




How to Navigate the Document

Reviewing a Resource Management Plan (RMP) can seem a daunting task, but by focusing your review on key areas you can distill the portions of the plan that are most important to you. While we encourage full review of the document, if time is a limiting factor, we suggest you use the following steps to guide you as you review the document. The back of this handout provides an annotated outline of the RMP.



Guide to the Lander Draft RMP and Draft EIS

The outline below provides an overview of the major sections of the Draft RMP and EIS.

Executive Summary

Provides a summary of why the RMP is being revised, descriptions of the alternatives, and the potential effects of the alternatives.

Chapter 1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the Draft RMP and EIS, describes the purpose and need to which the BLM is responding, provides an overview of the BLM planning process, identifies planning issues and criteria, and identifies topics not addressed by this RMP revision.

Chapter 2. Resource Management Alternatives

Chapter 2 discusses how the four alternatives (A, B, C, and D) were developed and provides the components and content of each alternative.

Chapter 3. Affected Environment

This chapter describes the Lander Field Office planning area and the existing environmental conditions that could be impacted by the alternatives.

Chapter 4. Environmental Consequences

Chapter 4 describes how the environment would be affected by the alternatives.

Chapter 5. Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination

Chapter 5 describes the public involvement process, as well as other key consultation and coordination activities undertaken to prepare the EIS in support of the RMP revision.

Chapter 6. References

This chapter provides full citation information for all references cited within the document.

Appendices and Maps

The appendices include documents that provide background and support analyses. Maps are available electronically on CD with hardcopy documents in Volume 3, included on CD versions of the document, or on the Lander RMP website (<http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/lander.html>).

Resource discussions in chapters 2, 3, and 4 are organized according to the following eight resource topics:

1000. Physical Resources

2000. Mineral Resources

3000. Fire and Fuels Management

4000. Biological Resources

5000. Heritage and Visual Resources

6000. Land Resources

7000. Special Designations

8000. Socioeconomic Resources

Making Effective Comments

The Lander Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is available for review and comment. This handout provides helpful tips on how to make effective comments. Please be sure to submit your comments before the end of the comment period on December 7, 2011.

WHY ARE PUBLIC COMMENTS SO IMPORTANT?

The BLM is a federal land management agency tasked with managing public lands in the public interest. As such, we factor in your issues and concerns through the public comment process. Comments that provide relevant and new information with sufficient detail are most useful. Substantive comments are compiled in a published document as an appendix to the proposed RMP and final EIS. Individual response letters will not be provided. A substantive comment is one that does one or more of the following:

- ✓ *Questions, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the RMP and EIS;*
- ✓ *Questions, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of, methodology for, or assumptions used for the environmental analysis;*
- ✓ *Presents new information relevant to the analysis;*
- ✓ *Presents reasonable alternatives other than those analyzed in the EIS; or*
- ✓ *Causes changes or revisions in one or more of the alternatives.*

BLM reviews all comments and identifies which comments are substantive and which are not. Comments that are not substantive will be considered, but will not be included in the published appendix. For example, a comment such as, “we disagree with Alternative B and believe the BLM should select Alternative C,” is noted, but will not receive formal BLM response in the appendix.

HOW TO REVIEW AND COMMENT

- ✓ *Start your review by reading the executive summary.*
- ✓ *Identify the topic that is most important to you.*
- ✓ *Focus on one topic at a time. For that topic, familiarize yourself and review the document in the following order: Maps, Chapter 3, Chapter 2 alternatives, and then Chapter 4.*

As you write your comments, consider the following general Do’s and Don’ts of commenting:

THE DO'S	THE DON'TS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Suggest specific changes in the document, and provide the page number and section of the document in your comment.✓ Clearly identify:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Where the issue or error is located.Why you believe there is an error.Alternative ideas about how to address issues or errors.✓ Provide constructive solutions with documentation or resources to support your recommendations.✓ If applicable, include your formal and informal education or training as it relates to your observations and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Avoid vague statements or concerns. Vague statements do not suggest a specific change or give the BLM direction on which to act.✓ Understand that a comment is not a vote for or against one of the alternatives. The BLM must rely on supporting information, not on the number of comments received. Numerous comments expressing the same concern or issue are considered to be one comment.✓ Avoid using form letters to convey your point. Your unique way of writing or phrasing a comment is important for understanding your point of view.

Alternatives A, B, C, and D are presented in Volume 1, **Tables 2.6 - 2.51** of the draft EIS. When making a comment, suggest how the document should be changed and provide supporting information. At this time, Alternative D is the BLM's Preferred Alternative. Each management action in **Tables 2.6 - 2.51** is associated with a "record number" in the left hand column. When commenting, please identify the record number and the alternative (A, B, C, or D) to which you are referring (e.g., 4013A or 4013-D). Including this information will help us identify the exact location of the subject of your comment.

EXAMPLE COMMENTS

Consider these example comments as you begin to formulate your own comments.

Helpful Comments:	Not so Helpful Comments:
Alternative B prescribes no new well pads within 200 meters of sand dune areas. This prescription is too restrictive. Data collected by Sias and Snell (1996) supports that impact to sand dune lizards are greatly reduced when new oil/gas well pads placed at least 100 meters away from occupied dune complexes while allowing oil and gas development to occur. The additional 100 meter protection area is excessive.	<p>A 200-foot buffer for no new wells around sand dunes is excessive and places unnecessary constraints on development.</p> <p>Why is this comment not helpful?</p> <p><i>The comment is not specific enough to allow BLM to understand why the buffer is excessive. It does not contain supporting information or rationale.</i></p>
ACEC designation is not required in the proposed High Hills because standard or routine management prescriptions (<i>list them out</i>) are sufficient to protect the resource values.	<p>Eliminate ACECs.</p> <p>Why is this comment not helpful?</p> <p><i>The BLM must provide the specific rationale for a decision not to provide special management attention for an area which has been nominated as an ACEC (BLM Manual 1613).</i></p>
I disagree with the visual resource management class II designation for the area between Low Valley and Dry River. This area contains radio towers, power lines, and fences which detract from the view already. This area also contains valuable mineral deposits which are currently being developed and that development is expected to continue. The classification should be changed to class III.	<p>The Preferred Alternative has too much Visual Resource Management Class II.</p> <p>Why is this comment not helpful?</p> <p><i>This comment is not specific enough for the BLM to consider in balance with other resource issues. It does not contain supporting information or rationale.</i></p>
Designation of Beauty Creek segment would preclude exercising valid existing water rights (<i>provide the details of the rights</i>).	<p>Wild and Scenic River designation is not needed.</p> <p>Why is this comment not helpful?</p> <p><i>The BLM must make a suitability determination for all segments of streams which have been determined eligible (BLM Manual 8351).</i></p>

Thank you for your time and effort to review the Lander Draft RMP and EIS. Your participation is needed to make the Lander RMP revision process a success.

**Submit your
comments to:**

Lander Field Office 1335 Main Street Lander, Wyoming 82520
LRMP_WYMail@blm.gov

PLEASE REMEMBER TO SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BY DECEMBER 7, 2011