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# **INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND**

## **Introduction**

The Battle Mountain District is comprised of the Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah Planning Areas (Map 1).  The Shoshone-Eureka Planning Area (**SEPA[[1]](#footnote-2)**) encompasses the northern 4.4 Million acres of public lands within the District while the Tonopah Planning Area encompasses the southern 6.1 million acres of public lands.

The Shoshone-Eureka Planning Area, managed by the Mount Lewis Field Office (**MLFO**) of the Battle Mountain District (District), Bureau of Land Management (**BLM**), comprises approximately 4.4 million acres of public land in Lander, Eureka, and Nye Counties, Nevada (Map 2). The Planning Area is now managed under decisions in the Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan (**RMP**), approved in 1986, and four amendments to that RMP.

The Tonopah Planning Area, managed by the Tonopah Field Office (**TFO**) of the Battle Mountain District, comprises approximately 6.1 million acres of public land in Nye, and Esmeralda Counties, Nevada (Map 3). The Planning Area is now managed under the decisions in the Tonopah RMP approved in 1997.

The District RMP Revision will revise both the Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah RMPs and will be initiated and completed as one District wide RMP Revision/Environmental Impact Statement (**EIS**).

Revision of the Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah RMPs will incorporate management decisions from the existing RMPs and amendments if those decisions remain appropriate, and will provide up-dated decisions for the balance of the issues. The proposed RMP/EIS will be completed in accordance with Bureau planning regulations and the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (**NEPA**.) It will provide for implementation of the Great Basin Restoration Initiative (**GBRI**) and the National Fire Plan on public lands within the Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah Planning Areas.

All interested publics will have opportunity for input into all aspects of the development of the RMP/EIS.The Plan will be prepared in close consultation and collaboration with appropriate federal, state, tribal, county, and local agencies.

## **Background**

Within the past few years, particularly after the widespread wildfires of 1999 and 2000 and in light of declining sage grouse numbers, attention has been focused on the health of the Great Basin, Mojave-Great Basin Transition, and Mojave regions of the western United States.

Concerns in the District include rangeland management, mining on public lands, renewable energy development, fuels management, water quality, recreational tourism, community expansion, and the protection of cultural resources and traditional cultural values. The health of sagebrush communities and pinyon/juniper woodlands and deteriorating ecological conditions of vegetative communities are of particular concern. Current ecological conditions that are of concern are reflected by a decline in water quality and quantity, a decline in sage grouse populations, the invasion of noxious weeds and invasive plant species, encroachment of woody species (especially pinyon/juniper) into non-woodland sites, and loss of resiliency (ability to recover from disturbance) of many sagebrush / perennial grass sites.

Vegetative communities of the Great Basin have changed markedly over the past 150 years. Livestock grazing, aggressive fire suppression, wild horse and burro use, and several other land uses were sometimes done in ways that caused unanticipated and unacceptable impacts to the ecosystem. Although practices have improved with restoration and rehabilitation efforts following surface-disturbance such as that caused by mining and wildfires, the ecological health of this portion of the Great Basin is still in need of help. Inadvertent introduction of noxious weeds and invasive, non-native plant species has contributed to the decline of ecological health of the Great Basin. Such changes have led to steadily increasing fuel loads, decreased fire return intervals; and increased wildfire intensity and size. The result has been a loss of soil productivity, a decrease in vegetative diversity, and deterioration of watersheds (i.e. soil erosion and reduced water quantity and quality).

These conditions must be addressed in order to return the Great Basin to an ecologically healthy condition. This should be done in concert with collaborative partners and local communities before accelerated deterioration makes restoration biologically and economically infeasible.

# **PURPOSE AND NEED**

## **Revision Needed**

Revision of the Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah RMPs are needed to update resource management direction and consolidate still-valid decisions in order to meet Bureau goals and objectives in the District (Map 1, Appendix 1). The EISwill include analysis of cumulative impacts of all identified issues

## **Evaluations**

The Shoshone-Eureka RMP was evaluated in 1993 and in 2000. Similar issues were raised in both evaluations. The 1993 evaluation report stated, “The evaluation team recommends that amendments be completed for all resource programs that have high visibility within the district at this point in time. An RMP revision for these activities will provide future managers with the appropriate guidance to maintain consistency within the programs.”

In the 2000 evaluation report, the management team recommended, “… a new **LUP** [Land Use Plan] be initiated for the SEPA.” Although the evaluators found that plan maintenance had been helping in several programs, amendment or revision was deemed necessary for the Recreation, Visual Resources, Minerals, Realty, Forestry, Soil, Water, Air, Noxious Weeds, Special Status Species, Cultural Resources, Wild Horse and Burro, Fire, and Wilderness programs. As a result of the 2000 evaluation an amendment for Fire Management was completed in September 2002.

The Tonopah RMP was evaluated in 2004. The evaluators found that plan maintenance had been helping in several programs. Amendment or revision to several decisions was deemed necessary for the Vegetation (adding Noxious Weeds and Invasive Non-native Species), Special Status Species, Wildlife Habitat Management, Riparian Habitat, Forestry and Vegetative Products, Livestock Grazing Management, Wild Horse and Burro, Cultural Resources, Lands and Rights-of-Way, and Recreation programs.

## **Goals of Revised RMP**

The revised RMP will describe the current management situation, identify desired future conditions to be achieved (or maintained), and describe management actions necessary to achieve those objectives. It is anticipated that the revised RMP will change or expand upon decisions in the existing RMPs and amendments. However, some of the existing decisions will be carried forward, without change, and made part of the revised RMP.

## **Neighboring Plans**

The revised RMP shall be consistent with other Federal, State and Local plans to the extent they are consistent with Federal laws (see Appendix 2) related to management of lands within or adjacent to the District. This may include, but is not limited to, other RMPs, Forest Plans, fire management plans, wildlife habitat management plans, special status species recovery plans, livestock grazing allotment management plans, integrated weed management plan and recreation management plans.

## **Collaboration**

Development of this RMP/EIS will be a collaborative effort. We anticipate working with representatives from Federal, State and local governments, Tribal governments, the general public in the District, the ranching community, the mining community, special interest groups, and other stakeholders who demonstrate an interest in the planning effort.

## **Function of Preparation Plan**

The Preparation Plan defines work that must be completed for this effort and provides a general blueprint for development of the RMP/EIS**.** It is intended that the Preparation Plan be flexible, since new issues and resource management considerations will be identified during the EIS process.

The purpose of this Preparation-Plan is to:

1. Document the boundaries of Planning Areas being addressed;
2. Identify the preliminary objectives and issues to be resolved and the planning criteria that will be used to address them;
3. Document the scope, complexity, major responsibilities, and requirements for the planning effort;
4. Establish the internal and external coordination for the agencies involved;
5. Identify a completion schedule and budget; and
6. Establish the public participation process.

#

# **PLANNING AREA DESCRIPTION**

## **Shoshone-Eureka Planning Area**

The SEPA is in north central Nevada and consists of about 4.4 million acres of public land. It includes most of Lander County, the southern two-thirds of Eureka County, and a small portion of the northern part of Nye County. (Appendix 1, Maps 1 and 2)

The SEPA is in the center of the physiographic area known as the Basin and Range Province, which is characterized by parallel north-trending mountain ranges separated by broad valleys. It is also within the Great Basin, a hydrologic area with no rivers draining to the sea. The varied topography, geology, soils, flora and fauna in the Planning Area are typical of the high (cold) desert.

Elevations range from 4,504 feet at Battle Mountain to 10,614 feet at the top of Diamond Peak. Primary vegetative types include sagebrush/perennial grass communities, pinyon/juniper woodlands, and salt desert shrub communities. Small areas of wetland habitats including perennial streams, wet meadows, springs, and seeps are scattered throughout the Planning Area. Noxious weeds and invasive non-native species have invaded many areas, and much more acreage is at risk from such invasion.

Approximately7,000 people live in the SEPA. There are approximately 5.7 million acres within the Planning Area boundaries, over 90 percent of which are administered by Federal agencies, including BLM (which manages 77 percent of the acreage), U.S. Forest Service (**USFS**), Bureau of Reclamation (**BOR**), and Bureau of Indian Affairs (**BIA**). Approximately 400,000 acres (7 percent of the total acreage) are privately owned. Primary land uses in the Planning Area include livestock grazing, agriculture, mining, and many forms of outdoor recreation.

The Yomba Indian Reservation is in Upper Reese River Valley at the southwest edge of the Planning Area. The Battle Mountain Band of the Te-Moak Shoshone Tribe has two parcels of land that are within a portion of the Elko BLM District managed by the MLFO. The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest extends into the Planning Area in four places, along the Shoshone, Toiyabe, Toquima, and Monitor mountain ranges. The BOR manages a small area at the north end of the Planning Area, near Battle Mountain. Towns include Austin and Kingston, as well as Battle Mountain and Eureka, county seats of Lander and Eureka Counties, respectively.

## **Tonopah Planning Area**

The Tonopah Planning Area is in south central Nevada and consists of about 6.1 million acres of public land. It includes the majority of Esmeralda County, and some of Nye County (Appendix 1, Maps 1 and 3).

The Planning Area is typical of the Great Basin geographical province, which is characterized by north-south trending mountain ranges separated by wide internally drained basins. Elevations range from 3,200 feet in the south to 9,651 feet in the northeast. The vegetation varies from the northern cold desert, the Mojave Desert, and the environmental ecotype between the two areas. The primary vegetative types include salt desert shrub, sagebrush/perennial grass communities, pinyon/juniper woodlands, and Hot Desert. Small areas of alkali meadows and bottoms, mountain mahogany, aspen and riparian areas are scattered throughout the Planning Area. Noxious weeds and invasive non-native species have invaded in some areas.

Approximately 14,000 people live in the Tonopah Planning Area. There are approximately 7.7 million acres within the Planning Area boundaries, with 98 percent administered by Federal agencies, including BLM (which manages 79 percent of the area), USFS, and BIA. Approximately 165,000 acres (2 Percent) are in private or local government ownership

The Timbisha Homeland Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-423) established a 2,800 acre area at Scotty’s Junction and a 3,000 acre area at Lida would be held in trust for the Timbisha Shoshone, in the southwest portion of the Planning Area. The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest extends into the Planning Area in four places, along the Shoshone, Toiyabe, Toquima, and Monitor mountain ranges. The Nevada Test and Training Range is located adjacent to the Planning Area on the east, Death Valley National Monument is adjacent to Planning Area on the southwest near Beatty, and the Inyo National Forest is adjacent to the Planning Area on the west near Dyer. Towns include Carvers, Round Mountain, Hadley, Beatty, Dyer, as well as Goldfield and Tonopah, county seats of Esmeralda and Nye Counties, respectively.

# **ANTICIPATED PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS**

A planning issue is a matter of controversy over a well-defined resource management topic. Planning issues can generally be stated as resource management problems or opportunities that BLM needs to address to ensure multiple use resource management. One or more entities may be interested in a particular public land resource, and each entity may have different values regarding the resource**.**

Planning issues identify concerns that:

* Present unresolved questions regarding allocation of a specific resource;
* Present major land use conflicts regarding management or maintenance of a base resource;
* Can be resolved by BLM within the life of the plan;
* Have opportunities to be developed.

It is recognized that issues are subject to change throughout the planning process as new conditions or opportunities are identified and as the public becomes fully involved in the process. It is fully expected that new issues will be developed during the scoping process.

Each issue will be placed in one of three categories:

* Issues to be resolved in the plan;
* Issues resolved through policy or administrative action; and
* Issues beyond the scope of the plan.

## **Anticipated Planning Issues**

BLM staff, individuals, and user groups have identified preliminary issues that reflect conflicts and/or problems with the existing RMPs. ***These issues are preliminary and presented as questions that will be addressed through the RMP revision. We expect that these issues will be modified, new issues will be added, and others will be deleted through the public scoping process.***

### Issue No. 1: Restoring Ecological Health

#### Watershed

* What management considerations for watersheds are necessary to ensure watershed health, properly functioning aquatic ecosystems, or to provide for other public uses?
* How will BLM ensure that federal actions on public land are completed in a manner that maintains, improves, or restores stream morphology to provide beneficial uses of riparian vegetative areas, aquatic and wildlife communities, thereby benefiting water quality/quantity and ensures public health, safety and economical stability?

#### Rangeland Vegetation

* Under what conditions, if any, should non-native plants be used in place of native plants for restoration activities?
* How will BLM ensure proper use of vegetation?

What criteria will be used to develop Desired Plant Communities?

Should annual or ephemeral vegetation areas be designated and how would they be managed?

* How should forage be allocated for multiple-use between wildlife, livestock, and wild horses and burros?
* What criteria should be used to determine if the allocation to wild horses, wild burros or livestock or wildlife should be increased or decreased?

#### Soils

* What are the solutions or treatments needed to reduce erosion and stabilize soils?
* How will soils be managed to protect biological crusts?
* What actions would BLM authorize to protect and stabilize soils?

#### Forest and Woodlands

* What are the characteristics (desired future conditions and historic range of variability) of a healthy forest/woodland within the planning units?
* What management tools and practices should be used to maintain healthy forest and woodlands (e.g. pinyon, juniper, aspen, mountain. mahogany, etc) conditions?
* How will pinyon/juniper woodlands be managed, including old growth to enhance watersheds, reduce surface erosion, improve water quality, and meet public demands?
* How will BLM manage forest and woodland areas such as aspen, mountain mahogany and bristlecone/limber pine?
* How would BLM pursue a program of promoting an increase in the commercial utilization, sustainable allowable harvest and subsequent thinning of pinyon/juniper woodlands (i.e. biomass fuels, particle-board production, building materials, meeting community needs, etc.)?
* Should additional, new areas be designated for greenwood fuel cutting locations, and if so, where should the areas be?
* What criteria will be used to define and harvest deadwood?
* How will BLM address access to designated greenwood cutting areas?
* How will pinyon-juniper forest and woodlands be managed to enhance and protect habitat for wildlife, to include Special Status Species (**SSS**)?
* How should BLM manage public and commercial collection of native plants and materials (wildings, seeds, cuttings, etc)?
* Should BLM allow commercial harvesting of woodland products after a fire?

#### Noxious Weeds/Invasive Species/Pests

* How will BLM minimize the spread of existing noxious weeds/invasive species and limit the potential spread of new infestations from ground disturbing activities.
* What criteria will BLM use to select the most appropriate Integrated Weed Management (**IWM**) approach for the treatment of noxious weeds and/or invasive species?
* What criteria will BLM use to determine if areas need seeding or restoration activities following a weed treatment?
* How will BLM restore areas with infestations of cheat grass, red brome and other invasive / non-native plant species?

#### Wetlands and Riparian Areas

* How should riparian/wetland areas be managed to maintain and achieve Proper Functioning Conditions (**PFC**)?
* Which riparian areas within the District require restoration?
* How will BLM manage ephemeral and intermittent streams?
* What measurable criteria are appropriate to ensure grazing use results in proper functioning riparian/wetlands?

### Issue No. 2: Air

* How will BLM minimize fugitive dust from ground disturbing activities?
* What actions are required for improving or maintaining air quality in the District and meeting standards established through the Clean Air Act?

### Issue No. 3: Water

* What management actions need to be taken to comply with the objectives of the Clean Water Act and state water quality standards?
* What measures should be employed to improve, protect, enhance and increase water sources necessary for multiple use management?
* How will BLM protect, maintain, or enhance water quality and quantity?
* How will surface subsidence caused by dewatering of the aquifer be prevented and/or mitigated?
* What measures will be taken by BLM on public lands for well head protection?
* How can BLM ensure that in stream flow is maintained for stream resources?

### Issue No. 4: Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns and Paleontology

* How will the BLM develop sufficient baseline information to assist in identifying the location, nature, importance, and appropriate use of all cultural resources, Native American traditional use areas, and paleontological resources known or expected to be present in the District?
* How will BLM ensure that it will continue to manage cultural and paleontological resources for present and future generations in ways consistent with their scientific, educational, recreational, and traditional uses?
* How should cultural and paleontological sites, especially those open to interpretation and/or recreation, be monitored, preserved and protected?

### Issue No. 5: Visual Resource Management

* Which areas should be revised for Visual Resource Management (**VRM**) in the District?
* What are current and potential conflicts with VRM and how can they be mitigated?

### Issue No. 6: Special Status Species (includes Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Status Species)

* How will BLM manage habitat of listed, candidate and sensitive species found on public lands to ensure the continued existence of these species?
* What areas should be identified as important habitat for SSS*?*
* How should BLM manage historic Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (**LCT**) streams that are not identified in the LCT Recovery Plan, dated 1995?
* What guidance criteria can be developed for threatened and endangered species to ensure that Federal undertakings result in habitat and species protection?

### Issue No. 7: Fish and Wildlife

* What are the criteria to be used in considering historical bighorn sheep areas for reintroduction~~s~~ and management?
* How will BLM address wildlife species that pioneer into new areas?
* When would BLM authorize introductions, reintroductions or augmentations of wildlife species?
* Should BLM continue to allow domestic sheep grazing in areas of historic or high potential bighorn sheep habitat?
* How will bat species and land use conflicts be managed?
* Should some or all streams capable or historically capable of supporting a fishery be managed primarily for that purpose?
* How should riparian and wetland areas be managed to maintain or enhance resource and habitat values in systems containing native fishes and/or introduced sport fishes?
* How will BLM implement the State of Nevada Wildlife Strategy and Conservation Plan?

### Issue No. 8: Wild Horses and Burros

* Should HMA (**HMA**) boundaries be adjusted, combined, eliminated or managed as complexes?
* Which HMAs are suitable for the long-term management of wild horses and burros?
* What criteria should be used to make habitat and population suitability and viability determinations?
* Should management of these areas consider augmentation of genetic material through introduction of wild horses or burros from another area?
* What age structure and sex ratios are appropriate to ensure healthy future herds of wild horses and burros?
* What methods other than removal through gathers should be considered to achieve and maintain Appropriate Management Levels (**AML**s)?
* Where are habitat improvement projects appropriate? What kinds of improvement projects are feasible? When is it appropriate to develop or augment water for wild horses and burros within HMAs?
* How should BLM address wild horse and burro urban interface issues?
* How will the RMP be utilized to facilitate wild horse and burro gather operations?

### Issue No. 9: Fire Management

* What is the Appropriate Management Response (**AMR**) for all Public Lands and adjacent areas of the District with respect to resource protection and protection of life and property?
* What damage or impact to resources may result from fire suppression activities?
* How do changes in fire regimes, fire return intervals and increased severity of wildland fires affect emergency stabilization and restoration costs?
* What are the Fire Regime and Condition Class (**FRCC**) designations for all acres of vegetation within the District boundaries?
* What and when is routine maintenance of existing and future fuels treatment in both the Wildland Urban Interface (**WUI**) and Non-WUI fuels treatments needed?
* Can fire (prescribed or fire-use) be identified as a potential management tool in the RMP to reduce fire hazard/risk?
* What vegetation conditions and fire prescriptions are necessary for fire to perform its natural role in fire adapted ecosystems?
* What is the desired vegetative structure (horizontal continuity and vertical arrangement) for the pinyon-juniper, sagebrush steppe and cheat grass fuel types that would result in:
	+ - A low crown fire potential;
		- Reduced rates of spread;
		- Reduced spotting potential;
		- Reduced fire line intensities;
		- Fewer acres burned;
		- Reduced fire severity?
* Which vegetative communities are fire-dependant and which are fire-intolerant?
* How can fuels management activities support biomass utilization/green energy?

### Issue No. 10: Livestock Grazing

* What livestock grazing management practices are appropriate to maintain and/or restore properly functioning vegetative communities?
* What criteria should BLM use to determine suitability for livestock grazing use?
* What criteria will be used to determine areas that should not be available to livestock grazing?
* How will vacant allotments be managed as forage reserves?
* What criteria should be utilized to determine if additional forage is available to consider Temporary Non Renewable (**TNR**) grazing above the preference and/or authorize temporary changes in use that are deemed outside the terms and conditions of the permit?
* What criteria should BLM use to convert sheep AUM’s to cattle AUM’s and cattle AUM’s to sheep AUM’s?
* What criteria should BLM use to determine appropriate triggers and end-point indicators as terms and conditions of grazing permits?
* How will BLM implement targeted grazing use of annuals and invasives and what limitations would prevent grazing use solely for the purposes of reducing those species?
* How will BLM manage livestock grazing if noxious weeds are present?
* How will BLM address allotment management that crosses field office boundaries?
* How will BLM continue to manage allotments within the boundaries of the Battle Mountain District in which grazing administration is the responsibility of neighboring districts?
* How will BLM determine and authorize carrying capacity for exchange of use Animal Unit Months (**AUM**s)?

### Issue No. 11: Recreation

* What Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (**ROS**) classes should be identified for the District?
* Where should new recreation facilities be developed? What are appropriate criteria for designation/development of new Recreation Areas as public demand increases? Are there areas that should be specified for more intensive management?
* Should areas be designated for specific recreation use (e.g. paragliding, recreational shooting areas and windsailing) and what criteria would be employed?
* How can historic linear features (trails, historically significant roads, railroad grades, etc.) be developed and maintained for recreational use while retaining the historical value of the features?

### Issue No. 12: Lands and Realty

* What lands should be withdrawn from operation of the public land laws (e.g. saleable, locatable and leasable minerals)? What criteria should be applied to determine when a protective withdrawal would be appropriate?
* Should the existing utility and Right-Of-Way (**ROW**) corridors be revised to provide for anticipated future needs? If so, what changes are needed?
* What areas, if any, should be designated as ROW use areas? What types of uses would be permitted in such areas?
* What criteria will BLM use to identify ROW avoidance and/or exclusion areas?
* What criteria will BLM use to acquire conservation easements?
* Which areas should be open to development (mining, mineral leasing, rights-of-way, etc.) only with special constraints to protect unique values? What areas should be identified as ROW avoidance areas or ROW exclusion areas?
* To improve land tenure distribution, which lands or interests in lands should be acquired if the acquisition would be economically prudent, and the owner was agreeable? Which private parcels within the “railroad checkerboard” should be identified for acquisition? Interests that might be acquired include:
	+ - Land (with or without mineral interest)
		- Mineral or sub-surface estate
		- Water rights,
		- Interest in land, including easements for purposes such as access, conservation, and open space, and
		- Land with threatened and endangered species habitat or other desirable resource values.
* To improve land tenure distribution, which lands or interests in lands would be appropriate for disposal? Which public lands within the “railroad checkerboard” should be identified for disposal?
* What criteria will be used to determine lands suitable for disposal? Should guidelines be established to dispose of lands not identified as disposable to meet unique management considerations?
* Should intentional trespass on public lands be prohibited from disposal criteria?
* Should lands where Desert Land Entries (**DLE**s) or other agricultural entries have been allowed and subsequently failed not be considered for these uses in the future?
* Should new permits for advertising signs or bill boards be allowed?
* How will BLM address the issue of “trespass town sites”?

### Issue No. 13: Mineral Resources (includes Oil, Gas, Geothermal, Coal, Saleable, Solid Leasable (except coal) and Locatable)

* Where should protective constraints be included as a condition of land use authorizations? Possible constraints include, but are not limited to:
	+ - *No Surface Occupancy* (**NSO**) (To protect existing rights or fragile resources)
		- *Controlled Surface Use & Timing Limitation (*To protect wildlife habitat, grazing allotments, HMAs, etc.)
		- *Controlled Surface Use* (To protect areas with erosive and fragile soils, watershed areas, special status species habitat, visually sensitive areas, nominated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (**ACEC**s), etc.)
		- *Timing Limitation (*To protect Off-Highway Vehicle (**OHV)** areas, sage grouse leks, deer winter ranges, etc.)
* Should any areas be closed to oil, gas and geothermal leasing?

### Issue No. 14: Hazardous Materials

* How will BLM ensure that mine closures and rehabilitation are completed, and that no potential danger to public health and safety or unnecessary or undue environmental degradation remains?

### Issue No. 15: Special Designations

* What are the criteria that would be applied to determine if areas should be set aside under a special designation? Possible special designations include, but are not limited to:
	+ - *ACECs*
		- *Wild Horse Ranges*
		- *Back Country Byways*
		- *National Historic Landmarks*
		- *National Historic Trails*
		- *Natural Areas*
		- *Wild and Scenic Rivers*
		- *Properties of Cultural and Religious Importance/Traditional Cultural Properties*

### Issue No. 16: Renewable Energy

* How can BLM accommodate development of renewable energy resources such as solar power, wind energy, and geothermal energy?
* What suitability criteria may be used for solar and wind generation locations?

### Issue No. 17: Socio-Economics

* What can BLM and collaborators do to enhance positive impacts that special land designations or recreational use and development might have on local communities?
* How will designated communication sites be maintained to aid community economic development and improvement as well as customer satisfaction, confidence, and public safety?
* What are the economic benefits to be derived from maintaining public lands on a sustainable level?
* What are the existing social and economic conditions of the communities and local or regional governments affected by this plan and how will they be affected by the RMP?
* How can BLM incorporate social information, values, beliefs, attitudes, lifestyles, community resiliency and land use patterns in management proposals?
* What scientific research should be encouraged on public lands and how can BLM facilitate such research?
* How can BLM meet the on-going and increasing need for Environmental Education?

### Issue No. 18: Environmental Justice

* How can BLM use information revealed through Environmental Justice analysis to assist in the development and consideration of planning alternatives that respond to Environmental Justice issues and problems facing minority and low-income populations living near public land or working with and/or utilizing public land resources?
* How can BLM use Environmental Justice analysis to facilitate communication and coordination with local community and government partners to determine if land disposal or acquisition policies affect real estate values and real income of minority and/or low income populations?
* What measures will be taken to encourage low-income, minority and Tribal populations to participate in the planning process?

### Issue No. 19: Sustainable Development

* Are coordination, consultation, and cooperation processes in place and working effectively with partnerships and stakeholders?
* Will citizen’s wellbeing be maintained or improved during the development and implementation of RMP decisions?
* Will the integrity of the environment be taken care of in the long term?
* Are the RMP decisions economically viable and is the community and regional economy adequately considered?
* Is the viability of traditional and non-market activities in the community and surrounding area maintained or improved with the RMP decisions?
* Will the RMP decisions adequately address Sustainable Development?
* Does a synthesis show the RMP decisions to be net positive or negative for people and ecosystems?

### Issue No. 20: Transportation Management

* Where does BLM need to acquire easements across private lands to allow legal access to public lands?
* What criteria may be developed for a District Transportation and Sign Plan?
* How many miles of road are maintained?
* What is the maintenance schedule, i.e. priority class to maintain roads?
* What are the standard maintenance practices and criteria in maintaining roads and trails?
* What type or level of maintenance would be performed on the different priority classes of roads identified?
* How will road re-alignment and new construction be identified?
* Will the existing agreements, with counties, other government agencies be identified in regards to road maintenance?

## **Management Concerns**

## **Existing Decisions To Be Brought Forward**

* Many existing decisions remain appropriate for incorporation in the revised RMP. We need to assess existing decisions, and make a decision as to which should become part of the new document. These include:
	+ - Decisions from the 1986 Shoshone-Eureka RMP and amendments
		- Decisions from the 1997 Tonopah RMP
		- Standards and Guidelines (developed by Resource Advisory Councils (**RAC**s) for BLM)
		- Conservation Plans (*e.g*. Sage Grouse, Desert Tortoise, Amargosa Toad)
		- Central Nevada Elk Management Plan
		- Multiple Use Decisions
		- Biological Opinions
		- Recovery Plans
		- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (**MBTA**), Interim Management Guidelines (Instruction Memorandum (**IM**) 2008-050), until such time as a Memorandum of Understanding (**MOU**) with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (**USFWS**) and BLM is completed
		- Interim Management Policy (**IMP**)for Lands Under Wilderness Review
* BLM should work with the RACs and other collaborators to expand upon and complement the Standards and Guidelines they developed to give more in-depth guidance and to cover other resources. Other resource uses and concerns that might be addressed include minerals, fire, recreation, wildlife habitat, special status species habitat, rehabilitation activities, invasive species control, and lands (realty) activities.

### Access

Access is multi-faceted, including everything from foot trails to paved highways. With the growth in Nevada, use of public lands has increased. This Plan needs to ensure that appropriate public access is identified and ensured. Access questions include:

* Where will motorized access be allowed, limited, prohibited?
* Should separate motorbike trails be designated?
* How should OHVs be managed? What criteria would be used to designate OHV use areas (routes) and the uses permitted on each?
* How will public access be provided and maintained for uses such as bike trails, horseback riding trails, hiking trails, All Terrain Vehicle (**ATV**) and mountain bicycle use? What criteria would be used to designate these trails and the uses permitted on each?
* Which roads in the District are needed to provide adequate access? How will these roads, additional needed access, and the trails system be incorporated into the District Transportation Plan
* BLM will coordinate and consult with the counties and other holders of RS2477 in accordance with Washington Office policy to obtain BLMs administrative non-binding determinations.

###

### Cultural Resources

* BLM is responsible for active management of cultural resources, as required to fulfill provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (**NHPA**). In addition to on-going compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, we need to address how we are going to fulfill mandated tasks such as:
	+ - Non-project inventories based on scientific research needs;
		- Site condition monitoring and reports;
		- Protecting sites from natural or human damage;
		- Preparing syntheses of known information; and
		- Promoting public education.

### Hazardous Conditions on Public Lands

* Abandoned Mine Land hazards need to be identified and reclaimed.
* Unauthorized dumpsites on public lands need to be identified, the dumps cleaned up, and measures taken to make sure the problem does not recur.
* Remediation of known Hazardous Material (**HazMat**) should continue.
* Hot springs need to be identified, signed, and fenced.

### Native American Concerns

* There is an on-going need to consult with Native American Tribes to ensure that their input is received in a timely manner so their concerns can be appropriately considered. (Consultation process)

### Program Specific Requirements

* BLM will identify, develop, implement and monitor resource-specific Best Management Practices (**BMP**s), stipulations, Standard Operating Procedures (**SOP**s), and Conditions of Approval (**COA**s) in order to ensure that potential adverse impacts as a result of land uses are adequately mitigated.

### Landscape Protection

* BLM will identify, develop and implement criteria to address:
* livestock closures due to drought, fire, insects and/or other natural events;
* management of annual and invasive plant species such as red brome and cheat grass

# **PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA**

Planning criteria (43 CFR 1610.4-2) are the ground rules that guide development of the plan. They ensure that plans are tailored to the identified issues and that unnecessary data collection and analyses are avoided.

The following preliminary criteria were developed internally. They will be available for public review during the scoping process. After public input is analyzed and, where appropriate, incorporated, they will become proposed criteria. These criteria can be added to or changed as issues are addressed or new information is presented. The Battle Mountain District Manager must approve the planning criteria and any changes to them.

* The revised Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah RMPs will be in compliance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (**FLPMA**) and all other applicable laws, regulations, and policy. (See Appendix 2.)
* Impacts of the revised RMP will be analyzed in an EIS, developed in accordance with regulations at 43 CFR Part 1600 and 40 CFR Part 1500.
* BLM will use a collaborative and multi-jurisdictional approach, where possible, to jointly determine the desired future condition of public lands.
* Lifestyles, concerns and safety of area residents will be recognized in the Plan.
* The Plan will recognize the State’s responsibility to manage wildlife.
* The Plan will recognize the existence of valid existing rights.
* Lands covered in the RMP will be public lands, including split estate, managed by BLM. Management decisions on lands not managed by BLM will not be made in the RMP. Lands identified for possible acquisition by BLM would come under the purview of this plan only if the lands were actually acquired by BLM.
* Lands acquired by BLM, will be managed in the manner the Plan prescribes for adjacent public land, subject to any constraints associated with the acquisition, and in accordance with specific acquisition objectives for the parcel in question.
* Public participation will be an integral part of the planning and EIS process.
* BLM will strive to ensure that decisions in the Plan are as consistent as possible with plans and policies of adjacent local, State, Tribal, and Federal agencies, within the parameters set by Federal law, regulations, and policy.
* The RMP/EIS will incorporate management decisions that are brought forward from the existing RMPs and amendments.
* The planning process will provide strategies for the protection of recognized Native American traditional and cultural uses.
* BLM, collaborative partners, and the contractor, will jointly develop alternatives for resolution of resource management issues.
* The planning process will incorporate appropriate Standards and Guidelines (developed by the RACs) in accordance with regulations in 43 CFR Subpart 4180, and as approved by the State Director. The Plan will lay out a strategy for ensuring proper grazing practices are followed.
* The State Historic Preservation Officer (**SHPO**) will be consulted and involved throughout the planning/EIS process under provisions in the National Programmatic Agreement and the State [of Nevada] Protocol Agreement between BLM and SHPO.
* Endangered species recovery plan goals, including plans for the reintroduction of endangered species and other species, will be addressed. In accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement on The Endangered Species Act (**ESA**) Section 7 Consultations and Coordination, dated August 30, 2000, BLM and USFWS will jointly prepare a programmatic consultation agreement.
* Areas potentially suitable for ACEC or other special management designations will be identified and analyzed in the RMP/EIS.
* The Plan will emphasize the protection and enhancement of the District’s biodiversity while, at the same time, providing the public with opportunities for compatible activities on public lands.
* The mineral development scenario will be based on mineral potential within the District, projected demand from the mineral industries, and the National Energy Plan. The planning process will address areas closed to mining, constraints to surface use, and post-mining land use.
* Baseline Reasonably Foreseeable Management/Development scenarios (**RFD**s) will be developed based on historical, existing, and projected levels for all programs.
* The Plan will provide management direction for lands returned to BLM management through revocation of withdrawals.
* Lands identified for disposal prior to July 25, 2000 will be identified for disposal under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (**FLTFA** or “Baca Bill”).
* The Plan will address transportation and access, and will identify where better access is warranted, where access should remain as is, and where access should be decreased to manage visitation and protect resources.
* Soil/vegetation correlations from Natural Resource Conservation Service (**NRCS**) Soil Surveys will be used to determine ecological site potentials. Ecological Site Inventory will be used to establish and document current vegetation conditions.
* The NRCS Major Land Resource Areas (**MLRA**) will be used to describe ecological or range site vegetative potential.
* BLM will work with NRCS to develop MLRA range site descriptions for all woodland and forested sites, and for riparian-wetlands.
* Fire and fuels management strategies will be consistent with the 2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy, the National Fire Plan, and other policies.
* The RMP/EIS will be consistent with Homeland Security policies.
* The life of this Plan will be 20 years. For NEPA analysis purposes, the short-term will be 5 years, and the long-term will be 50 years.
* All data used in this Plan will be in electronic format. All graphic material will be in Geographic Information System (**GIS**) format.
* GIS and metadata information will meet Federal Geographic Data Committee (**FGDC**) standards, as required by Executive Order (**EO**) 12906, signed April 11, 1994.
* Other applicable BLM data standards will be followed. The goal is to develop a plan with spatial data that can be easily accessed for use in subsequent NEPA analyses.

# **DATA AND GIS NEEDS AND AVAILABILITY**

The Battle Mountain District staff has identified available and needed GIS data that are required to provide baseline inventory and to document existing resource conditions to address resource issues and develop and analyze impacts of amendment alternatives. **Table 1: Data Available/Needed** summarizes these data needs and provides a cost estimate for collecting the data.

The GIS theme maps are the building blocks to quantify resources, create maps and manipulate information during alternative formulation. In some cases, existing resource information available in the Battle Mountain District will be used in formulating resource objectives and management alternatives. Some of this data, however, needs to be updated, compiled and put into digital format for use in the planning process and development of resource maps for the RMP/EIS. In other cases new information needs to be collected, compiled, and put into digital form.

Not all of the available information is complete and accurate. Fieldwork is needed to fill data gaps and to fine tune information that is not precise (e.g., fence line locations). Any new data generated during the RMP will be used to address planning issues and will meet applicable established standards

## **GIS DATA NEEDS**

#### **Watershed**

* Critical areas
* Floodplains (map all floodplains along with channel migration zone)
* Areas of concern under the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act as amended 1996
* Stream Surveys and long term monitoring data (for channel morphology and an assessment of geomorphic reach types)?

#### **Rangeland Vegetation**

* Mapped fire history: Monitoring data and site location
* Rangeland Condition & Trend
* Ecological Site Inventory (**ESI**)/Ecological Condition
* Major Vegetation Types
* Range site Descriptions
* Monitoring Site Locations and Descriptions (i.e. Key Management Area, Critical Area, Utilization site, livestock vs. wildlife, etc.)

#### **Soils**

* Order 3 soil surveys are presently available on Battle Mountain District GIS
* Eureka County Soil Survey needs to be updated/revised by NRCS

#### **Forest and Woodlands**

* Historic and existing forest and woodlands mapped by species
* Seed, wildings, and other vegetative use areas mapped
* Forest/woodland product use areas mapped
* Pinyon/Juniper density, age classes etc for the northern portion of the District entered into GIS from University of Nevada, Reno (**UNR**) data received in 2007

#### **Noxious Weeds/Invasive Species/Pests**

* Digitize survey and treatment data from old paper maps
* Complete metadata requirements for some shape files
* Create attribute tables for some shape files
* Coordinate and merge BLM-Nevada statewide and District weed data
* Collect up to date GIS from Nevada Department of Agriculture (pest control)
* Find or create a shape file identifying Cooperative Weed Management Areas (**CWMA**) boundaries
* There is a new National Weed Database coming on line in the near future and Nevada is one of the test states. New hard and software will be issued this year.
* Incorporate the new National Weeds Database system and equipment with our current state and local BLM systems.

#### **Wetlands and Riparian Areas**

* PFC data
* Site Vegetation (ecological site descriptions for riparian-wetlands and flood plains)
* Jurisdictional Wetlands classified under National Wetlands Inventory by USFWS

### Water

* Water resources and water rights
* Water quality (baseline data, monitored data and impaired or degraded data as listed by state 303d list and federal list)
* Areas of concern under the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act as amended 1996

### Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns and Paleontology

* Class I report for entire District
* District-wide probability map / predictive model for cultural resource locations
* Areas of sensitivity for Native American Concerns
* Paleontological baseline data
* Ethnographic synthesis for District
* National Register evaluations of historic trails / linear features within District
* Monitoring data to assess impacts from various activities (e.g. livestock)

### Visual Resource Management

* Map existing VRM designations

### Special Status Species (includes Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Status Species)

* Historic and Present Range
* Crucial or critical Habitat areas
* Data from Nevada Natural Heritage Program (**NNHP**), Nevada Department of Wildlife (**NDOW**), The Nature Conservancy (**TNC**), USFWS
* Sage grouse use areas
* LCT, Desert Tortoise, and Railroad Valley Spring fish habitat
* Other SSS habitat such as pygmy rabbit, raptors, etc.

### Fish and Wildlife

* Listing of all known species and preferred habitats within the District
* Historic and existing population numbers and distribution
* Aquatic habitat condition
* Problem areas
* Exotic species
* Naturalized species
* Wildlife improvements
* Non game species
* Invertebrates

### Wild Horses and Burros

* HMA and Herd Area (**HA**) boundaries
* Historic census & distribution data
* Current wild horse and burro inventory data
* Current habitat inventory data (Forage and water availability and condition)
* Fence locations within HMAs (Fragmentation and limitations to free roaming behavior)
* Population dynamics, animal characteristics, health, age structure, sex ratios, genetics

### Fire Management

* Fire management polygons (Fire Management Units [**FMU**s])
* Large fire polygons
* Fire Regime
* FRCC - (Condition Class)
* Planned / Existing Fuels Projects – Fuels Treatments
* WUI Areas – WUI areas are their own-separate FMU, with their own polygons
* Special Protection/ Priority Areas - associated with FMUs
* Fire Point Data
* Risk Assessment & Mitigation Strategies (**RAMS**)
* Fire tolerant and intolerant ecosystems

### Livestock Grazing

* Rehabilitation Sites (including Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation [**ESR**])
* Pastures and use areas
* Range improvement projects by type (including wildlife exclosures)
* Grazing Allotments (verification of allotment boundaries—i.e. updated boundaries per Range-line Agreements, boundary fences, etc.)
* Suitability: Slope information, waters, vegetation, etc.
* Past Evaluations
* Identification of land that is not meeting or progressing towards meeting rangeland standards due to permitted grazing practices

### Recreation

* Popular undesignated recreation areas – back country byways, etc.
* Potential recreation areas
* Designated Recreation areas
* Central Nevada Tourism information
* OHV designations

### Lands and Realty

* Utility corridors shape files
* Disposable Lands shape files
* Lands desirable for acquisition
* Lands Ownership shape file

### Mineral Resources

* Areas of high oil and gas, geothermal, coal, saleable, and solid leasable potential.
* Mine Plan project areas

###

### Hazardous Materials

### Hot Springs > 120oF

* Hazardous abandoned mine lands

###

### Special Designations

* Edge map existing special designation
* Map areas for proposed designations

###  Renewable Energy

* Geothermal Potential
* Wind Power Potential
* Solar Potential

### Socio-Economics

* U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System income, employment and production data by industrial sector.
* Population data and trends from Nevada State Demographer
* Political, social, and community organization data and information from County and local government officials and community leaders

### Environmental Justice

* Nevada Directory of Native American Resources Social and economic information and tribal profiles
* Census data by county for minority populations and demographics
* US Department of Health and Human Services and US Department of Labor data on poverty income
* Data for the State of Nevada Job Training Office

### Transportation Management

### District Transportation Plan (Roads digitized)

* Trail Systems
* Existing and Needed Signs

### Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation

* Stabilization
* Rehabilitation
* Road Repair from Suppression Efforts
* Dozer lines from Suppression Efforts

Existing data in the preceding 24 disciplines must be compiled and entered into GIS. Information already in a digital format must be to the same standards required for newly entered data. Geospatial data base development assumptions are identified below.

## **GEOSPATIAL DATABASE DEVELOPMENT**

#### Geospatial Database Development Assumptions:

The development of the geospatial database for this planning effort will be accomplished by the Contractor and within the context of existing BLM data management strategies currently under development. Database development tasks performed by the Contractor will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in national Federal governmental guidance and instructions regarding the use, development, and sharing of geospatial data and its management including the following:

* EO 12906 of 1994 – Coordinating Geographic Data Acquisition and Access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).
* Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-16 & the expected revision.
* OMB Information Initiative of 2000 – “Collecting Information in the Information Age”.
* OMB Information Quality Guidelines – (Public Law 106-554; H.R. 5658)

Database development tasks performed by the Contractor will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in national BLM guidance and instructions regarding the use, development and sharing of geospatial data and its management which include the following:

* Incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in Washington Office BLM planning guidance and other instructions regarding data management.
* BLM H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook.
* BLM IM No. 2001-038 (11/30/2000) – Development/Approval of Preparation Plans for New Planning Starts.
* BLM IM No. 2001-029 (11/13/2000) – Interim Data Management Guidance
* BLM IM No. 2001-202 (8/3/2001) – Interim Guidance for Data Management in Land Use Planning

GIS hardware/software resources assembled to support these planning efforts will be integrated and coordinated with:

• Bureau Architecture Design and Implementation, a national BLM initiative to define Information Technology processes, hardware, and software and implement the results as an enterprise system.

• BLM GIS Transition Strategy, a national BLM initiative to understand the existing situation and identify a strategy to transition the Bureau to the Enterprise GIS.

#### Geospatial Database Development Guidelines:

The following guidelines will be followed as the Contractor develops data for this planning effort:

1. Existing data will be used where possible and new data will be collected only where absolutely necessary. All new data will be collected to established data standards. Existing data will be converted to accepted and established data standards.
2. The development of redundant data will be avoided by extensive coordination with our data partners. Data from existing sources will be used when possible.
3. Data for this planning effort will be integrated into seamless corporate datasets.
4. The data standards strategy used will be the following:
	1. Established national data standards will be used when available.
	2. Data standards from other agencies will be adopted when appropriated.
	3. Data standards will be jointly developed and documented with our statewide data partners as appropriate. Data category standards teams, which include state data stewards, resource specialists, and GIS specialists from BLM and other agencies, will be used as necessary. The national BLM data stewards will be included in the review process as appropriate.
5. All geospatial data used in this planning effort will be documented with FGDC compliant metadata.
6. Data sharing with the public will be accomplished through the use of BLM GIS data servers and interactive GIS Map Servers connected through the Internet. The national BLM website design guidelines and deployment strategy will be followed.
7. Existing GIS-related agreements/partnerships will be used to supplement BLM resources for the data development and data integration efforts. Partners that are familiar with these datasets and that have a proven track record will be used.

### GIS Data Management Tasks

A brief overview of the specific data management tasks and processes is presented below.

1. External Coordination

 District GIS/Geospatial Data personnel will continue to coordinate with our data partners through participation in Nevada GIS meetings and activities and coordinate with Nevada BLM. Coordination with other entities will continue to be accomplished as required. This task will be coordinated and lead by the District.

1. Data Inventory

 This task includes cataloging available data sets, producing maps and screen displays of data for evaluation by the resource specialists. A preliminary information needs assessment has been conducted to identify data requirements for this planning effort. See the Data Matrix below for more information. This will be coordinated by the District and conducted by the District with Contractor assistance.

1. Data Acquisition

 This task includes contacting data providers to request data and metadata. This data will then be added to BLM corporate GIS database. Metadata will be prepared or modified as necessary. This task will be lead and coordinated by the District Contracting Officer’s Representative (**COR**) with Contractor assistance. The District staff will assist as necessary.

1. Data Development Process Outline

 Core Data Standards Development

 Nevada BLM Data Stewards/Program Leads

 Data Category Standards Teams

 Data Integration

 Includes data editing/updating

 Horizontal Data Integration

 District GIS Specialist

 Use of partnerships/contracts

 Contract Management (District GIS Specialist/District staff)

 Vertical Data Integration

 District GIS Specialist

 Use of partnerships/contracts

 Contract Management (District GIS Specialist/District staff)

 Attribute Integration/Updates

 District GIS Specialist

 Use of partnerships/contracts

 Contract Management (District GIS Specialist/District staff)

 Data Validation/Verification

 Includes verification map production and staff review of datasets.

 Spatial Data

 District GIS Specialist

 District Resource Specialists

 Attribute Data

 District GIS Specialist

 District Resource Specialists

 Metadata Documentation

 District GIS Specialist

 District Resource Specialists

 Combine Planning Data into the District BLM Corporate GIS Database

 Data Maintenance/Update Process

 District GIS Specialist

Needed Guidance

* Direction on Public Water Reserves and Water Rights and relationship to state legislation
* How to manage split estate

# **PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS**

Many people are involved in revising a land use plan. These include BLM employees, contractors working on the project, other Federal agencies, State governmental agencies, local government, commercial interests, special interest groups, holders of BLM land use authorizations, and numerous other interested members of the public. The following is a description of the plan revision participants and their roles in the process.

## **BLM Staff and Team Members**

### State Director

The Nevada State Director approves the Preparation Plan, approves the RMP/EIS, and signs the Record of Decision (**ROD**). Also, he provides staff coordination and review, assists in protests; and provides scarce skill specialists for the interdisciplinary team.

### District Manager

The Battle Mountain District Manager (**DM**) sets priorities in relationship to other workloads and provides overall direction to the Core and Interdisciplinary Teams (**IDT**s). This ensures that the final product responds to the issues and contains decisions that can be implemented. The DM coordinates with other agency managers to ensure that management of lands and resources along agency administrative boundaries is done in a collaborative manner. With the Core and IDTs, the DM helps develop issues and questions, keeps Nevada State Director up-to-date on progress, and helps to keep the process on schedule. The DM recommends that the Nevada State Director approve the Preparation Plan, the Draft RMP/Draft EIS, and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

### BLM Project Manager

The Project Manager carries out day-to-day oversight to ensure that the RMP/EIS is developed according to established schedules, priorities, and budgets. This person recommends EIS Core Team and IDT priorities, briefs the DM and the State Director on progress throughout the process, and maintains the administrative record for the RMP/EIS. The Project Manager helps develop issues and questions, anticipates and proactively avoids problems, works directly with the Core Team and environmental contractor, and is responsible for ensuring that approved budgets for the RMP/EIS are allocated to this work effort.

### Core Team

Members of the Core Team provide overall direction and management guidance to BLM Project Manager. In addition, the Core Team provides representation for key resources to ensure the RMP/EIS is developed in an interdisciplinary fashion and addresses all key issues. Line managers on the Core Team make decisions based upon recommendations received from other Core Team members and the ID Team.

Table 1 Core Team

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Name* | *Title* | *Responsibility* |
| *To be identified* | RMP Team Lead, BLM | RMP/EIS Project Manager, Planning, NEPA |
| Gene Seidlitz | Associate District Manager | Project Supervision |
| Dave Davis | Fire Management Officer, BLM | Fire Management |
| Doug Furtado | Mount Lewis Field Manager, BLM | Nonrenewable Resources: Minerals, Realty, Energy, Archaeology, Recreation, Visual Resources, etc.Renewable Resources: Vegetation, Wildlife Habitat, Livestock, Wild Horses and Burros, Soil & Air Quality, Water Quality |
| Tom Seley | Tonopah Field Manager, BLM  | Nonrenewable Resources: Minerals, Realty, Energy, Archaeology, Recreation, Visual Resources, etc.Renewable Resources: Vegetation, Wildlife Habitat, Livestock, Wild Horses and Burros, Soil & Air Quality, Water Quality |
| Leonard Brouse | Assistant Field Manager, Support Services | Rangeland improvement projects, roads, rehabilitation (ESR) and restoration projects (GBRI) |
| *To be identified* | Public Affairs Officer, BLM | Public contact, internet, press releases |
| Dorothy Harvey | Information Technology Specialist, BLM | Data standards & capability |
| Britany Scherer | Information Technology Specialist, BLM | Website maintenance |
| Kathy Graham | GIS Coordinator | GIS |
| Steve Foree | Habitat Biologist, NDOW | Wildlife management |

###

### Interdisciplinary Team (IDT)

Interdisciplinary Team Members attend all IDT meetings or conference calls; submit input for various components of the RMP/EIS in an interdisciplinary and coordinated manner; submit accurate and properly formatted input to the contractor; provide all submission by the assigned due date; coordinate and communicate with BLM staff specialists and specialists with other agencies to ensure that the RMP/EIS contains interdisciplinary, complete, and accurate information; consult with BLM Project Manager and their supervisor in advance of deadlines, in the event delays are anticipated or questions arise; assure an interdisciplinary approach is used by consulting with other resource specialists and support personnel; and provide information for maps at the appropriate scale and standards for publication and for use during the analysis.

Table 2 Interdisciplinary Team

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name*** | ***Title*** | ***Responsibility*** |
| *To be identified* | RMP Team Lead, BLM | Project Manager; Planning, NEPA, Sustainable Development, Data Steward |
| Duane Crimmins | Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist, BLM | Wildlife Terrestrial, Wildlife Aquatic/Riparian, Woodlands/Forestry, Soil/Water/Air |
| Bryson Code | Wildlife Biologist, BLM | Wildlife Terrestrial, Wildlife Aquatic/Riparian |
| Michele McDaniel, | Supervisory Rangeland Management Specialist, BLM | Vegetation, Livestock Grazing |
| Valerie Metscher | Rangeland Management Specialist, BLM | Vegetation, Livestock Grazing, Soil/Water/Air, Invasive/Non-native Species/Pests |
| Bob Hassmiller | Hydrologist, BLM | Water Resources |
| Shawna Richardson;Andrea Felton  | Wild Horse and Burro Specialists, BLM | Wild Horses & Burros |
| Michael Vermeys | Weed Management Specialist, BLM | Invasive/Non-native Species/Pests |
| Stephen Drummond | Supervisory Mining Engineer, BLM | Locatable/Leasable/Saleable Minerals, Hazardous Materials, Abandoned Mine Lands |
| Sheila Mallory | Geologist, BLM | Fluid Minerals (oil, gas, geothermal) |
| Alan Buehler | Supervisory Geologist, BLM | Locatable/Leasable/Saleable Minerals, Fluid Minerals (oil, gas, geothermal) |
| Daniel Aguirre | Environmental Protection Specialist, BLM | Hazardous Materials, Abandoned Mine Lands |
| Todd Neville;Noelle Glines-Bovio | Outdoor Recreation Technician, BLM | Recreation, Wilderness, VRM, Travel Management, ACEC |
| Chris Cook; Scott Stadler | Archaeologists, BLM | Cultural Resources, Paleontology |
| Chuck Lane | Realty Specialist, BLM | Lands, Realty |
| Jeff Brown | Realty Specialist, BLM | Lands, Realty |
| Gerald Dixon | Native American Coordinator, BLM | Native American Issues |
| Jill McConville  | Range Technician, BLM | ESR |
| Jason Spence, Marc Pointel | Rangeland Management Specialists, BLM | ESR |
| *To be identified* | Economist | Socio-Economics, Environmental Justice |
| Donovan Walker | Fire Ecologist, BLM | Fire and Fuels Management |
| Lisa Walker | Fire Planner, BLM | Fire and Fuels Management |
| Chad Lewis | Fuels Program Manager, BLM | Fire and Fuels Management |
| Diane Stamm | Deputy Assistant District Manager, Support Services, BLM | Facilities, Transportation, ESR |
| Leonard Brouse | Assistant District Manager, Support Services, BLM | Facilities, Transportation |
| ***Name*** | ***Title*** | ***Responsibility*** |
| Kathy Graham | GIS Coordinator, BLM | GIS |
| Alice Baldrica | SHPO1 | Cultural Resources |
| Steve ForeeMike Podborny | Wildlife Biologists, NDOW1 | Wildlife |
| *To be identified* | F&WS1 | Special Status Species |

*1. Will be invited to be Cooperating Agency*

*Internal Review of the Plan*

The IDT and the Core Team will review the RMP/EIS throughout its development, and meet with the contractor to continually refine the document and the analysis. Team members will submit review comments to BLM Project Manager by e-mail within the allotted timeframes. Comments will be reviewed and consolidated before submission to the environmental contractor.

*Accountability*

Individuals working on this RMP/EIS are accountable for completing their specific tasks on time. A smooth progression to each step requires this. Management and supervisors will be made aware of our progress. All efforts will be made by the Team Leader to keep team members and reviewers aware of the schedule and elapsed time. Being accountable for a job carries a responsibility for each individual involved to meet deadlines and to submit the best product possible. Any situations that occur in which a delay seem imminent will be resolved immediately by collaboration between the Team Leader and individuals involved. The objective will be to evaluate the circumstances, ensure all involved are aware of the impacts, and take actions to get the schedule and products on track again.

### GIS & Internet Coordinators - District Office & State Office

Planning data needs will be systematically identified and their quality clearly documented as part of this planning effort. With the exception of protected or sensitive information, data being used in development of the RMP/EIS will be made accessible to members of the Core and IDTs. Upon issuance of the Draft RMP, data used in support of planning decisions will be made available, to the extent allowed, to all interested parties. All data used in support of planning decisions is to be considered corporate data. Corporate data require established quality control procedures so as to ensure data consistency and standardization.

All planning data will be stored and maintained so that they are readily available to all team members. As a minimum, data will be updated and archived at the time of the management situation analysis, issuance of the draft EIS, the final EIS, and the Record of Decision. The GIS Coordinator will ensure that a strategy for regular backup of planning data is in place to protect against data loss.

The Internet coordinators will enter documents on internal and external web sites in a timely manner so that reviews can be completed on schedule.

### Environmental Contractor(s)

One or more contractors will be selected to gather new data, enter existing non-digitized data into GIS, analyze all data, and prepare the RMP/EIS. Each contractor will provide a Project Manager to serve as contact point and to be responsible for all aspects of the work were selected to complete. All contracted work will be done as specified in the Statement of Work and will be subject to BLM review and approval.

The contractor selected to prepare the RMP/EIS will manage the public participation for the process and be responsible for scheduling and managing all public scoping meetings, workshops, and public hearings. They will also be responsible for handling all mailings and notifications of public meetings, input deadlines, etc., associated with the public participation process. The contractor will be responsible for organizing data, ensuring all data is compliant with Federal metadata standards, and for ensuring that all GIS products, maps and tables are in suitable formats for displaying in text and in electronic format on the Internet. In conjunction with the IDT, the contractor will identify a reasonable range of alternatives for analysis (subject to BLM approval), and will be responsible for impact analysis and for writing, printing, and disseminating the Plan. Also, they will analyze public comments and draft initial responses to them.

## **Agencies and Stakeholders**

### Federal Agencies

Certain Federal agencies will be closely involved in preparation of the RMP/EIS. These include:

*Neighboring BLM offices:* The District will coordinate with adjoining BLM offices to ensure that planning decisions match at our common boundaries.

*U.S. Forest Service:* BLM will coordinate with neighboring USFS offices to ensure that planning decisions match, to the extent possible, at our common borders.

*U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service*: The proposed action and alternatives require consultation with the USFWS under the MBTA and under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. A Biological Assessment will be prepared in coordination with the USFWS and USFWS will give BLM a Biological Opinion regarding the Proposed RMP.

*Environmental Protection Agency* (**EPA**) – The EPA reviews the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (**DEIS**) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (**FEIS**) for adequacy under the regulations at 40 CFR 1500-1508.

Other potentially affected Federal agencies will also be consulted. These include:

*Bureau of Indian Affairs* (BIA)

*Bureau of Reclamation* (BOR)

*Federal Aviation Administration* (**FAA**)

*Federal Emergency Management Agency* (**FEMA**)

*Federal Highway Administration* (**FHwA**)

*Natural Resource Conservation Service* (NRCS)

*Animal Plant Health Inspection Service* (**APHIS**)

*U.S. Army Corp of Engineers* (**COE**)

*U.S. Navy* (**USN**)

### State Agencies

During preparation of the RMP/EIS, several State agencies will be involved. Also, the DEIS and FEIS will be sent to the State Clearinghouse in accordance with the MOU between the State of Nevada and BLM. State agencies expected to be involved include:

*Agricultural Extension Service/Nevada Department of Agriculture*

*Public Utilities Commission of Nevada* (**PUCN**)

*Nevada Division of Environmental Protection* (**NDEP**)

*Nevada Department of Transportation* (**NDOT***)*

*Nevada Department of Wildlife* (NDOW)

*Nevada Division of Minerals* (**NDOM**)

*State Historic Preservation Officer* (SHPO)

*Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies* (**WAFWA**)

*Western Regional Corridor Study by Western Utility Group* (**WUG**)

*Western Systems Coordination Council* (**WSCC**)

### Native American Tribes

Government to government coordination and consultation with the following Native American groups will begin upon issuance of the Notice of Intent, which initiates the scoping period.

*Shoshone Paiute Tribe of Duck Valley*

*Duckwater Shoshone Tribe*

*Ely Shoshone Tribe*

*Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribe*

*Lovelock Paiute Tribe*

*Summit Lake Paiute Tribe*

*Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone*

*Te-Moak Bands (Battle Mountain, Elko, South Fork, Wells)*

*Winnemucca Paiute Tribe*

*Yomba Shoshone Tribe*

### Resource Advisory Councils (RACs)

RACs provide advice to BLM on various issues. We will work collaboratively with the Northeastern Great Basin and Mojave-Southern Great Basin RACs throughout the process, in particular, at times such as issue identification, alternative formulation, and impact analysis. We anticipate numerous briefings to the RACs.

### State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)

The planning process requires consultation with SHPO. This will be done in accordance with the Nevada BLM and SHPO State Protocol Agreement signed on June 4, 1999.

### Local Governmental Agencies

The RMP/EIS will be developed in collaboration with representatives from Eureka, Lander, Esmeralda and Nye County governments.

### Other Stakeholders

Additional stakeholders will be identified throughout the process. A mailing list of these organizations, agencies, interest groups, and interested members of the public will be compiled and maintained by the environmental contractor. Some possible stakeholders are listed below.

*Commercial land users*

*Elected officials*

*Energy developers*

*Environmental organizations*

*Federal, State and local agencies*

*Fiber optic companies*

*Historical Societies (Eureka, Lander, Esmeralda, and Nye counties)*

*Mining companies & organizations*

*Nevada Archaeological Association*

*Nevada Mineral Commission*

*Permit holders*

*Utility companies*

*Ranchers*

*Sportsmen’s organizations*

*Telecommunication companies*

*Tri-County Weed District*

*Weed Districts (Eureka County, Lander County, Diamond Valley)*

*Wild horse interest groups*

*Wildlife organizations*

*Wind energy interests*

### Cooperating Agencies

Before the planning process is formally initiated, Federal and state regulatory agencies and local governments will be asked to be cooperating agencies on this project. Possible cooperating agencies include but are not limited to:

*Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW)*

*Nevada Division of Minerals (NDOM)*

*State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)*

*U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)*

*Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)*

*Environmental Protection Agency*

*U.S. Forest Service (USFS)*

*Counties of Eureka, Lander, Esmeralda and Nye*

#

# **FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN**

## **Format**

The format and contents of the RMP and EIS will comply with:

* The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), (42 USC 4321-4347)
* The Council on Environmental Quality (**CEQ**) regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR Part 1500)
* Section 203 of FLPMA (43 USC 1711 & 1712)
* Resource Management Planning regulations (43 CFR Subpart 1610)
* The Department of the Interior (**DOI**) Manual Part 516, Chapter 4 “Environmental Impact Statements”
* BLM NEPA Handbook, (H-1790-1)
* BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1)
* Other pertinent parts of the Departmental and BLM Manuals
* Current BLM guidance in the form of Washington Office and Nevada State Office IMs and Information Bulletins (**IB**s).

Decisions in the existing Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah RMPs and amendments will be reviewed and brought forward as appropriate. Also, the RMP/EIS will incorporate existing BLM management decisions from fire management plans, livestock grazing allotment management plans, wildlife habitat management plans, conservation/recovery plans for special status species, wild horse herd management area plans, recreation area management plans, Standards and Guidelines developed for BLM by the RACs, and other applicable plans. NEPA analysis prepared for such decisions will also be brought forward if it meets today’s standards.

The plan will describe the current management situation, and then identify desired future conditions to be maintained or achieved, management actions necessary to achieve objectives, and a schedule and a cost estimate for implementing the identified management actions.

## **Process**

Preparation of the RMP/EIS will begin, starting with scoping and ending with issuance of a ROD. District personnel will oversee the contractor(s).

To the extent possible, the RMP/EIS will be based on existing information and professional judgment, supported by credible scientific information. Data needs (shown on page 23, GIS and Data Needs and Availability) require the collection of new data in order to produce a legally defensible RMP. Data standards and sources are shown in Appendix 3. The contractor will provide the RMP/EIS Core Team with proposals for techniques to address, measure, and analyze anticipated impacts from the proposed action and any alternatives being analyzed.

Coordination with other Federal agencies, public entities, and Tribal, State, local governments will occur as outlined in section III: D and E of the Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1. Collaborative planning will emphasize contact with local governments and with the Northeastern Great Basin and Mojave-Southern Great Basin RACs.

## **Alternative Formulation**

A range of alternatives, including a No Action Alternative, will be developed to respond to the identified issues. Each alternative will provide different solutions to issues and concerns identified through scoping. Alternatives will be realistic and implementable solutions to the issues and concerns, and each will represent a complete plan. Sub-alternatives (alternatives within alternatives) may be identified if a portion of any alternative requires a variation in resource management methods.

# **PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE**

Contractor selection for data collection will take place in FY 2008-09, once funding is certain. If sufficient funding is received in the first quarter of FY 2009, we expect to complete the RMP/EIS by the end of FY 2013. Should funding be delayed, the preparation schedule will be delayed by at least the same amount of time.

*If funding starts in FY 2009* and continues in subsequent years, the project will be initiated with contracting data collection in FY 2009 and will be completed through a Record of Decision by the end of FY 2013, barring complications such as unresolved protests. The schedule for this planning process is in Appendix 4. If protests should result in a significant change to the RMP/EIS, a Notice of Significant Change would be published allowing a period for the public to comment on the change. (43 CFR 1610.5-1(b)) and the ROD would be delayed.

#

# **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN**

Agency and public participation are important parts of the planning process. All interested parties, whether local, statewide or national, will have opportunities for comment on all aspects of this RMP/EIS effort. This RMP/EIS will be prepared in close consultation with all appropriate Federal, State, tribal, County and local agencies, permit holders, environmental groups, and other private organizations and individuals.

Public participation opportunities for the major stages of the planning process are listed below. Every effort will be made to assure meaningful public involvement throughout the process. BLM Nevada State Office and Battle Mountain District web sites will provide information and solicit comments from interested members of the public. The following is a summary of public participation opportunities for this Planning effort.

*Identify Issues, Planning Criteria and Management Concerns*

1. The Federal Register Notice of Intent (**NOI**), press releases, mailings and links between BLM and the contractor’s website will be used to disseminate information regarding the preparation of this RMP/EIS and will notify the public of upcoming scoping meetings, field trips and public comment meetings and deadlines.

2. Public scoping meetings will be organized and facilitated by the project contractor in order to gather input on issues and disseminate information on management concerns and planning criteria.

*Formulate Alternatives*

3. Public meetings will provide the mechanism to discuss alternatives and ensure that issues are adequately addressed.

*Issue the Draft RMP/EIS*

4. A Federal Register Notice announcing the availability (**NOA**) of the DEIS and news releases to local and regional media will initiate a 90-day comment period.

5. Public meetings to gather verbal and/or written comments will be held in Battle Mountain, Eureka, Austin, Crescent Valley, Kingston, Reese River Valley (Yomba Tribal headquarters), Carvers, Tonopah, Goldfield, Beatty and Reno during the public comment period.

*Publish the Proposed Final RMP/EIS*

6. The FEIS will be sent to those on the mailing list and to all those who participated in the planning process. The availability of the FEIS will be advertised in regional newspapers and other media with notice of a 30-day protest period.

7. Solicit Governor’s consistency review (60 days).

8 Informal public input (written, verbal and e-mail) will be welcomed anytime during the process.

*Respond to Protests*

9. Protests will be resolved using established BLM processes.

10. If any significant change is made to the RMP/EIS in response to a protest, a Federal Register Notice will be published requesting public comment on the change(s).

*Publish Approved Plan*

Notify the public via news articles, e-mail, website and transmittal letters of the availability of the approved RMP/EIS.

# **BUDGET**

Appendix 5 provides a summary of the Proposed RMP/EIS Budget for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013. Details of the proposed budget are shown in Appendix 5. This budget includes estimated costs associated with development of the Statement of Work; preparing, awarding, administering and paying for the contract(s) for required data compilation, GIS input, and RMP/EIS preparation; as well as BLM work month and support costs. The total cost estimate is **$4,484,000** for the 10.5 million acres of public land within the District.

Based on the critical need to have a collaborative based approach for the RMP/EIS in addition to our lack of BLM human resource(s) to adequately address and consider the Socio-Economics involved with the documents, we are requesting $160,000 for this portion of the document to be contracted. In the previous RMP’s for Shoshone-Eureka and Tonopah a collaborative approach occurred. However, recently with a greater emphasis and priority being placed on “true” collaboration for all planning efforts, we would be remiss not to consider this option. Also, both the current RMP’s were protested and in both RMP’s we had to either immediately complete Plan Amendments for some programs and/or ignore ACEC’s (Tonopah) due to lack of upfront collaboration with our partners.

By contracting, we feel a contractor can “level the playing field” to provide a broader and fuller reading of public interests than other methods. Rather than relying on a few public meetings and a postcard campaign of an organized group, the BLM, through contracting, will be able to better offer multiple ways to participate that will be comfortable and meaningful to the residents/partners. A contract will be able to identify citizen issues at their emerging stage of development when they are easiest to deal with.

Contractors have extensive experience in NEPA compliance, and can conduct social and economic assessments suitable for inclusion in this land use planning effort. Another benefit from contractors is their ability to develop social and economic criteria for decision making, as well as conduct analysis of alternatives from a social and economic perspective.

Data collection for the RMP/EIS may be from a variety of sources. These include contracts, approved Assistance Agreements, and other cooperative and collaborative venues, such as the Cooperative Ecosystem Study Unit (**CESU**) for the Great Basin through the University of Nevada, Reno. The types of data to be collected will be determined by BLM. Data collection that is not already underway through contract, agreement, or BLM efforts will be collected by the RMP/EIS contractor in accordance with the task orders. In addition, this includes contracting assistance in the amount of $901,650 for our “lacking” GIS program. We realize the importance of this program to the RMP Revision/EIS. At this time we are considering using the congressionally appropriated $75,000 in 1430 as well as other monies in the BMD FY 08 AWP to contract an assessment/review of our GIS program. At FY 08 3rd quarter scrub, if additional monies are available at the WO and/or SO level, we would be receptive to the monies and would wisely use the money towards this said contract.

GLOSSARY

**With**

**Acronyms And Abbreviations**

**Abandoned Mine Lands** – lands where mining activity has taken place and the responsible party has abandoned the site without completing clean up and rehabilitation

**Allotment Management Plan** – a written program of livestock grazing management, including supportive measures, if required, designed to attain specific management goals in a grazing allotment

**Analysis of Management Situation** (**AMS)** – analysis of the existing situation; becomes the No Action Alternative of RMP/EIS

**Animal Plant Health Inspection Service** (**APHIS)** – Federal agency responsible for protecting and promoting U.S. agricultural health, administering the Animal Welfare Act, and carrying out wildlife damage management activities.

**Appropriate Management Level** (**AML)** – a level of use by wild horses or burros that results in a thriving natural ecological balance and avoids a deterioration of the range. (109 IBLA 118 API 1989)

**Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)** – areas of public lands where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. (43 CFR 1610.0-5)

**Baca Bill** – See FLTFA

**Biodiversity** – the diversity of living organisms considered at all levels of organization, including genetics, species, and higher taxonomic levels, and the variety of habitats and ecosystems as well as the processes occurring therein.

**Biological Crust --** complex and fragile mosaics of living organisms -- algae, blue-green algae, bacteria, lichens, mosses, liverworts, and fungi -- that grow on or just below the soil surface

**Biomass** – the part of the given habitat consisting of living matter. Usually expressed as volume per unit area (*e.g*., tons/acre)

**Collaboration, collaborative planning** – a cooperative process in which interested parties, often with widely varied interests, work together to seek solutions with broad support for managing public and other lands.

**Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act** **(CERCLA)** – a law designed to ensure cleanup of hazardous waste dumps; assigns responsibility for control and cleanup of such wastes to those who generated or transported them or to those who own or operate hazardous waste facilities.

**Cooperating Agencies** – any Federal agency other than a lead agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal or alternative; a State or local agency of similar qualifications; an Indian Tribe (by agreement with lead agency) when effects are on a reservation. (40 CFR 1508.5)

**Corporate Data** – electronic data and their derived applications, which are shared or exchanged across administrative units, used repetitively through time, applied in decision-making, and/or released to the public and others. Corporate data are official agency records and include all correspondence, memoranda, case files, photographs, and electronic records that BLM uses in connection with the transaction of business.

**Council on Environmental Quality** **(CEQ)** – established by Title II of NEPA to assist and advise the President in preparation of an annual Environmental Quality Report and stay abreast of trends in the quality of the environment

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)** – a preliminary edition of an EIS that is made available for public review and comment

**Ecological Site Inventory (ESI)** – a method used by BLM to determine vegetative or ecological site condition using soils information, range site descriptions, and production data to map and evaluate the health of plant communities.

**Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531)** (**ESA)** – the law that provides a program to identify and conserve threatened and endangered species; to provide a means to conserve ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend; and to provide a way to implement treaties and conventions. The Act requires that no action authorized on the public lands by BLM jeopardizes a threatened, endangered, or any species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered

**Environmental Impact Statement** **(EIS)** – a detailed written statement required by the National Environmental Policy Act when an agency proposed a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

**Federal Geographic Data Committee** (**FGDC) –** a committee established by the Office of Management and Budget and chaired by the Secretary of the Interior. Its purpose is to coordinate the Federal government’s development of a National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse. (EO 12906, April 11, 1994)

**Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976** **(FLPMA) –** Public Law 94-579, passed October 21, 1976. Provides much of BLM’s legislated authority, direction, policy, and basic management guidance, including a requirement that land use planning be done.

**Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (FLTFA)** – Title II of Public Law 106-248, passed on July 25, 2000. Provides for proceeds from the sale of public lands to be used for acquisition of privately owned in-holdings. The public land must have been identified for disposal when this Act was passed, and the owner of a private in-holding must have indicated a desire to sell to land or an interest in it. Also known as Baca Bill

**District Office** – BLM office responsible for on-the-ground management of public land. Formerly known as Field Office. In Nevada there are 6 District Offices.

**Final Environmental Impact Statement** (**FEIS)** – the version of an EIS that is approved by the agency

**Fire intensity –** the heat released per unit of time for each unit length of the leading fire edge. In other words, how hot the fire is at the flaming front at a given time.

**Fire severity –** also known as “burn severity”. A qualitative assessment of the heat pulse directed toward the ground during a fire. Burn severity relates to large fuels and heavy fuel loadings, duff consumption, consumption of the litter and organic layer beneath trees and shrubs, and mortality of buried plant parts.

**Forage Reserves** – allotments or portions of allotments held in reserve for the purpose of offsetting the impacts to rangelands and permittees due to drought, insect infestations, wildfire, or other acts of God

**Geospatial [or Geographic] Information System** (**GIS)** – a computer system capable of storing, analyzing, and displaying data and describing places on the earth’s surface.

**Great Basin Restoration Initiative** **(GBRI) –** national initiative whose mission is to restore the dynamic and diverse landscapes of the Great Basin for present and future generations

**Habitat Management Plan –** a written and approved activity plan for a geographical area of public lands, which identifies wildlife habitat management actions to be implemented in achieving specific objectives related to RMP/MFP (LUP) planning document decisions. Two types: Sikes Act HMP is a plan prepared and implemented jointly with state wildlife agency under Sikes Act, Title II and non-Sikes Act HMP.

**Hazardous Materials (HazMat) –** any element, compound, mixture, solution, or substance which, when released to the environment, may present substantial danger to public health and welfare or the environment. (CERCLA, sec. 101 (10))

**Herd Area** – the geographic area identified as having been used by a wild horse herd as its habitat in 1971. [43 CFR 4700.0-5(d)] Herd areas are limited to areas of the public lands identified as being habitat used by wild horses and burros at the time of the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971.

**Herd Management Areas** **(HMAs)** – those Herd Areas designated for long-term management of wild horses and burros (43 CFR 4710.3-1). Herd Areas become Herd Management Areas (HMAs) when the decision has been made that wild horses and/or burros can be managed for the long term within their habitat. The decision to a herd area for long-term wild horse and burro management is accomplished through the land use planning process by designating the area as a HMA.

**Herd Management Area Plan (HMAP) –** the Authorized Officer is required to prepare a Herd Management Area Plan (HMAP) or some other type of activity plan after a decision has been made to initiate long-term management of wild horses or burros within a herd area (43 CFR 4710.3-1). Where two or more related activities occur within an area containing a herd management area, a single coordinated plan can be prepared.

**Horizontal continuity –** the horizontal distribution of fuels at various levels or planes.

**Lahontan cutthroat trout (LCT)** – native Great Basin trout listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Plans for the recovery of this species are being implemented in the Great Basin Region.

**Major Land Resource Areas (MLRA)** – interpretive units differentiated in terms of the climax plant community best adapted to a unique combination of prevailing environmental factors. These units are described as range or ecological sites. A range site is the product of all the environmental factors responsible for its development including soils, topography, climate and fire. Each site supports a native plant community typified by an association of species that differs from that of other range sites in the kind or proportion of species or in total production

**Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** – a written agreement between BLM and another entity(ies) that confirms the use of cooperative policies or procedures to promote mutual endeavors.

**Metadata** – data about data; for example, time and date of data collection, methods used, persons who collected the data, etc.

**Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)** – signed in 1918, and amended in 1936, 1974, and 1989; the domestic law that implements the United States commitment to four international conventions (with Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia) for the protection of migratory birds.

**Multiple Use** – management of public ands and resource values so they are utilized in the combination that best meets the present and future needs of the American people, with consideration given to the relative values of the resources and not necessarily to the uses that will give the greatest economic return or unit output (43 CFR 1601.0-5 (f))

**Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA)** – public law that requires consultation with appropriate Indian tribes prior to the excavation of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony on federal lands.

**National Training Center** **(NTC)** – BLM training center in Phoenix, AZ

**National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)** – law enacted to declare a national policy to encourage productive harmony between humans and their environment, promote efforts to prevent or eliminate environmental damage, enrich understanding of ecological systems and natural resources, and establish the CEQ.

**National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)** – law that requires consideration of the effects of federally regulated undertakings on cultural resources

**Natural Resource Conservation Service** **(NRCS)** – agency responsible for preparing soil surveys and developing range site descriptions in the major lands and resource areas (MLRA); formerly Soil Conservation Service-

**Nevada Division of Environmental Protection** **(NDEP)** – State agency responsible for protecting and enhancing the environment of the state in order to protect public health, sustain healthy ecosystems and contribute to a vibrant economy.

**Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW)** – State agency responsible for managing wildlife within the State of Nevada

**Nevada Natural Heritage Program (NNHP) –** an organization whose mission is to help coordinate the resource needs of Nevada's diverse biological heritage with human activities. They maintain an inventory and current databases on the locations, biology, and conservation status of all threatened, endangered, and sensitive species and biological communities in the state.

**Nevada State Office –** BLM office over the Nevada Field Offices, including Battle Mountain

**No Surface Occupancy** (**NSO)** – a fluid minerals leasing constraint that prohibits occupancy or disturbance on all or part of the lease surface to protect special values or uses. Lessees may exploit the fluid mineral resources under the leases restricted by this constraint through use of directional drilling from sites outside the NSO area.

**Off-highway vehicle (OHV)** – motorized vehicles capable of traveling off of existing roads and trails; also called ORVs (off road vehicles)

**Proper functioning condition (PFC)** – streamside riparian areas are functioning properly when adequate vegetation, large woody debris, or rock is present to dissipate stream energy associated with high water flows. Elements indicating proper functioning condition such as avoiding accelerating erosion, capturing sediment, and providing for groundwater recharge and release are determined by the following measurements as appropriate to the site characteristics: Width/Depth ratio; Channel roughness; Sinuosity of stream channel; Bank stability; Vegetative cover (amount, spacing, life form); and Other cover (large woody debris, rock).

Natural spring, seeps, and marsh areas are functioning properly when adequate vegetation is present to facilitate water retention, filtering, and release as indicated by plant species and cover appropriate to the site characteristics.

**Reasonably Foreseeable Development** **(RFD)** – changes, expansion, or improvements that might be expected to occur in a given area, barring unforeseen circumstances; used in cumulative impact analysis.

**Resource Advisory Council** **(RAC)** – advisory committees established under authority of FLPMA to provide recommendations to BLM authorized officer on issues related to public land management (43 CFR 1784 and 4180.2). The Northeastern Great Basin and Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource Advisory Councils are collaborators on this RMP

**Resource Management Plan** **(RMP)** – a land use plan, as described by FLPMA, that generally establishes land allowable resource uses, areas designated for restricted use, general management constraints, general implementation sequences, and monitoring standards; not a final implementation decision on actions that require further steps (43 CFR 1601.0-5 (k)).

**Right-Of-Way Avoidance Areas –** areas designated in the RMP where rights of way will be allowed only under extenuating circumstances and with special mitigation

**Right-Of-Way Exclusion Areas –** areas designated in the RMP where rights-of-way will not be allowed

**Right-Of-Way Use Areas –** areas where rights-of-way may be allowed subject to standard stipulations and to mitigation identified in the environmental analysis

**Special Status Species (SSS)** – includes proposed, listed, and candidate species under the ESA, as well as State-listed species and BLM State Director-designated sensitive species. (See BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Policy)

**State Historic Preservation Officer** **(SHPO)** – State officer with responsibilities under State law and under Section 101 (b)(3) of the National Historic Preservation Act to advise and assist as appropriate, Federal and State agencies and local governments in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities and to consult with the appropriate Federal agencies in accordance with the Act on Federal undertakings that may affect historic properties, and the content and sufficiency of any plans developed to protect, manage, or reduce or mitigate harm to such properties.

**The Nature Conservancy** **(TNC)** – a national, non-profit organization, founded in 1951 to preserve the plants, animals and natural communities.

**U.S. Forest Service (USFS)** – managers of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest Lands adjacent to BLM-managed lands in the District

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)** – an agency of the Department of Interior. Its mission is to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats. The FWS manages more than 530 national wildlife refuges, enforces federal wildlife laws, and administers the Endangered Species Act as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

**Vertical arrangement –** the relative heights of fuels above the ground and their vertical continuity, which influences fire reaching various levels or strata. (Surface fuels vs. aerial fuels, and their relationships to one another)

**Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies** **(WAFWA)** – a quasi-governmental organization of public agencies, founded in 1922. Charged with protection and management of fish and wildlife resources in the western part of the United States and Canada. Currently, there are 23 members (Alaska, Alberta, Arizona, British Columbia, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Saskatchewan, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and the Yukon). The Association has been a key organization in promoting the principles of sound resource management and the strengthening of federal, state, and private cooperation in protecting and managing fish and wildlife and their habitats in the public interest.

**Wild Horse and Burro Ranges –** HMAs designated to be managed principally, but not exclusively, for wild horse or burro herds. An HMA may be considered for designation as a wild horse or burro range when there is a significant public value present, such as unique characteristics in a herd or an outstanding opportunity for public viewing. The Authorized Officer may only establish a wild horse or burro range after a full assessment of the impact on other resources and the degree of public acceptance (43 CFR 4710.3-2).

**Washington Office** **(WO)** – the headquarters office of the Bureau of Land Management

**Wildfire** – an unwanted wildland fire.

**Wildland Fire** – any non-structure fire, other than a prescribed fire, that occurs in the wildland.

**Wildland-Urban Interface** **(WUI)** – the line, area, or zone where structures and other human development meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuel.

**Withdrawal** – the closure of public land to certain activities by formally excluding the land in question from the operation of public land and mineral laws specified in the withdrawal order. A **de facto withdrawal** is a closure (segregation) of public lands that remains after the reason for the segregation no longer exists (e.g., closed Desert Land Entries).
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APPENDIX 2

Laws, Executive Orders, and Other Guidance

The following is a partial list of laws, Executive Orders, and other guidance that will be followed in development and implementation of the revised RMP.

**Laws**

American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1979 (P.L. 95-341)

American Antiquities Act of 1906

Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979

Clean Air Act (1955), as amended (P.L. 84-159)

Clean Water Act of 1987, as amended

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980

Desert Land Act, as amended (Act of March 3, 1877)

Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986

Endangered Species Act of 1963, as amended

Farmland Protection Policy Act

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (1996)

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976

Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 (BACA Bill)

Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1973, as amended

General Mining Law of 1872

Lacey Act

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

The Wild and Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971

Public Rangeland Improvement Act of 1978

Resource Conservation Recovery Act of 1976

Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996

Solid Waste Disposal Act (1965)

Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act, P.L. 105-263

Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (1986 – amends CERCLA)

Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977

Sikes Act, as amended (1978)

Taylor Grazing Act of 1934

Toxic Substances Control Act (1976)

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (1968)

Wilderness Act of 1964

**Executive Orders**

Executive Order (EO) 13287 – Preserve America – (March 3, 2003)

EO 13212 – Actions to Expedite Energy-Related Projects – (May 18, 2001)

EO 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds -- (January 11, 2001)

EO 13148 – Greening the Government through Leadership in Environmental Management – (April 21, 2000)

EO 13112 – Invasive Species – (February 3, 1999)

EO 13007, Indian Sacred Sites – (May 24, 1996

EO 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice – (February 11, 1994)

EO 12580, Superfund Implementation – (, February 23, 1987)

EO 12372 – Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs – (July 14, 1982)

EO 12088 – Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards – (October 13; 1978) -- amended by EO 12580

EO 11988 – Floodplain Management – (May 24, 1977)

EO 11990 – Protection of Wetlands – (May 24, 1977)

EO 11991 – Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality – (May 24, 1977)

EO 11514 – Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality – (March 5, 1970) – amended by EO 11991

**Plans, Reports, MOUs,**

Resource Advisory Council Standards and Guidelines

 Northeastern Great Basin RAC

Mojave-Southern Great Basin RAC

National Strategic Plan for Management of Wild Horses and Burros on Public Lands (05/2000)

National Energy Policy

Nevada Wild Horse and Burro Tactical Plan (2001)

National Triennial Mid-winter Bald Eagle Count and Wintering Birds of Prey Survey Reports for NE Nevada dating back to 1992

Spotted Frog Conservation Agreement

Nevada Sage Grouse Conservation Strategy

Central Nevada Sage Grouse Conservation Plan

Nevada Bat Conservation Plan

Central Nevada Elk Management Plan

BLM Special Status Species policy

Programmatic Agreement Among The Bureau Of Land Management, The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation, and The National Conference Of State Historic Preservation Officers Regarding The Manner in Which BLM Will Meet Its Responsibilities Under The National Historic Preservation Act (March 26, 1997)

Memorandum of Agreement on the Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultations and Coordination (August 30, 2000) – provides for BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to jointly prepare a programmatic consultation agreement

MOU with NDEP (1992) – conferred the authorities and responsibilities to BLM of Designated Planning and Management Agency relative to non-point source control for water quality protection on BLM-managed public lands in the State of Nevada.

APPENDIX 3

Data Needs, Standards, and Sources

***Battle Mountain District RMP Revision***

| **1****Resource[[2]](#footnote-3)** | **2****Needed****Data Set(s)[[3]](#footnote-4)** | **3****Data Set Available?[[4]](#footnote-5)*****Yes/No/Partially*** | **4****Data Appropriateness[[5]](#footnote-6)** | **5****Proposed Remedy for Data Gaps[[6]](#footnote-7)** | **6****Est.****Costs[[7]](#footnote-8)****$$** | **7****Availability of FGDC Metadata[[8]](#footnote-9)*****Yes/No*** | **8****Name/Source of Data Standard[[9]](#footnote-10)** | **9****Data Meets National or Regional Standard?[[10]](#footnote-11)** | **10****Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard[[11]](#footnote-12)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Baseline Data*** | County boundaries | Yes | Have district\lands - In GIS database - compiled at 1:24,000 |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Field Office boundaries | Yes  | Have in Statewide\lands and in district\lands- In GIS database - Compiled at NSO at 1:100,000 - district at 1:24,000 |  |  | YesYes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Geographic place names | Yes  | In GIS database – GNIS database (from USGS) GNIS2004 No immediate need statewide\ placename |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Indian reservation boundaries | Yes  | Have district\lands - In GIS database - compiled at 1:24,000 |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| National Park/Monument boundaries | Yes  | NA- In GIS database - compiled at 1:24,000 (no parks or monuments in our district) |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| State boundaries | Yes  | Have Statewide \lands - In GIS database - compiled at 1:100,000 |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Town locations | Yes | Have Statewide\lands District\lands - In GIS database – origin/scale unknown (possibly USGS) |  |  | YesYesYesYes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| USFS boundaries | Yes  | Have as part of land ownership data Statewide\lands- In GIS database – owner compiled at 1:100,000; USFS unknown |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| DEM | Yes  | \dem No immediate need- In GIS database – 30 meter. Also one statewide grid 10 and 30 meter NATIONAL ELEVATION DATA (NED) IS ALSO AVAILABLE |  |  | Not complete | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Quad Index | Yes | Have \drg - In GIS database |  |  | YesYesYes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Precipitation/Climatic Data | Yes | NOAA, Western Regional Climate Center, Oregon State University |  | $1,100 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Digital Raster Graphics | Yes  | drg\ No immediate need |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| DOQQ | Yes  | doqq\No immediate need - In GIS database, image date mostly 1994 |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| NAIP - Color IR | Yes | Doqq\ - In GIS database, image done in 2006 |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Public Land Survey System | Yes  | Have Statewide\plss district\plss- In GIS database - compiled at 1:100K |  |  | YesYes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| GCDB | Yes  | In GIS database |  |  | Yes | Unknown | SYSTEM STANDARD | Unknown |
| ***Watershed******(Management Concern)*** | Hydrography - line (streams) Perennial Streams, Intermittent standing water and streams | Yes | Have statewide\hydrology district\hydrology - In GIS database - compiled at 1:100,000 | Acquire positional data from Landsat augmented by National Hydrographic Database; USGS data |  | Yes Avail. under FGDC auspices Hydro. Delineation Guidelines for 5th & 6th level water-sheds and sub water-sheds | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Hydrography - point (springs)Spring Inventory | Yes | Have statewide\hydrology district\hydrology - In GIS database - compiled at 1:100,000 | Could get data from old ASPEN database at state officeDigitize data |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Hydrography - polygon (lakes) | Yes  | Have statewide\hydrology district\hydrology In GIS database - compiled at 1:100,000  |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Riparian Inventory | Yes  | - In GIS database -Have District\hydrology |  |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Water basin map / 5th order hydrologic mapping (see Hydrologic Unit Code) | Yes | Yes Have 2-order HUCs, 3-4 may be available and 5th order in progress (NRCS, EPA, FS, USGS, BLM) | Ensure that 3-4 order HUC are available and input order 5 when available | $550 | Yes, when complete  | Bureau of Rec. | Federal Standard for Delineation of Hydrologic Unit Boundaries No | FGDC |
| Stream Surveys | Yes  | Have statewide\wildlife\ndowdata\ fish\stream\_survey- Acquired from NDOW 7/2005 | Digitize BM District Data (numerous years that are mostly in paper format); Acquire NDOW Data | $44,550  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Floodplains | No | Need | Explore use of High Resolution Imagery; Acquire data from FEMA | $550 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Erosion factors – NRCS Soil Surveys | Yes | Available In NRCS Soil Survey | Convert available information to GIS |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Slope Analysis | Yes  | Yes - DERIVED FROM EXISTING DEM DATA | Establish procedure |  | No | Unknown | Yes. Local GIS from Soil Surveys | Unknown |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Rangeland Vegetation****(Issues under Resource Protection and Resource Use)* | ESI Data /Ecological Condition | Partially | Yes | Enter all upcoming ESI data into GIS; digitize ESI that is mapped but not incorporated into GIS | $4,400 | Yes | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) | No | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) |
| Rangeland Veg. Types/ Range Site Identification  | Partially | Yes - Have statewide\vegetation district\vegetation- Regap data - code, description; bm-veg - code, cover\_type: - district\vegetation - In GIS database - acquired from various sources UNR - aspen inventory | Ensure range site layer is maintained; bring forward past allotment evaluation data; acquire Vegetation Data from Landsat ETM data |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Monitoring Sites | Partially | Partially | Ensure all current KMAs and other monitoring sites are incorporated in GIS; verify information currently in GIS for sites that are currently incorporated. | $2,200 | No | BMDO standard under development | No | Use Battle Mountain standard |
| ***Soils*** | Soils (SSURGO) | Yes  | Have by soil survey - not complete for Forest service areas- In GIS database – NRCS data at 1:250,000; | NRCS is revising Eureka Soil Survey |  | Yes NRCS – 3rd order soil survey Manipulate SSURGO and USGS data for complete coverage | NRCS | Yes | NRCS |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Forest and Woodlands*** | Historic and existing Forest & Woodlands mapped by species (aspen, mahogany, PJ, etc) | Partially | Yes | Have PJ and aspen info for Mt. Lewis for input to GIS | $2,200 | No | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) | Partially | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) |
| Seed, wildings, and vegetative use areas; Forest/ Woodland Use Area; Pine nut harvest, xmas trees, etc. | Partially | Yes | Use contract maps and known use areas; Use contract maps enter into GIS - Digitize from Topo  | $2,200 | No | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) | No | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) |
| Forest Pests and Pathogens | Partially | No | Update GIS with current information | $4,400 | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Noxious Weeds /Invasive Species/Pests*** | Survey and treatment areas  | Partial | Yes | Digitize from old maps; GIS updates for current files | $13,200 | No | National Weed Database |  Not yet | National Weed Database |
| NDOA data (pests) | Yes | Yes | N/A - Collect | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| CWMA boundary | No | If it exists, unknown | Create or find a shape file | $550 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Wetlands and Riparian Areas****(Several Issues under Recreation heading)* | Complete review and verification of PFC assessments for planning area | Yes | Yes | In progress  | $2,200 | This needs to be verified | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) | Yes | Vegetation Classification Standard (FGDC) |
| ***Water*** *(Issues under Resource Protection)* | 1980’s Water Inventory | Yes | Yes | Convert 1980s data from T&R to UTM – may need to complete by hand to get exact locations | $8,800 | No | Inventory completed by BMDO personnel | No known standard, but could be modified to meet | Unknown |
| Water Quality – inventory | Partially | Yes | Input available inventory data; acquire additional data from USGS & NDEP  | $4,400 | No | Inventory completed by BMDO personnel, verified by Certif. labs | Unknown | Unknown |
| Water Rights/PWR Inventory | Partially | Yes NDWR, BLM | Gather data from State/ local agencies, convert to GIS | $4,400 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Cultural Resources (Issues under Resource Protection; also a Management Concern)*** *)* **(Proprietary – not for public release)**  | Historic trails, other linear features (see Baseline) | Partially  | Partially | GPS survey of linear features; recordation, evaluation; finish georectifying GLO plats  | $6,600 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Cultural sites/surveys: Locations of resources; predictive models | Partial –NVCRIS coverage + District-wide site data.Only about 10% surveyed | Limited utility as small sample; certain areas more complete than others… | Additional limited survey; synthesis of existing information | $20,000 | Yes  | In Progress | Being devised | FGDC subcommittee on cultural resources |
| Historic Trails / Linear features: Locations and National Registerevaluations | Partial – Some in GIS database – digitized at NVSO at 1:250,000, District data at 24,000 PartialDatabase shared by BLM, SHPO, and other agencies | Have District\cultural GPS survey of linear features; do recordation & evaluation; prepare Management Plan(s) | Additional limited survey; synthesis of existing information; preparation of Management Plans | $10,000 | Yes | NLCS Data Boundary GIS Standards | Unknown | Unknown |
| Arch. Sensitivity Areas: Predictive model; accurate paleoclimactic data; better site recordation | Partial | No | Create in-house once additional data gathered | $10,000 | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Gnomon GIS database for Nevada (Database shared by SHPO, BLM, and other Federal agencies): BMFO GIS database in progress | Yes | Yes | Need to Integrate data categories so databases can be cross-referenced. Add missing fields, (e.g. National Register determinations, Smithsonian #s): fill database gaps |  | No | Unknown | Yes | Unknown |
| Regional overview – Compilation & interpretation of existing information (Class 1) | Partially | Critical | Regional synthesis using already collected data (e.g.. sites, eligibility, potential use, protection needs, fieldwork needs); full Class I needed; Synthesis of all existing cultural resource data; prehistoric / historic land use data; veg. / soils/ hydrological data; Use category determinations | $50,000 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Arch. Sensitivity Areas | Partial | No | Create in-house once additional data gathered | $10,000 | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Native American Concerns*** *(Issue under Serving Communities)* **(Proprietary – not for public release)**  | Tribal Boundary Locations | No | No | Recently Received from NSO |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Location of sacred sites & other areas of importance | No | No | Comprehensive District Ethnography | $125,000Can’t be done in-house | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Location of traditional plant gathering areas (Locations & Uses) | No | No | Comprehensive District Ethnography | $125,000 | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| PCRI’s: Locations and designations | No | No | Comprehensive District Ethnography | $125,000 | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Paleontology*** *(Issue under Resource Protection)* | PFYC’s for district based on known resources and geological formations | Partial - None | **No** | Geological maps digitized; PFC guidance from regional Paleontologist; GIS model | $25,000 | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Visual Resource Management***  *(Management Concern)* | Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes | Yes | Yes | Will need revision during RMP |  | No | BLM – Integrating GIS technologies with the VRM Inventory Process – Tech. Note 407 (Nov. 2001) | Yes | BLM – Integrating GIS technologies with the VRM Inventory Process – Tech. Note 407 (Nov. 2001) |
| ***Special Status Species (includes Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Status Species)*** *(Issue under Resource Protection)* | Historic & present species location and habitat/ home range | Yes  | Yes | NNHP/NDOW, USFWS, ETC;enter into GIS | $9,900 | Yes | Unknown | No | NNHP |
| Critical and important habitat | Yes  | Yes | NDOW, NNHP and other Enter into GIS | $1,100 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Population census, NDOW and other | Yes  | Yes | NDOW or NNHP Enter into GIS | $1,100 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Recovery Plans, CAS, etc. | Yes  | Yes | NDOW - Enter into GIS | $1,100 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Habitat condition surveys | Partially | Yes | NDOW/BLM Enter into GIS | $13,200 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| SSS Habitat Improvements (Vegetation treatments, etc.) | Yes | Yes | BMDOEnter into GIS | $4,400 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Fish and Wildlife****(Issue under Resource Protection)* | Historic & present species location and habitat/home range | Partially | Yes | NDOW, NNHP, USFWS, OTHER Enter into GIS | $6,600 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| NDOW stream & population surveys | Partially  | Yes | NDOW, BLM Enter into GIS | $2,200 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| BLM stream habitat condition | Partially  | Yes | NDOW, BLM. enter existing data to GIS  | $22,000 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Listing of all Wildlife species and known habitats in BMDO | Yes | Yes | Update and Covert text, TRs to GIS | $6,600 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Critical & important habitat | Partially | Yes (pronghorn, and mule deer in progress) | Use NDOW and BLM data Convert to GIS. | $1,100 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Special Habitat Features | Yes | Yes | old inventory if can be found Enter into GIS | $17,600 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Population census, NDOW & other | Yes  | Yes | NDOW & NNHP Convert available data to GIS. | $1,100 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| NDOW past & future transplants, etc. | Yes  | Yes | NDOW Enter data into GIS. | $1,100 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| NDOW Big Game Mgt. Plans | Yes  | Yes | NDOW Enter data into GIS. | $1,100 | Yes  | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Habitat Condition Surveys-BLM | Partially | Yes | Input habitat condition from RHE | $17,600 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Key wildlife forage species | Partially | Yes | Use NRCS Soil Surveys | $8,800 | Yes THROUGH THEIR WEBSITE | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Wild Horses & Burros*** *(Issue under Resource Protection)* | HMA and HA boundaries | Yes  | Appropriate and suitable– in GIS, minor modification needed | In-house staff work | $2,000 | Yes | NSO HMA Standard | HMAs YesNo (lacks tables) | NSO HMA Standard |
| Historic census & distribution data | Yes | Appropriate and suitable – some compiled, some not | In-house staff work, assistance from GBI | $5,000  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Current wild horse and burro inventory data  | Partially  | Appropriate and suitable– current census on most HMAs, but not post gather on many | Fill in with regular scheduled future census. (NO NEW DATA ALLOWED) | $5,000 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Current Habitat Inventory Data (Forage and water availability and condition) | Partially  | Appropriate and suitable- Some recent data from RHAs. Little current or historic habitat data in inaccessible higher elevations (80% of HMAs) | (NO NEW DATA ALLOWED)Extrapolate from recent evaluations. Estimate for the rest based on range site descriptions. Compilation of existing inventory, range, PFC and other data – in house staff work | $9,000 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Population dynamics, animal characteristics, health, age structure, sex ratios, genetics | Yes  | Appropriate and suitable– some compiled, some not. Genetics available on most, some has not been received(NOT GIS) | In-house staff work, assistance from GBI | $5,000  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Fire Management (Issue under Serving Communities)*** | Fire Management Units - polygons (FMUs) | Yes | Available in GIS Work (can be put into Data) THIS DATA IS CURRENTLY BEING UPDATED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL |  | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Fire History (includes fire point data) | Yes  | - Large polygons contained in fire history coverageUSE District corporate Data from 1999 on; fire point data based on actual 1202 data and coverage is near completion. |  | $4,950 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Fire Regime | Partially | Yes – It is a required element to justify fuels funding – We have info for Historic Fire Regimes – no current or altered fire regimes info. | Use LANDFIRE Data to complete | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| FRCC (Condition Class) | Yes  | Yes – It is a required element to justify fuels funding - LANDFIRE DATA |  | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Planned / Existing Fuels Projects – Fuels Treatments | Yes/Partially  | Yes - Coverages near completion in GIS DATA. |  | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Wildland Urban Interface Areas (WUI) – are their own separate FMU, with their own polygons | Yes  | Yes - We have this DATA. Available in Fire Management Plan Data |  | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Special Protection/ Priority Areas - associated with FMUs | Need  | Yes | Areas need to be identified by the Resources Staff – work with staff to obtain areas | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Risk Assessment & Mitigation Strategies (RAMS) | Yes  | Yes – Located in GIS WORK |  | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Fire tolerant and intolerant ecosystems | Partially  | Can be compiled relatively quickly Need this info to help delineate AMR or wildland fire-use areas |  | $550 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Livestock Grazing****(Several Issues under Recreation heading)* | Livestock Grazing history, existing permit info, use areas, etc. | Partially | Yes | Digitize past allotment evaluations that implemented use areas; stocking rates; ensure recent decisions that include use areas are placed in GIS data | $4,400 | Not inputted, but available | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Range Improvements by type (including wildlife exclosures)  | Partially | Yes | Records search, field GPS, MTP search and reference back to project files | $13,200 | No | DATA STANDARD COMPLETE SEE NV IM 2006-031 | Partially | Under development at NSO |
| Allotment Boundaries | Yes | Yes | Records search (i.e. Rangeline agreements, project files, MTPs, etc.) plus GPS; field work required – corrections | $13,200 | Yes | NSO Grazing Allotment Standard for GIS NV IM 2002-059 | No | NSO Grazing Allotment Standard for GIS NV IM 2002-059 |
| Suitability: Slope, distance from water, Analysis  | Yes | Yes | None at this time |  | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Recreation*** *(Several Issues under Recreation heading)* | Developed sites | Partially | Yes | Enter into GIS | $8,800 | No | Unknown: THERE IS A NATIONAL INTER-AGENCY TRAILS DATA STANDARD IN PROGRESS THROUGH THE FGDC | Unknown: TRAIL DATA CONTENT AND DATA TRANSFER STANDARD | Unknown: FGDC |
| Existing signage | Partially | Yes | Field inventory | $2,200 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Popular recreation areas (Non-developed) | Partially | Yes | GPS recreation use areas; enter into GIS | $8,800 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes | No | Yes | Analyze & interpret field data | $2,200 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Quality of recreation | No | Yes | Community & user feedback & surveys | $2,200 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Lands and Realty****(Issue under Resource Use)* | Lands and Land Interests that have been acquired | No | No – needs to be created | Conf. w/ other Res. Specs.; LR2000 | $2,200 | No | Utilities Data Standard – FGDC/NSDI  | No | Unknown |
| Withdrawals; Segregations and withdrawals to be terminated  | No | No | Conf. w/ other Res. Specs; LR2000 | $8,800 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Land status – surface(public, private, withdrawals, de facto withdrawals) | Yes | Yes - In GIS database - compiled at 1:24K from GCDB snapped data - Needs revision for accuracy & possible updates | YesDe facto withdrawals not in GIS Review MTPs /LR 2000 for de facto withdrawals. Incorporate into database Have district\lands |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Lands identified for disposal before 07/25/2000 (Baca bill)  | Yes | STATEWIDE DISPOSAL LANDS DATA  | Obtain from RMPs; update files from current lands that have been disposed  | $4,400 | Yes  | Unknown NEVADA DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE LANDS IM 2004-074 | Yes | Unknown  |
| Unauthorized occupancy or enclosure | Partially | Partially - Much can be created with existing data | Serialized cases in LR 2000. Field inventory needed to record others, MTPs, Air photos etc. | $4,400 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Utility Corridors (existing) | Partially | Western Energy Corridor EIS data from DOE, in house data | From DOE, Digitize from MTPs, LR2000 | $2,200 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Power lines & fiber optic cables  | Power - PartiallyFiber - Partially | CONSIDER ROW’S DIGITIZED FROM MTPS BY UNR | Some available from LR2000Acquire data from power line owners Arc data available from NSO | $550 | No | Unknown | Unknown | UnknownUnknown |
| Communication Sites and Towers  | Partially | CONSIDER ROW’S DIGITIZED FROM MTPS BY UNR – NSO ALSO HAS SOME COMM SITE DATA | Acquire data from owner, LR2000, Commsite Plans and digitize from topo/air photos | $2,200 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ROW Locations  | Partially | InaccurateCONSIDER ROW’S DIGITIZED FROM MTPS BY UNR | GPS centerlines; verify existing shape files; ground truth | $17,600 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Mineral Resources\*****(Issue under Resource Use)***\*For all—existing data needs to be obtained/compiled; some large scale digitization will be needed**  | Surface geology | Yes | Yes - In GIS database -1:500,000, derived from USGS | Have statewide\minerals\ geology500k\ and in statewide\minerals |  | No | YesYes | Unknown | Unknown |
| Oil and Gas Potential | Yes | Yes (USGS Data) |  |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Solid Leasable Mineral Potential  | Partially |  | Consult NV Bureau of Mines | $1,100 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Saleable Mineral Potential | Partially |  | Consult NV Bureau of Mines | $1,100 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Coal Potential | No |  | Consult NV Bureau of Mines | $1,100 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Locatable Mineral Permitted Mine Locations | Partially | Unknown at this time | Contact Mines where data is lacking |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Mining Districts  | Yes | NSO HAS THE GIS DATA | Convert existing information to GIS |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Hazardous Materials (Management Concern)*** | Abandoned mines considered to be hazardous | Yes  | NV Division of Mines maintains database | Acquire copy of data for Planning Area |  | Yes | Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology | Yes | BLM WO AML Program |
| Hot Springs > 120oF | Partially |  | NV Bureau of Mines | $550 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Special Designations (Management Concern)*** | Special Designations | Partial | No | Digitize Railroad Valley Wildlife Management Area | $550 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Renewable Energy (Management Concern)*** | Geothermal Potential | Partially | Yes (NV Bureau of Mines) |  | $1,100 | Yes | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Wind Power Potential  | Yes | Data from Wind Programmatic EISNSO HAS THE NREL DATA | Acquire from NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY | $4,400 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Areas of solar energy potential  | Yes | Available from Programmatic EISNSO HAS THE NREL DATA | May be under revision NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY | $4,400 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Socio-Economics (Management Concern)***  | Economic Profile of Planning Area | Partially |  | Determine socio-economic baseline for RMP  |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| NV state and county data earnings and employment data | No | THIS CAN ALL BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA | US Dept of Commercial, Reg. economic information system |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| US Department of Commerce | No | THIS CAN ALL BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA  |  |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Population data and trends | No | THIS CAN ALL BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA |  |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Political, social, and community organization data. | No | THIS CAN ALL BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA |  |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Planning Area Boundaries  | Yes | Available at BMFO but not accurate | 150,000 – PA boundary |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Unknown | Unknown |  |
| ***Environmental Justice (Management Concern)***  | Native American socio-economic information and tribal profiles | No | THIS MIGHT BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA | Nevada directory of Native American Resources Social and Economic information and tribal profiles |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Census data by county for minority populations and demographics | No | THIS MIGHT BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA | Census Bureau |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Data on poverty income | No | THIS MIGHT BE ANALYZED FROM THE US CENSUS “TIGER” DATA | US Dept. of Health and Human Services and US Dept. of Labor , Data for the State of Nevada Job Training Office |  | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Transportation Management (Management Concern)*** | Road inventory/ classification (including WSA)  | No |  | Cooperate to collect data & do new Transportation PlanMIGHT GET SOME DATA FROM NDOT. NEED TO ASSESS WHAT DATA HAVE BEEN COLLECTED LOCALLYAND WHERE THE GAPS ARE; Classification of roadways | $17,600 | Yes, for major roads | NSDI/FGDC Transportation Std (draft) | No | NSDI/FGDC Transportation Std (draft) |
|  Signage  | No |  | GPS In-HouseCAN THIS BE QUERIED FROM FAMS? | $8,800 | No | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Emergency Stabilization & Rehabilitation (Issue under Serving Communities)*** THERE IS A BLM ES&R DATABASE STANDARD UNDER DEVELOPMENT IN DENVER | Rehabilitation efforts | Partially | Yes - 2006/2007 | Research project files and update GIS to best of our knowledge Complete | $2,200 | Yes | Under development at NSO GeoMac Perimeter Data Element | 1970s to 80’s years don’t recent years do Partially | GeoMac |
| Stabilization | Yes  | Yes - 2006/2007 | Complete | $2,200 | Yes | Under development at NSO | Unknown | Unknown |
| Dozer lines from Suppression Efforts | Yes  | Yes - 2006/2007 | Complete | $2,200 | Yes | Under development at NSO | Unknown | Unknown |
| ***Air Quality******(Management Concern)*** | Classified and unclassified Air sheds | Yes | Yes | Discuss availability of digital information with NDEP, NDEQ, & EPA | $1,100 | No | NDEP | Unknown | Unknown |
| Air Quality Monitoring | Partially | Yes | Data from NDEP, Mine info, etc.  | $1,100 | No | NDEP | Unknown | Unknown |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Estimate Cost | $901,650 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX 4

Plan Preparation Schedule

| **Battle Mountain District RMP Revision Schedule** |
| --- |
| **Planning Phase** | **Planning Task** | **Time Frame** | **Date****(mm/yy)** | **Who** | **How** |
| ***Pre-Planning*** | Formation of Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) | 1 day | 08/31/07 | Battle Mountain District (**BMD**) | Management Staff appoints staff to IDT |
| Mailing List started | On-going | Started 01/08 | BMD | Input from staff & collaborators |
| Initiate coordination with other agencies | On-going | Started 01/08 | BMD | Phone calls, Meetings |
| Preparation Plan Preparation and Approval | 4 months | 01/08-04/08 | BMD | RMP IDT drafts; State Office (**SO**) and Washington Office (**WO**) review, comment, and approve |
| RMP Team Lead Recruitment Package developed and sent to SO | 2 months | 01/08-02/08 | BMD | BMD managers draft and sent to SO |
| RMP Lessons Learned  | 1 day | 01/08 | BMD IDT/Jeff Johnson (Winnemucca BLM Office) | Jeff Johnson (Winnemucca BLM Office) and IDT |
| Planning Concepts Training | 2 days | 03/08 | BMD/National Training Center (**NTC**)/ Collaborators | BMD Managers, IDT and Collaborators/ Partners attend in Tonopah, NV |
| Design, establish and maintain website  | On-going | Start 04/08 | BMD/Contractor | Electronic |
| Publish Preparation Plan on website | 2 days | 05/08 | BMD | After WO approval of Preparation Plan  |
| Develop Statements of Work (**SOW**)  | 2 months | 04/08-05/08 | BMD/SO | BMD Managers draft SOW; SO Review, comment and approve |
| Develop Analysis of Management Situation (**AMS**) | 6 months | 04/08-10/08 | BMD/SO | RMP IDT drafts; SO review, comment and approve |
| Planning Nuts and Bolts Training | 4 days | 06/08 | BMD/NTC | BMD managers, IDT and Collaborators attend in Battle Mountain, NV |
| Publish AMS on website | 1 week | 11/08 | BMD/Contractor | Post on web after completion and SO approval |
| Social and Economic Aspects of Planning | 3 days | 11/18/08 – 11/20/08 | BMD/NTC | BMD staff to attend this training in Phoenix, AZ |
| ***Data Organization***  | Review existing data and put into GIS.  | On-going | Start 04/08[[12]](#footnote-13) | BMD/Contractor | Contractor work with appropriate resource specialists & agencies |
| Review existing RMP decisions, including amendments, for suitability for bringing forward into revised RMP | 12 months | 01/08-01/09 | BMD/Contractor | BMD personnel can start the review; will be completed after contractor is on board |
| ***Formal Initiation of Planning & Scoping*** | Select contractor(s) to prepare RMP/EIS | 1 month | 11/08[[13]](#footnote-14) | BMD | GSA list |
| Begin GIS/data evaluation with contractor | 1 month | 12/08 | BMD/Contractor | Electronic; Meetings with specialists |
| Prepare draft Notice of Intent (NOI) announcing intention to revise RMP and prepare EIS | 1 month | 01/09-02/09 | BMD | Electronic |
| Develop Public Participation Plan; publish on website | 2 months | 01/09-03/09 | BMD/Contractor/SO | Electronic; Website |
| NOI published in Federal Register | 4 months | 02/09-06/09[[14]](#footnote-15) | WO | Published after WO review and approval |
| Prepare Press Release, publish in State-wide newspapers | 2 weeks | 06/09 | BMD/SO | BMD prepare Press Release in conjunction with SO for publication in newspapers concurrent with FR publication. |
| Send NOI Interested Party Letter | 1 week | 06/09 | Contractor | Concurrent with FR publication. Send to all on mailing list, Include postcard, post Press Release on Website |
| Publish Press Release on website | 1 week | 06/09 | BMD | When published in FR |
| Public Scoping Meetings -- *Battle Mountain, Eureka, Austin, Crescent Valley, Kingston, Reese River Valley (Yomba Tribal headquarters), Carvers, Tonopah, Goldfield, Beatty & Reno* | 3 weeks | 07/09 | BMD/Contractor | At least 15 days after NOI is published. Announce in newspapers, fliers, letters, etc |
| Comment Period | 2 months | 06/09-08/09 | BMD/Contractor/Public | Letters; electronic, fax |
| Public Comment Analysis & Scoping Report | 3 months | 07/09-09/09 | BMD/Contractor | Comments can be reviewed and analyzed as they come in during the comment period and finalized after the comment period is over; Publish Scoping Report on website |
| Finalize planning issues, concerns, criteria, opportunities | 1 month | 10/09 | BMD/Contractor | Publish on Website |
| ***Alternative Formulation; Writing and Publishing Draft RMP/EIS (DEIS)*** | Develop No Action alternative | 1 month | 11/09 | BMD/Contractor | Based on AMS |
| Work with contractor & collaborators to develop alternatives | 5 months | 11/09-04/10 | BMD/Contractor | Contractor/ID Team meetings |
| Continue public involvement throughout alternative formulation |  | 11/09-04/10 | BMD/Contractor | Meetings, website |
| Ensure that all alternatives provide issue resolution |  | 11/09-04/10 | BMD/Contractor |  |
| Write Preliminary DEIS (PDEIS) | 5 months | 04/10-09/10 | Contractor | Meetings/electronic |
| Prepare draft Biological Assessment (BA) for Special Status species | 4 months | 05/10-10/10 | BMD/Contractor | Develop concurrently with PDEIS. Work with USFWS, using the species list. |
| PDEIS review by ID Team, cooperators, collaborators | 2 months | 09/10-11/10 | BMD/Contractor | Meetings/electronic  |
| Review by SO and WO | 2 months | 09/10-11/10 | SO/WO | Electronic |
| Respond to internal review of PDEIS | 1 month | 12/10 | BMD/Contractor | Electronic; comment database |
| Select Preferred Alternative | 1 weeks | 12/10 | BMD/FM/SD | Team recommendation to management |
| Send BA to USFWS for preparation of Biological Opinion. (BO) | 5 months | 12/10-05/11 | BMD/USFWS/Contractor | When Preferred Alternative is selected. Meetings/electronic |
| Brief State Director on DEIS | 1 week | 12/10 | BMD | PowerPoint |
| Approval to print | 1 week | 12/10 | SD | Can now publish NOA in FR. |
| BLM’s NOA for DEIS published in FR | 4 months | 12/10-04/11 |  | Must wait for approval |
| Layout & printing of DEIS | 6 weeks | 12/10-01/11 | Contractor | When date for FR publication of BLM’s NOA is received |
| File DEIS with EPA and OEPC | 2 weeks | 04/11 | BMD | When BLM’s NOA is published in FR. |
| EPA’s NOA of DEIS published in FR | 2 weeks | 04/11 | EPA | Starts 90-day comment period |
| DEIS mailed to interested parties (mailing list) | 2 weeks | 05/11 | BMD/Contractor | To coincide with EPA’s FR publication |
| News Release announcing availability of DEIS, public meetings | 1 week | 05/11 | BMD/SO | To coincide with EPA’s FR publication |
| Public Meetings | 3 weeks | 06/11 | BMD/Contractor | During comment period |
| Comment period ends |  | 06/11 |  |  |
| ***Analysis of Public Comments; Preparation & Publication of Proposed RMP / Final EIS*** | Analyze public comments; prepare summary | 2 months | 07/11-09/11 | BMD/Contractor | Electronic; Meetings |
| Prepare Proposed RMP/FEIS | 3 months | 09/11-12/11 | BMD/Contractor |  |
| Review draft BO from USFWS | 2 months | 05/10-07/11 | BMD, contractor | Electronic & hard copy; meetings as needed |
| Final BO received from USFWS | 2 months | 09/11 | USFWS | Electronic & hard copy |
| Internal review of Proposed RMP/FEIS | 1 month | 01/12 | BMD, Cooperators, Collaborators, SO, WO | Could be 2 steps – BMD review first, then SO/WO |
| Brief SD; secure permission to print | 1 week | 01/12 | BMD/SD |  |
| BLM’s NOA for Proposed RMP/FEIS published in FR | 4 months | 01/12-05/12 | BMD/WO | Must wait for approval |
| File Proposed RMP/FEIS with EPA and OEPC | 1 week | 05/12 | BMD | When date for FR publication of BLM’s NOA is received |
| EPA’s NOA for Proposed RMP/FEIS published in FR | 2 weeks | 05/12 | EPA | Initiates 30 day protest period for Proposed RMP |
| Proposed RMP/FEIS mailed to interested parties (mailing list) | 2 weeks | 05/12 | BMD/Contractor | To coincide with EPA’s and BLM’s FR publications |
| Send Proposed RMP/FEIS to Governor (State Clearinghouse) | 1 week | 05/12 | BMD/Contractor | Initiates 60 day Governor’s consistency review period |
| Publish Proposed RMP/FEIS on website | 1 week | 05/12 | BMD/Contractor | To coincide with NOA in FR |
| News release | 1 week | 05/12 | BMD | Newspapers, website, other media |
| Protest period ends |  | 05/12 (estimate) |  |  |
| Governor’s consistency review period ends |  | 06/12 |  |  |
| ***Decision*** | Resolution of protests, if any were filed[[15]](#footnote-16) | 5 months | 06/12-11/12 | BMD/SO/WO | Letters to protesting parties |
| Record of Decision (ROD) drafted | 1 month | 11/12 | BMD | As protest resolution progresses |
| Brief SD and ROD signed by SD | 1 week | 12/12 |  | After protest resolution is complete |
| NOA for ROD published in FR | 4 months | 12/12-04/13 | BMD/WO | Must wait for approval |
| ROD sent to interested parties | 1 week | 04/13 | BMD/Contractor | After publication of NOA in FR |
| News release | 1 week | 04/13 | BMD | After NOA publication in FR |

APPENDIX 5

Proposed RMP/EIS Budget

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COST SUMMARY *Battle Mountain District RMP Revision*** | **FY 2009** | **FY 2010** | **FY 2011** | **FY 2012** | **FY 2013** | **TOTAL** |
|   |   |   |   |   |  |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |   |   |  |   |
| GIS Data Needs | **$676,000** | **$225,650** |  |  |  | **$901,650** |
|   |   |   |   |   |  |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |  |   |
|  BLM labor (oversight) | $945,000 | $665,000 | $455,000 | $175,000 | $175,000 | $2,415,000 |
|  BLM ops/training | $565,000 | $285,000 | $195,000 | $75,000 | $75,000 | $1,168,000 |
| BLM total | $2,186,000 | $1,175,650 | $650,000 | $250,000 | $250,000 | $4,484,650 |
|   |   |   |   |   |  |   |
| **RMP/EIS subtotals** | **$2,186,000** | **$1,175,650** | **$650,000** | **$250,000** | **$250,000** | **$4,484,650** |
|   |   |   |   |   |  |   |
| **Totals** | **$2,186,000** | **1,175,650** | **$650,000** | **$250,000** | **$250,000** | **$4,484,650** |

APPENDIX 6

Contact/Comment Documentation

1. Name:

1. Address:

3. Phone Number 4. E-Mail

5. Location Of Contact

6. Person Documenting Contact 7. Date\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

8. What part of the planning process does this contact deal with?

 \_\_\_A. Mailing List \_\_\_H. Objectives/Goals

 \_\_\_B. Response to News Article/Letter \_\_\_I. Alternative(s)

 \_\_\_C. Response to Federal Register Notice \_\_\_J. Draft RMP/Draft EIS

 \_\_\_D. Schedule \_\_\_K. Proposed RMP/Final EIS

 \_\_\_E. Preplan Analysis \_\_\_L. Record of Decision

 \_\_\_F. Maps \_\_\_M. Protests

 \_\_\_G. Planning Issues \_\_\_N. Other

9. Summary Of Contact And Input (Use reverse side if necessary):

Return to: BLM Battle Mountain District Office

 Attn: Gene Seidlitz

 BLM RMP/EIS Project Manager

 50 Bastian Road

 Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820

1. The first time an acronym is used it is shown in **bold**. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. resource – The Resource with a data requirement. Develop resources derived from anticipated planning decisions to be made (see Appendix C, Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601. This is the driver for all the analyses required and therefore for the data needed to conduct the analyses. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. needed data sets – The specific data needed to address the planning question. What GIS maps need to be constructed to address the questions listed in Column AU List all required. In other words, list what maps you need to compare or analyze to resolve the planning questions. Each planning question normally will have at least one GIS theme tied to it. Each theme is listed in a separate row, next to the planning question to which it pertains [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. data set available? – Is there existing data or new data yet to be collected or acquired? What data sets are needed to create the themes listed in Column BU Each GIS theme will have at least one data set tied to it. Where more than one, each data set is listed in a separate cell, in the row corresponding to the GIS theme it supports. Many existing BLM data sets are documented at: [http://sc2962.sc.blm.gov/datashopper/default.asp](http://sc2962.sc.blm.gov/datashopper/default.asp%20) and at <http://web.blm.gov/CDD/rds/index.html>

4 data Appropriateness? – Is the data suitable and appropriate for the intended use? Does it meet the requirements for the business needs? [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. 5 proposed remedy for data gaps – If new data, describe how the data will be obtained. If existing data will be converted to GIS or some other format, describe processing.

6 estimated costs – Summary of costs associated with collecting or converting required data (Based on 40hours to complete 1- 24K quad; $20.00/hour (employee); 10% of supervisors time at $50.00/hour and 450 – 24K quads for the District. This represents the high range estimates for No data sets available and half of the estimate for partially available data sets).

7 availability of fgdc metadata – Does metadata exist that is in compliance with the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Geo-Spatial Metadata Content Standard?

8 name/source of data standard – What is or will be the name/source of the data standard? What kind of standard is it: has it been designated by BLM at the National, State, Regional, Local level If the data does not meet a national or regional standard be sure to document the standard being used. If the data does not meet any standard, indicate that.

9 data meets national or regional standard? – If there is a national or regional standard, does/will the data meet that standard? (*Verify with data steward.*)

10name/source of potential data national or regional standard – If there is a national or regional data standard in general use but is not being used in your plan, and you believe it would be an appropriate standard to work toward, list it. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Dates from this point are dependant on an approved budget with sufficient funding for this work. If budget approval is delayed, or if funding is not adequate, dates from here on will be revised as necessary. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. If funding is approved [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. WO review/approval is required before a document is published in the Federal Register. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. If any significant change is made to the Plan during protest resolution, public notice and an opportunity for public comment is required before the ROD can be signed. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)