

Now, we do have some questions that have already come in, so let's start with those that we received earlier.

Sam and Dave, you guys ready?

We will see if we can stump you here, okay?

>> D. Harmon: All right.

>> D. Charpio: All right.

We have an email from Barry in Oregon, and Barry has three questions.

I will cover the first one and then I will cover the other one that came in and we'll come back to his other two.

Will there be Washington office direction regarding interim management direction for lands with wilderness characteristics?

Will there be Washington office direction regarding interim management for lands with wilderness characteristics?

>> S. Gaugush: That's a very good question, especially since it's a point I forgot to cover in my notes. When it comes to protecting an area for its wilderness characteristics, there's no required set of prescriptions for that area.

The planning guidance attached to the I.M. does include some potential examples of management actions and various combinations that would provide protection and that's really what we are looking for is do the management actions taken holistically provide protection for wilderness characteristics.

Some examples of these types of actions would be designating the area as VRM class 2, closing to mineral leasing or leasing with a no surface occupancy stipulation, things like that and there are other examples listed in the guidance.

>> D. Charpio: Okay.

Dave, anything to add?

Nope?

>> D. Harmon: Just -- no.

It did remind me, you know, we don't have a policy guidance like for -- like we do for wilderness study areas.

There's not going to be any interim management policy guidance issued for these areas.

So maybe Barry was thinking about that.

>> D. Charpio: Okay.

So the emphasis is on the inventory and not the management guidance yet.

Okay.

I have another question.

This comes from Allison in buffalo, Wyoming.

Former guidance used to determine land clearly and obviously lacking wilderness characteristics, that term does not appear in the new guidance.

Why not?

>> D. Harmon: Well this guidance is not supporting the wild lands policy like the previous guidance was. So there's some changes, some differences.

This is -- this guidance is just simply supporting our requirement to maintain inventories under Section 201 of FLPMA.

And if it lacks wilderness characteristics, it will probably be easy to document the case on the inventory forms, but, you know, if that -- if an area needs to have its inventory updated and you are finding an area that's really wiped out, lots of surface disturbance still need to document the fact on form 2, but it would be a relatively easy process to do, and then you have updated your inventory.

You have found there are no wilderness characteristics and -- and you are good to go.

>> S. Gaugush: Yeah, Don, Dave is right.

I would like to add real quick that I think the phrase the question was referring to came out of the project

manual 6303 that was associated with the secretarial order and that has gone away.

That's not part of this new policy.

There's no special review provisions for projects just going back to the NEPA process, business as usual.

>> D. Charpio: Okay.

All right.

We have a caller.

We have Matt in Prineville and he has a NEPA guidance question.

Matt go ahead.

>> Participant: Sam had mentioned if there was land with wilderness characteristics it should be mentioned.

Is one of these wilderness characteristics any different than any other resource that if it's not going to be potentially is significantly affected, and not an issue, does it still need to be discussed and/or analyzed in the NEPA?

>> D. Charpio: Sam, did you get all of that?

>> S. Gaugush: To answer your question, Matt, I would advise you to treat it in the same manner as any other significant resource when you are putting together NEPA documents and doing your analysis.

>> D. Charpio: Thanks, Matt, for that question.

We appreciate it and, Sam, thanks for the answer.

Now we have robin in the Idaho state office.

Go ahead, robin.

>> Participant: Hi.

My question is: If we have an office that's currently in the RMP process, but they haven't released their draft, they did the LWC inventory prior to the guidance being released, and didn't necessarily use the same road definition as -- that's put out in the I.M., I'm -- do they -- should they go back and relook at their inventory using the existing guidance?

>> D. Charpio: Thanks, robin.

Who is going to take that?

Dave?

Sam?

>> D. Harmon: Yeah.

Sure.

It kind of depends on how different it was.

If the difference would mean that boundaries and identification of lands with wilderness characteristics there would be substantial differences in what you would find using the present guidance, we better take a look at it.

Some minor differences that really wouldn't reflect a change in ultimate finding of presence or absence of wilderness characteristics, I wouldn't worry about that.

So maybe we can talk about that more later on.

It kind of depends on the scope of difference.

>> D. Charpio: That's a good point.

Again, if your question is -- we don't get quite to all of -- remember after the broadcast, you can contact Dave and Sam and they will be glad to talk to you because we have a number of questions.

So thanks, robin, for that question.

We do appreciate it.

Now, we have a fax from Redding, California, Bill says -- he has two questions, actually.

Our RMP is almost 10 years old.

Over that period, we have required over -- we have acquired, excuse me, over 50,000 acres and more coming of land that was private or other public.

What inventory requirements are there for these lands?

Again, these are lands that have been acquired since their old RMP was completed.

So what are the requirements for them to do the inventory on those lands?

>> S. Gaugush: Well, as mentioned earlier, if the BLM acquires lands, that would be an instance in which we would want to update the inventory for the field office so those lands have been inventoried to -- to confirm whether or not wilderness characteristics are present on those lands, particularly if you are going to be undertaking projects in those areas, that would have the potential to impact wilderness characteristics if they were present.

>> D. Charpio: Follow-up question, Sam.

She asks, given that case, in the meantime, can they log or practice forestry, build trails or cross these areas if they are required?

>> S. Gaugush: What have you to think about, without -- what you have to think about, without getting into the specifics here, what have you to think about is are you able to analyze the impact on a resource that you are not sure if it's this or not?

That's why I would advise them to conduct inventories on these lands that were acquired to determine whether or not the resource is there or not.

It should be part of the NEPA analysis to analyze those impacts when they are present.

>> D. Charpio: Okay.

Dave?

>> D. Harmon: I could add that after you update the inventory, say you have -- you may find, no, there are no lands of wilderness characteristics and, of course, the plan decision could go ahead, logging or whatever action.

If they are found to be present, you just want to make sure that the things that Sam mentioned, the full range of alternatives are analyzed, the impacts under the alternatives are analyzed and yes, you can go ahead and log, you know, even when -- after you have identified lands with wilderness characteristics if that's what the decision is to do.

So --

>> D. Charpio: Thanks, Dave.

Now, these specific questions, again, make sure that you follow up with either Dave or Sam on it and they will be glad to help you out.

Now, we have a caller from Spokane, Steve in Spokane.

What's your question?

>> Participant: Yeah, hi, Don.

In determining if BLM adjacent lands to federal roadless areas are qualified, I understand you should work closely with the agency.

My question is if we should be working from the existing E.I.S. for the adjacent agency or upcoming planning in making our determination as to whether or not BLM has -- meets the qualification.

>> D. Charpio: Okay.

Understood.

>> D. Harmon: Yeah, I think -- I think there's some room for common sense here.

When you are coordinating with the other agency, you know, they need to have identified when there's characteristics and an indication that they intend to protect the characteristics, and they may or may not have actually gotten their new plan signed and on the street yet.

So I would -- I would work with that other agency and find out what their intentions are and where they think they are going with that adjacent land and then make your call if you feel you have met the size exception or not, in the case like -- if size is an issue here.

>> D. Charpio: Thanks, Dave.

And thanks, Steve, for that question.