

APPENDIX B**PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA****GENERAL PLANNING CRITERIA**

1. This planning effort will recognize valid existing rights.
2. Actions must comply with laws, executive orders, and regulations.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Where practicable and timely for the planning effort, current scientific information, research, and new technologies will be considered.
8. 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.
9. 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.

1 **PLANNING CRITERIA FOR SPECIFIC RESOURCE PROGRAMS**

2 1. Criteria for Use of Wyoming BLM Mitigation Guidelines for Surface Disturbing -
 3 The Wyoming BLM has developed "mitigation guidelines" for use in determining
 4 the types and levels of mitigation needed to protect important resources from
 5 actions involving surface-disturbing and other human-presence disturbance or
 6 disruptive activities. These guidelines are used in the planning/NEPA process for
 7 (1) developing management options and alternatives and analyzing their impacts ;
 8 and (2) as part of the planning criteria for developing the options and alternatives
 9 and for determining mitigation requirements. The "Wyoming BLM Mitigation
 10 Guidelines for Surface-disturbing and Disruptive Activities" contain further
 11 information on how these guidelines are used in the planning/NEPA process.

12 2. Criteria for Coal Planning/Screening Process - The coal planning/screening
 13 process (including application of the coal unsuitability criteria) under 43 CFR
 14 3461) will not be conducted for the planning effort. Any interest in exploration
 15 for or leasing of federal coal will be handled on a case-by-case basis. If an
 16 application for a federal coal lease is received sometime in the future, an
 17 appropriate land use and environmental analysis will be conducted (which will
 18 include conducting the coal screening/planning process), to determine whether or
 19 not the federal coal areas applied for are acceptable for development and leasing
 20 consideration. The Pinedale RMP will be amended as necessary. To date, there
 21 has been no interest expressed to the BLM for leasing and development of federal
 22 coal in the planning area. It is noted that the coal occurrence potential in the
 23 planning area must still be determined because of the interest in coal bed methane
 24 development. Thus, the Notice of Intent to conduct a planning review and
 25 modification of the Pinedale RMP will include a call for any available coal and
 26 other resource information for the planning area.

27 3. Criteria for Healthy Rangelands - The Standards for Healthy Rangelands and
 28 Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands Administered by
 29 the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Wyoming (S&Gs) were approved
 30 by the Secretary of the Interior on August 12, 1997.

31 The Secretary of the Interior approved the Wyoming BLM S&Gs to aid in
 32 achieving the four fundamentals of rangeland health outlined in the grazing
 33 regulations (43 CFR 4180.1). These four fundamentals are: (1) watersheds are
 34 functioning properly; (2) water, nutrients, and energy are cycling properly; (3)
 35 water quality meets state standards; and, (4) habitat for special status species is

- 1 protected. The standards apply to all resources and land and resource uses on the
2 public lands, while the guidelines apply specifically to livestock grazing practices.
3 The S&Gs are used to aid in developing options and alternatives for analysis and
4 in considering appropriate management options necessary to implement the
5 S&Gs.
- 6 Management objectives and actions described in each alternative addressed in the
7 EIS would be subject to the standards for healthy rangelands. In addition, the
8 livestock grazing management objectives and related actions for each of the
9 alternatives would be subject to both the standards for healthy rangelands and the
10 guidelines for livestock grazing management. Therefore, because the S&Gs are
11 policy guidance, they are common to all alternatives. However, specific actions
12 to implement the S&Gs may vary by alternative.
- 13 4. Criteria for Multiple Use Considerations - Multiple use is defined in the Federal
14 Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976, as the management of public
15 lands and their various resource values so they are utilized in the combination that
16 will best meet the present and future needs of the American people and not
17 necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return
18 or the greatest unit output. BLM policy requires that BLM-administered public
19 lands be managed under this multiple use concept. As appropriate, management
20 objectives and actions described for each alternative addressed in the
21 planning/NEPA process will consider all resources and resource uses in the
22 planning area, (physical, biological, and socioeconomic).
- 23 5. Criteria for Hydrocarbon Potential - To aid in the planning review and RMP
24 modification criteria will be developed for leasing and development of
25 hydrocarbon-based minerals (oil and gas, and coal bed methane). Using available
26 geologic information, reports of past production, and information from the
27 minerals industry, areas of high, moderate, and low potential for the occurrence
28 and development of hydrocarbons in the planning area will be identified.
29 Estimates of reasonably foreseeable oil and gas (including coalbed methane)
30 exploration and development activity will be developed from analysis of past
31 activity and production. These estimates will be used to aid in the analysis of
32 environmental consequences. Because they are general, these occurrence and
33 development potential classifications and production estimates are appropriate for
34 planning purposes, but they are not appropriate for, nor are they intended to
35 predict, future specific activity or the specific locations of new discoveries.
- 36 6. Criteria for Other Leasable Minerals - Other leasable minerals (coal, phosphates,
37 geothermal, etc.) will not be addressed in this planning review. There is no
38 known development potential in the planning area for other leasable minerals.
- 39 7. Criteria for Salable Mineral Potential - Information on salable minerals (sand,
40 gravel, decorative stone, et al.) occurrence potential and records of past minerals

- 1 activities will be used to estimate what types and amounts of future salcable
2 mineral development would take place in the planning area. Estimates of
3 reasonably foreseeable mineral development will be used to aid in the analysis of
4 environmental consequences.
- 5 8. Criteria for Locatable Minerals Potential - Criteria will be developed for
6 determining the occurrence and development potential of locatable minerals such
7 as gold, diamonds, uranium and bentonite. Areas of high, moderate, and low
8 occurrence and development potential will be determined to facilitate analysis of
9 the effects that the variety of other land and resource uses and management
10 actions would have on locatable minerals development and vice versa. This will
11 only be based on a representative analysis by inference and does not imply that
12 there may or may not be undiscovered locatable minerals of economic value in
13 the planning area.
- 14 9. Criteria for Withdrawals and Classifications - Under sections 202(d) and 204(l) of
15 the FLPMA, any classification or withdrawal on BLM-administered public land is
16 subject to periodic review to determine whether or not it is serving its intended
17 purpose and is still needed. These reviews will be conducted during the planning
18 effort and may result in determining that some classifications and withdrawals
19 should be modified or terminated. During the planning effort, the need for new or
20 expanded withdrawals may also be identified. Where the need for new
21 withdrawals is identified that overlap existing withdrawals that should be
22 terminated, the new withdrawals will be put in place before terminating old
23 withdrawals on the same areas.
- 24 The criteria for conducting these reviews in the course of the planning effort are
25 presented below. For purposes of providing an adequate comparison of impacts
26 for the planning effort, all existing withdrawals and classifications and their
27 segregation effects will be assumed to continue in effect in the description of
28 continuation of existing management direction.
- 29 10. Withdrawals Under Other Agency Jurisdiction - The withdrawal review
30 requirement of the FLPMA has not yet been completed on those federal lands
31 withdrawn for purposes of other federal agencies (i.e., those under the jurisdiction
32 of the Department of Defense or Bureau of Reclamation). For the purposes of
33 this planning effort, it must be assumed that these withdrawals will remain in
34 effect, and that the planning and management authorities for these withdrawn
35 lands will remain with those agencies. Thus, the planning effort will not include
36 consideration of any planning or management decisions for either the federal land
37 surface or federal minerals within these withdrawn areas. These lands will,
38 however, be considered in conducting the environmental analysis for the planning
39 effort in terms of cumulative impacts and in terms of how they may be affected by
40 management in the planning area or vice versa.

- 1 11. Withdrawals and Classifications Under BLM Jurisdiction - The review of
2 withdrawals and classifications on any lands under BLM jurisdiction may result
3 in a determination that withdrawals or classifications are no longer serving their
4 intended purposes and should be terminated (either all or in part). This review
5 will include consideration of whether new withdrawals or classifications, for other
6 purposes, are needed and should be put into place before terminating old
7 withdrawals on the same areas.
- 8 12. Criteria for Wild Horse Management - There are no wild horses or wild horse
9 “herd management areas” in the planning area. Historic wild horse “herd areas”
10 will be identified and existing land use plan decisions will be revisited.
- 11 13. Criteria for Wilderness Management - There are two wilderness study areas
12 (WSA—Lake Mountain and Scab Creek) on BLM-administered public lands in the
13 planning area. These WSAs were established in accordance with the
14 requirements of Section 603(c) of FLPMA and section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act
15 of 1964. These WSAs will continue to be managed under the Interim
16 Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) until Congress
17 either designates all or portions of the WSAs as wilderness or releases the lands
18 from further wilderness consideration. There may be instances where resource
19 values within WSAs will require RMP management decisions or prescriptions
20 that are more stringent than the IMP.
- 21 While there have been no other areas with wilderness characteristics identified on
22 public lands in the planning area, such additional lands could be identified during
23 the planning effort (per the general provisions of Section 202 of FLPMA).
- 24 14. Criteria for Wild and Scenic Rivers - Any public land surface found to meet the
25 suitability factors to be given further consideration for inclusion in the Wild and
26 Scenic River System (being handled under separate contract) will be addressed in
27 the RMP modification effort in terms of developing interim management options
28 in the alternatives for the EIS (in accordance with Section 5(d) of the Wild and
29 Scenic Rivers Act, BLM Manual 8351, and Instruction Memo WY-98-40 (see
30 Appendix 3)). However, for purposes of providing an adequate comparison of
31 impacts for the planning effort, the description of continuation of existing
32 management direction (No Action Alternative) will not include any consideration
33 of wild and scenic rivers. The only planning decision to be made in the RMP is
34 the interim management prescription to maintain or enhance the outstandingly
35 remarkable values and WSR classifications for those public land surface areas
36 that meet the Wild and Scenic River suitability factors.
- 37 15. Criteria for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) - The relevance and
38 importance criteria for ACEC designation, found in BLM Manual 1613, will be
39 applied to BLM-administered public lands in the planning area to determine if any
40 areas have the potential for ACEC designation. An ACEC designation alone does

1 not change the allowed uses of the public lands involved (FLPMA-Sec.201(a) and
2 43 CFR 1601.0-5a). An ACEC designation is not a substitute for a WSA or
3 wilderness suitability recommendation (BLM Manual 1613.06). Protective
4 measures for ACECs are not applied or required simply because of the
5 designation; rather, the nature of the values, resources, or natural hazards they
6 contain are the bases for determining the appropriate types and levels of
7 management needed. The only automatic requirement due to an ACEC
8 designation is that a “plan of operations” must be submitted for any degree of
9 mining claim development in the area (43 CFR 3809.1-4).

10 CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES

- 11 The following will be considered in one or more of the alternatives to be developed.
- 12 16. Special or other management areas and their potential management.
- 13 17. Intensive management of significant cultural, historic, and paleontological
14 resources, including Native American respected places and trails.
- 15 18. The use of prescribed fire, chemical, and mechanical treatments to improve
16 natural resources.
- 17 19. The reduction of hazardous fuels on BLM-administered lands near wildland
18 interfac communities that are at high risk from wildfire, such as Hoback Rim.
- 19 20. Fire suppression management options.
- 20 21. Management options for the protection and enhancement of riparian and wetland
21 areas.
- 22 22. Management options for reducing the spread of noxious weeds.
- 23 23. Management options for the protection of habitat for threatened, endangered,
24 sensitive, and other important wildlife and plant species.
- 25 24. Management options for protection of wild and scenic river values.
- 26 25. Various types of vegetation uses, including wildlife habitat, watershed protection,
27 livestock grazing, etc.
- 28 26. Various levels of livestock grazing.

- 1 27. Identification of lands suitable for minerals exploration and development, off-
 2 highway vehicle use, rights-of-way construction, and other activities that may
 3 result in surface disturbance.
- 4 28. Identification of rights-of-way concentration areas, exclusion areas and avoidance
 5 areas to provide for development needs and protection of resource values.
- 6 29. Opportunities for enhancing recreation.
- 7 30. Opportunities for land exchanges that could be useful in meeting goals for
 8 resource manageability and public access.
- 9 31. Providing or improving access to public lands for reasonable levels of public use
 10 and for resource development and manageability.
- 11 32. Management of recreational use and designation of Special Recreation
 12 Management Areas.
- 13 33. Visual Resource Management (VRM) classifications will be evaluated and
 14 modified, as necessary, to reflect present conditions and future needs. Areas
 15 where specific land uses need to be modified or restricted to resolve conflicts will
 16 be identified.
- 17 34. Watersheds and watershed needs will be considered in the development of
 18 management options and alternatives for all resource and land.
- 19 35. Vegetation management objectives or objectives for desired future condition will
 20 be included in all alternatives. Mitigation of surface disturbing activities will also
 21 be considered.

22 **CRITERIA FOR ANALYZING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

23 The following potential effects will be addressed:

- 24 36. Effects of opening or closing BLM-administered lands to some uses or activities.
- 25 37. Effects of resource protection measures on land and resource uses and activities.
- 26 38. Effects of surface-disturbing uses and other disruptive human activities on air
 27 quality, cultural resources, recreational opportunities, watershed, and wildlife/fish
 28 resources, including special status species.

- 1 39. Effects of land tenure adjustments, livestock grazing, and OHV use on other land
2 and resource uses.
- 3 40. The socioeconomic effects of the alternatives in the EIS will be addressed.
- 4 41. The effects of mineral development on other resources and land uses.
- 5 42. Effects of all types of land and resource uses on the diversity of plant and animal
6 species.
- 7 43. Effects on land and resource uses from retention or termination of existing
8 withdrawals and classifications.
- 9 44. Effects of all types of land and resource uses on the vegetation, water, soil, and air
10 resources.

11 **CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

12 The following considerations will guide selection of the preferred alternative:

13

- 14 45. Levels of land use restrictions needed to protect resources and keep lands and
15 resources available for public use.
- 16 46. The potential for the occurrence and development of mineral resources.
- 17 47. Consistency with the land use plans, programs, and policies of other federal
18 agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes.
- 19 48. The potential for sustaining the productivity and diversity of ecosystems while
20 providing for human values, products, and services.
- 21 49. Social and economic values.
- 22 50. Existing law, regulations, and BLM policy.
- 23 51. Public input, welfare and safety.
- 24 52. Environmental impacts.
- 25 53. Consistency with the objectives of the National Fire Plan and the 10-year
26 Comprehensive Fire Strategy.

- 1 54. Consistency with existing conservation strategies/recovery plans for threatened,
2 endangered, and sensitive species.

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

- 6 55. The Management Situation Analysis (MSA) procedure and documentation consist
7 of a detailed evaluation and description of (1) the Continuation of Existing
8 Management Direction (or “No Action”) Alternative (this alternative will have a
9 20-year projection or analysis period); (2) the description of the affected or
10 existing environment; and (3) the description of the impact analysis of the No
11 Action Alternative (including the input of both informal and formal public
12 scoping conducted to that point). The results of this analysis and scoping provide
13 (4) the basic determination of the problems, concerns, conflicts and issues
14 associated with continuation of existing management direction in the planning
15 area, upon which the remainder of the planning effort will be focused. The MSA
16 procedure and documentation also includes (5) the planning criteria for
17 conducting the planning effort; (6) a record data/information compiled and new
18 data/information gathered or specifically needed for the planning effort; and (6) a
19 record of resource management options, opportunities, and limitations to respond
20 to and resolve the issues, concerns, etc. At this point in the process, a
21 determination will be made on whether the RMP modification will be an
22 amendment, or a complete revision. Regardless of that determination, the
23 environmental analysis level for the Pinedale RMP modification will be an EIS
24 (rather than an environmental assessment or EA).
- 25 56. Upon completion of the MSA, alternatives (i.e., alternatives to existing
26 management direction, or alternatives to the No Action Alternative) will be
27 developed for detailed impact analysis (as with the MSA, all alternatives will
28 have a 20-year projection or analysis period). An alternative is a comprehensive
29 and complete “alternative RMP” and is made up of resource and land use
30 “management options” among the various programs of resource and land uses
31 occurring in the planning area. In compliance with NEPA, the Council on
32 Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and the BLM planning regulations and
33 guidance, alternatives must be reasonable and must be capable of implementation.
34 Two basic alternative “themes” will be used to formulate the first two alternatives
35 – one that emphasizes development and intensive management and de-emphasizes
36 environmental protection (within the parameters of law and regulation), and one
37 that emphasizes environmental protection and de-emphasizes development and
38 intensive management (within the parameters of law and regulation). The basic
39 objectives of these alternatives is to try to resolve the issues, concerns, problems
40 and conflicts associated with the No Action Alternative; to provide an adequate
41 range of alternatives to analyze in detail; and to provide a good basis for
42 comparative impact analyses. A detailed analysis of each of these alternatives is
43 conducted and documented. It is possible that other alternative themes could be

- 1 identified as a result of these analyses. Other management options and
2 alternatives that are “considered,” but not analyzed in detail, are also documented,
3 along with the reasons and rationale for not conducting a detailed analysis on
4 them.
- 5 57. Based upon the analyses of the above alternatives, the Preferred Alternative (i.e.,
6 the BLM’s preferred alternative) will then be selected and analyzed in detail.
7 Usually, none of the above alternatives can, individually, represent the BLM’s
8 preferred alternative and another alternative is formulated as the Preferred
9 Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is usually made up of a combination of
10 management options from the other alternatives that provide the best mix and
11 balance of multiple land and resource uses to resolve the issues with existing
12 management in the planning area, based on the Planning Criteria for selection of
13 the Preferred Alternative.
- 14 58. The draft EIS for the RMP will then be prepared. The descriptions of all the
15 alternative RMPs analyzed in detail (including the Preferred Alternative) make up
16 Chapter 2 of the EIS. The description of the affected or existing environment is
17 Chapter 3 of the EIS, and the descriptions of the environmental consequences of
18 the alternatives is Chapter 4 of the EIS. Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter
19 describing the planning issues and planning criteria, and Chapter 5 is a description
20 of the public involvement and coordination occurring to this point in the planning
21 process.
- 22 59. Following the public review and comment period on the draft EIS, the final EIS
23 will be prepared. The final EIS will be a complete, stand-alone document (not an
24 abbreviated document). The final EIS has the same basic outline and content as
25 the draft EIS. The primary difference between the draft and final EISs is that the
26 focus of the final EIS is on the “Proposed RMP Decisions or Proposed RMP
27 Modification,” which is included in Chapter 2 of the final EIS. Based upon public
28 comment, any new information and correction of errors in the draft EIS, the final
29 EIS will present the Proposed RMP Decisions or Proposed RMP Modification
30 (which is usually a refinement or modification of the Preferred Alternative in the
31 draft EIS), along with the other alternatives.
- 32 60. Following a concurrent 60-day Governor’s consistency review and a 30-day
33 protest period on the Proposed RMP and final EIS, any protests submitted will be
34 resolved and both the Record of Decision (ROD) for the EIS and the Approved
35 RMP Decisions, or RMP Modification, will be prepared in one document and
36 issued to the public.

37
38