

**PREPARATION PLAN
FOR
MODIFICATION OF THE
GREAT DIVIDE (RAWLINS)
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

RAWLINS FIELD OFFICE

WYOMING

August 2001

Concurred:

Field Manager

Date

Approved:

State Director

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| BACKGROUND | 1 |
| 1. Southwest Wyoming Resource Evaluation Report and Recommendations..... | 2 |
| 2. Plan Maintenance Needs Identified in the Wyoming Planning and Environmental Coordination Core Group Workshop..... | 2 |
| 3. Report to Congress, Land Use Planning for Sustainable Resource Decisions | 2 |
| ANTICIPATED PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS..... | 3 |
| PRELIMINARY ISSUES IDENTIFIED FOR PURPOSES OF THIS PLANNING REVIEW | 4 |
| 1. ISSUE 1: Development of Energy Minerals and Related Issues..... | 4 |
| 2. ISSUE 2: Special Management Designations | 5 |
| 3. ISSUE 3: Resource Accessibility | 6 |
| 4. ISSUE 4: Wildland/Urban Interface..... | 6 |
| 5. ISSUE 5: Special Status Species Management | 7 |
| 6. ISSUE 6: Water Quality | 7 |
| 7. ISSUE 7: Vegetation Management | 7 |
| 8. ISSUE 8: Recreation Cultural Resources and Paelontological Resource Management | 8 |
| PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA..... | 9 |
| 1. Criteria for Use of Mitigation Guidelines | 9 |
| 2. Criteria for Coal Screening Process..... | 9 |
| 3. Criteria for Healthy Rangelands..... | 10 |
| 4. Criteria for Multiple Use Considerations..... | 10 |
| 5. Criteria for Hydrocarbon Potential | 10 |
| 6. Criteria for Other Leasable Minerals..... | 10 |
| 7. Criteria for Salable Mineral Potential | 11 |
| 8. Criteria for Locatable Minerals Potential..... | 11 |
| 9. Criteria for Withdrawals and Classifications..... | 11 |
| Withdrawals Under Other Agency Jurisdiction | 11 |
| Withdrawals and Classification Under BLM Jurisdiction | 11 |
| 10. Criteria for Wild Horse Management | 11 |
| 11. Criteria for Wilderness Management | 12 |
| 12. Criteria for Wild and Scenic Rivers..... | 12 |
| 13. Criteria for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)..... | 12 |
| PLANNING CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES..... | 13 |
| PLANNING CRITERIA FOR ANALYZING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES..... | 14 |
| PLANNING CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE..... | 15 |
| PLANNING CRITERIA FOR USING THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS PROCEDURE TO DEVELOP LAND USE PLAN (RMP) PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT DECISIONS..... | 15 |
| DATA AND GIS NEEDS | 17 |
| PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS..... | 19 |
| PLANNING TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES | 19 |
| 1. State Office Coordinator..... | 19 |
| 2. State office Review Team | 20 |
| 3. Field Manager | 20 |
| 4. Field Office Public Affairs Specialist..... | 20 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 5. | Interdisciplinary Planning Team..... | 21 |
| a. | Team Leader | 21 |
| b. | Technical Coordinator..... | 21 |
| c. | GIS Coordinator | 22 |
| d. | Interdisciplinary Team | 22 |
| e. | Editor | 23 |
| f. | Support Team | 23 |
| | FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN..... | 23 |
| | Procedural Requirements..... | 23 |
| | ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS, DOCUMENTATION, AND REVIEW | 25 |
| | Preplanning - Development of the Management Situation Analysis..... | 25 |
| | 1. Alternative Formulation | 25 |
| | 2. Development of the Preferred Alternative..... | 26 |
| | BUDGET | 26 |
| | PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE | 26 |
| | | |
| | APPENDIX B - FISCAL YEAR 2001 EVALUATION OF THE GREAT DIVIDE RMP | |
| | APPENDIX C - WYOMING MITIGATION GUIDELINES FOR SURFACE-DISTURBING AND DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITIES | |
| | APPENDIX D - STANDARDS FOR HEALTHY RANGELANDS AND GUIDELINES FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC LANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE STATE OF WYOMING | |
| | | |
| | APPENDIX F - DIGITAL CARTOGRAPHIC SUPPORT FOR THE GREEN RIVER FIELD OFFICE AREA | |
| | APPENDIX G - METADATA DIRECTION | |
| | APPENDIX H - DRAFT PUBLIC OUTREACH/PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR THE GREAT DIVIDE RMP REVIEW AND MODIFICATION | |
| | APPENDIX I - INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM MEMBERS AND RESPONSIBILITY | |

ACRONYM LIST

ACEC - area of critical environmental concern
AML - appropriate management level
BLM - Bureau of Land Management
BOR - Bureau of Reclamation
CEQ - Council on Environmental Quality
CFR - Code of Federal Regulations
DM - Departmental Manual
EA - environmental assessment
EIS - environmental impact statement
ESI - ecological site inventory
FGDC - Federal Geographic Data Committee
FLPMA - Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FWS - Fish and Wildlife Service
GIS - geographic information system
HA - herd area
HMA - herd management area
HMP - habitat management plan
IDT - interdisciplinary team
IMP - interim management policy
LUP - land use plan
MSA - management situation analysis
NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
NOI - Notice of Intent
NPDES - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS - National Resource Conservation Service
NSO - no surface occupancy
OHV - off-highway vehicle
PSP - planning support project
RFA - reasonable (or reasonably) foreseeable action (or activity)
RFD - reasonable (or reasonably) foreseeable development
RMP - resource management plan
ROD - record of decision
R&PP - Recreation & Public Purpose
SDC - Spatial Data Clearinghouse
S&G - standards and guidelines
SMA - surface management agency
SRMA - special recreation management area
TMDL - total maximum daily load
VRM - visual resource management
WARMS - Wyoming Air Resources Monitoring System
WGFD - Wyoming Game and Fish Department
WGIAC - Wyoming Geographic Information Advisory Council
WHMP - wild horse management plan
WMP - watershed management plan
WSA - wilderness study area
WSR - wild and scenic river

WSRA - Wild and Scenic River Act
WSRS - Wild and Scenic River System

A PREPARATION PLAN FOR MODIFICATION OF THE GREAT DIVIDE RMP (RAWLINS FIELD OFFICE)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Preparation Plan is to identify the process to be followed and the manpower and funding needed to conduct a comprehensive review of the Great Divide Resource Management Plan (RMP). Modification of the current plan may occur through maintenance, amendment, or revision. Plan review and modification work will be coordinated with ongoing Planning Support Projects (PSPs). The PSPs address planning needs by issue or resource on a statewide basis rather than plan by plan. Tackling these issues on a statewide basis will yield efficiencies and shorten the time required to modify all of Wyoming's RMPs. Integration of PSPs and this plan review and modification process are identified in the Issues Section of this Preparation Plan.

Other specific objectives of the Preparation Plan are to:

1. Identify the process for conducting the Great Divide RMP planning review and modification.
2. Identify data, information, or decision needs and recommend tasks and approaches to efficiently collect necessary data.
3. Identify schedules and budgets for the plan modification work.
4. Make staffing and workload evaluations and identify potential shortages.
5. Identify participants in the planning project and present a public participation plan.

The majority of the plan review and modification, including National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance, will be performed by a contractor, with oversight provided by Rawlins Field Office personnel.

BACKGROUND

The Great Divide RMP provides management guidance and direction for approximately four million acres of BLM-administered public land surface and five million acres of BLM-administered federal mineral estate in Albany, Carbon, Laramie, and Sweetwater Counties. The planning area includes five wilderness study areas (WSAs -- Encampment River Canyon, Prospect Mountain, Bennett Mountains, Adobe Town, Ferris Mountain), four areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC -- Jep Canyon, Como Bluff, Shamrock Hills, Sand Hills), and three special recreation management areas (SRMAs -- Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, North Platte River, Shirley Mountain Caves).

Areas administered by other federal agencies within the planning area include the Medicine Bow National Forest; Pathfinder/Seminole Reservoirs, administered by the Bureau of Reclamation; and two small wildlife refuges, administered by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. BLM land use plan decisions do not apply to these areas.

The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Great Divide RMP was signed on November 8, 1990. Two amendments and eight maintenance actions have been completed since the ROD was signed. New issues and concerns identified during the recent RMP evaluations conducted throughout the state have necessitated a planning review of the Great Divide RMP to determine modification needs (see issue section). *Note--As used in this Preparation Plan, "planning review" means a detailed evaluation of the existing Great Divide RMP.* The preliminary evaluations have helped to clarify the planning issues and have pointed to some possible solutions. The recommendations in this Preparation Plan are related directly to these preliminary RMP evaluations. The final report for the Great Divide RMP preliminary evaluation (Rawlins Field Office) was signed July 5, 2001. The boom in mineral development activity, combined with the age of the RMP, made the timing of the preliminary evaluation urgent, and the evaluation findings are indispensable to this Preparation Plan. The Great Divide Evaluation Report is attached to this Preparation Plan as Appendix B.

Recent studies on the adequacy of Wyoming RMPs contributed to the recent evaluation findings. Those other studies have included:

1. **Southwest Wyoming Resource Evaluation Report and Recommendations (February 1999).** Addressing the Green River, Pinedale, Kemmerer, and **Great Divide** RMPs, it was determined that, (1) Oil and gas-related decisions in the four resource management plans are uniformly consistent with only minor technical differences in the application of mitigation measures. (2) BLM's methods and practices of both assessing impacts from oil and gas development in southwest Wyoming and complying with NEPA are reasonable and appropriate. (3) The number of oil and gas wells in each of the four field office management areas is below the level of development projected in the RMP EISs. *Note--The number of wells drilled in the Great Divide RMP management area has been exceeded in the time since the Southwest Wyoming Resource Evaluation Report was completed.* The surface disturbance estimates used for analysis purposes in the RMP EIS will be exceeded during this RMP review process. A plan review and possible modification will be conducted concurrently with the development of an ongoing coalbed methane EIS. (4) The **Great Divide RMP** should be evaluated to determine whether there have been any unacceptable environmental effects during plan implementation. The evaluation should focus on multiple use decisions including resource allocations and planned mitigation measures.
2. **Plan Maintenance Needs Identified in the Wyoming Planning and Environmental Coordination Core Group Workshop (June 1999).** The participants of this workshop recommended that, (1) Wild and scenic river (WSR) reviews need to be conducted in the Kemmerer, Pinedale, Washakie, **Great Divide**, Lander, and Platte River RMP planning areas. This may involve amendments to some plans if the reviews identify any BLM-administered lands that meet the WSR eligibility criteria and suitability factors. (2) When completed, national policy on the management of off-highway vehicles (OHV) needs to be incorporated into Wyoming RMPs. (3) A withdrawal review of lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation will be needed for Washakie, Grass Creek, **Great Divide** (possibly with Little Snake RMP), Green River, Pinedale, and Kemmerer RMPs. (4) Several field offices need to address the revocation of oil shale, coal, and phosphate withdrawals on an estimated 11.5 million acres.

3. **Report to Congress, Land Use Planning for Sustainable Resource Decisions (February 2000)**. This report indicated the need for planning and NEPA actions in Wyoming, to include during FY 2001, (1) Southwest Wyoming resource assessment and subsequent plan amendments identified for the **Rawlins**, Kemmerer, Pinedale, Lander, and Rock Springs field offices to address oil and gas leasing, air and water quality, wildlife habitat, vegetation, and special status species. (2) Wyoming and other state resource assessments and conservation strategies for special status species (for example, mountain plover, prairie dog, and greater sage-grouse). (3) BLM-wide land use plan evaluations for OHV decisions.

The following are ongoing and future planning and NEPA actions in the planning area:

1. Continental Divide/Wamsutter II Natural Gas EIS--ROD allowing 2,130 wells (1,065 on federal lands) signed May 26, 2000. The decision was not appealed.
2. Atlantic Rim Coalbed Methane Project EIS – Petroleum Development Corporation (PEDCO) proposes 3,880 wells. Scoping expected to begin in June 2001.
3. Collaborative Planning with Counties (Counties are starting land use plan revisions).
4. Seminole Road Coalbed Methane Pilot Project EA--Dudley & Associates propose 19 exploratory wells (eight on public lands) and water disposal testing. Scoping completed in July 2000. Biological Opinion and release of EA for public comment occurred in June 2001 and the Decision Record was signed July 23, 2001.
5. Hanna Draw Coalbed Methane Exploration Project EA--Barrett Resources proposes 25 exploratory wells, ten on public lands. Public scoping completed on April 27, 2001. EA release for public review expected by August 2001.
6. Desolation Flats Natural Gas Development Project EIS--Marathon Oil and other operators propose drilling 385 wells on 361 locations in the 232,000 acre project area. The Mulligan Draw EIS and Dripping Rock EA areas are included in the Desolation Flats Project Area. Public scoping was completed in June 2000. The EIS is expected to be available for public review by the summer of 2001.
7. Development of a revised Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for the planning area to address the above and future oil and gas proposals. RFD scenario for oil and gas will be the basis for a planning review conducted concurrently with the Atlantic Rim Coalbed Methane Development EIS.
8. Q Creek Ranch Electric Fence Proposal EA--Conversion of approximately 14 miles of conventional barbed wire to electric fence. Public access to public lands is a controversial issue in this proposal.
9. Snowy Range Vegetation Treatment EA--Cooperative project with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department and Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest to create 25 different shrub age classes to improve the quality of ungulate big game seasonal ranges. A programmatic EA to evaluate the cumulative effects of the long-term vegetation management is expected to be completed by the end of 2001. Site-specific EAs will be prepared for each treatment action.

10. Increased vegetation treatment actions in FY 2001 are planned with associated EAs. Twelve vegetation fuels projects covering approximately 20,000 acres are planned for the summer of 2001.
11. Preparation of an activity plan for the Sand Hills ACEC (expected in FY 2002).
12. Work on a proposed land exchange with the Pittsburgh and Midway Mining Company.
13. A planning review of BOR-administered withdrawn lands to be restored to BLM jurisdiction.
14. Other agency planning efforts in or near the planning area include a forest plan revision for the Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest (Notice of Intent issued in October 1999) and a revision/update of the Sweetwater County Land Use Plan (currently ongoing).
15. Consistency review of decisions across BLM administrative boundaries.

ANTICIPATED PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

The process for developing, amending, or revising an RMP begins with identifying the issues (40 CFR 1501.7; 43 CFR 1610.4-1).

Issues express concerns, conflicts, and problems associated with the management of public lands. Issues are related to how some land and resource uses affect other land and resource uses. Issues also reflect new data, new or revised policies, and changes in resource uses affecting the planning area.

The issues addressed in the EIS for the current Great Divide RMP (1990) were reviewed and found to be applicable to this planning review. Additional issues have been identified through the RMP evaluations discussed above, and may, in several cases, reflect national concerns described in BLM's February 2000 "Report to the Congress, Land Use Planning for Sustainable Resource Decisions."

The ongoing Planning Support Projects (PSP) relate to the issues: Color IR photography, Wyoming ethnohistoric report, National Historic Trails report, regional trails context report, GIS updates, MSA/existing environment reports, oil and gas resource assessment, coal resource assessment, Section 7 Program Consultation-T&E species, Section 7 Consultation-Other Species, watershed mapping, soil survey by NRCS, wild and scenic river inventory, analysis of non-market values, IMPLAN, range economic model, national wetland maps (may be done), invasive weed assessment, OHV implementation strategy, maintain fire LUP decisions, ESI, migratory bird monitoring, Mountain Plover habitat monitoring, paleontology resource assessment, visibility monitoring, *WARMS*

PRELIMINARY ISSUES IDENTIFIED FOR PURPOSES OF THIS PLANNING REVIEW

The first three issues below are the basic issues that were addressed in the 1990 Great Divide RMP. Because of changing levels of public demand for land and resource uses, these

preliminary issues are restated to reflect the current situation. Additional preliminary issues 4-8 were also identified through the Great Divide RMP evaluation.

1. **ISSUE 1: Development of Energy Minerals and Related Issues**

Issue 1 addresses the conflicting demands for consumptive and non-consumptive uses of the resources in the Rawlins Field Office management area. The basic challenge is protecting resource values such as watershed, water quality, vegetative cover, and wildlife habitat while allowing resource uses such as oil and gas development and mining. Special attention is needed to address mineral development (i.e., oil/gas, coalbed methane, coal, solar, and wind energy) and related transportation network conflicts with other land and resource uses and values. Principal considerations include disruptive activities and human presence in big game (i.e., elk, deer, antelope, moose, bighorn sheep) habitat, big game crucial habitat (crucial winter range and birthing areas), and other important wildlife species habitats (e.g., sage grouse, plovers, raptors, fish); on recreation values, forage uses, air quality, sensitive vegetation types, and sensitive watersheds. Areas where surface-disturbing activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development activities, right-of-way construction activities, etc.) are suitable, not suitable, or should be restricted, need to be identified. Questions to be answered include:

- a. Do current management decisions correctly balance elk, moose, mule deer, antelope, and fisheries habitat issues with other resource uses and demands?
- b. Are sufficient measures being taken to ensure air quality, water quality, and watershed protection?
- c. What areas are suitable, not suitable (particularly No Surface Occupancy areas), or restricted for development activity?
- d. Are current decisions regarding what public lands are available for oil and gas leasing still appropriate?
- e. Should areas with "no surface occupancy" or other conditions of use for leases and other surface uses be readdressed or changed?
- f. Are there areas being leased for mineral development without special conditions? Should these areas be reviewed or changed?
- g. Should withdrawals be pursued, and if so, where?
- h. Are current decisions, for Federal coal that is acceptable for development and further consideration for leasing, still appropriate? Is there new coal resource information that would modify the existing coal management decisions? What areas are unsuitable for coal development?
- i. How should minerals such as sand and gravel be managed?

- j. What special operating conditions, if any, should be applied to geophysical operations?
- k. What special operating conditions, if any, should be applied to coalbed methane operations?
- l. What types of restrictions should be applied to future mineral development to insure air quality values?
- m. Are the decisions made in the 1990 RMP still adequate?

For mineral development, Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) projections will be made for use in this plan review. For minerals and all other programs and activities, reasonably foreseeable actions or activity projections will also be made for the review. An oil and gas resource assessment to be completed in FY 2003 will be used to check and adjust the preliminary oil and gas RFD.

2. **ISSUE 2: Special Management Designations**

Issue 2 addresses areas, values, or resources that meet the criteria for protection and management under special management designations, including wilderness. There are unique areas or sensitive lands and resources in the Great Divide Field Office area that meet the criteria for protection and management under special management designations. There are four areas already designated as areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC – Como Bluff, Sand Hills, Jep Canyon, and Shamrock Hills Raptor Concentration Area) that contain unique resources requiring special management attention. Three of these designated ACECs (Como Bluff, Jep Canyon, and Shamrock Hills) are within the railroad checkerboard land pattern. Effective management of these ACECs will be extremely difficult without full landowner cooperation which presently does not exist. There are also three special recreation management areas (SRMA – Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, North Platte River, and Shirley Mountain Caves) containing recreation values that require special management attention. There are also four proposed or designated National Natural Landmarks (NNL – Gangplank, proposed; Big Hollow, designated; Sand Creek, designated, and Como Bluff, designated) containing unique landscape values that require special management attention. In some places, unique or sensitive lands and resources are in danger of being lost. There are also concerns that special management area designations may result in too many restrictions on the use of public lands. The following questions about these areas need to be answered in the plan.

- a. Are current special management designations still appropriate?
- b. Are management practices or restrictions for the existing ACECs adequate?
- c. Should other areas be designated for special management?
- d. What designations are appropriate and what should the management emphasis be for those areas?
- e. Should the decisions made in the 1990 RMP be reviewed or changed?

3. **ISSUE 3: Resource Accessibility**

Issue 3 relates to the idea that the value or useability of some resources is enhanced by improved accessibility. To be used, resources must be accessible (in terms of legal and physical access) and manageable (in terms of ability to apply constraints or requirements to benefit other resources). There are some areas in the Rawlins Field Office management area that are isolated and difficult to access (i.e., legal and physical access) and manage. Land disposals and acquisitions could provide improved access and manageability of public lands. Questions to be answered include:

- a. Should parcels of public land in the planning area identified as suitable for consideration for disposal (exchange, sale, R&PP sale or lease, etc.) to other federal agency administration or state or local governments, private organizations, or private individuals, be modified?
- b. Should parcels be identified for possible acquisition by BLM?
- c. Where should physical or legal access, or both, be obtained? Are access needs identified still appropriate?
- d. Are the decisions made in the 1990 RMP still adequate?

4. **ISSUE 4: Wildland/Urban Interface**

New demands are being placed on public lands due to accelerated growth in and around cities and towns in the planning area. Growth has changed the way communities relate to surrounding public lands and has changed the communities' expectations. The basic problem is providing for public land management along with increased demands for public land resources. Principal considerations include providing for healthy air and water quality, preventing water source depletion, reducing accelerated erosion in critical watersheds, and preventing fragmentation of critical wildlife habitat. Considerations also include providing for development patterns, transportation and utility corridor planning, and demands for open space and recreational uses, land tenure adjustments and wildland fire management. Specific questions include:

- a. Should parcels of public land in the planning area identified as suitable for consideration for disposal (exchange, sale, R&PP sale or lease, etc.) to other Federal agency administration or to local or state governments, private organizations or private individuals be modified? What new parcels should be identified?
- b. Are there areas where emphasis should be placed on land acquisition?
- c. Where should physical or legal access, or both, be obtained? Are access needs identified still appropriate?

- d. Are the utility corridor decisions identified in the RMP still valid? Should new corridors be established?
- e. Where are rights-of-way allowed and where should they be avoided? What types of restrictions should be applied to such activities and where?
- f. Where and under what conditions should fire be used as a vegetative management tool?
- g. What areas should be identified for either full suppression or limited suppression of wildfire?
- h. Are there areas where fire should be allowed to burn with virtually no suppression activity?
- i. Should the decisions made in the 1990 RMP be reviewed or changed?

5. **ISSUE 5: Special Status Species Management**

Attention is needed to address management of special status species (threatened and endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive plant and animal species) and the interrelationships of these species with other resource uses and activities. Principal considerations include management of species habitat to ensure continued use by these species. Areas where other resource activities may conflict with special status species and their habitat requirements need to be identified.

- a. What threatened and endangered, candidate, proposed and sensitive species are present in the planning area?
- b. What management actions should be taken to ensure habitat is available for these species.
- c. Should the decisions made in the 1990 RMP be reviewed or changed?

6. **ISSUE 6: Water Quality**

There are concerns with maintaining or improving water quality, and complying with State and Federal requirements.

- a. What conditions of use should be applied to activities to avoid or minimize adverse effects to surface and subsurface water quality and quantity?
- b. What actions should be taken to improve water quality, fisheries habitat, and riparian habitat health where conditions are unsatisfactory?
- c. What watershed management practices are needed to reduce soil erosion, sedimentation, and salinity contributions to the Green/Colorado River systems?
- d. Should the decisions made in the 1990 RMP be reviewed or changed?

7. ISSUE 7: Vegetation Management

There are conflicting demands for consumptive and non-consumptive uses of the vegetation resources in the planning area. The basic problem is maintaining resource values and non-consumptive uses while allowing for consumptive uses. Resource values include vegetative cover, watershed protection, maintenance and enhancement of riparian areas, soil stabilization, maintenance and enhancement of wildlife habitat (particularly big game crucial winter range and habitat for candidate, sensitive, proposed, or threatened and endangered wildlife and vegetative species). Consumptive uses include livestock grazing; off-road vehicle use; and vegetation removal by mineral development, rights-of-way construction, and other surface disturbing activities. Questions to be answered include:

- a. What are the current vegetation uses and what are the capabilities to meet current and future demands?
- b. Should vegetative communities still be managed for the types of uses identified?
- c. What is the desired future condition of the vegetative communities?
- d. What types and levels of livestock grazing use should be allowed and what accommodations should be made to provide for wildlife and T&E species habitat, and watershed protection?
- e. Are current management practices for wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitats still appropriate?
- f. Should the objectives and parameters developed for vegetation manipulation be changed?
- g. Should improved or increased forage still be allocated as defined in the 1990 RMP?
- h. What management practices and resource development projects will help achieve new management objectives for livestock grazing, wildlife habitat, reintroduction of non-threatened and endangered species, and watershed enhancement on public lands?

Are invasive, non-native vegetation species inhibiting achievement of resource objectives?

- j. How should habitat diversity be provided for non-game populations?
- k. Are management practices or restrictions designed to maintain or improve habitat for elk, mule deer, antelope, sage grouse, and fish still adequate? Should the areas where these management practices or restrictions are applied be changed?

- l. Are updated management practices or restrictions needed to provide essential habitat for threatened, endangered, or sensitive wildlife species still adequate? In what parts of the planning area should these management practices or restrictions be applied?
- m. Where and under what conditions should fire be used as a vegetative management tool?
- n. What areas should be identified as either full suppression or limited suppression of wildfire?
- o. Are there areas where fire should be allowed to burn with virtually no suppression activity?
- p. Are the decisions made in the 1990 RMP still adequate?

8. **ISSUE 8: Recreation, Cultural Resources (including National Historic Trails) and Paleontological Resource Management**

There are certain resources and areas that need protection while others need to be considered for more public and recreational uses. Off-highway vehicle use can conflict with other land and resource uses and can cause damage to resources, including wildlife and watershed values and other recreation values. Principal considerations include providing for suitable and sufficient recreation uses and facilities (both dispersed and commercial), visual resource management direction, off-road vehicle use designations, management of paleontological resources, and management of cultural and historical resources (of particular concern is the need for protection of significant emigrant trails, such as the Overland and Cherokee Trails, other historic transportation resources in the region, including prehistoric and historic Indian trails, early historic exploration trails, Expansion Era roads, and Native American respected places). Visual values along these trails and surrounding Native American respected places are also an issue.

- a. What are the current recreation values and what are the capabilities to meet current and future demands?
- b. Where is vehicular use causing resource damage or conflicting with other resource uses?
- c. Are areas identified as open, limited, or closed to off-road vehicular use still appropriate? Where should vehicular use be allowed to occur and under what conditions or designations?
- d. Is there a need to provide for visitor health and safety within the planning area?
- e. How should historic trails be managed?
- f. How should cultural properties and Native American respected places be managed?
- g. What management actions are needed to manage paleontological resources?
- h. Should the decisions made in the 1990 RMP be reviewed or changed?

PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA

Planning criteria are the constraints or ground rules that are developed to guide and direct the planning review for the Great Divide RMP. The planning criteria serve to:

- Ensure that the planning effort follows and incorporates legal requirements, provides for management of all resource uses in the planning area, is focused on the issues, and is accomplished efficiently;
- To identify the scope and parameters of the planning effort; and
- Inform the public of what to expect of the planning effort.

Planning criteria are based on standards prescribed by laws and regulations; guidance provided by the BLM Wyoming State Director; results of consultation and coordination with the public, other agencies and governmental entities, and Indian tribes; analysis of information pertinent to the planning area; public input; and professional judgement.

The planning criteria focus on the development of management options and alternatives, analysis of their effects, and selection of the Preferred Alternative and the Proposed RMP. Additional planning criteria may be identified as the planning process progresses.

Criteria for specific resource programs - All program specific guidance that apply, as noted in land use planning manual 1601 and handbook H-1601-1, Appendix C.

1. Criteria for Use of Mitigation Guidelines

The Wyoming BLM has developed "mitigation guidelines" for use in determining the types and levels of mitigation needed to protect important resources from actions involving surface-disturbing and other human-presence disturbance or disruptive activities. These guidelines are used in the planning/NEPA process for (1) developing management options and alternatives and analyzing their impacts; and (2) as part of the planning criteria for developing the options and alternatives and for determining mitigation requirements. The "Wyoming BLM Mitigation Guidelines for Surface-disturbing and Disruptive Activities" are detailed in Appendix C, which also contains further information on how they are used in the planning/NEPA process.

2. Criteria for Coal Screening Process

The previously conducted coal planning/screening process (including application of the coal unsuitability criteria) under 43 CFR 3461 will be revisited and conducted, as necessary, for the planning effort. The Notice of Intent to conduct a planning review and modification of the Great Divide RMP will include a call for any available coal and other resource information for the planning area. The planning review and coal screening process will be consistent with the Federal Coal Management Program, policies, environmental integrity, national energy needs, and related demands. Conducting the environmental analysis and developing the environmental impact statement will serve as a mode for public input to the coal screening/planning process.

The coal screening process will be conducted for the Great Divide RMP planning area to determine if existing RMP coal planning decisions are still appropriate in light of changes to the Federal coal regulations and changes in resource conditions since the Great Divide RMP was approved (1990). After identifying areas of coal occurrence potential and coal with any degree of development potential in the planning area, the remainder of the coal screening/planning process will be conducted on those federal coal areas with development potential to determine what federal coal is acceptable for further consideration for leasing.

3. **Criteria for Healthy Rangelands**

The Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Wyoming (S&Gs) were approved by the Secretary of the Interior on August 12, 1997. They have been included in this document as appendix D.

The Secretary of the Interior approved the Wyoming BLM S&Gs to aid in achieving the four fundamentals of rangeland health outlined in the grazing regulations (43 CFR 4180.1). These four fundamentals are: (1) watersheds are functioning properly; (2) water, nutrients, and energy are cycling properly; (3) water quality meets state standards; and, (4) habitat for special status species is protected. The standards apply to all resource uses on public lands while the guidelines apply specifically to livestock grazing practices. The S&Gs are used to aid in developing alternatives for analysis and in considering appropriate management actions necessary to implement the S&Gs.

4. **Criteria for Multiple Use Considerations**

Multiple use is defined in the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA) 1976, as "the management of public lands and their various resource values so they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the America people and not necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or the greatest unit output. " BLM policy requires that BLM-administered lands be managed under this multiple-use concept. As appropriate, management objectives and actions described for each alternative addressed in the planning/NEPA process will consider all resources and resource uses in the planning area (physical, biological, and socioeconomic).

5. **Criteria for Hydrocarbon Potential**

To aid in the planning review, criteria will be developed for leasing and development of hydrocarbon-based minerals (oil and gas, and coalbed methane). Using available geologic information, reports of past production, and information from the minerals industry, areas of high, moderate, and low potential for the occurrence and development of hydrocarbons in the planning area will be identified. Estimates of reasonably foreseeable oil and gas (including coalbed methane) exploration and development activity will be developed from analysis of past activity and production. These estimates will be used to aid in the analysis of environmental consequences. Because they are general, these occurrence and development potential classifications and production estimates are appropriate for planning purposes, but they are not

appropriate for, nor are they intended to predict, future specific activity or the specific locations of new discoveries.

6. **Criteria for Other Leasable Minerals**

Other leasable minerals (phosphates, geothermal, etc.) will not be addressed in this planning review. There is no known development potential in the planning area for other leasable minerals.

7. **Criteria for Salable Mineral Potential**

Information on salable mineral (sand, gravel, decorative stone, etc.) occurrence potential and records of past minerals activities will be used to estimate what types and amounts of future salable mineral development would take place in the planning area. Estimates of reasonably foreseeable mineral development will be used to aid in the analysis of environmental consequences.

8. **Criteria for Locatable Minerals Potential**

Criteria will be developed for location and development of locatable minerals such as gold, diamonds, uranium and bentonite. Areas of high, moderate, and low occurrence and development potential will be determined to facilitate analysis of the effects that the variety of other land and resource uses and management actions would have on locatable minerals development and vice versa. This will only be based on a representative analysis by inference and does not imply that there may or may not be undiscovered locatable minerals of economic value in the planning area.

9. **Criteria for Withdrawals and Classifications**

Under sections 202(d) and 204(l) of the FLPMA, any classification or withdrawal on BLM-administered public land is subject to periodic review to determine whether or not it is serving its intended purpose and is still needed. These reviews will be conducted during the planning effort and may result in determining that some classifications and withdrawals should be modified or terminated. During the planning effort, the need for new withdrawals may also be identified. Where the need for new withdrawals is identified that overlap existing withdrawals that should be terminated, the new withdrawals will be put in place before terminating old withdrawals on the same areas. The criteria for conducting these reviews in the course of the planning effort are presented below.

For purposes of providing an adequate comparison of impacts, for the planning effort, all existing withdrawals and classifications and their segregative effects will be assumed to continue in effect in the description of the continuation of existing management direction.

- a. **Withdrawals Under Other Agency Jurisdiction.** The withdrawal review requirement of the FLPMA has not yet been completed on those federal lands withdrawn for purposes of other federal agencies (i.e., those under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense or Bureau of Reclamation). For the purposes of this

planning effort, it must be assumed that these withdrawals will remain in effect, and that the planning and management authorities for these withdrawn lands will remain with those agencies. Thus, the planning effort will not include consideration of any planning or management decisions for either the federal land surface or federal minerals within these withdrawn areas. These lands will be considered in conducting the environmental analysis for the planning effort in terms of cumulative impacts and in terms of how they may be affected by management in the planning area or vice versa.

- b. **Withdrawals and Classifications Under BLM Jurisdiction.** The review of withdrawals and classifications on any lands under BLM jurisdiction may result in a determination withdrawals or classifications are no longer serving their intended purposes and should be terminated (either all or in part). This review will include consideration of whether new withdrawals or classifications, for other purposes, are needed and should be put into place before terminating old withdrawals on the same areas.

10. **Criteria for Wild Horse Management**

There are three wild horse herd management areas (HMAs – Adobe Town, Lost Creek, and Stewart Creek) on BLM-administered public land within the planning area. These HMAs were established in accordance with the requirements of Section 3 of the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act, as amended. These HMAs will continue to be managed under existing policy and guidance which emphasizes multiple-use management.

Three Herd Areas (HAs) in the planning area were not established as HMAs. Significant amounts of private land and lack of landowner consent to allow wild horses to occupy private property precluded consideration of these HAs as HMAs. This decision will be revisited to determine whether current conditions warrant retaining these three HAs in non-HMA status.

The current appropriate management levels (AMLs) for wild horses were based on an 1994 evaluation of wild horse HMAs in the planning area. The evaluation analyzed and interpreted extensive monitoring data collected over a number of years. Management actions to support the current AMLs will continue until additional monitoring data supports a need to modify the AMLs. It is assumed that any wild horses within the planning area that are above the current AMLs are “excess”, in the meaning of the Act, and are subject to removal.

Removal methods, transportation of wild horses, handling/preparation, adoption, and long-term care arrangements are beyond the scope of this analysis and will not be addressed in this planning review.

11. **Criteria for Wilderness Management**

There are five wilderness Study Areas (WSA – Adobe Town, Ferris Mountains, Prospect Mountain, Bennett Mountains, and Encampment River Canyon) on BLM-administered public lands in the planning area. These WSAs were established in accordance with the

requirements of Section 603(c) of FLPMA and section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964. These WSAs will continue to be managed under the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) until Congress either designates all or portions of the WSAs as wilderness or releases the lands from further wilderness consideration. There may be instances where resource values within WSAs will require RMP management decisions or prescriptions that are more stringent than the IMP.

While there have been no other areas with wilderness characteristics identified on public lands in the planning area, such additional lands could be identified during the planning effort (per the general provisions of Section 202 of FLPMA).

12. **Criteria for Wild and Scenic Rivers**

In the course of conducting the management situation analysis (MSA) for the planning effort, BLM-administered public land along waterways in the planning area will be reviewed, under separate contract, to determine their eligibility and suitability to be considered for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. In preparing and analyzing options and alternatives for the planning effort, interim management prescriptions will be developed for any public land waterway segments determined to be suitable for further consideration. However, for purposes of providing an adequate comparison of impacts for the planning effort, the description of continuation of existing management direction (no action alternative) will not include any consideration of wild and scenic rivers.

13. **Criteria for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)**

The relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designation, found in BLM Manual 1613, will be applied to BLM-administered public lands in the planning area to determine if any areas have the potential for ACEC designation. An ACEC designation alone does not change the allowed uses of public lands involved (FLPMA-Sec.201(a) and 43 CFR 1601.0-5a). An ACEC designation is not a substitute for a WSA or wilderness suitability recommendation (BLM manual 1613.06). Protective measures for ACECs are not applied or required simply because of the designation, rather, the nature of the values, resources, or natural hazards they contain are the basis for determining the appropriate types and levels of management needed. The only automatic requirement due to an ACEC designation is that a "plan of operations" must be submitted for any degree of mining claim development in the area (43 CFR 3809.1-4).

This planning effort will recognize valid existing rights.

Actions must comply with laws, executive orders and regulations.

Lands covered in the EIS for the planning effort include any/all lands that may affect, or be affected by, the management occurring on the BLM-administered public lands in the planning area. However, the planning decisions in the RMP will apply only to the BLM-administered public lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area. This includes decisions on the BLM-administered federal minerals that underlie non-federal lands (split estate) in the planning area. Within the planning area, there will be no RMP decisions made on non-federal land surface or mineral estate, on federal lands administered by

other federal agencies, or the federal mineral estate underlying federal lands administered by other federal agencies.

A collaborative and multi-jurisdictional approach will be used, where possible, to jointly determine the desired future condition and management direction for the public lands. To the extent possible and within legal and regulatory parameters, BLM management and planning decisions will complement the planning and management decisions of other agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes, with jurisdictions intermingled with and adjacent to the planning area.

Planning and management direction will be focused on the relative values of resources and not the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or economic output.

Where practicable and timely for the planning effort, current scientific information, research, and new technologies will be considered.

Reasonably Foreseeable Action or Activity (RFA) scenarios for all land and resource uses (including minerals) will be developed and portrayed based on historical, existing, and projected levels for all programs.

Existing endangered species recovery plans, including plans for reintroduction of endangered species and other species, will be considered. Consultation, coordination and cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service will be in accordance with the 2000 BLM/FWS Interagency Memorandum of Understanding regarding Section 7 Consultation. All existing biological assessments and biological opinions regarding areas within the planning area will be reviewed for adequacy and possible consolidation and update.

PLANNING CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES

If the Great Divide RMP is to be amended or revised, the following will be considered in one or more of the alternatives to be developed.

1. Special or other management areas and their potential management
2. Intensive Management of significant cultural, historic, and paleontological resources including Native American respected places
3. The use of prescribed fire to improve natural resources.
4. The reduction of hazardous fuels on BLM-administered lands near wildland/urban interface communities that are at high risk from wildfire.
5. Fire suppression management options.
6. Management options for the protection and enhancement of riparian and wetland areas.
7. Management options for reducing the spread of noxious weeds.

8. Management options for the protection of habitat for threatened, endangered, sensitive, and other important wildlife and plant species.
9. Management options for protection of wild and scenic river values.
10. Various types of vegetation uses, including wildlife habitat, watershed protection, livestock grazing, etc.
11. Various levels of livestock grazing.
12. Identification of lands suitable for minerals exploration and development, off-highway vehicle use, rights-of-way construction, and other activities that may result in surface disturbance.
13. Identification of rights-of-way concentration areas, exclusion areas and avoidance areas to provide for development needs and protection of resource values.
14. Opportunities for enhancing recreation.
15. Opportunities for land exchanges that could be useful in meeting goals for resource manageability and public access.
16. Providing or improving access for reasonable levels of public use and for resource development and manageability.
17. Management of recreational use and designation of Special Recreation Management Areas.
18. Visual Resource Management (VRM) classifications will be evaluated and modified, as necessary, to reflect present conditions and future needs. Areas where specific land uses need to be modified or restricted to resolve conflicts will be identified.
19. Watersheds and watershed needs will be considered in the development of management options and alternatives for all resource and land.
20. Vegetation management objectives or objectives for desired future condition will be included in all alternatives. Mitigation of surface disturbing activities will also be considered.

PLANNING CRITERIA FOR ANALYZING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The following potential effects will be addressed.

1. Effects of opening or closing BLM-administered lands to some uses or activities.
2. Effects of resource protection measures on land and resource uses and activities.

3. Effects of surface-disturbing uses and other disruptive human activities on air quality, cultural resources, recreational opportunities, watershed, and wildlife resources.
4. Effects of land tenure adjustments, livestock grazing, and OHV use.
5. Economic effects of management options on livestock grazing, minerals exploration and development, and recreation.
6. The effects of mineral development on other resources and land uses.
7. Effects of all types of land and resource uses on the diversity of plant and animal species.
8. Effects on land and resource uses from retention or termination of existing withdrawals and classifications.
9. Effects of all types of land and resource uses on the vegetation, water, soil, and air resources.

PLANNING CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The following considerations will guide selection of the preferred alternative.

1. Levels of land use restrictions needed to protect resources and keep lands and resources available for public use.
2. The potential for the occurrence of mineral resources.
3. Consistency with the land use plans, programs, and policies of other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes.
4. The potential for sustaining the productivity and diversity of ecosystems while providing for human values, products, and services.
5. Social and economic values.
6. Existing law, regulations, and BLM policy.
7. Public input, welfare and safety.
8. Environmental impacts.

PLANNING CRITERIA FOR USING THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS PROCEDURE TO DEVELOP LAND USE PLAN (RMP) PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

1. The Management Situation Analysis (MSA) procedure and documentation consist of a detailed evaluation and description of (1) the Continuation of Existing Management Direction (or "No Action") Alternative (this alternative will have a 20 year projection or analysis period); (2) the description of the affected or existing environment; and (3) the

description of the impact analysis of the No Action Alternative (including the input of both informal and formal public scoping conducted to that point). The results of this analysis and scoping provide (4) the basic determination of the problems, concerns, conflicts and issues associated with continuation of existing management direction in the planning area, upon which the remainder of the planning effort will be focused. The MSA procedure and documentation also includes (5) the planning criteria for conducting the planning effort; (6) a record data/information compiled and new data/information gathered or specifically needed for the planning effort; and (6) a record of resource management options, opportunities, and limitations to respond to and resolve the issues, concerns, etc. At this point in the process, a determination will be made on whether the RMP modification will be an amendment, or a complete revision. Regardless of that determination, the environmental analysis level for the Great Divide RMP modification will be an EIS (rather than an environmental assessment or EA).

2. Upon completion of the MSA, alternatives (i.e., alternatives to existing management direction, or alternatives to the No Action Alternative) will be developed for detailed impact analysis (as with the MSA, all alternatives will have a 20 year projection or analysis period). An alternative is a comprehensive and complete "alternative RMP" and is made up of resource and land use "management options" among the various programs of resource and land uses occurring in the planning area. In compliance with NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and the BLM planning regulations and guidance, alternatives must be reasonable and must be capable of implementation. Two basic alternative "themes" will be used to formulate the first two alternatives - one that emphasizes development and intensive management and de-emphasizes environmental protection (within the parameters of law and regulation), and one that emphasizes environmental protection and de-emphasizes development and intensive management (within the parameters of law and regulation). The basic objectives of these alternatives is to try to resolve the issues, concerns, problems and conflicts associated with the No Action Alternative; to provide an adequate range of alternatives to analyze in detail; and to provide a good basis for comparative impact analyses. A detailed analysis of each of these alternatives is conducted and documented. It is possible that other alternative themes could be identified as a result of these analyses. Other management options and alternatives that are "considered", but not analyzed in detail, are also documented, along with the reasons and rationale for not conducting a detailed analysis on them.
3. Based upon the analyses of the above alternatives, the Preferred Alternative (i.e., the BLM's preferred alternative) will then be selected and analyzed in detail. Usually, none of the above alternatives can, individually, represent the BLM's preferred alternative and another alternative is formulated as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is usually made up of a combination of management options from the other alternatives that provide the best mix and balance of multiple land and resource uses to resolve the issues with existing management in the planning area.
4. The draft EIS for the RMP will then be prepared. The descriptions of all the alternative RMPs analyzed in detail (including the Preferred Alternative) make up Chapter 2 of the EIS. The description of the affected or existing environment is Chapter 3 of the EIS, and the descriptions of the environmental consequences of the alternatives is Chapter 4 of the EIS. Chapter 1 is an introductory Chapter describing the planning issues and

planning criteria, and Chapter 5 is a description of the public involvement and coordination occurring to this point in the planning process.

5. Following the public review and comment period on the draft EIS, the final EIS will be prepared. The final EIS will be a complete, stand-alone document (not an abbreviated document). The final EIS has the same basic outline and content as the draft EIS. The primary difference between the draft and final EISs is that the focus of the final EIS is on the "Proposed RMP Decisions or Proposed RMP Modification", which is included in Chapter 2 of the final EIS. Based upon public comment, any new information and correction of errors in the draft EIS, the final EIS will present the Proposed RMP Decisions or Proposed RMP Modification (which is usually a refinement or modification of the Preferred Alternative in the draft EIS), along with the other alternatives.
6. Following a concurrent 60 day Governor's consistency review and a 30 day protest period on the Proposed RMP and final EIS, any protests submitted will be resolved and both the Record of Decision (ROD) for the EIS and the Approved RMP Decisions, or RMP Modification, will be prepared in one document and issued to the public.

DATA AND GIS NEEDS

As applicable, the following map data themes may be used in the planning/NEPA effort to support RMP decisions.

1. Land and Mineral Ownership
2. Boundaries
 - Planning Area
3. Political
4. Vegetation
 - special status species and habitat
5. Slope (Digital Elevation Models)
6. Aspect
7. Flood Plains
8. Surface Water
 - Perennial Streams
 - Intermittent Streams
 - Standing Water
 - Watershed boundaries
9. Fencing
10. Grazing Allotments
11. Range Improvement Projects

12. Wildlife areas
 - Antelope
 - Deer
 - Elk
 - Moose
 - Important and Crucial Big Game Seasonal Ranges and Parturition Areas
 - Migration Corridors
 - Herd Units and Hunt Areas
 - Sage Grouse leks, nesting, wintering, and brood rearing habitats
 - Raptor Nests and roosting areas
 - Prairie Dog Towns
 - T&E species habitat
 - special status species habitat
13. Soils
14. VRM management classes
15. ORV designations
16. Recreation
 - SRMA
 - ERMA
 - Recreation Sites-developed/undeveloped
17. ROW Corridors and exclusion, avoidance, and open areas
18. Land Tenure Adjustment
 - acquisition and disposal areas
 - Withdrawals
 - Public Water Reserves
 - R&PP lands
 - Seminole Reservoir/Miracle Mile and Savery-Pothook BOR withdrawal review lands.
19. Transportation and Transmission Systems
 - Roads
 - Pipelines
 - Power lines
 - Railroads
 - Historic Trails
 - Communication sites
20. Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential
 - Solid Minerals
 - Fluid Minerals
 - Locatable Minerals
 - Salable Minerals
 - Oil and Gas well information
 - Geologic Hazards

- Landslides
 - Active faults
 - Wind blown sand deposits
 - H2S production areas
21. Oil and Gas Unit Boundaries
 22. Cultural
 - National Historic Trails
 - Other sites
 23. Air Quality
 24. Forestry
 25. Paleontology
 26. Fire Occurrence
 27. ACECs and Proposed Areas
 28. WSAs and Proposed Areas
 29. Fisheries
 30. Wild and Scenic Rivers
 31. Wild Horses
 - Wild Horse Herd Areas
 - Wild Horse Herd Management Areas

The meta data and actual electronic data for these themes are being compiled. When the compilation is completed it will be added as an appendix. Throughout the planning process a list of currently available data, data gaps, and a data inventory and collection activity plan will be maintained. Appendix F (GIS Themes) is an example of the 40 standard GIS Themes used in the Green River RMP Preparation Plan. The Wyoming metadata standards will be used for naming GIS databases.

The Wyoming state office is developing a GIS web page with downloadable maps listed by field office. The site, recently located at <http://www2.wy.blm.gov>, has the potential of becoming a complete inventory of GIS available for land use planning. See Appendix G (Metadata Direction) for further discussion on GIS data and information.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS

The participants in the planning process include the public, required reviewers of the planning/NEPA documentation products, the contractor, and the planning team. Public participation is described and required reviewers are identified in Appendix H (Public Participation Plan). The BLM planning teams are discussed below and the team members are listed in Appendix I (ID Team Members).

PLANNING TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The planning team consists of the State Director and State Office staff, Field Manager and Field Office staff, Contractor, and support team as listed below.

The State Director, with the SO Staff, is responsible for providing technical and policy guidance during the planning effort. The State Director shares quality control responsibilities with the Field Manager.

1. State Office Coordinator

The State Office Coordinator is the State Director representative on the interdisciplinary team and is responsible for ensuring that clear project assistance, quality control, and policy and guidance requirements are met. This may include coordinating the assignment of needed personnel from the State Office and the coordination of timely State Office review to ensure processing and quality control. Such reviews will be coordinated through the Field Manager and Team Leader. Specific functions of the State Office Coordinator would include:

- a. Resolve differences among State Office and Field Office specialists. Ensure that Specialists' comments guide conformance of the planning/NEPA process with policy, individual program requirements, particularly the Planning Manual and Handbook (1601 and H-1601-1).
- b. Provide orientation, planning/NEPA procedural guidance and training for the planning team.
- c. Ensure that review comments include positive suggestions for revision, improvement, solution, etc.
- d. Ensure consistent and accurate interpretation of policy and State Director guidance and that process review is focused on content and substance.
- e. Ensure all comments provide clear direction on what needs to be done.
- f. Maintain familiarity with planning effort so that he/she can serve as the contact points with State and Field Office staffs.
- g. Serve as main contact point with State government for consistency review.
- h. Serve as main contact point with Washington Office for protest resolution.

2. State Office Review Team

The State Office Review Team is responsible for review of preliminary documents and providing program and State Director guidance. Specific functions of the State Office Review Team include:

- a. Ensure that review comments include suggestions for revision, improvement, solution, etc.
- b. Ensure consistent and accurate interpretation of policy and State Director guidance and that process review is focused on content and substance.
- c. Ensure all comments provide clear direction on what needs to be done.
- d. Maintain familiarity with planning effort so that he/she can serve as contact point with other State office support staffs.
- e. Ensure conformance with policy, the planning/NEPA process, individual program requirements, and the Planning Manual and Handbook (1601 and H-1601-1).

3. **Field Manager**

The Field Manager has overall responsibility for the planning effort.

Specific responsibilities of the Field Manager include:

- a. Providing overall guidance, making Field Office staff assignments as necessary, and setting the overall goals of the planning effort.
- b. Providing input to key portions of the planning/NEPA process, particularly updating of issues and planning criteria, MSA direction, alternative formulation, and selection of the preferred alternative.
- c. Inventory collection and data interpretation.
- d. Direct supervision of the field office team members to the extent of their participation in this project. Directing the day-to-day activities of the interdisciplinary team involved in the planning/NEPA process.
- e. Participating with the State Office coordinator in establishing the scope and level of detail of the planning effort. The Field Manager is also responsible for product and process quality control at the Field Office level.
- f. Keeping all local interest groups and key individuals informed of general progress of the planning/NEPA effort.
- g. Reviewing Federal Register notices and news releases before issuance.
- h. Maintaining a general awareness of the progress of the planning/NEPA effort.

4. **Field Office Public Affairs Specialist**

The Field Office Public Affairs Specialist develops a public participation plan, coordinates public meetings, handles Congressional and media inquiries, and prepares media releases with help from the planning team leader. Provides assistance to the team

leader and writer-editor for Federal Register notices, newsletters, public correspondence, etc.

5. **Interdisciplinary Planning Team**

Members of the interdisciplinary planning team will supply technical data, draft narratives, impact analyses, and other information in approved formats and in time to meet established deadlines. Team members are responsible for consulting with the RMP Team Leader and Technical Coordinator, in advance of deadlines, on any questions and on any anticipated needs or shortfalls. Members will also meet with the public and industry to acquire information and input.

In the development of the plan, team members will work in an interdisciplinary manner, consult with other professionals as needed or required, and make full use of other Field Office and State Office expertise assigned to the planning team.

a. **Team Leader**

The Team Leader has the primary responsibility for directing the planning effort through the planning process and for the preparation of the RMP/EIS documentation and ensuring that schedules are met. He/She recommends planning direction and the resolution of management conflicts to the Field Manager. The Team Leader will report to the Field Manager, who is the responsible line official. The Team Leader will be the primary spokesperson for the RMP/EIS and will direct all public involvement connected with the project. The Team Leader will direct the day-to-day activities of the interdisciplinary team when they are involved in the planning process. Typing assistance and other critical support needs will be coordinated by the Team Leader. It is the responsibility of the Team Leader to keep the Field Manager informed and involved at key process points and work closely with all. He/She is responsible for the coordination among various agencies, industry and interest groups, the planning team, and the general Public.

The Team Leader ensures the planning process is conducted and the RMP is prepared within the technical and procedural quality standards which meet the requirements of NEPA, CEQ, Bureau, and departmental guidelines. His/Her duties include ensuring deadlines are met, overseeing day-to-day work, complying with the approved preparation plan, communicating any changes in preparation, and maintaining interdisciplinary coordination.

Other responsibilities include:

- Supervising and directing any contractors hired to assist BLM in the land use planning process.
- Coordinating with Field Managers and State Office staff throughout the process.

- Ensuring that mapping, documentation, and printing schedules are identified and maintained.
- Identifying manpower needs for special tasks.
- Compiling, reviewing, and analyzing public comments on the EIS for the Field Manager and the State Director.

b. Technical Coordinator

In the absence of the Team Leader, acts in the Team Leader capacity in all respects.

The Technical Coordinator assists the Team Leader in developing time schedules, ensuring schedules are met and assignments completed, and in providing team guidance.

The Technical Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that information is technically correct and scientifically consistent throughout the RMP/EIS process. He/She will have the responsibility for management of inventory collection and interpretation. The Technical Coordinator will provide guidance to the specialists in regards to how information is to be presented and he will have responsibility for reviewing and editing specialist's work for technical accuracy and consistency. He/she will coordinate mapping and information needs and products with the ID team, contractors, and WSR technographics and printing support. He/She will work closely with the Team Leader and the Editor.

c. GIS Coordinator

The GIS Coordinator is responsible to the Team Leader. General responsibilities include:

- Insuring that the data base is provided to the State Office for input into the GIS system.
- Coordinating with the State Office all GIS data needs.
- Determining the level of detail of GIS information to be input into the system.
- Coordinating product proofing with the ID Team and the State Office. Provides guidance on inventory collection and technical guidance.
- Creation of maps needed for the RMP document and for ID team use. Analysis of GIS information to assist ID team in impact analysis and description of the affected environment.

d. Interdisciplinary Team

The ID Team participates in the planning process in the following steps: issue identification, development of planning criteria, analysis of the management situation, formulation of alternatives, assessment of alternatives, and responses to comments, and EIS changes and modifications.

The ID Team is responsible for knowing schedule deadlines and completing all draft and final write-ups for their disciplines and resource components in a usable form and according to schedule. They are responsible for review and input into products provided by contractors.

Each member of the ID Team is responsible for one or more resources and/or programs to be addressed through the RMP process. They are also responsible for the related data accumulation, and recommendations to be made.

The ID Team identifies program and resource component mapping needed for the plan and EIS.

The ID Team is responsible for attendance at small group or public meetings as required. The ID team is responsible for making public, peer, and agency contacts for acquiring and sharing resource information.

The ID Team is responsible for attending ID team meetings.

The ID Team will supply additional assistance when necessary and requested by the Team Leader.

e. Editor

The Editor is responsible for providing editorial management of style, tone, format, and readability. The Editor is the principal determinant concerning layout, assembly and printing of the RMP, and assists in the preparation and cataloging of public comment summaries. He/She provides the technical editing expertise necessary in all sections of RMP documents and assumes the load in coordinating the preparation of graphics and illustrations. He/She recommends and assembles the bibliography and glossary contents and format. The Editor directly assists the Team Leader and Public Information Officer in the implementation of the Public Participation Plan.

The Editor has overall responsibility for the format of typing submissions for the word processor. The Editor schedules and coordinates typing submissions.

f. Support Team

The Support Team will provide policy guidance and review to the ID Team. They will coordinate between the Field Office and State Office staffs as necessary. They are charged with monitoring their individual program needs in support of the RMP and ensuring that the supplemental program guidance is followed. Support Team duties also include identifying and monitoring funding for development and implementation of the RMP.

The Support Team may provide additional support to the RMP effort at the request of the Field Manager or Team Leader.

FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN

Procedural Requirements

The BLM land use (or resource management plan -- RMP) planning process, explained in 43 CFR 1600, BLM 1601 Manual, and BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), falls within the framework of the NEPA environmental analysis and decision making process described in the CEQ regulations of 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Department of the Interior NEPA Manual (516 DM 1-7), and the BLM NEPA Handbook H-1790-1. New RMPs and RMP revisions (a complete rewrite of the RMP) require an environmental impact statement. Land use plan amendments and a planning analysis require either an environmental assessment (EA) or EIS, depending on the significance of the proposed amendment and its environmental effects. A planning analysis is conducted when it is not known for sure whether the NEPA analysis will result in a plan amendment (since an amendment is one of two possible outcomes of the process—the other being a continuation of existing management direction.) A plan analysis begins with a notice of intent to “conduct a planning review” published in the *Federal Register*. The planning review must be completed using the same procedures as land use plan amendments.

Procedural requirements for land use planning in 43 CFR 1600 are the same as procedural requirements for NEPA, except as outlined below. The following list includes only requirements of BLM’s planning process that are not imposed by the NEPA guidance.

1. A Notice of Intent (NOI) is published in the *Federal Register* to begin an EA-level plan amendment because the planning regulations mandate an NOI to initiate public participation in the planning process (see 43 CFR 1610.2 (c)). For EIS-level plans, revisions, or amendments, the NOI must meet the requirements of both NEPA and the planning regulations. The NOI may identify preliminary planning criteria. Simultaneously with the *Federal Register* NOI, submit an NOI for circulation among state agencies. In addition, submit this notice to federal agencies, the heads of county boards, other local governmental units, and tribal representatives who have requested such notice, as well as any other entities or individuals the manager feels would be concerned with the planning effort (see 43 CFR 1610.3-1(d)).
2. Planning criteria are prepared to ensure decision making is tailored to the issues pertinent to the planning effort and to ensure BLM avoids unnecessary data collection and analyses. BLM gives public notice and an opportunity for review of, and comment on, the planning criteria before they are approved (see 43 CFR 1610.2 (f) (2) and 1610.4-2). In giving public notice, BLM will use whatever means are needed to reach the audience. Use of e-mail and web pages is encouraged, but by themselves, these are not sufficient to notify the public.
3. At least a 90-day public review and comment period is allowed on draft EISs prepared to analyze draft land use plan decisions (see 43 CFR 1610.2(e)).

4. BLM's land use plans and amendments must be consistent with officially approved or adopted resource-related plans of Indian tribes, other federal agencies, and state and local governments to the maximum extent practical, given that BLM's land use plans must also be consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of FLPMA and other federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands (see 43 CFR 1610.3-2 (a)).

If these other entities do not have officially approved or adopted resource-related plans, then BLM's land use plans must, to the maximum extent practical, be consistent with their officially approved and adopted resource-related policies and programs. This consistency will be accomplished so long as BLM land use plans are consistent with the policies, programs, and provisions of public land laws and regulations (see 43 CFR 1610.3-2 (b)).

6. Before BLM approves proposed land use plan decisions, the Governor(s) must have 60 days to identify inconsistencies between the proposed plan and state and local plans and provide written comments to the State Director. (The BLM and the State may mutually agree upon a shorter review period satisfactory to both.) If the Governor(s) does not respond within this period, it is assumed that the proposed land use plan decisions are consistent. If the Governor recommends changes in the proposed plan or amendment that were not raised during the public participation process, the State Director shall provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the recommendations (see 43 CFR 1610.3-2 (e)). This public comment opportunity will be offered for 30 days and may coincide with the 30-day comment period for the Notice of Significant Change. If the State Director does not accept the Governor's recommendations, the Governor has 30 days to appeal in writing to the BLM Director (see 43 CFR 1610.3-2(e)).
7. The public must have 60 days to review any proposed ACEC designations (see 43 CFR 1613.)
8. There is a 30-day protest period for proposed land use plan decisions (see 43 CFR 1610.5-2). Protests must be filed with the BLM Director.
9. Before a land use plan decision is approved, the BLM must give public notice and provide a 30-day public comment period if there has been any significant change to the proposed plan (see 43 CFR 1610.5-1(b)). Comments in response to this Notice of Significant Change will be addressed by the State Director.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS, DOCUMENTATION, AND REVIEW

Preplanning – Development of the Management Situation Analysis

The interdisciplinary planning team with a contractor will begin the planning effort by developing the management situation analysis (MSA) for the planning area. The MSA will begin with a comprehensive description of the existing management direction in the planning area. This description will eventually become the “No Action Alternative” to be included in Chapter 2 of the RMP EIS. The description of existing management is comprised of brief statements of management actions and objectives. This section should follow the format used in recently published Wyoming RMPs (such as the Grass Creek and Newcastle RMPs). The description of existing management should identify the land use activities and production levels that are anticipated to occur during the analysis period of the EIS. These Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) and Reasonably Foreseeable Action (RFA) scenarios are important “assumptions for analysis” that are needed to formulate and understand environmental consequences.

Next, the MSA will include a description of the Affected Environment. The Affected Environment will become Chapter 3 of the RMP EIS. Finally, the planning team will prepare a comprehensive description of the environmental consequences associated with continuing existing management. The analysis will become part of Chapter 4 in the RMP EIS and will set the stage for developing the alternatives to existing management.

1. **Alternative Formulation**

The basic goal in formulating alternatives for the RMP EIS is to identify combinations of desired outcomes (and the allowable public land uses and actions to achieve the desired outcomes) that respond to the planning issues. The alternatives should also address ways to resolve or mitigate the environmental consequences of continuing existing management that are described in the MSA.

Each alternative represents a complete and reasonable land use plan to guide future management of public lands and resources. The “No Action” Alternative represents continuation of existing management direction. Other alternatives provide a range of choices for solving problems associated with existing management. (The problems with existing management are identified through the planning process, including public involvement.)

The analysis of impacts that would be associated with each of the alternatives is required by BLM resource management planning regulations and regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), which are based on NEPA. Comparison of the differences of impacts among the alternatives is also required. With this analysis, BLM managers are able to choose a preferred alternative from one of the complete alternatives, from combined portions of the various alternatives, by modification of an alternative, or by development of a different alternative.

At least three alternative themes can be identified in the development of most RMPs.

- a. **Alternative A.** This alternative would continue present management practices based on existing land use plans. The alternative is known as the “No Action” Alternative.
- b. **Alternative B.** Compared to existing management, this alternative would focus on increasing resource yields through fewer restrictions on activities such as mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and OHV travel.
- c. **Alternative C.** Compared to existing management, this alternative would favor resources such as wildlife habitat, vegetative production, and opportunities for primitive recreation in resolving resource conflicts.

2. **Development of the Preferred Alternative**

The development and selection of the Preferred Alternative occurs after the previously formulated alternatives have been analyzed and their effects have been evaluated. After this analysis and evaluation, the Field Manager selects or develops the Preferred Alternative from among the alternatives considered. This alternative, in the manager’s judgment, best addresses the issues and management requirements of the planning area.

The Preferred Alternative may be one of the alternatives studied in detail; it may be developed from parts of the various alternatives; it may reflect management’s modification of options previously considered; or it may be developed from new options. The latter two situations could occur when management actions result in undesirable impacts in all of the alternatives and it becomes apparent that another management approach, or a management compromise, is needed.

The State Director reviews the Preferred Alternative in the Preliminary Draft EIS for the RMP and notifies the Field Manager of any required modifications. If necessary, a modified Preferred Alternative is again analyzed and the Draft EIS is submitted to the State Director for approval. When approved by the State Director, the Draft EIS is published and filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and made available for public review and comment.

PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE

The proposed schedule for the Great Divide RMP modification will result in completion of the proposed RMP and Final EIS, including the 30-day protest period, in 42 months (completion date 1/05). The schedule includes all steps necessary to complete a plan review from Preparation Plan development through Protest of the Proposed RMP decisions. An additional undetermined time period will be required to resolve any protests before issuing the ROD and RMP decisions for State Director approval.

GREAT DIVIDE RMP MODIFICATION SCHEDULE

(Note that dates of actions following September 2001 are not current or accurate. While some in-house work on the project is in progress, some of the following dates need to be adjusted. However, the completion date of October 2004 is fixed.)

| Planning Tasks | Time Frame | Target Dates |
|--|-----------------|--|
| 1) Develop Preparation Plan (Project Charter) and Develop Draft Planning Criteria (Maintain Preparation Plan current throughout project) Preparation Plan approved by SD | | 09/30/01 |
| 2) Develop Statement of Work for RMP modification effort Award Contract | | 12/15/01 01/01/02 |
| 3) Prepare and Issue Notice of Intent to conduct a planning review, call for resource information (including call for coal resource information), start MSA, establish mailing list -request T&E species list, initiate consultation with FWS -establish website for public information -establish website for internal use - Contractor on board 01/01/02 | 30 days | Send NOI to WO for review 11/30/01 Publish NOI 12/31/01 |
| 4) Prepare description of continuation of existing management direction- No Action Alternative for EIS (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -Include resource condition, potential and trend -Initiate/complete mineral RFDs -Initiate/complete W&S Rivers review, identify coal occurrence and development potential, wilderness review, etc. (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -Data call Period ends | 120 days | Start 01/01/02 2/28/02 |
| 5) Describe Existing Environment (Contractor with ID team and SO Staff) | 45 days | Total overlap |
| 6) Develop assumptions for analysis, including RFDs and RFAs – for No Action Alternative - for all resource and land uses - e.g., grazing, recreation, all minerals, etc. (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) | 60 days | 45 day overlap |
| 7) Analyze Continuation of Existing Management Direction (No Action Alternative) and Identify Planning area Specific Concerns, Problems, Conflicts and Issues (Contractor with ID team and SO Staff) -Identify data gaps and develop strategy to resolve -Identify resource capability and options and opportunities to resolve conflicts, concerns, problems, and issues | 60 days | 45 day overlap |
| 8) Compile and Organize Inventory and Other Data -Finalize and adjust RFDs and RFAs for all resources-grazing, recreation, all minerals, etc. (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -informal public involvement/scoping throughout | on going | |

| Planning Tasks | Time Frame | Target Dates |
|--|-------------------|--|
| 9) Adjust Planning Criteria if necessary (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) | 15 days | |
| 10) Prepare MSA for public review (Contractor with ID team and SO Staff) | 30 days | 15 day overlap |
| 11) Prepare and conduct State Director and SO Staff Briefing (ID team and SO staff, with contractor) Final MSA and Draft Planning Criteria | #4-11 180 days | 06/30/02 |
| 12) Formal Scoping-Prepare and issue media releases and mailings, include planning criteria, provide MSA for public review, meet with other agencies and local governments, hold public scoping meetings (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -update website(s) - WO Review of Planning Criteria Complete #12 by - Scoping Period ends | 60 days | 30 day overlap 07/31/02 09/30/02 |
| 13) Prepare summary of scoping comments and input, finalize issues and planning criteria, adjust MSA, brief State Director and SO staff (Contractor with ID team and SO staff) -Make available to public -update website(s) - Complete Planning Criteria and Scoping Report | 60 days | 30 day overlap 10/31/02 |
| 14) Develop Alternatives (Alternative RMPs) for EIS (Contractor with ID team and SO Staff) -Develop assumptions for analysis, including RFDs and RFAs for all resource and land uses - e.g., grazing, recreation, all minerals, etc. | 90 days | |
| 15) Analyze Alternative RMPs and document the analysis for draft EIS (Contractor with ID team and SO Staff) -adjust alternatives and analyses and prepare for public review | 65 days | |
| 16) Public review of alternatives. Meet with other agencies and local governments (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -Make adjustments to alternatives and analyses -update website(s) | 45 days | |
| 17) Develop and Analyze BLM Preferred Alternative -Develop assumptions for analysis, including RFDs and RFAs for all resource and land uses - e.g., grazing, recreation, all minerals, etc. (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -prepare BA and consult with FWS on T&E species | 60 days | |
| 18) Prepare Preliminary Draft EIS for SO briefing and review (Contractor with ID team and SO staff). - incorporate SO comments and finalize draft EIS -typeset and prepare draft EIS for printing -issue printing/mailing contract | 105 days | 30 day overlap |

| Planning Tasks | Time Frame | Target Dates |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| - Assure coordination with EPA and OEPC for EPA draft EIS filing notice in Federal Register | | |
| 19) Prepare and Issue BLM Federal Register Notice of Availability of draft EIS -update website(s) | 60 days #14-19 365 days | 30 day overlap 10/31/03 |

| | | |
|---|---------|----------------------------|
| 20) Draft EIS Comment Period (initiates with EPA filing notice for draft EIS)(ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) - Hold public meetings, open houses, and hearings (hearing required for coal) - brief other agencies, state and local governments, and interest groups -update website(s) -Comment Period Ends | 90 days | 01/31/04 |
| 21) Review and prepare responses to public comment on draft EIS (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -time frames dependent upon number and content of comments -may include public meetings, interest group meetings, meetings with state, local, and federal agencies -Complete BA, if necessary; obtain Biological Opinion from FWS | 60 days | 30 day overlap 02/28/04 |
| 22) Review and incorporate new information, changes, corrections to Preferred Alternative and prepare proposed RMP decisions and preliminary final EIS for SO briefing and review (Contractor with ID team and SO Staff) - incorporate SO comments and prepare final EIS -typeset and prepare final EIS for printing -issue printing/mailing contract -Initiate Governor's Consistency Review of proposed RMP decisions -update website(s) | 60 days | 04/30/04 |
| 23) Prepare and issue Federal Register Notice of Availability for proposed RMP decisions and final EIS (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -includes protest period (30 days) on proposed RMP decisions (initiates with EPA filing notice for final EIS) - Assure coordination with EPA and OEPC for EPA final EIS filing notice in Federal Register -update website(s) -Protest Period Ends | 60 days | 06/30/04 08/30/04 |
| 24) Resolve protests and finalize RMP decisions (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -update website(s) | 60 days | |

| | | |
|---|-----|----------|
| <p>***!!! If protests are filed, the dates for the remainder of the planning effort are unpredictable and will be determined at a later time.</p> | | |
| <p>25) If applicable, notify public of and provide opportunity for comment on any significant changes to proposed RMP decisions (may require Federal Register Notice and minimum 30 day comment period) -update website(s)</p> | TBD | |
| <p>26) Prepare and issue ROD and RMP decisions for State Director approval (ID team and SO Staff with Contractor) -typeset and prepare ROD and RMP decisions for printing -issue printing/ mailing contract -Federal Register Notice of Availability (includes required notice of OHV designations and other required notifications) -update website(s)</p> | TBD | 10/31/04 |

APPENDIX B

FISCAL YEAR 2001 EVALUATION OF THE GREAT DIVIDE RMP (RAWLINS FIELD OFFICE)

REVIEW AND CONCURRENCE

I have reviewed the following evaluation and concur with the findings and recommendations.

Field Manager

Date

INTRODUCTION

The Great Divide RMP provides management guidance and direction for approximately 4 million public land surface acres and 5 million acres of Federal mineral estate in Albany, Carbon, Laramie, and Sweetwater counties. The Record of Decision for the RMP was signed on November 8, 1990. Ongoing or pending BLM planning and NEPA efforts include a proposal for a 3,800 well coal bed methane project at Atlantic Rim and two exploratory coal bed methane projects; a natural gas field proposal, shared with the Rock Springs Field Office in the Desolation Flats area (scoping completed in June 2000); preparation of an oil and gas RFD, (including coal bed methane); the highest EA workload in the state; implementation of the Snowy Range Vegetation Treatment Project; an activity plan for the Sand Hills ACEC; a proposed land exchange with the Pittsburgh and Midway Mining Company; a resource assessment and updated activity plan for historic trails management; a WSR review of all public lands in the planning area; and review of BOR-administered withdrawn lands to be restored to BLM jurisdiction. Other agency planning efforts in or near the planning area include a forest plan revision for the Medicine Bow National Forest (Notice of Intent [NOI] issued in October 1999). The planning area includes five wilderness study areas (WSAs – Encampment River Canyon, Prospect Mountain, Bennett Mountains, Adobe Town, Ferris Mountain), four ACECs (Jep Canyon, Como Bluff, Shamrock Hills, Sand Hills), and three special recreation management areas (SRMAs – Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, North Platte River, Shirley Mountain Caves). Future amendments to the Great Divide RMP are anticipated primarily from proposals for traditional oil and gas and coal bed methane exploration and development.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Air Quality

FINDING: Air quality decisions are adequate (comply with state law/standards and guidelines), but there is a need for a region wide analysis.

RECOMMENDATION: It has been adequately addressed in activity plans, primarily oil and gas EISs. The basic approach could be to: ensure emission inventory in SW Wyoming is complete; run the acceptable model when needed; keep up baseline data and inventory of new emission sources. This information could be used to update the RMP.

Cultural and Natural History Resources

FINDING: Over the last decade, a series of events and undertakings have taken place, which will greatly affect National Historic Trail resources in Wyoming. Congressionally designated National Historic Trails in Wyoming include the Oregon, Mormon, California, and Pony Express trails. Among the events and undertakings, the Sesquicentennial of the Oregon, Mormon, and California trails brought national and international attention to Wyoming's trail resources during three large celebrations. In addition, five regional interpretive centers have come on line or will open within the next year, including the Kearney Nebraska Archway, National Historic Trails Interpretive Center in Casper, the Mormon Handcart Visitor Center near Rawlins, the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center in Baker Oregon, and the End of the Trail Center in western Oregon. Recently, the National Park Service completed a comprehensive management plan with BLM input for the congressionally designated trails. Finally, the Wyoming BLM's support of the trails program is evidenced by the hiring of a historic trails coordinator during seven of the last 10 years.

RECOMMENDATION: With the public's burgeoning interest in western history and an influx of "heritage tourism", opportunities should be pursued to enhance public education and interpretation along the trails. Simultaneously, there is a greater need to protect the landscapes and viewsheds through which the trails pass, since these surroundings are essential for an accurate experience of western history, and the reason for higher visitation by the public.

Environmental Justice

FINDING: Environmental Justice has not been addressed.

RECOMMENDATION: Determine if an environmental justice evaluation can be completed with an RMP update or should it be addressed on project specific basis.

Lands and Realty

FINDING: Old C&MU Act classifications and withdrawals are being used to protect various resource values.

RECOMMENDATION: It should be determined which classifications and withdrawals are still in place, then conduct a planning review to establish new withdrawals to protect resource values at risk (if any).

FINDING: Management direction for utility and transportation systems and communication sites may be inadequate.

RECOMMENDATION: Re-evaluate existing management direction to also consider fiber optic lines, high/low power sites, digital cellular sites, and buffers.

FINDING: Management direction for land tenure adjustment may be inadequate.

RECOMMENDATION: Re-evaluate existing management direction and address lands for disposal, exchanges and competitive sales.

Livestock Grazing Management

FINDING: Standards for rangeland health need to be incorporated into all programs.

RECOMMENDATION: Have the Wyoming State Office develop guidance on addressing rangeland health standards in all programs when proposed actions are considered. Document the compliance with these standards in all future NEPA analyses. (This is a statewide and national need as well.)

FINDING: The vegetation resource is treated as a subset of livestock grazing.

RECOMMENDATION: It is more important than that. Objectives need to be established and supporting decisions about sensitive and T&E species habitat, water quality, and erosion control are needed. Objectives for livestock grazing impacts to general vegetation resources should be incorporated into the RMP.

FINDING: Invasive plant decisions are absent from the RMP.

RECOMMENDATION: Develop objectives and decisions to management invasive plant species.

Minerals Management

FINDING: Reasonable Foreseeable Development scenarios (RFD) are deficient.

RECOMMENDATION: RFDs for oil and gas development, including coal bed methane should be updated or completed as appropriate.

Paleontological Resources

FINDING: Protection standards for paleontological resources are lacking.

RECOMMENDATION: Develop protection standards for paleontological.

Recreation

FINDING: OHV designations have not been incorporated into the RMP.

RECOMMENDATION: Complete OHV designations based on the new BLM OHV policy.

FINDING: Recreational uses and demands are increasing.

RECOMMENDATION: Re-evaluate existing RMP decisions to determine if updates are necessary.

Soils

FINDING: Some county soil surveys are incomplete or the status is not known.

RECOMMENDATION: The Carbon and Sweetwater Surveys need to be completed. Basic geology is not addressed in the RMPs.

Special Designations

FINDING: New ACEC designations may be needed and existing ones may be outdated.

RECOMMENDATION: Existing and proposed ACEC designations should be evaluated.

T&E and Sensitive Species

FINDING: Consultation for T&E and sensitive species is incomplete or lacking.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider completing programmatic consultation for listed, proposed, Category I species, and species on the BLM State Sensitive Species list.

Visual Resources

FINDING: VRM classifications are out dated. There are inconsistencies between field office and forest service boundaries. The designation for Adobe Town WSA is inconsistent between the RSFO and the RFO.

RECOMMENDATION: Re-evaluate the VRM classifications to include rural subdivision and inconsistencies.

Watersheds and Water Quality

FINDING: Federal and State requirements for addressing water quality warrants additional attention as the RMP is implemented and updated.

RECOMMENDATION: New water quality requirements should be addressed in future NEPA documents and in updates to the RMP. Several pending or recently enacted changes in Federal and State water quality regulations require special attention. These include the Environmental Protection Agency's TMDL, NPDES, and Source Water Protection regulations and Wyoming's revised Water Quality and Credible Data regulations. These regulations are likely to impose significantly more stringent requirements for the protection of water quality and the analysis of impacts on a watershed basis. In addition, provisions within BLM's Unified Federal Policy (pertaining to cooperative approaches for managing watersheds) and strategic plan for implementing the Clean Water Action Plan, will influence BLM's management of watershed and water quality issues. The state's 305b Water Quality Assessment Report should be consulted, as well, when NEPA documents are prepared.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

FINDING: Wild and scenic river evaluations have not been conducted in the Planning Area.

RECOMMENDATION: Conduct the wild and scenic river analysis process.

Wildlife Habitat Management

FINDING: There is some inconsistency with Wyoming Game & Fish Department (WGFD) objective numbers and migration corridors.

RECOMMENDATION: Determine if RMP decisions need to be updated to be consistent with changes in WGFD herd unit objectives or migration corridors.

APPENDIX C

WYOMING MITIGATION GUIDELINES FOR SURFACE-DISTURBING AND DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITIES

Mitigation requirements (including restrictions on surface occupancy and/or surface activity and use) are applied as conditions of land and resource use for the following reasons: (a) to protect important cultural resources, recreational values, and wildlife resources (including T&E and candidate species); (b) to minimize soil movement on slopes; (c) to minimize disturbance of vegetation in sensitive areas such as wetland/riparian areas; or (d) to protect visual resources and historic trails.

As appropriate, surface-disturbing activities would be subject to one or more of the mitigation requirements exemplified in the mitigation guidelines. On lands where the federal surface is administered by other agencies and the federal mineral estate is administered by the BLM, the Wyoming BLM mitigation guidelines would only be applied where the surface managing agency has not developed other surface protection mitigative measures or stipulations that are needed. The mitigation guidelines would be applied to land surface areas that are privately owned or owned by the state of Wyoming or local governments only in cases where those lands overlay BLM-administered federal minerals and only in situations where the mineral actions authorized by the BLM could (a) cause adverse on-site or off-site effects on T&E or candidate species or on cultural resource values; or (b) cause adverse on-site or off-site effects on any resource values on any other lands.

Mitigation requirements ultimately included in the approved RMP, that are developed through the use of the mitigation guidelines, could later be waived, modified, excepted, or combined with other conditions of resource use. Circumstances which would warrant these changes are as follows: (a) as a result of addressing situations beyond the analysis level of the EIS (for example, development and analysis of an activity plan or a site-specific project proposal); (b) if the conditions that originally warranted a restriction (such as the presence of an active raptor nest) no longer exist; or, (c) if the location of a proposed activity or use were to be moved to avoid such conditions. Conversely, mitigation requirements that are not identified in the approved RMP could be applied to address situations or resource values either not present or not identified at the time the RMP was developed, but that were later identified through site-specific investigations. An example where mitigation requirements might be used could be on a newly discovered raptor nest or newly identified cultural resources. Addition or modification of mitigation requirements generally would be allowed as long as modified conditions of use did not prohibit the exercise of valid existing rights. The Wyoming BLM Standard Mitigation Guidelines for Surface-Disturbing Activities as presented in the Great Divide RMP are presented below.

INTRODUCTION

The "Wyoming BLM Standard Oil and Gas Lease Stipulations" were developed in 1986. During their implementation, it was recognized that various land uses, other than those related to oil and gas exploration and development, should be subject to similar kinds of environmental protection requirements. Using the Wyoming BLM standard oil and gas lease stipulations as a basis, development of the "Wyoming BLM Standard Mitigation Measures for Surface-Disturbing Activities" began.

The term "guidelines" better describes the intent and use of these mitigation standards than the terms "stipulations" or "measures." These guidelines are primarily for the purpose of attaining statewide consistency in how requirements are determined for avoiding and mitigating environmental impacts and resource and land use conflicts. Consistency in this sense does not mean that identical requirements would be applied for all similar types of land use activities that may cause similar types of impacts. Nor

does it mean that the requirements or guidelines for a single land use activity would be identical in all areas.

There are two ways the standard mitigation guidelines are used in the resource management plan/environmental impact statement (RMP/EIS) process: (1) as part of the planning criteria in developing the RMP alternatives, and (2) in the analytical processes of both developing the alternatives and analyzing the impacts of the alternatives. In the first case, an assumption is made that any one or more of the standard mitigations will be appropriately included as conditions of relevant actions being proposed or considered in each alternative. In the second case, the standard mitigations are used (1) to develop a baseline for measuring and comparing impacts among the alternatives; (2) to identify other actions and alternatives that should be considered, and (3) to help determine whether more stringent or less stringent mitigations should be considered.

Some of the seasonal restrictions in the standard oil and gas lease stipulations contain the statement, "This limitation does not apply to maintenance and operation of producing wells." This statement was included because the stipulations were developed specifically for application to oil and gas leases at the time of issuance, not for activities associated with producing wells. At lease issuance, the only action that can be generally contemplated is the possibility that exploratory drilling may occur somewhere on the lease area. Unfortunately, the provision has been interpreted by some people to mean that the seasonal restriction disappears at the operational stage (i.e., if a producing well is attained). It must be understood that at both the oil and gas exploration stage and the operation or development stages, additional site-specific environmental analyses are conducted and any needed restrictions or mitigations identified become part of the operational or development plan. For example, wells may continue to produce, but related activity may be limited. Thus, it is possible for such seasonal restrictions to continue in effect and be applicable to maintenance and operation of producing wells, if supported by the environmental analyses.

The RMP/EIS does not decide or dictate the exact wording or inclusion of these guidelines. Rather, the standard guidelines are used in the RMP/EIS process as a tool to help develop the RMP alternatives and to provide a baseline for comparative impact analysis in arriving at RMP decisions. These guidelines will be used in the same manner in analyzing activity plans and other site-specific proposals. These guidelines and their wording are matters of policy. As such, specific wording is subject to change primarily through administrative review, not through the RMP/EIS process. Any further changes that may be made in the continuing refinement of these guidelines and any development of program-specific standard stipulations will be handled in another forum, including appropriate public involvement and input.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the "Standard Mitigation Guidelines" are (1) to reserve, for the BLM, the right to modify the operations of all surface and other human presence disturbance activities as part of the statutory requirements for environmental protection, and (2) to inform a potential lessee, permittee, or operator of the requirements that must be met when using BLM-administered public lands. These guidelines have been written in a format that will allow for (1) their direct use as stipulations, and (2) the addition of specific or specialized mitigation following the submission of a detailed plan of development or other project proposal, and an environmental analysis.

Those resource activities or programs currently without a standardized set of permit or operation stipulations can use the mitigation guidelines as stipulations or as conditions of approval, or as a baseline for developing specific stipulations for a given activity or program.

Because use of the mitigation guidelines was integrated into the RMP/EIS process and will be integrated into the site-specific environmental analysis process, the application of stipulations or mitigation requirements derived through the guidelines will provide more consistency with planning decisions and plan implementation than has occurred in the past. Application of the standard mitigation guidelines to all surface and other human presence disturbance activities concerning BLM-administered public lands and resources will provide more uniformity in mitigation than has occurred in the past.

ALL MITIGATION GUIDELINES

1. Surface Disturbance Mitigation Guideline

Surface disturbance will be prohibited in any of the following areas or conditions. Exception, waiver, or modification of this limitation may be approved in writing, including documented supporting analysis, by the Authorized Officer.

- a. Slopes in excess of 25 percent.
- b. Within important scenic areas (Class I and II Visual Resource Management Areas).
- c. Within 500 feet of surface water and/or riparian areas.
- d. Within either one-quarter mile or the visual horizon (whichever is closer) of historic trails.
- e. Construction with frozen material or during periods when the soil material is saturated or when watershed damage is likely to occur.

Guidance

The intent of the SURFACE DISTURBANCE MITIGATION GUIDELINE is to inform interested parties (potential lessees, permittees, or operators) that when one or more of the five (1a through 1e) conditions exist, surface-disturbing activities will be prohibited unless or until a permittee or his designated representative and the surface management agency (SMA) arrive at an acceptable plan for mitigation of anticipated impacts. This negotiation will occur prior to development.

Specific criteria (e.g., 500 feet from water) have been established based upon the best information available. However, such items as geographical areas and seasons must be delineated at the field level.

Exception, waiver, or modification of requirements developed from this guideline must be based upon environmental analysis of proposals (e.g., activity plans, plans of development, plans of operation, applications for permit to drill) and, if necessary, must allow for other mitigation to be applied on a site-specific basis.

2. Wildlife Mitigation Guideline

- a. To protect important big game winter habitat, activities or surface use will not be allowed from November 15 to April 30 within certain areas encompassed by the authorization. The same criteria apply to defined big game birthing areas from May 1 to June 30.

Application of this limitation to operation and maintenance of a developed project must be based on environmental analysis of the operational or production aspects.

Exception, waiver, or modification of this limitation in any year may be approved in writing, including documented supporting analysis, by the Authorized Officer.

- b. To protect important raptor and/or sage and sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat, activities or surface use will not be allowed from February 1 to July 31 within certain areas encompassed by the authorization. The same criteria apply to defined raptor and game bird winter concentration areas from November 15 to April 30.

Application of this limitation to operation and maintenance of a developed project must be based on environmental analysis of the operational or production aspects.

Exception, waiver, or modification of this limitation in any year may be approved in writing, including documented supporting analysis, by the Authorized Officer.

- c. No activities or surface use will be allowed on that portion of the authorization area identified within (legal description) for the purpose of protecting (e.g., sage/sharp-tailed grouse breeding grounds, and/or other species/activities) habitat.

Exception, waiver, or modification of this limitation in any year may be approved in writing, including documented supporting analysis, by the Authorized Officer.

- d. Portions of the authorized use area legally described as (legal description), are known or suspected to be essential habitat for (name) which is a threatened or endangered species. Prior to conducting any onsite activities, the lessee/permittee will be required to conduct inventories or studies in accordance with BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines to verify the presence or absence of this species. In the event that (name) occurrence is identified, the lessee/permittee will be required to modify operational plans to include the protection requirements of this species and its habitat (e.g., seasonal use restrictions, occupancy limitations, facility design modifications).

Guidance

The WILDLIFE MITIGATION GUIDELINE is intended to provide two basic types of protection: seasonal restriction (2a and 2b) and prohibition of activities or surface use (2c). Item 2d is specific to situations involving threatened or endangered species. Legal descriptions will ultimately be required and should be measurable and legally definable. There are no minimum subdivision requirements at this time. The area delineated can and should be defined as necessary, based upon current biological data, prior to the time of processing an application and issuing the use authorization. The legal description must eventually become a part of the condition for approval of the permit, plan of development, and/or other use authorization.

The seasonal restriction section identifies three example groups of species and delineates three similar time frame restrictions. The big game species including elk, moose, deer, antelope, and bighorn sheep, all require protection of crucial winter range between November 15 and April 30. Elk and bighorn sheep also require protection from disturbance from May 1, to June 30, when they typically occupy distinct calving and lambing areas. Raptors include eagles, accipiters, falcons (peregrine, prairie, and merlin), butes (ferruginous and Swainson's hawks), osprey, and burrowing owls. The raptors and sage and

sharp-tailed grouse require nesting protection between February 1 and July 31. The same birds often require protection from disturbance from November 15 through April 30 while they occupy winter concentration areas.

Item 2c, the prohibition of activity or surface use, is intended for protection of specific wildlife habitat areas or values within the use area that cannot be protected by using seasonal restrictions. These areas or values must be factors that limit life-cycle activities (e.g., sage grouse strutting grounds, known threatened and endangered species habitat).

Exception, waiver, or modification of requirements developed from this guideline must be based upon environmental analysis of proposals (e.g., activity plans, plans of development, plans of operation, applications for permit to drill) and, if necessary, must allow for other mitigation to be applied on a site-specific basis.

3. Cultural Resource Mitigation Guideline

When a proposed discretionary land use has potential for affecting the characteristics which qualify a cultural property for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), mitigation will be considered. In accordance with Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, procedures specified in 36 CFR 800 will be used in consultation with the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in arriving at determinations regarding the need and type of mitigation to be required.

Guidance

The preferred strategy for treating potential adverse effects on cultural properties is "avoidance." If avoidance involves project relocation, the new project area may also require cultural resource inventory. If avoidance is imprudent or unfeasible, appropriate mitigation may include excavation (data recovery), stabilization, monitoring, protection barriers and signs, or other physical and administrative measures.

Reports documenting results of cultural resource inventory, evaluation, and the establishment of mitigation alternatives (if necessary) shall be written according to standards contained in BLM Manuals, the cultural resource permit stipulations, and in other policy issued by the BLM. These reports must provide sufficient information for Section 106 consultation. Reports shall be reviewed for adequacy by the appropriate BLM cultural resource specialist. If cultural properties on, or eligible for, the National Register are located within these areas of potential impact and cannot be avoided, the Authorized Officer shall begin the Section 106 consultation process in accordance with the procedures contained in 36 CFR 800.

Mitigation measures shall be implemented according to the mitigation plan approved by the BLM Authorized Officer. Such plans are usually prepared by the land use applicant according to BLM specifications. Mitigation plans will be reviewed as part of Section 106 consultation for National Register eligible or listed properties. The extent and nature of recommended mitigation shall be commensurate with the significance of the cultural resource involved and the anticipated extent of damage. Reasonable costs for mitigation will be borne by the land use applicant. Mitigation must be cost effective and realistic. It must consider project requirements and limitations, input from concerned parties, and be BLM approved or BLM formulated.

Mitigation of paleontological and natural history sites will be treated on a case-by-case basis. Factors such as site significance, economics, safety, and project urgency must be taken into account when making

a decision to mitigate. Authority to protect (through mitigation) such values is provided for in FLPMA, Section 102(a)(8). When avoidance is not possible, appropriate mitigation may include excavation (data recovery), stabilization, monitoring, protection barriers and signs, or other physical and administrative protection measures.

4. Special Resource Mitigation Guideline

To protect (resource value), activities or surface use will not be allowed (i.e., within a specific distance of the resource value or between date to date) in (legal description).

Application of this limitation to operation and maintenance of a developed project must be based on environmental analysis of the operational or production aspects.

Exception, waiver, or modification of this limitation in any year may be approved in writing, including documented supporting analysis, by the Authorized Officer.

Example Resource Categories (Select or identify category and specific resource value):

- a. Recreation areas.
- b. Special natural history or paleontological features.
- c. Special management areas.
- d. Sections of major rivers.
- e. Prior existing rights-of-way.
- f. Occupied dwellings.
- g. Other (specify).

Guidance

The SPECIAL RESOURCE MITIGATION GUIDELINE is intended for use only in site-specific situations where one of the first three general mitigation guidelines will not adequately address the concern. The resource value, location, and specific restrictions must be clearly identified. A detailed plan addressing specific mitigation and special restrictions will be required prior to disturbance or development and will become a condition for approval of the permit, plan of development, or other use authorization.

Exception, waiver, or modification of requirements developed from this guideline must be based upon environmental analysis of proposals (e.g., activity plans, plans of development, plans of operation, applications for permit to drill) and, if necessary, must allow for other mitigation to be applied on a site-specific basis.

5. No Surface Occupancy Guideline

No Surface Occupancy will be allowed on the following described lands (legal description) because of (resource value).

Example Resource Categories (Select or identify category and specific resource value):

- a. Recreation Areas (e.g., campgrounds, historic trails, national monuments).
- b. Major reservoirs/dams.
- c. Special management area (e.g., areas of critical environmental concern, known threatened or endangered species habitat, wild and scenic rivers).
- d. Other (specify).

Guidance

The NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY (NSO) MITIGATION GUIDELINE is intended for use only when other mitigation is determined insufficient to adequately protect the public interest and is the only alternative to "no development" or "no leasing." The legal description and resource value of concern must be identified and be tied to an NSO land use planning decision.

Waiver of, or exception(s) to, the NSO requirement will be subject to the same test used to initially justify its imposition. If, upon evaluation of a site-specific proposal, it is found that less restrictive mitigation would adequately protect the public interest or value of concern, then a waiver or exception to the NSO requirement is possible. The record must show that because conditions or uses have changed, less restrictive requirements will protect the public interest. An environmental analysis must be conducted and documented (e.g., environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, etc., as necessary) in order to provide the basis for a waiver or exception to an NSO planning decision. Modification of the NSO requirement will pertain only to refinement or correction of the location(s) to which it applied. If the waiver, exception, or modification is found to be consistent with the intent of the planning decision, it may be granted. If found inconsistent with the intent of the planning decision, a plan amendment would be required before the waiver, exception, or modification could be granted.

When considering the "no development" or "no leasing" option, a rigorous test must be met and fully documented in the record. This test must be based upon stringent standards described in the land use planning document. Since rejection of all development rights is more severe than the most restrictive mitigation requirement, the record must show that consideration was given to development subject to reasonable mitigation, including "no surface occupancy." The record must also show that other mitigation was determined to be insufficient to adequately protect the public interest. a "no development" or "no leasing" decision should not be made solely because it appears that conventional methods of development would be unfeasible, especially where an NSO restriction may be acceptable to a potential permittee. In such cases, the potential permittee should have the opportunity to decide whether or not to go ahead with the proposal (or accept the use authorization), recognizing that an NSO restriction is involved.

APPENDIX D

STANDARDS FOR HEALTHY RANGELANDS AND GUIDELINES FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC LANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE STATE OF WYOMING

As appropriate, management objectives and actions described for each alternative addressed in the EIS would generally be subject to all of the standards. In addition, the livestock grazing management objectives and actions for each of the alternatives would be subject to both the standards and the guidelines. Therefore, actions to implement the S&Gs (including mitigation measures) in the planning area are described in the descriptions for each alternative. Because the S&Gs provide policy guidance (first phase of the BLM planning process) they apply to all alternatives. However, the intensity of objectives and actions to implement the S&Gs may vary by alternative. Additional site specific actions to implement the S&Gs will be developed on a case-by-case basis through site-specific activity planning (third phase of the planning process).

INTRODUCTION

According to the Department of the Interior's final rule for grazing administration, effective August 21, 1995, the Wyoming Bureau of Land Management (BLM) State Director is responsible for the development of standards for healthy rangelands and guidelines for livestock grazing management on 18 million acres of Wyoming's public rangelands. The development and application of these standards and guidelines are to achieve the four fundamentals of rangeland health outlined in the grazing regulations (43 CFR 4180.1). Those four fundamentals are: (1) watersheds are functioning properly; (2) water, nutrients, and energy are cycling properly; (3) water quality meets State standards; and (4) habitat for special status species is protected.

Standards address the health, productivity, and sustainability of the BLM administered public rangelands and represent the minimum acceptable conditions for the public rangelands. The standards apply to all resource uses on public lands. Their application will be determined as use-specific guidelines are developed. Standards are synonymous with goals and are observed on a landscape scale. They describe healthy rangelands rather than important rangeland by-products. The achievement of a standard is determined by observing, measuring, and monitoring appropriate indicators. An indicator is a component of a system whose characteristics (e.g., presence, absence, quantity, and distribution) can be observed, measured, or monitored based on sound scientific principles.

Guidelines provide for, and guide the development and implementation of, reasonable, responsible, and cost-effective management practices at the grazing allotment and watershed level. The guidelines in this document apply specifically to livestock grazing management practices on the BLM administered public lands. These management practices will either maintain existing desirable conditions or move rangelands toward statewide standards within reasonable timeframes. Appropriate guidelines will ensure that the resultant management practices reflect the potential for the watershed, consider other uses and natural influences, and balance resource goals with social, cultural/historic, and economic opportunities to sustain viable local communities. Guidelines, like standards, apply statewide.

Implementation of the Wyoming standards and guidelines will generally be done in the following manner: Grazing allotments or groups of allotments in a watershed will be reviewed based on the BLM's current allotment categorization and prioritization process. Allotments with existing management plans and high-priority allotments will be reviewed first. Lower priority allotments will be reviewed as time

allows or when it becomes necessary for BLM to review the permit/lease for other reasons such as permit/lease transfers, permittee/lessee requests for change in use, etc. The permittees and interested publics will be notified when allotments are scheduled for review and encouraged to participate in the review. The review will first determine if an allotment meets each of the six standards. If it does, no further action will be necessary. If any of the standards aren't being met, then rationale explaining the contributing factors will be prepared. If livestock grazing practices are found to be among the contributing factors, corrective actions consistent with the guidelines will be developed and implemented before the next grazing season in accordance with 43 CFR 4180. If a lack of data prohibits the reviewers from determining if a standard is being met, then a strategy will be developed to acquire the data in a timely manner.

On a continuing basis, the Standards for Healthy Rangelands will direct on-the-ground management on the public lands. They will serve to focus the on-going development and implementation of activity plans toward the maintenance or the attainment of healthy rangelands.

Quantifiable resource objectives and specific management practices to maintain or achieve the standards will be developed at the local BLM District and Resource Area levels and will consider all reasonable and practical options available to achieve desired results on a watershed or grazing allotment scale. The objectives shall be reflected in site-specific activity or implementation plans as well as in livestock grazing permits/leases for the public lands. These objectives and practices may be developed formally or informally through mechanisms available and suited to local needs (such as Coordinated Resource Management (CRM) efforts).

The development and implementation of standards and guidelines will enable on-the-ground management of the public rangelands to maintain a clear and responsible focus on both the health of the land and its dependent natural and human communities. This development and implementation will ensure that any mechanisms currently being employed or that may be developed in the future will maintain a consistent focus on these essential concerns. This development and implementation will also enable immediate attention to be brought to bear on existing resource concerns.

These standards and guidelines are compatible with BLM's three-tiered land use planning process. The first tier includes the laws, regulations, and policies governing BLM's administration and management of the public lands and their uses. The previously mentioned fundamentals of rangeland health specified in 43 CFR 4180.1, the requirement for BLM to develop these State (or regional) standards and guidelines, and the standards and guidelines themselves, are part of this first tier. Also part of this first tier are the specific requirements of various Federal laws and the objectives of 43 CFR 4100.2 that require BLM to consider the social and economic well-being of the local communities in its management process.

These standards and guidelines will provide for statewide consistency and guidance in the preparation, amendment, and maintenance of BLM land use plans, which represent the second tier of the planning process. The BLM land use plans provide general allocation decisions concerning the kinds of resource and land uses that can occur on the BLM administered public lands, where they can occur, and the types of conditional requirements under which they can occur. In general, the standards will be the basis for development of planning area-specific management objectives concerning rangeland health and productivity, and the guidelines will direct development of livestock grazing management actions to help accomplish those objectives.

The third tier of the BLM planning process, activity or implementation planning, is directed by the applicable land use plan and, therefore, by the standards and guidelines. The standards and guidelines,

as BLM statewide policy, will also directly guide development of the site-specific objectives and the methods and practices used to implement the land use plan decisions. Activity or implementation plans contain objectives which describe the site-specific conditions desired. Grazing permits/leases for the public lands contain terms and conditions which describe specific actions required to attain or maintain the desired conditions. Through monitoring and evaluation, the BLM, grazing permittees, and other interested parties determine if progress is being made to achieve activity plan objectives.

Wyoming rangelands support a variety of uses which are of significant economic importance to the State and its communities. These uses include oil and gas production, mining, recreation and tourism, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, and livestock grazing. Rangelands also provide amenities which contribute to the quality of life in Wyoming such as open spaces, solitude, and opportunities for personal renewal. Wyoming's rangelands should be managed with consideration of the State's historical, cultural, and social development and in a manner which contributes to a diverse, balanced, competitive, and resilient economy in order to provide opportunity for economic development. Healthy rangelands can best sustain these uses.

To varying degrees, BLM management of the public lands and resources plays a role in the social and economic well-being of Wyoming communities. The National Environmental Policy Act (part of the above-mentioned first planning tier) and various other laws and regulations mandate the BLM to analyze the socioeconomic impacts of actions occurring on public rangelands. These analyses occur during the environmental analysis process of land use planning (second planning tier), where resource allocations are made, and during the environmental analysis process of activity or implementation planning (third planning tier). In many situations, factors that affect the social and economic well-being of local communities extend far beyond the scope of BLM management or individual public land users' responsibilities. In addition, since standards relate primarily to physical and biological features of the landscape, it is very difficult to provide measurable socioeconomic indicators that relate to the health of rangelands. It is important that standards be realistic and within the control of the land manager and users to achieve.

STANDARDS FOR HEALTHY PUBLIC RANGELANDS

STANDARD #1

Within the potential of the ecological site (soil type, landform, climate, and geology), soils are stable and allow for water infiltration to provide for optimal plant growth and minimal surface runoff.

THIS MEANS THAT:

The hydrologic cycle will be supported by providing for water capture, storage, and sustained release. Adequate energy flow and nutrient cycling through the system will be achieved as optimal plant growth occurs. Plant communities are highly varied within Wyoming.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Water infiltration rates;
- Soil compaction;
- Erosion (rills, gullies, pedestals, capping);
- Soil micro-organisms;
- Vegetative cover (gully bottoms and slopes); and
- Bare ground and litter.

The above indicators are applied as appropriate to the potential of the ecological site.

STANDARD #2

Riparian and wetland vegetation has structural, age, and species diversity characteristic of the stage of channel succession and is resilient and capable of recovering from natural and human disturbance in order to provide forage and cover, capture sediment, dissipate energy, and provide for ground water recharge.

THIS MEANS THAT:

Wyoming has highly varied riparian and wetland systems on public lands. These systems vary from large rivers to small streams and from springs to large wet meadows. These systems are in various stages of natural cycles and may also reflect other disturbance that is either localized or widespread throughout the watershed. Riparian vegetation captures sediments and associated materials, thus enhancing the nutrient cycle by capturing and utilizing nutrients that would otherwise move through a system unused.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Erosion and deposition rate;
- Channel morphology and flood plain function;
- Channel succession and erosion cycle;
- Vegetative cover;
- Plant composition and diversity (species, age class, structure, successional stages, desired plant community, etc.);
- Bank stability;
- Woody debris and instream cover; and
- Bare ground and litter.

The above indicators are applied as appropriate to the potential of the ecological site.

STANDARD #3

Upland vegetation on each ecological site consists of plant communities appropriate to the site which are resilient, diverse, and able to recover from natural and human disturbance.

THIS MEANS THAT:

In order to maintain desirable conditions and/or recover from disturbance within acceptable timeframes, plant communities must have the components present to support the nutrient cycle and adequate energy flow. Plants depend on nutrients in the soil and energy derived from sunlight. Nutrients stored in the soil are used over and over by plants, animals, and micro organisms. The amount of nutrients available and the speed with which they cycle among plants, animals, and the soil are fundamental components of rangeland health. The amount, timing, and distribution of energy captured through photosynthesis are fundamental to the function of rangeland ecosystems.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Vegetative cover;
- Plant composition and diversity (species, age class, structure, successional stages, desired plant community, etc.);
- Bare ground and litter;
- Erosion (rills, gullies, pedestals, capping); and
- Water infiltration rates.

The above indicators are applied as appropriate to the potential of the ecological site.

STANDARD #4

Rangelands are capable of sustaining viable populations and a diversity of native plant and animal species appropriate to the habitat. Habitats that support or could support threatened species, endangered species, species of special concern, or sensitive species will be maintained or enhanced.

THIS MEANS THAT:

The management of Wyoming rangelands will achieve or maintain adequate habitat conditions that support diverse plant and animal species. These may include listed threatened or endangered species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife-designated), species of special concern (BLM-designated), and other sensitive species (State of Wyoming-designated). The intent of this standard is to allow the listed species to recover and be delisted, and to avoid or prevent additional species becoming listed.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Noxious weeds;
- Species diversity;
- Age class distribution;
- All indicators associated with the upland and riparian standards;
- Population trends; and
- Habitat fragmentation.

The above indicators are applied as appropriate to the potential of the ecological site.

STANDARD #5

Water quality meets State standards.

THIS MEANS THAT:

The State of Wyoming is authorized to administer the Clean Water Act. BLM management actions or use authorizations will comply with all Federal and State water quality laws, rules and regulations to address water quality issues that originate on public lands. Provisions for the establishment of water quality standards are included in the Clean Water Act, as amended, and the Wyoming Environmental Quality Act, as amended. Regulations are found in Part 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and in *Wyoming's Water Quality Rules and Regulations*. The latter regulations contain Quality Standards for Wyoming Surface Waters.

Natural processes and human actions influence the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of water. Water quality varies from place to place with the seasons, the climate, and the kind substrate through which water moves. Therefore, the assessment of water quality takes these factors into account.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Chemical characteristics (e.g., pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen);
- Physical characteristics (e.g., sediment, temperature, color); and
- Biological characteristics (e.g., macro- and micro-invertebrates, fecal coliform, and plant and animal species).

STANDARD #6

Air quality meets State standards.

THIS MEANS THAT:

The State of Wyoming is authorized to administer the Clean Air Act. BLM management actions or use authorizations will comply with all Federal and State air quality laws, rules, regulations and standards. Provisions for the establishment of air quality standards are included in the Clean Air Act, as amended, and the Wyoming Environmental Quality Act, as amended. Regulations are found in Part 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and in *Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations*.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Particulate matter;
- Sulfur dioxide;
- Photochemical oxidants (ozone);
- Volatile organic compounds (hydrocarbons);
- Nitrogen oxides;
- Carbon monoxide;
- Odors; and
- Visibility.

BLM WYOMING GUIDELINES FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT

1. Timing, duration, and levels of authorized grazing will ensure that adequate amounts of vegetative ground cover, including standing plant material and litter, remain after authorized use to support infiltration, maintain soil moisture storage, stabilize soils, allow the release of sufficient water to maintain system function, and to maintain subsurface soil conditions that support permeability rates and other processes appropriate to the site.
2. Grazing management practices will restore, maintain, or improve riparian plant communities. Grazing management strategies consider hydrology, physical attributes, and potential for the watershed and the ecological site. Grazing management will maintain adequate residual plant cover to provide for plant recovery, residual forage, sediment capture, energy dissipation, and ground water recharge.
3. Range improvement practices (instream structures, fences, water troughs, etc.) in and adjacent to riparian areas will ensure that stream channel morphology (e.g., gradient, width/depth ratio, channel roughness and sinuosity) and functions appropriate to climate and landform are maintained or enhanced. The development of springs, seeps, or other projects affecting water and associated resources shall be designed to protect the ecological and hydrological functions, wildlife habitat, and significant cultural, historical, and archaeological values associated with the water source. Range improvements will be located away from riparian areas if they conflict with achieving or maintaining riparian function.
4. Grazing practices that consider the biotic communities as more than just a forage base will be designed in order to ensure that the appropriate kinds and amounts of soil organisms, plants, and animals to support the hydrologic cycle, nutrient cycle, and energy flow are maintained or enhanced.
5. Continuous season-long or other grazing management practices that hinder the completion of plants' life-sustaining reproductive and/or nutrient cycling processes will be modified to ensure adequate periods of rest at the appropriate times. The rest periods will provide for seedling establishment or other necessary processes at levels sufficient to move the ecological site condition toward the resource objective and subsequent achievement of the standard.
6. Grazing management practices and range improvements will adequately protect vegetative cover and physical conditions and maintain, restore, or enhance water quality to meet resource objectives. The effects of new range improvements (water developments, fences, etc.) on the health and function of rangelands will be carefully considered prior to their implementation.
7. Grazing management practices will incorporate the kinds and amounts of use that will restore, maintain, or enhance habitats to assist in the recovery of Federal threatened and endangered species or the conservation of federally-listed species of concern and other State-designated special status species. Grazing management practices will maintain existing habitat or facilitate vegetation change toward desired habitats. Grazing management will consider threatened and endangered species and their habitats.
8. Grazing management practices and range improvements will be designed to maintain or promote the physical and biological conditions necessary to sustain native animal populations and plant communities. This will involve emphasizing native plant species in the support of

ecological function and incorporating the use of non-native species only in those situations in which native plant species are not available in sufficient quantities or are incapable of maintaining or achieving properly functioning conditions and biological health.

9. Grazing management practices on uplands will maintain desired plant communities or facilitate change toward desired plant communities.

DEFINITIONS

ACTIVITY PLANS. Allotment Management Plans (AMPs), Habitat Management Plans (HMPs), Watershed Management Plans (WMPs), Wild Horse Management Plans (WHMPs), and other plans developed at the local level to address specific concerns and accomplish specific objectives.

COORDINATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (CRM). A group of people working together to develop common resource goals and resolve natural resource concerns. CRM is a people process that strives for win-win situations through consensus-based decisionmaking.

DESIRED PLANT COMMUNITY. A plant community which produces the kind, proportion, and amount of vegetation necessary for meeting or exceeding the land use plan/activity plan objectives established for an ecological site(s). The desired plant community must be consistent with the site's capability to produce the desired vegetation through management, land treatment, or a combination of the two.

ECOLOGICAL SITE. An area of land with specific physical characteristics that differs from other areas both in its ability to produce distinctive kinds and amounts of vegetation and in its response to management.

EROSION. (v.) Detachment and movement of soil or rock fragments by water, wind, ice, or gravity. (n.) The land surface worn away by running water, wind, ice, or other geological agents, including such processes as gravitational creep.

GRAZING MANAGEMENT PRACTICES. Grazing management practices include such things as grazing systems (rest-rotation, deferred rotation, etc.), timing and duration of grazing, herding, salting, etc. They do not include physical range improvements.

GUIDELINES (For Grazing Management). Guidelines provide for, and guide the development and implementation of, reasonable, responsible, and cost-effective management actions at the allotment and watershed level which move rangelands toward statewide standards or maintain existing desirable conditions. Appropriate guidelines will ensure that the resultant management actions reflect the potential for the watershed, consider other uses and natural influences, and balance resource goals with social, cultural/historic, and economic opportunities to sustain viable local communities. Guidelines, and therefore, the management actions they engender, are based on sound science, past and present management experience, and public input.

INDICATOR. An indicator is a component of a system whose characteristics (e.g., presence, absence, quantity, and distribution) can be observed, measured, or monitored based on sound scientific principles. An indicator can be evaluated at a site- or species-specific level. Monitoring of an indicator must be able to show change within timeframes acceptable to management and be capable of showing how the health of the ecosystem is changing in response to specific management actions. Selection of the appropriate

indicators to be observed, measured, or monitored in a particular allotment is a critical aspect of early communication among the interests involved on-the-ground. The most useful indicators are those for which change or trend can be easily quantified and for which agreement as to the significance of the indicator is broad based.

LITTER. The uppermost layer of organic debris on the soil surface, essentially the freshly fallen or slightly decomposed vegetal material.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. Management actions are the specific actions prescribed by the BLM to achieve resource objectives, land use allocations, or other program or multiple use goals. Management actions include both grazing management practices and range improvements.

OBJECTIVE. An objective is a site-specific statement of a desired rangeland condition. It may contain either or both qualitative elements and quantitative elements. Objectives frequently speak to change. They are the focus of monitoring and evaluation activities at the local level. Monitoring of the indicators would show negative changes or positive changes. Objectives should focus on indicators of greatest interest for the area in question.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS. Range improvements include such things as corrals, fences, water developments (reservoirs, spring developments, pipelines, wells, etc.) and land treatments (prescribed fire, herbicide treatments, mechanical treatments, etc.).

RANGELAND. Land on which the native vegetation (climax or natural potential) is predominantly grasses, grass-like plants, forbs, or shrubs. This includes lands revegetated naturally or artificially when routine management of that vegetation is accomplished mainly through manipulation of grazing. Rangelands include natural grasslands, savannas, shrublands, most deserts, tundra, alpine communities, coastal marshes, and wet meadows.

RANGELAND HEALTH. The degree to which the integrity of the soil and ecological processes of rangeland ecosystems are sustained.

RIPARIAN. An area of land directly influenced by permanent water. It has visible vegetation or physical characteristics reflective of permanent water influence. Lakeshores and streambanks are typical riparian areas. Excluded are such sites as ephemeral streams or washes that do not have vegetation dependent on free water in the soil.

STANDARDS. Standards are synonymous with goals and are observed on a landscape scale. Standards apply to rangeland health and not to the important by-products of healthy rangelands. Standards relate to the current capability or realistic potential of a specific site to produce these by-products, not to the presence or absence of the products themselves. It is the sustainability of the processes, or rangeland health, that produces these by-products.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS. Terms and conditions are very specific land use requirements that are made a part of the land use authorization in order to assure maintenance or attainment of the standard. Terms and conditions may incorporate or reference the appropriate portions of activity plans (e.g., Allotment Management Plans). In other words, where an activity plan exists that contains objectives focused on meeting the standards, compliance with the plan may be the only term and condition necessary in that allotment.

UPLAND. Those portions of the landscape which do not receive additional moisture for plant growth from run-off, streamflow, etc. Typically these are hills, ridgetops, valley slopes, and rolling plains.

APPENDIX F
DIGITAL CARTOGRAPHIC SUPPORT
FOR THE
GREEN RIVER RMP AREA

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
|---------------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | <u>Field Office Area</u> | <u>State Office</u> | |
| 1 | LANDNET | 188 (1:24K) | M-T Plats 7 ½ minute USGS Topo quads Cadastral surveys | | | 8/31/89 |
| 2 | Ownership | 188 (1:24K) | M-T Plats 100 Ks Salt Wells/Big Sandy MFPs | | | 8/31/89 |
| 3 | Boundaries Field Office Area Boundary Modification County State Political | 102 (1:24K) 3 | Grazing allotments M-T plats Quads | 1.0 WM | | 7/14/89 |
| 4 | Vegetation | 188 (1:24K) | Aerial photos existing photos, 6 SWA data for truthing LANDSAT. 8 individual quads. | \$24,000 0.25 WM | 0.25 WM | 09/29/89 |
| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
| 5 | Slope Mapping | 188 (1:24K) | DEMS Sort by slope classification | 24 DEMs to be purchased from USGS | \$960 | 08/31/89 |

DEMS, place on
1 tape. Add new as
available.

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 6 | Aspect Mapping | (1:24K) | | | | |
| 7 | Orthophoto Film Base LANDNET DEMs internal landline overlays for 57 orthophoto negatives | 57 (1:24K) | USGS when available Due 1989 DONE | 0.1 WM | | |
| 8 | Floodprone Areas | 46 (1:24K) | USGS, HUD | 0.5 WM | | |
| 9 | Live Water Perennial Streams Intermittent Streams Standing Water | 117 (1:24K) 60 ¹ (1:24K) | USGS quads (1:100K), Allotment files, Activity plans USFWS | 1.0 WM | | 10/16/89 |
| 10 | Fencing | 150+ (1:24K) | Range, Wildlife | 0.75 wm | | 10/16/89 |
| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
| | | | | <u>Field Office Area</u> | <u>State Office</u> | |
| 11 | Allotments | 181 (1:24K) | Range files | 1.0 WM | 0.75 WM | 10/16/89 |
| 12 | Range Improvement Projects Existing Projects | 181 (1:24K) | Range; Wildlife | 0.75 wm | | 10/16/89 |
| 13 | Wildlife areas antelope | 36 (1:100K) | Wildlife; WGFD | 1.5 WM | | 10/31/89 |

| | | | Area inventories | |
|----|-------------------------------|----------------|--|--------|
| | deer | | | |
| | elk | | | |
| | moose | | | |
| | sage grouse/wildlife projects | 9 (1:100K) | | |
| | prairie dog/ferrets/T&E | 9 (1:100K) | | |
| | raptors | 140 (1:24K) | | |
| 14 | Soils | N/A | | |
| 15 | VRM | 10 (1:100K) | Field Office Area files | 0.5 WM |
| 16 | ORV | 10 (1:100K) | Field Office Area files | 0.5 WM |
| 17 | Recreation | 80? (1:24K) | Field Office Area files, USGS quads | 0.1 WM |

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
|---------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | <u>Field Office Area</u> | <u>State Office</u> | |
| 18 | Utility Corridors Rights-of-Way Communication sites | 9 (1:24K) 5 (1:100K) | M-T Plats; USGS quads | | | |
| 19 | Land Tenure Adjustment Eden/Farson & Seedskadee withdrawals Public Water Reserves R&PP CMU | 47 (1.24K) 13 (1:100K) | | | | |
| 20 | Transportation Roads Pipelines Railroads Historical Trails | 161 (1:24K) 17 (1:24K) 41 (1:24K) | USGS quads; Field Office Area files | 1.0 WM | | |
| 21 | Plant Sites Trona plants Coal mines Oil & Gas | 8 (1:100K) 6-8 (1:24K) | Field Office Area files | 0.1 WM | | |
| 22 | Solid Mineral Potential | TBA ² | Field Office Area files | 0.5 WM | | |

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | <u>Field Office Area</u> | <u>State Office</u> | |
| 23 | Fluid Mineral Potential Oil Shale Oil & Gas | 188 (1:24K) | Field Office Area files. PI Data | 0.5 WM | | |
| 24 | Oil/Gas Well Data Organize PI tapes and overlay with boundary | n/a | PI data base | 0 | | |
| 25 | Geologic Hazards Landslides Active faults Wind blown sand deposits | (1:24K) 29 17 55 | State geologic hazards map | 0.5 WM | | |
| 26 | Lease Boundary Areas Coal Trona | 5 (1:100K) 3 | USGS Quads, District files | 0.1 WM | | |
| 27 | Mine Permit Boundary Areas | 4 (1:100K) | USGS Quads, District files | 0.1 WM | | |
| 28 | Special Mineral Boundaries KSLA Oil Shale Withdrawal | 6 (1:100K) 2 4 | USGS Quads, District files | 0.1 WM | | |
| 29 | Cultural NRHP sites | Est 12 (1:24K) | USGS Quads, Federal Register notices | 0.1 WM | | |
| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
| | | | | <u>Field Office Area</u> | <u>State Office</u> | |
| 30 | Air Quality | | Field Office Area files | 0.1 WM | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|--------|--|
| 31 | Forestry | 11 (1:24K) | Field Office Area files | | | 10/31/89 |
| 32 | Paleontology | 8 (1:100K) 20 (1:24K) | Big Sandy/Salt Wells MFPs, USGS quads | 0.1 WM | | |
| 33 | Fire Occurrence | | DPS8 program to be transferred to MOSS | 0 | 0.5 WM | |
| 34 | Mineral Materials Salables | 10 (1:100K) | Project Files | 0.1 WM | | |
| 35 | ACECs | 24 (1:24K) | Field Office Area files | 0.2 WM | | 10/16/89 |
| 36 | WSAs and Proposed Areas | 24 (1:24K) | Field Office Area files | 0.2 WM | | 10/16/89 |
| 37 | Fisheries | 100? (1:24K) | Field Office Area Files No. 9, Live Water | | | |
| 38 | Wild and Scenic Rivers | (1:24K) | USGS Topo Quads No. 9, Live Water | | | |
| <u>Number</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>No. of Quads (Scale)</u> | <u>Existing Sources</u> | <u>Estimated Digitizing Costs</u> <u>Field Office Area</u> <u>State Office</u> | | <u>Date Sent to Service Center</u> |
| 39 | Great Divide Basin/ Red Desert | 16+ ³ (1:24K) | USGS Topo Quads Field Office Area Files | | | |
| 40 | Wild Horse Herd Areas | 6 (1:100K) | Field Office Area Files | | | |

¹Some quads with water information are being digitized by USFWS as one of their projects. We will try to obtain this information rather than duplicate the effort.

²to be announced

³Maybe more later

APPENDIX G

METADATA DIRECTION

While much of the GIS data needed for land use planning is produced by staff in BLM field offices, data compiled by other Federal agencies; tribal, state, and local governments; and private organizations is available as well.

Through the Wyoming Geographic Information Advisory Council (WGIAC), the State of Wyoming provides technical and data acquisition assistance for statewide GIS projects. The WGIAC inventories available GIS data and coordinates GIS data standards and sharing throughout the state. Online, the WGIAC maintains a home page providing comprehensive access to information about the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of GIS information in Wyoming.

The WGIAC has established the Wyoming Spatial Data Clearinghouse (SDC) on the Internet to access and deliver GIS data to public and private sectors, including all Wyoming state agencies, 23 Wyoming counties, Wyoming municipalities and the University of Wyoming. The SDC posts metadata in accordance with the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) content standards for digital geospatial metadata. (The content standard is contained at <http://fgdc.gov/metadata/metadata.html>) Training and documentation are provided by the SDC to state, federal, and local agencies as well as other public and private sectors on the use of the web site. Their goal is to allow quick and easy access to the data provided in the clearinghouse, both metadata and actual data.

Geospatial datasets, developed or enhanced by departments and organizations at the University of Wyoming, can be downloaded from the University's Spatial Data and Visualization Center. The site, which is operated by the Wyoming Natural Resources Data Clearinghouse, includes an extensive library of data themes valuable for land use planning. A frequently updated list of what's new at the clearinghouse is located at <http://www.sdvc.uwyo.edu/clearinghouse/update.html>

As pointed out in a recent WO Instruction Memorandum (No. 2001-038, Change 1), a metadata template for use in BLM land use planning and examples of completed metadata are posted at http://web.blm.gov/CDD/standards/land_use_plan.html

It is expected that compilation of metadata records will require the cooperation of resource program, geographic information system, and planning personnel at state office and field office levels. Questions concerning the acceptability of data sources to be used in planning should be referred to the national data steward for that resources. The data stewards are listed on the data management intranet web site at <http://web.blm.gov/CDD/datastewds.htm> The planning efforts for all Wyoming RMP updates are committed to meet this requirement for compiling and maintaining metadata records.

APPENDIX H

**DRAFT PUBLIC OUTREACH/PARTICIPATION PLAN
FOR THE
GREAT DIVIDE RMP REVIEW AND MODIFICATION**

DRAFT - DRAFT - DRAFT

Public involvement is an integral part of BLM's planning process and is needed to facilitate the review and modification of the Great Divide Resource Management Plan (RMP). The public participation process for the Great Divide planning effort will consist of three components which coincide with the resource management planning process. The components are preplanning, plan modification, and plan implementation. The preplanning component involves activities that include issue identification, development of planning criteria, determination of inventory needs, and the existing management situation analysis. The plan preparation phase involves development of alternatives for analysis, preparation of an environmental impact statement, a record of decision and a modified RMP. Plan implementation includes implementing land use plan decisions, ensuring activities conform with the land use plan decisions, monitoring to track the implementation of land use plan decisions, and evaluating decisions made in the plan to determine if the decisions and NEPA analysis are still valid, or if changes are needed.

The objectives of public participation for this planning effort are to:

- Inform the public of the BLM's resource management planning activities.
- Provide the public with an understanding of BLM programs and proposed actions.
- Ensure that public needs and concerns are understood by BLM.
- Broaden the information base upon which planning decisions are made.
- Communicate to the public the reasons for decisions and the benefits to be derived through the chosen course of action.

Criteria for Collaborative Planning and Public Involvement

Section 202 (c) (9) of FLPMA requires BLM to provide for the involvement of other federal agencies and state, local, and Indian governments in developing land use plans. Collaboration must start early in the planning process and continue throughout.

The collection of regional information to support planning efforts and the use of new information technologies are leading to stronger partnerships, better science, and improved public participation. Planning Support Project (PSP) work related to coal and oil and gas development, watershed mapping, T&E and sensitive plant and animal species, socioeconomics, and historic trails will involve BLM in partnerships with the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of Energy, the University of Wyoming, various State of Wyoming agencies, conservation districts, county governments, and local historical societies.

Finally, technology is bringing a new dimension to partnering and public involvement by allowing planning documents and the results of resource assessments to be posted on the world wide web. Under a cooperative agreement between BLM and the State of Wyoming, geographic information used in various agency planning efforts is being gathered in an online data clearinghouse by the Wyoming Geographic Information Advisory Council. Through these partnerships, the BLM in Wyoming can magnify the efficiencies and benefits of land use planning, while making the planning/NEPA process more available and accessible to all Americans.

Components of Public Participation

1. **Planning Review Phase** - Public participation for the Great Divide RMP planning review will begin with press releases and media contacts indicating the BLM's intention to conduct a planning review of the Great Divide RMP and to modify the RMP as necessary, why the planning review is being done, and related time frames. A *Federal Register* notice will be published if needed and general scoping letter mailed to notify people about the Great Divide planning effort and public meetings may be held.

Upon completion of the planning review, the results will be made available to the public. If the review results in the need for a major amendment (requiring an EIS) or a revision, a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS will be published in the *Federal Register*. Additional public meetings will be conducted.

2. **RMP Modification Preparation Phase** - The following public notices will be published during the plan preparation phase:

Publication of a *Federal Register* Notice of Intent, requesting resource information and indicating the BLM's intention to amend or revise the Great Divide RMP . The notice will include the following:

- Identification of the geographic area to be covered.
- Kind and extent of public participation activities to be provided.
- Time, date, and location of scheduled public open houses and meetings.
- Name, title, address, and telephone number of the BLM officials to be contacted for further information.
- Location and availability of documents relevant to the planning process.
- A request for coal and other resource-specific information.
- A preliminary list of resource management issues and concerns identified by BLM Field Office staff.
- A request for identification of concerns, problems, conflicts, and issues by the public.

An updated scoping letter will be mailed to notify people about the Great Divide planning effort. A regional press release about the planning effort will be issued.

- Upon publication of the draft EIS for the RMP revision/amendment, a notice will be published in the *Federal Register* allowing a 90-day review period and requesting public comment. This will include notification of any proposed special management area designations.

- Upon publication of the proposed plan and final EIS, a notice will be published in the *Federal Register* allowing a 30-day protest period.

- Following State Director approval of the RMP Record of Decision, a notice will be published in the *Federal Register* informing the public of the availability of the RMP and of any changes made as a result of protests on the proposed RMP presented in the final EIS.

3. **RMP Implementation Phase** - An education phase begins with issuance of the record of decision and the approved RMP. It will be necessary for BLM to continue contacts with the public in order to effectively implement the RMP.

Feedback from the public will be needed to assess the effectiveness of the RMP decisions and to document shortcomings and changes which will be addressed in future RMP maintenance actions, amendments, or revisions. Contacts will be made primarily by resource specialists during their day-to-day activities. Written documentation of these contacts must continue throughout the implementation of the RMP. Additional feedback will likely come in the form of letters from people experiencing problems or having questions.

At the same time the public is assessing the effectiveness of the RMP from its standpoint, it is incumbent upon resource specialists to help the public understand the precepts of the RMP, and how and why its implementation is to be accomplished.

Getting Started

1. **General Meetings** - The purpose of the general meetings is to make the public, particularly local government, aware of our planning review, its purpose, what it would involve, and what their involvement would be. This will be especially important if the local governments bring up cooperating agency requests.
2. **Briefings/Meetings (Ongoing)**
 - County Commissioners - Laramie, Albany, Carbon, and Sweetwater County briefings
 - State of Wyoming agencies' coordination Meeting (suggest in tandem w/Pinedale planning review)
 - Congressional briefings
 - Open house in Rawlins
 - Individual industry or target group meetings (i.e., energy operators or livestock permittees) upon request
 - Others
3. **Establish an Internet Website linked to Wyoming BLM's home page (by Dec 30, 2001)**
4. **Press Releases**
 - General release issued on initiation of the planning review
 - Other releases as appropriate during planning review

5. **Tours** - Schedule for summer of FY 2002 when the planning review is completed and next phase begins.
6. **Materials** - Materials, websites, and presentations intended for public consumption will be coordinated with the field office public affairs specialist.

The Interested and Affected Public

1. **Identification of the Public** - A mailing list of individuals, organizations, businesses, and other parties interested in planning and resource management in the Rawlins Field Office will be maintained. The mailing list will be updated when other interested individuals or groups are identified, ensuring that all interested parties are represented.
2. **Federal, State, and Local Governments** - In addition to other public involvement, the planning regulations in 43 CFR 1610.3-1 require coordination with other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes. The objectives of the coordination are for the State Director and Field Manager to keep apprized of non-BLM plans; assure that consideration is given to those plans that are germane to the development of RMPs for public lands; assist in resolving inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans; and provide for meaningful public involvement of other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes in developing the RMP, including early public notice of proposed decisions which may have a significant impact on non-federal lands. See the list of required reviewers at the end of this appendix.
3. **Methods of Public Involvement Include** -
 - Direct mailings will be made to parties identified on the mailing list.
 - The public will be informed of the various stages of the planning effort through the local news media, mailings and through *Federal Register* notices at specific points in the process.
 - The opportunity for orientation and planning meetings will be offered to interested organizations and individuals.
 - Opportunities will be provided for resource specialists to discuss management proposals with specific elements of the public at open houses, organizational meetings, and public outreach activities (Resources Day, County Fair, Trout Unlimited, Rotary Club, and other meetings as requested).
 - An internet website will be established and updated regularly with information about the status of the planning effort, planning criteria, upcoming public meetings, *Federal Register* notices, press releases, etc., with a link to the NEPA page.

Handling Public Comment

1. **Documentation** - Written records of all public comments will be maintained. Each record will be completed by the person responsible for obtaining the public input. Copies of all correspondence from the BLM to the public and copies of news releases and *Federal Register* notices will be retained. Summaries or transcripts of all public meetings will be prepared and retained.

2. **Analysis and Summary** - Comments having specific information about the planning effort, such as those providing new or additional technical information or those that point out errors, will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Appropriate action will be taken to include the information or make needed corrections. The person providing the input will be acknowledged of our receipt and disposition of the input.

General comments, especially those received during formal comment periods, will be reviewed for their applicability to the planning effort. Those providing specific information will be treated as described above. Unless management desires a specific breakdown of comments to be used in answering specific questions, input will not be coded. Instead, input will be summarized. Summaries will be used to support development of the various planning phases.

Freedom of Information Act Considerations

Comments submitted to BLM for use in its planning efforts, including names and home addresses of individuals submitting the comments, are subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552). However, names and home addresses of individuals may be protected from disclosure under exemption 6 of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). In order to protect names and home addresses from public review or disclosure, the individual(s) submitting comments must request that their names and addresses be held in confidence.

The following or a similar statement must be placed in all notices requesting public input, including notices on the Internet, in Federal Register Notices of Intent and Notices of Availability, and in “Dear Interested Party” letters in the EA/EIS:

“FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT CONSIDERATIONS: Public comments submitted for this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the XYZ Field Office during regular business hours (x:xx a.m. to x:xx p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals who are representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.”

An abbreviated statement would also be included in press releases:

Public comments including name and address would be available for public review. If people wish to withhold their name and/or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, they must state this prominently at the beginning of the written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law.

Public Participation Plan Evaluation

Evaluation of this public participation plan will be ongoing throughout the planning effort. The team leader, field office public affairs officer, and the management team will regularly assess the efficiency and

success of the plan. It is suggested that evaluation of this plan occur after each major public participation period.

This public participation plan is necessarily flexible. It should be altered to take advantage of changes in policy direction, schedules, budgets, and manpower and should be responsive to periodic evaluations.

COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION

The Great Divide RMP Planning Review and Modification will be carried out in a manner which encourages and provides for early involvement by affected federal, state, and local agencies, state and local governments, interest groups, and the general public.

Wyoming Media for Great Divide RMP Planning Review and Modification

Newspapers:

- Rawlins Daily Times
- Casper Star Tribune
- Green River Star
- Rock Springs Rocket Miner
- Laramie Daily Boomerang
- Saratoga Sun
- Wyoming State Tribune Eagle

Television:

- KTWO, Casper
- KGWN, Cheyenne

Radio:

- KRAL Rawlins
- KUWR Wyoming Public Radio
- CSNN Statewide Radio Network
- KUGR/KQSW Green River
- KRKK/KYCS/KSIT Rock Springs
- KOWB Laramie
- KLDI Laramie
- KIMX Laramie
- KTWO Casper
- Clear Channel Radio Cheyenne

Required Reviewers Other Recipients of Planning Documents

(this listing will be periodically reviewed and updated)

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC
PRESERVATION
1100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE STE 809
WASHINGTON DC 20004

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
DALE MOLLOCK NPS-744
PO BOX 37127
WASHINGTON DC 20013-7127

THE HONORABLE JIM GERINGER
GOVERNOR OF WYOMING
CAPITOL BUILDING
CHEYENNE WY 82002

USDI FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE
CHIEF, DIV ENV COORD
WASHINGTON DC 20240

WYOMING OFFICE OF FEDERAL LAND
POLICY
CLEARINGHOUSE COORDINATOR(17 copies)
HERSCHLER BLDG 1 WEST
CHEYENNE WY 82002-0600

USDA/FOREST SERVICE
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
PO BOX 2417 RM 3210 SO BLDG
WASHINGTON DC 20013

USDI BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (D-150)
DENVER FED CENTER BLDG 67
PO BOX 2507
DENVER CO 80225-0007

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMIN (HEV-1)
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
400 SEVENTH ST SW
WASHINGTON DC 20590

USDI GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS PROGRAM
NATIONAL CENTER (423)
RESTON VA 22092

DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION (UGM-22)
PROGRAM GUIDANCE DIV
4000 7TH ST SW RM 9301
WASHINGTON DC 20590

U.S. EPA-REGION VIII 8WM-EA
CAROL CAMPBELL
999 18TH ST STE 500
DENVER CO 80202-2405

OFC DEPUTY A/S, USAF
ENVIRON, SAFETY, OCCUP HEALTH
SAF/RQ ROOM 4C916, PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20330-0001

BLM LIBRARY
BARBARA CLAUSON D-553A (2 copies)
BLDG 50 DFC BOX 25047
DENVER CO 80225-0047

NATIONAL PARK SVC (MIB 121)
ENVIRONMENTAL QUAL DIV - 774
PO BOX 37127
WASHINGTON DC 20013-7127

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (EH-23)
OFFICE OF ENV COMPLIANCE
1000 INDEPENDENCE AVE SW
WASHINGTON DC 0585
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT (760)
1849 C ST NW 406LS (12 to 16 copies)
WASHINGTON DC 20240

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS-AREA
RICHARD WHITESELL, DIRECTOR
316 N 26TH ST
BILLINGS MT 59101

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
RICK BLASKOVICH, CHIEF, LANDS & ENV. RES
PO BOX 30137
BILLINGS MT 59107-0137

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
2764 COMPASS DRIVE, SUITE 106
GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81506

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
125 S STATE ST RM 6107
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84138-1102

And, five copies each of the following (FEDEX
before document is mailed to public):

PEARL YOUNG-BOOKER
EIS FILING ROOM 7241 OFA-NEPA COMP DIV
ARIEL RIOS BLDG (SO OVAL LBY)
1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20044

DOI/OEPC
PHYLLIS DAVIS
18TH & C ST NW MAILSTP 2340
WASHINGTON DC 20240

APPENDIX I

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM MEMBERS AND RESPONSIBILITY

Rawlins Field Office

Kurt Kotter - Field Manager, Management Oversight
John Spehar - Team Leader
 - Technical Coordinator
Andy Warren - Livestock Grazing
Brenda Vosika - Neuman - Coal Resources
Chuck Reed - Wild Horse Management, Livestock Grazing
Clare Miller - Oil and Gas Resources
Frank Blomquist - Sensitive Plant Management
Fred Hurlock - Law Enforcement
Gay Seay - Lands Program Management
Janelle Wrigley - Lands Program Management
 - Water Resources Management
Krystal Clair - Trails, Recreation, and Visual Resource Management
Larry Apple - ACEC
Larry Trapp - Fire Management
Lynn McCarthy - GIS Support
Mark Newman - Paleontological Resources, Locatable and Salable Minerals
Mary Apple - Public Affairs
Mary Read - Wildlife Habitat Management
Michael Bower - Fisheries Management
Sandra Meyers - Cultural Resource Management
Susan Foley - Soil Management and Weed Program Management
William Mack - Forest Resource Management
 - Writer/Editor

Wyoming State Office

Joe Patti - Planning Coordination and Consistency
Susan Caplan - Air Resource Management

