key habitat areas such as crucial winter range, seasonal calving area, sagegrouse leks, and nesting sites. Special emphasis will be placed on helping to meet the needs of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species.

**Structural Improvement Standard** - Structural improvements will be designed to allow big-game movement and avoid or reduce hazards to other wildlife species.

**Road management standards** – Road density is measured by DFC by Management area. Guidelines are as follows. **DFC 10:** 1 mile per square mile. **DFC 12:** .25 mile per square mile.

**Vacant Allotment Guideline** - Vacant allotments should be stocked, incorporated into adjacent allotments, or withdrawn from grazing to benefit other resources needs.

**Proper Use Guideline** - Range proper-use standards, including forage utilization standards, should vary depending on site-specific objectives.

**Livestock Grazing Coordination Guideline** - Integration of improved management on associated public and private lands should be encouraged. Coordinated resource management and development of AMP's should be used.

**Fish Habitat Management Guideline** - For fish habitat providing a fishery at or near its potential, fish populations should be maintained at existing levels. For habitat below its potential, habitat should be improved or maintained to at least 90 percent of its natural potential. First priority for improvement should be given to Colorado River and Bonneville cutthroat trout, which are Sensitive species.

**Streambank Stability Guideline** - At least 90 percent of the natural bank stability of streams that support a fishery, particularly, Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species, and all trout species, should be maintained. Streambank vegetation should be maintained at 80 percent of its potential natural condition or a Habitat Condition Indices (HCI) rating of 85 or greater. (HCI's are no longer used as a guideline on the Bridger-Teton National Forest). Streambank stability, vegetation, and fish numbers and biomass should be managed by stream type.

**Restoring Stream Channel Conditions Guideline** - Areas where human activities have resulted in adverse impacts such as channel widening, channel aggradations, or lowering of the water table should be restored.

## MONITORING

Monitoring activities can be divided into two categories: Forest Plan monitoring and project-specific monitoring. The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requires that National Forests monitor their forest plans (36 CFR 219.11). The monitoring and evaluation activities to be conducted as part of Forest Plan implementation are discussed in Chapter 5 of the Forest Plan (pp. 323-335). The three categories of Forest Plan monitoring include:

- **Implementation Monitoring:** Used to determine whether the goals, objectives, standards and guidelines, and practices of the Forest Plan are implemented as specified in the Forest Plan.
- **Effectiveness Monitoring:** Used to determine whether Forest Plan practices and standards and guidelines, as designed and implemented, are effective in accomplishing the desired result.
- **Validation Monitoring:** Used to determine whether the data, assumptions, and estimated effects used in developing the Forest Plan are correct.

Effectiveness and validation monitoring are not typically conducted as part of project implementation. The ID Team identified implementation monitoring and project-specific effectiveness monitoring as important aspects of the Upper Green River Area Rangeland Project.

### Implementation Monitoring

Implementation monitoring will be used to determine whether the selected alternative is implemented as planned in this document. If either Alternative A or Alternative B are selected, implementation monitoring will be conducted annually on a subset of allotments to determine whether the allotments are being managed in accordance with their AMP's and Annual Operating Instructions (AOI's). Allotment administrators will make field observations and document their findings in the individual permit files. These observations

## 2 Alternatives

could include, for example, whether livestock were moved to other pastures or removed from an allotment before the maximum prescribed utilization parameters (pertaining to forage and browse utilization, stubble height, and streambank alteration) are exceeded. The field observations documented in the file will be summarized at the end of each year and a determination made whether on-the-ground management practices met the specified guidelines. Administrative action will be taken (as specified in FSH 2209 16.21) if established utilization parameters are exceeded.

Very limited implementation monitoring will be required under Alternative C. Monitoring will likely be conducted only periodically to determine whether trespass livestock were grazing on National Forest System lands within the project area. Action will be taken under 36 CFR 261.7 for any trespass discovered during implementation monitoring.

### **Project-specific Effectiveness Monitoring**

Effectiveness monitoring will be conducted under either Alternative A or Alternative B to determine whether the assumptions made in the analysis for this project are correct. (Chapter 4 of this document describes the environmental effects anticipated for each of the alternatives.) Effectiveness monitoring will identify whether the actual effects of implementing the selected alternative were consistent with the effects originally projected. This monitoring will be conducted in cooperation with the permittees in the project area and will require the continued establishment and maintenance of long-term monitoring sites. The methods used to conduct effectiveness monitoring could include establishing permanent riparian photo points and running greenline and groundcover transects. Through adaptive management, effectiveness monitoring sites may need to be relocated or new sites established.

Effectiveness monitoring will not be necessary under Alternative C, since livestock grazing will be phased out under that alternative.

### **Monitoring Practices**

The following monitoring practices will be incorporated, as applicable, into the AMP's for each of the six allotments.

- Monitor to determine compliance with Forest Plan Utilization Standards.
- Monitor riparian and upland range sites to determine the effectiveness of (or need for changes in) herding, distribution, and improvements.
- Monitor to determine the success of vegetative treatments and identify needed adjustments in grazing capacity.
- Monitor to determine whether grazing at proper use is maintaining water quality standards that comply with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Forest Service and Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality.
- Monitor the impacts of livestock on heritage resource sites to determine whether additional management or mitigation measures are needed to protect them.

- Monitor the impacts of livestock on Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species (TES) to determine whether additional management or mitigation measures are needed to protect them.

## MITIGATION

The analysis documented in this EIS discloses the effects that may occur as a result of implementing the actions proposed under each alternative. Mitigation measures have been developed to avoid, reduce, minimize, or eliminate the adverse effects of actions. Development of these measures is guided by direction in the Forest Plan.

### Alternative A: Mitigation Measures

The following measures will be used in conjunction with Forest Plan standards and guidelines to mitigate the effects of livestock grazing and associated activities.

#### Heritage Resources

- Heritage resource sites will continue to be inventoried and monitored. Mitigation measures will be applied to identified sites that are being directly affected by livestock grazing activities. The mitigation measures will be developed in conjunction with the Wyoming SHPO and may include fencing the site area, placing barriers or woody debris over site areas to prevent livestock from impacting sensitive site areas, or data recovery. All proposed range improvements will be evaluated and cleared by a heritage resources specialist prior to construction.

#### Wildlife

- A Biological Assessment will be prepared for all Threatened and Endangered species and submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service. (Refer to Chapter 3 of this document for a complete list of Threatened and Endangered species.)
- Existing food storage and livestock carcass removal measures will continue to be implemented to minimize grizzly bear/livestock and grizzly bear/human safety concerns.
- The enclosure fence at Kendall Warm Springs will continue to be maintained to reduce livestock impacts on the Kendall dace.
- Cooperative work with Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) will continue in order to address such issues as meeting herd objectives for various species, monitoring forage availability, and maintaining migration routes.

#### Livestock Distribution and Range Improvements

- Cooperative work with permittees, intended to improve livestock distribution through riding and proper salt placement (as identified in AMP's, grazing permits, and AOI's), will continue.
- Approximately 80 miles of existing fence and two water developments will continue to be maintained or reconstructed as needed.

## 2 Alternatives

### Alternative B: Mitigation Measures

All mitigation measures listed above under Alternative A will also be implemented under Alternative B. Additionally, site-specific mitigation measures (prescriptions) will be applied to individual pastures in each allotment to meet or move these areas toward desired future conditions (DFC's). These prescriptions were developed based on the results of assessments conducted to determine the "properly functioning condition" of vegetation, stream function, and watersheds in the project area. Most of the prescriptions consist of range improvements or site-specific stream bank disturbance and forage utilization standards. Generally, the prescriptions specify a maximum percent of forage utilization (in upland areas) and (in riparian areas) a minimum remaining stubble height, or a maximum stream bank disturbance allowed. Other prescribed mitigation measures include dividing or rotating pastures to improve livestock distribution and decrease overall forage utilization. A complete list of all site-specific mitigation measures proposed under Alternative B is contained in Appendix 1 of this document. These prescriptions will be used in conjunction with Forest Plan standards and guidelines to mitigate the effects of livestock grazing and associated activities.

### Alternative C: Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures will be implemented under Alternative C.

#### Range Improvements

Approximately 75 miles of existing interior fence, two water developments, four rider cabins/facilities, and nine water crossings (e.g., culverts, bridges, etc.) will be removed, as they will no longer be needed for livestock management. Approximately 5 miles of allotment boundary fence will remain in place, and the responsibility for maintaining it will revert to the permittees on adjacent grazing allotments or to private landowners, as applicable. These numbers reflect only range improvements maintained by the permittees for the six allotments in the project area.

## COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

This section provides a summary of the key differences between the alternatives. The following tables compare the alternatives based on their ability to meet the purpose and need for the project (Table 2-4) and respond to key issues (Table 2-5). These tables are intended to display the effects of the alternatives so they may be compared easily and efficiently. This information is summarized from Chapters 3 and 4; these chapters should be read for a full understanding of the effects, including detailed descriptions of existing conditions and the expected environmental consequences of the alternatives.

**Table 2-4  
Ability of Alternatives to Meet Purpose and Need**

Purpose & Need Criteria*	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
<p><b>Meets Forest Service objectives pertaining to proper utilization of available forage (for both wildlife and livestock) while moving toward the desired rangeland conditions specified in the Forest Plan. Rotational grazing systems are implemented.</b></p>	<p><i>Partially meets</i> Forest Service objectives for proper forage utilization. Changes in livestock management strategies are not fully implemented; therefore, new utilization standards are not initiated to help move conditions toward Forest Plan DFC's for rangeland areas.</p>	<p><i>Fully meets</i> Forest Service objectives for proper forage utilization. Changes in livestock management strategies are implemented to improve resource conditions. Site-specific utilization standards are initiated to help move conditions toward Forest Plan DFC's for rangeland areas.</p>	<p><i>Fully meets</i> Forest Service objectives for proper forage utilization. Livestock use is eliminated, and wildlife forage utilization will not be expected to exceed proper use thresholds.</p>
<p><b>Assesses whether current livestock management practices are meeting resource objectives in the project area and determines what management strategies and standards are needed to meet the objectives.</b></p>	<p><i>Partially meets these criteria. Livestock management practices are assessed; however, changes in livestock management strategies and standards are not fully implemented. Current strategies are not sufficient to meet objectives.</i></p>	<p><i>Fully meets these criteria. Livestock management practices are assessed, and new management strategies and standards are initiated to achieve resource objectives.</i></p>	<p><i>Not applicable to this alternative. Livestock are removed from the project area.</i></p>
<p><b>Provide an amount of forage for livestock that contributes to the community prosperity goals established in the Forest Plan.</b></p>	<p><i>Fully meets</i> Forest Plan goals by authorizing approximately 46,100 AUM's of livestock grazing in the project area.</p>	<p><i>Fully meets</i> Forest Plan goals by authorizing approximately 46,100 AUM's of livestock grazing in the project area.</p>	<p><i>Does not meet</i> Forest Plan goals; 46,107 AUM's of livestock grazing in the project area are eliminated.</p>

\* A full discussion of the purpose and need for this project is included in Chapter 1.

# 2 Alternatives

<b>Table 2-5 Ability of Alternatives to Respond to Key Issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternative A: Grazing as Currently Permitted (No Action)</b>	<b>Alternative B: Grazing with Management Modification (Proposed Action)</b>	<b>Alternative C: No Grazing by Domestic Livestock</b>
<b>Issue 1:</b> Effects on Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (TES)	Habitat conditions for TES species will not be expected to improve under this alternative. Terms and conditions from Biological Opinions will be incorporated into the grazing permits to reduce unfavorable impacts on TES species.	Habitat conditions for some TES species will be expected to improve under this alternative, due to the implementation of improved grazing management practices. Terms and conditions from Biological Opinions will be incorporated into the grazing permits to reduce unfavorable impacts on TES species. Unfavorable impacts on some TES species will be reduced through the accomplishment of restoration in some degraded areas.	Habitat conditions for some TES species will be expected to improve under this alternative. Over time, unfavorable impacts from livestock grazing will be eliminated. However, no restoration projects will be planned for degraded areas.
<b>Issue 2:</b> Riparian and Aquatic Conditions	Unlikely to fully meet DFC's for ground cover, streambank stability, and stream channel morphology in identified problem areas. Restoration projects will not be planned for some areas where the cumulative effects of a variety of activities have resulted in degraded conditions.	Initiation of new forage utilization standards, grazing management strategies, and increased monitoring of riparian areas will be expected to move ground cover, streambank stability, and stream channel morphology conditions in identified problem areas toward DFC's. Restoration projects will be planned for some degraded areas.	Cessation of livestock grazing will be expected to move ground cover, streambank stability, and stream channel morphology conditions toward DFC's in areas where livestock grazing practices are currently hindering attainment of DFC's. However, restoration projects will not be planned for some areas where the cumulative effects of a variety of activities have resulted in degraded conditions.

**Table 2-5 (continued)**  
**Ability of Alternatives to Respond to Key Issues**

Issue	Alternative A: Grazing as Currently Permitted (No Action)	Alternative B: Grazing with Management Modification (Proposed Action)	Alternative C: No Grazing by Domestic Livestock
<p><b>Issue 3:</b> Social and Economic impacts</p>	<p>No change in the custom and culture of local communities will be expected under this alternative. There will also be no change in the amount of effort or money expended by permittees to comply with grazing requirements.</p>	<p>A slight change in the custom and culture of local communities will be expected under this alternative. Permittees will also have to expend additional effort and money to comply with new grazing requirements.</p>	<p>The custom and culture of local communities will be more likely to change, and unfavorable economic impacts on permittees will be highest, under this alternative.</p>
<p><b>Issue</b></p>	<p>Alternative A:  Grazing as Currently Permitted  (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative B:  Grazing with Management Modification  (Proposed Action)</p>	<p>Alternative C:  No Grazing by Domestic Livestock</p>
<p><b>Issue 4:</b> <b>Rangeland function</b></p>	<p>Vegetation in most areas will be expected to remain in properly functioning condition. Vegetation conditions in identified problem areas will be unlikely to fully meet DFC's. Restoration projects will not be planned for some areas where the cumulative effects of a variety of activities have resulted in degraded conditions.</p>	<p>Vegetation in most areas will be expected to remain in properly functioning condition. Vegetation conditions in identified problem areas will be expected to improve as a result of new grazing management practices. Restoration projects will be planned for some degraded areas.</p>	<p>Vegetation in most areas will be expected to remain in properly functioning condition. Vegetation conditions in identified problem areas will be expected to improve over time. However, restoration projects will not be planned for some areas where the cumulative effects of a variety of activities have resulted in degraded conditions.</p>