

QUESTIONNAIRE – USES OF GRAZING ADMINISTRATION RANGELAND RECORDS

The Division of Rangeland Resources (WO-220), in coordination with the Division of IRM Governance (WO-560), is considering amending the Range Management System, LLM-2, Privacy Act (72 FR 9025, Feb. 28, 2007) system of records notice. We are, therefore, re-examining routine uses (see 43 CFR 2.46 (j) for the definition of “routine use”). Additional clarification is needed from State and Field Office Staff regarding typical uses of grazing information and the utility of disclosing personal information maintained in the BLM’s grazing administrative records.

Please answer the two questions (I & II) below. State offices should ask their field offices and provide a consolidated response in electronic form to Ken Visser (WO-220) at kvisser@blm.gov by July 13, 2007.

- The February 2007 amendment describes how the BLM uses the records within LLM-2-RMS:
 - a. to identify the permittees and lessees authorized to graze land administered by the BLM;
 - b. to print statements of grazing preference, grazing authorizations, billings for grazing fees due, and other reports;
 - c. to maintain the information required to administer livestock grazing on public rangelands in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; and
 - d. to provide information concerning the grazing permittees and lessees for administrative use.

I. Are there other BLM uses of grazing administration records that are necessary for effective administration of the public lands?

- The current routine uses of LLM-2-RMS provide that the BLM may disclose the records outside of the DOI as follows:
 1. to the Department of Justice, or to a court, adjudicative or other administrative body, or to a party in litigation before a court or adjudicative or administrative body, when
 - a) the Department or any component of the Department, any Departmental employee acting in his or her official capacity, or any Departmental employee acting in his or her individual capacity where the Department of Justice has agreed to represent the employee is a party in the suit;
 - b) the BLM deems disclosure to be relevant and necessary to the proceeding, and compatible with the purpose for which the information was complete;
 2. to Federal, State, or local agencies to manage their activities related to the BLM’s grazing program; and
 3. to a congressional office from the record of an individual. This would be in response to a written inquiry the individual has made to the congressional office.

II. Are there other specific disclosures outside of the DOI that are necessary for effective administration of the public lands? If so, describe the disclosures and the purposes of the recommended disclosures.

Note: The intent of the Privacy Act is to balance the government’s need to maintain information about individuals with the rights of individuals to be protected against warranted invasions of their privacy stemming from federal agencies’ collection, maintenance, use and disclosure of personal information about them.