

To: Sally Butts[sbutts@blm.gov]
From: Nelson, Britta
Sent: 2017-02-10T17:40:54-05:00
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: GSENM RMP-A questions
Received: 2017-02-10T17:41:45-05:00
GSENM RMP-A Questions_021017.docx

You bet. Here you go!

Britta Nelson, M.P.A., Program Analyst
National Conservation Lands (WO-410)
Bureau of Land Management
303.236.0539

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 3:37 PM, Sally Butts <sbutts@blm.gov> wrote:

Can you send to me as a word doc? Thanks!

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 10, 2017, at 4:45 PM, Nelson, Britta <bknelson@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi Sally, the GSENM RMP-A questions have been updated and shared with you. The third bullet under WSA is more general so I am not sure if we should include it.

Let me know know your thoughts and if further updates are needed.
Thanks!

GSENM RMP-A Questions_021017.docx

Britta Nelson, M.P.A., Program Analyst
National Conservation Lands (WO-410)
Bureau of Land Management
303.236.0539

TO: Nikki Moore, Sally Butts, Peter Mali
FROM: Britta Nelson
DATE: February 10, 2017
SUBJECT: updated questions for GSENM RMP-A

The following information should be identified for the GSENM DRMP-A to aid the WO review.

General

- Are all National Conservation Lands units that are located within the planning area identified and impacts on those lands addressed in the RMP-A alternatives?
- Are management actions identified in the RMP that limit or exclude land use activities that are incompatible with the management of National Conservation Land units and other related special areas?

National Monuments

- Do alternatives consider impacts to the resources, objects, and values for which the GSENM was designated? If not, provide an explanation about how future project-level actions and analyses would consider impacts.
- Are all land use planning decisions in the RMP consistent with the purposes and objectives of the designating proclamation that established the GSENM?

Wilderness Study Area

- Do alternatives establish new discretionary uses in WSAs that would impair the suitability for wilderness designation?
- Do the alternatives introduce changes in manner and degree to grandfathered livestock grazing uses within WSAs?
- Do the alternatives otherwise meet the non-impairment standard described in Manual 6330 -- Management of BLM Wilderness Study Areas?"

Wilderness

- If motorized use is necessary in order to maintain livestock management structures and installations in the wilderness, are the alternatives drafted to determine the method that least impacts wilderness character while remaining consistent with the rule of practical necessity and reasonableness in supporting the livestock grazing program?

Lands with wilderness characteristics

- Does the FO have a complete, updated inventory of lands with wilderness characteristics? Yes, No, or Partial?
- Have external organizations provided inventory information and has that information been acknowledged in the RMP?
- Do alternatives consider impacts to wilderness characteristics? If not, provide an explanation about how future project-level actions and analyses would consider impacts.

Eligible and Suitable WSR

- Have WSR eligibility and suitability evaluations been conducted and are they current? Yes or No?
- Are impacts to eligible and suitable WSR segments considered in the RMP-A? If not, provide an explanation about how future project-level actions and analyses would consider impacts.

National Scenic and Historic Trails

- Has an inventory of National Trail resources, qualities, values, and associated settings and the primary use or uses been conducted? Yes or No?
- Are impacts to the National Trail resources, qualities, values, and associated settings and the primary use or uses considered? If not, provide an explanation about how future project-level actions and analyses would consider impacts.