

# Comparing alternatives

**Table 2-2. Comparing how the alternatives address the issues**

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F <sub>±</sub>
<b>Issue: Effect on over-the-snow winter recreation</b>					
<b>Ability to expand groomed routes</b>					
<p>Grooming could expand under direction in existing plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Grooming levels were stable during the 1990s and are not likely to increase during the next 5 years due to increased costs of machinery and operations, and no increases in funding from states</li> </ul>	<p>Grooming could expand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ On about 3,500 miles of designated ungroomed routes</li> <li>♦ Additional grooming is limited on the Flathead, Gallatin, Targhee, and Ashley NF because most designated routes are currently groomed</li> </ul>	<p>Grooming could expand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ On about 3,500 miles of designated ungroomed routes</li> <li>♦ In areas of consistent snow compaction</li> </ul>	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C
<b>Ability to expand designated routes</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Designated ungroomed routes could expand based on existing plan direction</li> <li>♦ For outfitter-guide permits, changes in season of use are possible, but there is little ability to expand because of permitting process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ New designated routes would not be allowed above what exists as of 2000</li> <li>♦ For outfitter-guide permits, changes in season of use would be limited, and</li> <li>♦ Little ability to expand would be found because of permitting process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ New designated routes would be allowed in areas of consistent snow compaction</li> <li>♦ For outfitter-guide permits, changes in season of use possible in areas of consistent snow compaction, but there is little ability to expand because of permitting process</li> </ul>	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F <sub>±</sub>
<b>Effect on over-the-snow recreation</b>					
No change in over-the-snow winter recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Present opportunities would continue to exist</li> <li>♦ In the few units where grooming cannot expand, the quality of the user experience may decrease due to more crowding and safety issues.</li> <li>♦ Outfitters could not expand winter operations into new areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Present opportunities would continue to exist</li> <li>♦ All units would be able to provide more groomed routes and opportunities, so user experience should not change</li> <li>♦ Outfitters could expand services into some new areas</li> </ul>	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F‡
<b>Issue: Effects on wildland fire risk to communities</b>					
<b>Limits imposed on fuel treatments in winter snowshoe hare habitat</b>					
Direction in existing plans	<p>Only limits precommercial thinning; other fuel treatment projects allowed (e.g. prescribed burning, timber harvest, slashing, etc)</p> <p>Precommercial thinning allowed only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Within 200 feet of administrative sites, dwellings, or outbuildings</li> </ul>	<p>Limits all types of fuel treatment projects except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Within 200 feet of structures</li> </ul>	<p>Limits all types of fuel treatment projects, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Within 200 feet of structures</li> <li>♦ When a broad scale assessment finds different historic forage levels</li> <li>♦ To maintain or improve foraging habitat in the long term</li> <li>♦ To daylight thin larch, ponderosa pine, planted rust-resistant white pine, aspen, or restore whitebark pine</li> </ul>	<p>No limit on fuel treatment projects identified through a collaborative process.</p>	<p>No limit on fuel treatment projects within the WUI, except that no more than 6% of lynx habitat on each FS unit can exceed the vegetation standards.</p> <p>Limits fuel treatment projects outside the WUI except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Within 200 feet of structures</li> <li>♦ To maintain or improve foraging habitat in the long term</li> <li>♦ To daylight thin planted rust-resistant white pine, aspen, or restore whitebark pine</li> <li>♦ When new information indicates little to no effect, or beneficial long-term effect</li> </ul>
<b>Limits on fuel treatments outside winter snowshoe hare habitat</b>					
Direction in existing plans	Standards VEG S1 through VEG S4 could limit fuel treatment in some circumstances – most projects could be designed to meet the standards			No limits on fuel treatment projects	No limits on fuel treatment projects within the WUI, except no more than 6% of lynx habitat on each FS unit can

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F <sup>‡</sup>
					exceed the vegetation standards Standards VEG S1 and S2 could limit fuel treatment projects outside the WUI in some cases. Most projects could be designed to meet the standards
<b>Total acres of the 10 year fuel treatment program in lynx habitat that would be unconstrained (standards would not apply)</b>					
881,000 acres	> 881,000 acres	0	0	881,000 acres	284,000 acres
<b>Acres of the 10 year fuel treatment program in the WUI that would be unconstrained (standards would not apply)</b>					
284,000 acres	> 284,000 acres	0	0	284,000 acres	284,000 acres
<b>Acres of the 10 year fuel treatment program outside the WUI that would be unconstrained (standards would not apply)</b>					
597,000 acres	> 597,000 acres	0	0	597,000 acres	0
<b>Effect on wildland fire risk</b>					
No change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Constrains only fuel treatments that use precommercial thinning</li> <li>♦ May limit ability to reduce fire size and intensity in some places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Constrains fuel treatments</li> <li>♦ Likely to limit ability to reduce fire size and intensity in some places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Constrains fuel treatments, but has less standards than Alt C</li> <li>♦ Likely to limit ability to reduce fire size and intensity in some places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Would not constrain fuel treatment</li> <li>♦ Would not limit ability to reduce fire size and intensity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Would not constrain fuel treatment in the WUI</li> <li>♦ Would not limit ability to reduce fire size and intensity in the WUI</li> <li>♦ Constrains fuel treatments outside the WUI</li> <li>♦ Likely to limit ability to reduce fire size and intensity in some places outside the WUI</li> </ul>

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F <sup>‡</sup>
<b>Issue: Effects on maintaining winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</b>					
<b>Primary activities precluded in winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</b>					
Direction in existing plans	Precommercial thinning, with minor exceptions	All vegetation management projects, with minor exceptions	All vegetation management projects, with some minor exceptions	All vegetation management projects, except fuel treatment projects and minor exceptions	All vegetation management projects, except fuel treatment projects in the WUI and some additional minor exceptions
<b>Effect on winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests outside wilderness</b>					
May be reduced by 5%	May be reduced by 2%	No reduction, forage habitat maintained	No reduction, plus some habitat improved.	May be reduced by 5%, plus some habitat improved	May be reduced by 2%, plus some habitat improved
<b>Issue: Effect on the ability to restore tree species and forest structures in decline</b>					
<b>Ability to precommercially thin young regenerating forests to maintain or restore tree species in decline</b>					
Direction in existing plans	Only when stands no longer provide foraging habitat, or: ♦ Within 200 feet of structures	Same as Alternative B, plus: ♦ Research and genetic tests	Same as Alternative C, plus: ♦ Daylight thinning around planted rust resistant white pine, western larch, and ponderosa pine retaining 80% of forage habitat ♦ Restoring whitebark pine & aspen ♦ Thinning lodgepole pine to promote future old growth ♦ When a broad scale assessment finds different historic forage levels	Same as Alternative C, plus: ♦ Fuel treatments developed through a collaborative process	Same as Alternative C, plus: ♦ Daylight thinning around planted rust resistant white pine, retaining 80% of forage habitat ♦ Restoring whitebark pine & aspen ♦ Based on new information which indicates little to no effect or would have long term beneficial effects

<b>The amount of precommercial thinning that could be done in planning area by alternative (in acres) based on full funding</b>							
	<b>Alt A</b>		<b>Alt B</b>	<b>Alt C</b>	<b>Alt D</b>	<b>Alt E</b>	<b>Alt F†</b>
Reason for precommercial thinning	Outside lynx habitat	Inside lynx habitat	Inside lynx habitat	Inside lynx habitat	Inside lynx habitat	Inside lynx habitat	Inside lynx habitat
Research	80	1,450	0	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450
Genetic tests	320	220	0	220	220	220	220
Within 200 feet of building	4,170	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190
Restoration *	123,080	232,620	0	0	232,210	0	63,250
Western white pine	19,610	51,090	0	0	51,090	0	51,090
Whitebark pine	250	9,110	0	0	9,110	0	9,110
Aspen	3,070	3,050	0	0	3,050	0	3,050
Ponderosa pine	48,450	11,660	0	0	11,660	0	0
Larch	45,280	123,160	0	0	123,160	0	0
Lodgepole pine	6,420	34,550	0	0	34,550	0	0
Other	53,240	158,850	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total thinning **</b>	<b>180,890</b>	<b>395,330</b>	<b>2,190</b>	<b>3,860</b>	<b>236,480</b>	<b>3,860</b>	<b>67,110</b>
*Restoration = western white pine + whitebark pine + aspen+ ponderosa pine + larch + lodgepole pine **Total thinning = research + genetics + within 200 feet of buildings + restoration + other  Acres shown are total thinning program requested. Based on average historic funding, only about 34% of the requested amount is actually received.							

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F‡
<b>Precommercial thinning deferred during next decade, based on full funding</b>					
No deferral	393,140 acres	391,470 acres	158,850 acres	391,470 acres	328,220 acres
<b>Precommercial thinning deferred during next decade, based on historic average funding of about 34% of what is requested</b>					
No deferral	131,580 acres	131,060 acres	55,110 acres	131,060 acres	110,650 acres
<b>Effect on tree species in decline</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Opportunities for research &amp; tree improvement</li> <li>♦ Contributes to improving conditions for whitebark pine &amp; aspen</li> <li>♦ Contributes to improving conditions for western white pine, western larch, ponderosa pine &amp; old growth lodgepole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ No opportunities for research &amp; tree improvement</li> <li>♦ Contributes to continued decline of western white pine, whitebark pine, aspen, western larch &amp; ponderosa pine</li> <li>♦ Contributes to decrease in old growth lodgepole pine</li> </ul>	<p>Same as Alternative B, only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Opportunities for research &amp; tree improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Opportunities for research &amp; tree improvement</li> <li>♦ Contributes to improving conditions for whitebark pine &amp; aspen</li> <li>♦ Contributes to improving conditions for western white pine, western larch, ponderosa pine &amp; old growth lodgepole</li> </ul>	<p>Same as Alternative C, except</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ May contribute to improving conditions for whitebark pine and aspen if they are treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Opportunities for research and tree improvement</li> <li>♦ Contributes to improving conditions for whitebark pine, western white pine, and aspen</li> <li>♦ May contribute to decline in ponderosa pine, western larch, and old growth lodgepole pine</li> </ul>

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F‡
<b>Issue: What level of management direction should be applied to activities that the FWS remand notice found were not a threat to lynx populations?</b>					
<b>Nature of management direction applied to grazing, minerals, roads, and over-the-snow recreation</b>					
None	<b>Grazing</b> Objective GRAZ O1 Standards GRAZ S1 to GRAZ S4 Standard LINK S2	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Objective GRAZ O1 Guidelines GRAZ G1 to G4 Guideline LINK G2	Same Objective and Guidelines as Alternative E; Guideline GRAZ G2 has slightly different wording
None	<b>Minerals</b> Objective HU O5 Standard HU S3 Guidelines HU G4 and HU G5	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Objective HU O5 Guidelines HU G4, HU G5, and HU G12	Same Objective and Guidelines as Alternative E; Objective HU O5 has slightly different wording
None	<b>Roads</b> Guidelines HU G6 to HU G9	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
None	<b>Over-the-snow recreation</b> Objective HU O1 Standards HU S1 and HU S3	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Objective HU O1 Guidelines HU G11 and HU G12	Same Objective and Guidelines as Alternative E; Guideline HU G11 has slightly different wording

‡Alternative F as described in this table represents the effects of Alternative F Scenario 1. Under Scenario 1 the management direction would apply to all lynx habitat (occupied and unoccupied) in LAUs and linkage areas. Under **Alternative F Scenario 2** the management direction **would apply only to all occupied habitat**. Occupied forests are the Flathead, Kootenai, Lolo, Helena, Idaho Panhandle, Targhee, Custer, Gallatin, Bridger-Teton, Shoshone, Lewis & Clark, and Clearwater National Forests. On these Forests the effects under Alternative F Scenario 2 would be the same as under Alternative F Scenario 1.

Under **Alternative F Scenario 2** the management direction **would NOT apply to unoccupied habitat**. For those units that are unoccupied the effects listed in the Alternative A column would reflect the effects on these units under Alternative F Scenario 2 until they become occupied, if ever. The units that are unoccupied are the Nez Perce, Salmon-Challis, Beaverhead-Deerlodge, Bitterroot, Ashley, Bighorn, and certain isolated mountain ranges of the Custer, Gallatin, Helena and Lewis & Clark National Forests. However, these units, at their option, may consider the management direction in Alternative F, so the actual effects for these units would likely be somewhere between what is indicated for Alternative A and Alternative F.

Table 2-2 Comparing how the alternatives address the issues

**Table 2-3. Comparing how management concerns are addressed in the alternatives**

<b>Alt A</b>	<b>Alt B</b>	<b>Alt C</b>	<b>Alt D</b>	<b>Alt E</b>	<b>Alt F</b>
<b>Management concern: Size of area to which Standard VEG S1 is applied. Note: Standard VEG S1 limits to 30% the amount of an area that can be in the stand initiation structural stage (that is, too short to provide winter snowshoe hare habitat).</b>					
Does not apply	Applies to an LAU, about 16,000 to 25,000 acres – this size makes it difficult to consider natural disturbance processes because they often involve larger areas	Applies to multiple contiguous LAUs – more closely resembles the scale of many natural disturbances	Applies to sub-basin or isolated mountain range, about 500,000 to one million acres – this size about the scale of many natural disturbances	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative B
<b>Management concern: Standards that focus on particular methods, such as timber harvest and salvage logging</b>					
Not applicable	Standards VEG S2, VEG S4, VEG S5 & VEG S6	Standard VEG S4	None of the standards	Standard VEG S5	Standards VEG S2 and VEG S5
<b>Management concern: Guidelines that focus on methods such as timber harvest and salvage logging</b>					
Not applicable	None	Guideline VEG G6	Guideline VEG G7	Same as Alternative D	None
<b>Management concern: How denning habitat is considered</b>					
Not applicable	If less than 10% denning habitat, then ♦ Defer projects in potential denning habitat	Same as Alternative B	If less than 10% denning habitat, then ♦ Defer projects in potential denning habitat, or ♦ Leave enough standing trees and coarse woody debris to provide den sites	Same as Alternative D, only ♦ Fuel treatments are not required to meet the 10% denning standard	Denning habitat should be distributed in each LAU. In cases where denning habitat appears to be lacking, project should retain coarse woody debris piles

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>Management concern: How adaptive management is incorporated into the Standards</b>					
Not applicable	The 30% in the stand initiation structural stage in Standard VEG S1 could be changed based on a broad scale assessment	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alt. B, plus ♦ Standards VEG S5 and VEG S6 would allow precommercial thinning if a broad scale assessment finds different historic forage levels ♦ Standard ALL S2 would allow projects to proceed if they have no adverse effects on lynx	Same as Alternative B, plus ♦ Standard ALL S2 would allow projects to proceed if they have no adverse effects on lynx, or projects that may adversely affect lynx in the short term but have beneficial effects in the long term	Same as Alternative B, plus ♦ Project-specific changes in VEG S5 may be based on new, peer reviewed information and acceptance by regional levels of FS, and state level of FWS
<b>Management concern: Size of area for Standard HU S1 over-the-snow routes</b>					
Not applicable	LAU; this size makes it difficult to consider entire routes because they often involve larger areas	By LAU, or a combination of immediately adjacent LAUs	Same as Alternative C	By LAU, or a combination of immediately adjacent LAUs. Standard HU S1 changed to Guideline HU G11	Same as Alternative E
<b>Management concern: How lynx diurnal security habitat is considered</b>					
Not applicable	Standard HU S2: When developing or expanding ski areas, locate trails, access roads, and lift termini, to maintain and provide lynx security habitat if it has been identified as a need	Guideline HU G10: When developing or expanding ski areas and trails, access roads and lift termini should be located to maintain and provide lynx diurnal security habitat if it has been identified as a need	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C	Guideline HU G10: When developing or expanding ski areas and trails, consider locating access roads and lift termini to maintain and provide lynx security habitat if it has been identified as a need.
<b>Management concern: How upgrading roads is considered</b>					
Not applicable	Guideline HU G6: avoid upgrading or paving roads	Guideline to HU G6: avoid or reduce effects on lynx when upgrading or paving roads	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C	Same as Alternative C

Table 2-3 Comparing how management concerns are addressed in the alternatives

**Table 2-4. Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives**

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Amount of lynx habitat in stand initiation structural stage that is too short to provide foraging habitat</b>					
<p>Most FS plans contain limited or no direction</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S1, S2</u> <u>Guideline VEG G1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S1 limits the amount to 30% per LAU unless a broad scale assessment finds different historic levels</li> <li>♦ Standard VEG S2 limits how much can be created by timber harvest to 15% of an LAU over a 10-year period</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G1 encourages creating foraging habitat where it is lacking</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S1</u> <u>Guideline VEG G1, S6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S1 limits the amount to 30% per combination of adjacent LAUs unless a broad scale assessment finds different historic levels</li> <li>♦ Standard VEG S2 changes to Guideline VEG G6</li> <li>♦ Changes Guideline VEG G1 to identify forest conditions to target for creating forage habitat</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S1</u> <u>Guideline VEG G1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S1 limits the amount to 30% per sub-basin or isolated mountain range unless a broad scale assessment finds different historic levels</li> <li>♦ Drops Standard VEG S2, so no restrictions on how much unsuitable habitat can be created by timber harvest</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G1 same as Alternative C</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S1</u> <u>Guideline VEG G1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S1 limits the amount to 30% per combination of adjacent LAUs unless a broad scale assessment finds different historic levels, but would not apply to fuel treatment projects</li> <li>♦ Standard VEG S2 dropped, same as Alternative D</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G1 same as Alternative C</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S1, S2</u> <u>Guideline VEG G1</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative B, except Standards VEG S1 and S2 would not apply to fuel treatments within the WUI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Fuel treatment projects cannot exceed the vegetation standards on more than 6% of lynx habitat within an administrative unit</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G1 encourages creating foraging habitat where it is lacking (The guideline has slightly different wording from Alternative C)</li> </ul>

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Denning habitat</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Most plans contain some direction for keeping dead &amp; down material</li> <li>♦ Management direction inadequate or lacking in three FS plans</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S3, S4</u> <u>Guideline VEG G2, G3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S3 requires retaining 10% denning habitat; if less, projects in potential denning habitat deferred</li> <li>♦ Standard VEG S4 prohibits salvage after a disturbance kills trees in patches smaller than five acres; unless there is 10% denning habitat, with some exceptions</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G2 encourages creating denning habitat where it is lacking</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G3 says to restore or retain denning habitat where it is less likely to burn by wildfire</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S3, S4</u> <u>Guideline VEG G2, G3</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative B, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S4 allows salvage logging within 200 feet of structures, dwellings, or outbuildings</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G3, G7</u></p> <p>Standard VEG S3 same as Alternative B, only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Allows projects to move towards 10% denning habitat by leaving standing trees &amp; coarse woody debris</li> <li>♦ Standard VEG S4 changed to Guideline VEG G7, so consider no salvage harvest in patches smaller than five acres if less than 10% denning per LAU</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G2 incorporated into VEG S3</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G3 same as Alternative B</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G3, G7</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative D, only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard VEG S3 does not apply to fuel treatment</li> </ul>	<p><u>Guideline VEG G11</u></p> <p>All standards and guidelines on denning combined into Guideline VEG G11, which states, “Denning habitat should be distributed in each LAU in the form of packets of large amounts of large woody debris...If denning appears to be lacking in the LAU, then projects should be designed to retain some coarse woody debris, piles, or residual trees...”</p>

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Lynx foraging habitat (winter snowshoe hare habitat)</b>					
<b>In young regenerating forests</b>					
<p>Most FS plans contain limited or no direction that restrict activities in young regenerating forests.</p> <p>Precommercial thinning (PCT) and whitebark pine restoration (thinning followed by burning) could reduce about 24% of high density winter snowshoe hare habitat in young forests if fully funded</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S5</u></p> <p>Would restrict PCT, with one minor allowance. PCT could reduce less than 1% of high density winter snowshoe hare habitat in young forests</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S5</u></p> <p>Would restrict PCT, with a couple of minor exceptions. PCT could reduce less than 1% of high density winter snowshoe hare habitat in young forests</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S5</u></p> <p>Would restrict some PCT, but PCT would be allowed to restore tree species and structures in decline. PCT could reduce about 15% of high density winter snowshoe hare habitat in young forests</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S5</u></p> <p>Same as Alt C, except would allow fuel treatments that use PCT as a tool in young forests</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S5</u></p> <p>Would restrict some PCT, but PCT would be allowed to restore some tree species and structures in decline. PCT could reduce about 8% of high density winter snowshoe hare habitat in young forests if fully funded</p>
<b>In multistoried forests</b>					
<p>Most FS plans contain limited or no direction that restrict activities in multistoried forests – except old growth direction.</p> <p>Fuel treatments could reduce about 8% of winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</p>	<p><u>Standard VEG S6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Would restrict PCT, with one minor allowance. Would allow other vegetation management projects within multistoried forests.</li> <li>♦ Fuel treatments could reduce about 4% of winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Would restrict all vegetation management, with a couple of minor exceptions.</li> <li>♦ Fuel treatments could reduce less than 1% of winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Would restrict all vegetation management, with some exceptions.</li> <li>♦ Fuel treatments could reduce less than 1% of winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</li> </ul>	<p><u>Guideline VEG G8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Does not restrict vegetation management – but instead instructs projects to provide habitat over time.</li> <li>♦ Would not apply to fuel treatments</li> <li>♦ Fuel treatments could reduce less than 8% of winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standard VEG S6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Would restrict all vegetation management, with a couple of minor exceptions.</li> <li>♦ Would not apply to fuel treatments in the WUI</li> <li>♦ Fuel treatments could reduce less than 3% of winter snowshoe hare habitat in multistoried forests</li> </ul>

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Wildland fire management</b>					
Most FS plans contain limited or no direction	<u>Objective VEG O3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G4</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Objective VEG O3 says to conduct fire use activities to restore ecological processes &amp; maintain or improve lynx habitat</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G4 says fire use activities should not create permanent travel routes that facilitate snow compaction. Constructing permanent firebreaks on ridges or saddles should be avoided.</li> <li>♦ The VEG objectives, standards, and guidelines would not require suppressing fires nor apply to wildland fire use</li> </ul>	<u>Objective VEG O3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G4</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Objective VEG O3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G4</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Objective VEG O3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G4</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Objective VEG O3</u> <u>Guideline VEG G4</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Objective VEG O3 same as Alternative B.</li> <li>♦ Guideline VEG G4 says prescribed fire activities should not create permanent travel routes that facilitate snow compaction. Constructing permanent firebreaks on ridges or saddles should be avoided</li> <li>♦ The VEG objectives, standards, and guidelines would not require suppressing fires nor apply to wildland fire use</li> </ul>
<b>LCAS risk factor: Winter recreation</b>					
Most FS plans contain limited or no direction	<u>Standard HU S1, S2, S3, ALL S1</u> <u>Guidelines HU G1, G2, G3</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard HU S1 says no net-increase allowed in designated over-the-snow routes</li> </ul>	<u>Standard HU S1, S3, ALL S1</u> <u>Guidelines HU G1, G2, G3, G10</u> Same as Alternative B, however <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard HU S1 says no net-increase in</li> </ul>	<u>Standard HU S1, S3, ALL S1</u> <u>Guidelines HU G1, G2, G3, G10</u> Same as Alternative C	<u>Standard ALL S1</u> <u>Guidelines HU G1, G2, G3, G10, G11, G12</u> Similar to Alternative C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard HU S1 changed to Guideline</li> </ul>	<u>Standard ALL S1</u> <u>Guidelines HU G1, G2, G3, G10, G11, G12</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standards HU S1, S2, and S3 changed to Guideline HU G11, G10, and G12, respectively.</li> </ul>

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
	<p>per LAU unless consolidating use or improving lynx habitat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard HU S2 says when developing or expanding ski areas, locate routes &amp; access roads to maintain &amp; provide lynx security habitat</li> <li>♦ Standard HU S3 restricts over-the-snow access for non-recreation special uses, timber sales, etc., to designated routes</li> <li>♦ Includes Guidelines HU G1, HU G2, and HU G3 that require considering lynx habitat and movement needs</li> <li>♦ Standard ALL S1 says new or expanded developments must maintain habitat connectivity</li> </ul>	<p>designated over-the-snow routes allowed per combination of adjacent LAUs, unless consolidating use, improving lynx habitat, or in areas of consistent snow compaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard HU S2 changed to Guideline HU G10, which says access roads and lift termini should be located to maintain and provide diurnal lynx security habitat</li> <li>♦ Guidelines HU G1, G2, and G3 same as Alternative B</li> </ul>		<p>HU G11, which says use should not expand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard HU S2 changed to Guideline HU G10, which says access roads and lift termini should be located to maintain and provide lynx diurnal security.</li> <li>♦ Standard HU S3 changed to Guideline HU G12, which say winter access should be limited to designated routes and designated over-the-snow routes</li> <li>♦ Guidelines HU G1, G2, and G3 same as Alternative B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard ALL S1 is worded slightly differently from Alternative B, to be specific to LAUs and linkage areas.</li> <li>♦ Guidelines HU G1, G2, and G3 same as Alternative B.</li> <li>♦ Guideline HU G10 is worded slightly differently to say access roads and lift termini should be located to maintain and provide lynx security habitat</li> <li>♦ Guideline HU G11 is worded slightly differently from Alternative E to include a combination of immediately adjacent LAUs.</li> <li>♦ Guideline HU G12 same as E.</li> </ul>

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Highways</b>					
<p>Most FS plans contain limited or no direction</p>	<p><u>Standards ALL SI and LINK SI</u>  <u>Guideline ALL GI</u>                      ♦ Standard ALL SI says new or expanded developments must maintain habitat connectivity                      ♦ Standard LINK SI says within linkage areas, potential highway crossings must be identified when construction or reconstruction is proposed                      ♦ Guideline ALL GI encourages avoiding or reducing effects on lynx when constructing or reconstructing highways and forest highways</p>	<p><u>Standards ALL SI and LINK SI</u>  <u>Guideline ALL GI</u>                      Same as Alternative B</p>	<p><u>Standards ALL SI and LINK SI</u>  <u>Guideline ALL GI</u>                      Same as Alternative B</p>	<p><u>Standards ALL SI and LINK SI</u>  <u>Guideline ALL GI</u>                      Same as Alternative B</p>	<p><u>Standards ALL SI and LINK SI</u>  <u>Guideline ALL GI</u>                      Same as Alternative B</p>

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Forest &amp; backcountry roads</b>					
<p>Some FS plans contain direction which may conserve lynx, but others contain little or no direction</p>	<p><u>Guidelines HU G6, G7, G8, G9</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Guideline HU G6 discourages upgrading &amp; paving roads in lynx habitat where increases in human activity would result</li> <li>♦ Guideline HU G7 discourages building permanent roads on ridge-tops &amp; saddles</li> <li>♦ Guideline HU G8 discourages cutting brush along low-speed, low-traffic roads</li> <li>♦ Guideline HU G9 encourages restricting public motorized use on new roads built to access projects &amp; decommissioning new roads not needed for other reasons</li> </ul>	<p><u>Guidelines HU G6, G7, G8, G9</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative B, only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Guideline HU G6 encourages avoiding or reducing effects on lynx when upgrading &amp; paving roads in lynx habitat where increases in human activity would result</li> </ul>	<p><u>Guidelines HU G6, G7, G8, G9</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative C</p>	<p><u>Guidelines HU G6, G7, G8, G9</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative C</p>	<p><u>Guidelines HU G6, G7, G8, G9</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative C</p>

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Livestock grazing</b>					
<p>Some existing direction (INFISH, PACFISH) partially meets lynx conservation needs in most plans</p>	<p><u>Standards GRAZ S1, S2, S3, S4, LINK S2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Standard GRAZ S1 says grazing shall be managed to allow shrubs &amp; trees to regenerate in fire- &amp; harvest-created openings</li> <li>♦ Standard GRAZ S2 says grazing shall be managed to ensure aspen propagation</li> <li>♦ Standards GRAZ S3, GRAZ S4, and LINK S2 says grazing shall be managed to achieve seral stage distribution similar to historic patterns in wet areas, willows, and shrub-steppe habitats</li> </ul>	<p><u>Standards GRAZ S1, S2, S3, S4, LINK S2</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative B</p>	<p><u>Standards GRAZ S1, S2, S3, S4, LINK S2</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative B</p>	<p><u>Guidelines GRAZ G1, G2, G3, G4, LINK G2</u></p> <p>Changes Standards GRAZ S1, S2, S3, S4 and LINK S2 to Guidelines GRAZ G1, G2, G3, G4 and LINK G2. Changing the requirements from the imperative “shall” to “should”</p>	<p><u>Guidelines GRAZ G1, G2, G3, G4, LINK G2</u></p> <p>Same as Alternative E. Guideline GRAZ G2 wording changed so the guideline more explicitly contributes to the long-term health and sustainability of <i>aspen</i></p>

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Table 2-4 Comparing how the LCAS risk factors are addressed in the alternatives

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>LCAS risk factor: Oil &amp; gas leasing</b>					
Most FS plans contain limited or no direction	<u>Standard HU S3</u> <u>Guidelines HU G4, G5</u> ♦ Standard HU S3 says motorized over-the-snow access for mineral & energy exploration & facilities shall be restricted to designated routes ♦ Guideline HU G4 encourages remote monitoring ♦ Guideline HU G5 encourages developing reclamation plans that improves lynx habitat	<u>Standard HU S3</u> <u>Guidelines HU G4, G5</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Standard HU S3</u> <u>Guidelines HU G4, G5</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Guidelines HU G4, G5, G12</u> Similar to Alternative B, only ♦ Changes Standard HU S3 to Guideline HU G12, changing the requirement from the imperative “shall” to “should”	<u>Guidelines HU G4, G5, G12</u> Same as Alternative E
<b>LCAS risk factor: Land ownership patterns</b>					
Most FS plans contain limited or no direction	<u>Guideline LINK G1</u> ♦ Guideline LINK G1 encourages retaining NFS lands in public ownership	<u>Guideline LINK G1</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Guideline LINK G1</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Guideline LINK G1</u> Same as Alternative B	<u>Guideline LINK G1</u> Same as Alternative B

Table 2-5. Comparing how the alternatives affect lynx

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>Effects on lynx: Effects of proposal (change in effects from Alternative A)</b>					
<p><b>To Individuals</b> No change; adverse effects continue.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> No change; adverse effects continue</p>	<p><i>To Individuals</i> Substantial beneficial effects, with some adverse affects possible because there is no management direction for multistoried forests, beyond limiting precommercial thinning. All other risk factors have been addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Substantial beneficial effects, with some adverse affects possible because there is no management direction for multistoried forests, beyond limiting precommercial thinning. All other risk factors have been addressed.</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Beneficial effects; all risk factors substantially addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Long-term beneficial effects; all risk factors substantially addressed.</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Some beneficial effects; some risk factors related to vegetation are only partially addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Some beneficial effects; some risk factors related to thinning are only partially addressed.</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Some beneficial effects; some risk factors related to vegetation management and fuels treatment are only partially addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Some beneficial effects. Allowance for fuel treatment projects may result in adverse affects across an administrative unit</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Some beneficial effects; some risk factors related to vegetation management and fuels treatment only partially addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Some beneficial effects; Allowance for fuel treatment projects in the WUI may result in adverse affects on 6% of lynx habitat within an administrative unit</p>
<b>Effects on lynx: Effects of plans as amended</b>					
<p><b>To Individuals</b> No change: adverse effects continue.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b></p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Substantial beneficial effects, with some adverse affects possible because there is no management direction for multistoried forests, beyond limiting precommercial thinning. All other risk factors have been</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Beneficial effects; all risk factors substantially addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Beneficial effects; all risk</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Some beneficial effects; may be some adverse effects over the short term; some risk factors related precommercial thinning only partially addressed.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b></p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Some beneficial effects; may be some adverse effects over the short or long term. Allowing fuel treatment projects may result in adverse effects.</p> <p><b>To Populations</b> Some beneficial effects; may be some adverse effects over the</p>	<p><b>To Individuals</b> Some beneficial effects; may be some adverse effects over the short or long term; some risk factors. Allowing fuel treatment projects in the WUI may result in adverse effects on 6% of lynx habitat in an administrative</p>

Table 2-5 Comparing how the alternatives affect lynx

Table 2-5 Comparing how the alternatives affect lynx

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
No change; adverse effects continue.	addressed. <b>To Populations</b> Substantial beneficial effects, with some adverse affects possible because there is no management direction for multistoried forests, beyond limiting precommercial thinning. All other risk factors have been addressed.	factors substantially addressed.	Some beneficial effects; may be some adverse effects over the short term; some risk factors related to precommercial thinning only partially addressed.	short or long term. Allowing fuel treatment projects may result in adverse effects.	unit. <b>To Populations</b> Some beneficial effects; may be some adverse effects over the short term. Allowing fuel treatment projects in the WUI are not likely to result in adverse effects on populations because 94% of lynx habitat would have adequate protections
<b>Effects on lynx: Contributes to conserving species</b>					
No	Substantially contributes to conservation of lynx; however there is no management direction beyond precommercial thinning for multistoried forests	Yes	Partially Many standards contribute to conserving lynx but thinning allowances may result in adverse effects	Partially Many standards contribute to conserving lynx but vegetation standards that allow fuel treatment may result in adverse effects	Yes, because risk factors have been substantially addressed and there are limits on fuel treatment projects in lynx habitat.

Table 2-6. Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>Effects on threatened, endangered, and proposed animal species other than lynx</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	All alternatives result in <i>both limited reduction and improvement</i> in habitat and are not likely to adversely affect listed or proposed species. Species include: <u>mammals</u> including grey wolf and grizzly bear; <u>fish</u> including bull trout, Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and sockeye salmon.				
<b>Effects on sensitive animal species</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	<p>All alternatives result in <i>limited improvement</i> in habitat for <u>mammals</u> including wolverine; <u>birds</u> including black-backed woodpecker, red-naped sapsucker, three-toed woodpecker, Williamson's sapsucker, and white-headed woodpecker; and <u>amphibians</u> including boreal toad and northern leopard frog.</p> <p>All alternatives result in <i>both limited reduction and improvement</i> in habitat and are not likely to adversely affect any sensitive species. Species include: <u>mammals</u> including fisher and marten; <u>birds</u> including boreal owl, great grey owl, northern goshawk, olive-sided flycatcher, and Swainson's thrush; <u>fish</u> including arctic grayling, Bonneville cutthroat trout, burbot, Colorado River cutthroat trout, interior redband trout, mountain sucker, Pacific lamprey, Snake River cutthroat trout, Snake River spring/summer Chinook, westslope cutthroat trout, and Yellowstone cutthroat trout.</p> <p>All alternatives may cause <i>limited reduction</i> in habitat for one bird species, the Hammond's flycatcher.</p> <p>The alternatives are not likely to adversely affect these species.</p>				
<b>Effects on management indicator species</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	<p>All alternatives result in <i>limited improvement</i> in habitat for <u>mammals</u> including beaver and moose; <u>birds</u> including blue grouse, downy woodpecker, hairy woodpecker, mountain bluebird, northern flicker, red-breasted nuthatch, ruby-crowned kinglet, willow flycatcher, yellow bellied sapsucker, and yellow warbler.</p> <p>All alternatives result in <i>both limited reduction and improvement</i> in habitat and are not likely to adversely affect any species. Species include: <u>mammals</u> including black bear, bobcat, elk, mule deer, red squirrel, and white-tailed deer; <u>birds</u> including pileated woodpecker; <u>fish</u> including brook trout, cutthroat trout, rainbow trout, trout; and <u>macro-invertebrates</u></p>				
<b>Effects on fish &amp; aquatics</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects	Negligible effects.				

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
from those described in existing Forest Plans.					
<b>Effects on plants – threatened, endangered, proposed, and sensitive species</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	Beneficial or no effect to all species.				
<b>Effects on timber management</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	May reduce opportunities for regeneration harvest where there are large areas of very young regenerating forests. Approximately 13% of the LAUs exceed the 15% timber and 30% disturbance standards. Could increase opportunities for regeneration harvest where foraging habitat is lacking. Some projects may have to be deferred or locations changed where denning habitat is lacking; but denning habitat generally is not lacking.	Same as Alternative B, except that in Alternative C: It is less likely that the amount of habitat in very young forest condition would constrain regeneration harvest; and Timber harvest in multistoried foraging habitat could be deferred or modified to avoid reducing habitat.	Same as Alternative C, except that in Alternative D: Some timber harvest could take place in multistoried foraging habitat, especially when it can be designed to maintain and improve forage conditions.	Same as Alternative D, except that in Alternative E: Only timber harvest for fuel treatment would be unaffected by any of the vegetation standards.	Same as Alternative B, except that in Alternative F: Some timber harvest may be unaffected if done for fuel treatment purposes within the WIU, as defined by HFRA. Timber harvest could occur in multistory forest when designed to maintain and improve forage conditions, or in areas where forage is lacking. Denning habitat would not constrain timber harvest.
<b>Effects on range</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add	Limited effects: In some cases, livestock management may need to be intensified or structural			Same as Alternative B, except that Alternatives E and F:	

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<p>any new management direction. Current livestock grazing practices would not change on federal grazing allotments. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.</p>	<p>improvements added in the allotment. Most likely to affect grazing on units east of the Continental Divide that currently are without aquatic direction in existing plans.</p>			<p>May have fewer effects on livestock grazing practices because standards are changed to guidelines.</p>	
<b>Effects on developed winter recreation</b>					
<p>The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. <b>Ski areas</b> and <b>outfitter-guide operations</b> on NFS lands would be managed as they have been under the existing plans. <b>Winter trails:</b> designation and grooming are not constrained beyond what is currently described in each Plan, but they are likely to remain at current levels for at least the next five years due to funding. There would be no change in effects to winter recreation from those described in existing Forest Plans.</p>	<p><b>Ski areas:</b> No change to existing ski areas. Would not preclude further development, however, new ski areas and expansions would have to incorporate design measures to provide for lynx habitat needs. Could affect timing of operations, where ski runs are located, and the costs associated with development. <b>Outfitter-guide:</b> would be limited to existing designated over-the-snow routes and areas. <b>Winter trails:</b> The level of designated routes would be maintained at about</p>	<p><b>Ski areas:</b> Same as Alternative B, only Alternatives C and D are less likely to affect timing of ski area operations. <b>Outfitter-guide:</b> Could expand into areas of consistent snow compaction that are not currently designated or groomed. <b>Winter trails:</b> Would allow increases in designated over-the-snow routes if the increases consolidate use and improve lynx habitat. Grooming could expand on 3,500 miles of designated, ungroomed routes in lynx habitat.</p>		<p><b>Ski areas:</b> Same as Alternatives C and D. <b>Outfitter-guide:</b> Same as Alternatives C and D. <b>Winter trails:</b> Could result in an increase in designated over-the-snow routes, but should not result in more compacted snow since expansion would be into areas already compacted as established in the baseline. Grooming could expand on 3,500 miles of designated, ungroomed routes in lynx habitat.</p>	

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
	8,000 miles. Grooming could expand on approximately 3,500 miles of designated ungroomed routes in lynx habitat.				
<b>Effects on minerals</b>					
Management direction concerning <b>mineral materials, locatable minerals, leasable minerals, or development of outstanding or reserved rights</b> would not be changed under the No Action Alternative, so there would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	<p><b>Mineral Materials:</b> There would be minimal effects on new sites, or expansion or further development of existing sites since most are near existing roads.</p> <p><b>Locatable minerals:</b> Operations can not be precluded, but lynx habitat needs to be considered and lynx habitat connectivity to be provided. This could require additional mitigation to minimize effects on lynx, and could increase costs of development.</p> <p><b>Leasable minerals:</b> These alternatives would not affect availability nor preclude operations. However, there is potential of increased costs for mineral exploration and development due to mitigation measures such as remote monitoring, shifting proposed winter operations to other seasons, or the use of off-site mitigation or off-site production facilities.</p> <p><b>Outstanding minerals or reserved rights:</b> Operations can not be precluded, but reasonable mitigation measures may be used to protect habitat for lynx.</p>			<p><b>Mineral Materials:</b> Some standards changed to guidelines, but effects would be the same as Alternative B.</p> <p><b>Locatable minerals:</b> May have lower cost increases than Alternatives B, C, and D because some standards are changed to guidelines.</p> <p><b>Leasable minerals:</b> May have lower cost increases than Alternatives B, C, and D because some standards are changed to guidelines.</p> <p><b>Outstanding minerals or reserved rights:</b> May have lower cost increases than Alternatives B, C, and D because some standards are changed to guidelines. Operations can not be precluded, but reasonable mitigation measures may be used to protect habitat for lynx.</p>	
<b>Effects on highways</b>					
Incorporating wildlife crossings into highway design is already being done by state and federal agencies. The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.	Little effect is anticipated. Incorporating wildlife crossings into highway design, is already being done by state and federal agencies.				

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>Effects on forest roads</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans	No restrictions on existing roads. Public motorized use of newly built roads in lynx habitat may be restricted Upgrades to existing roads that result in increased traffic speeds or volumes are discouraged	Same as Alternative B, except: Where upgrades to existing roads result in increased traffic speeds or volumes, they may be allowed if designed to reduce effects on lynx.			
<b>Effects on changing land ownership</b>					
The real estate program would not change. Land ownership adjustments would continue, but may not be a priority because of limited funding. The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans	Limited effect on land exchanges.  Discourages disposing of lynx habitat by exchanging it away.  Lynx habitat could be acquired.				
<b>Effects on land uses</b>					
The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction to maintain lynx habitat connectivity in linkage areas. There	Projects would need to maintain lynx habitat connectivity.				

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans					
<b>Economic effects from limiting precommercial thinning</b>					
<p>Based on historic average funding, under the No Action Alternative about 200,000 acres would be thinned, representing about 180 jobs per year and about \$2.0 million per year in labor income.</p> <p>Based on full funding, about 581,000 acres would be thinned, representing about 530 jobs per year and about \$5.8 million per year in labor income</p>	<p>Based on historic average funding, about 120 jobs per year could be reduced and labor income decreased by \$1.3 million per year from Alternative A</p> <p>Based on full funding, about 360 jobs per year could be reduced and labor income decreased by \$4 million per year from Alternative A</p>		<p>Based on historic average funding, about 70 jobs per year could be reduced and labor income decreased by \$800,000 per year from Alternative A</p> <p>Based on full funding, about 210 jobs per year could be reduced and labor income decreased by \$2.3 million per year from Alternative A.</p>	Same as Alternatives B and C.	<p>Based on historic average funding, about 100 jobs per year could be reduced and labor income decreased by \$1.1 million per year from Alternative A</p> <p>Based on full funding, about 300 jobs per year could be reduced and labor income decreased by \$3.2 million per year from Alternative A.</p>
<b>Economic effects from limiting increases to groomed and designated over-the-snow routes</b>					
An increasing trend in snowmobile use is likely. Since the No Action Alternative would impose no change to winter recreation opportunities, it would have no effect on the economic contributions of snowmobiles.	<p>No effect to economy: Existing uses would continue</p> <p>Some undesignated routes may see increased use</p> <p>There may be some local effects because outfitters cannot expand. ‡</p>	<p>No effect to the economy.</p> <p>Would allow no net increase in designated over-the-snow routes, except where existing use already is concentrated.</p> <p>Grooming could expand on routes currently designated.</p> <p>Unlikely to result in localized effects on outfitters.</p>			

Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F
<b>Social effects</b>					
<p>Alternative A would not change the current social environment or employment opportunities, so there would be no social effects from the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Higher use on existing designated or groomed over-the-snow routes could occur, changing user experience ‡ Fewer employment opportunities due to decreases in precommercial thinning (see economics effects above). Higher use on existing designated or groomed over-the-snow routes could occur, changing user experience There would be negligible social effect from grazing, ski areas, and mining direction.</p>	<p>Over-the-snow user experience should not change as a result of Alternative C Fewer employment opportunities due to decreases in precommercial thinning (see economics effects above). There would be negligible social effect from grazing, ski areas, and mining direction.</p>	<p>Social effects same as Alternative C with somewhat different employment opportunities, depending on alternative (see economics effects from limiting precommercial thinning, above).</p>		
<b>Effects on environmental justice</b>					
<p>The No Action Alternative would not add any new management direction. There would be no change in effects from those described in existing Forest Plans.</p>	<p>No differential effects to any minority or low-income population or community were found. Input from all interested persons and groups have been considered.</p>				

‡ Grooming levels have been stable during the past five years and are not likely to increase during the next five. This is due the increased costs of machinery and grooming operations, while the funding from the states to do grooming has not increased.

Table 2-6 Comparing how the alternatives affect other resources