



# **U.S. Department of the Interior**

Bureau of Land Management

Dillon Field Office  
1005 Selway Drive  
Dillon, MT 59725

January 2003



---

## **RMP Digest**

### **Description of the Existing Condition and Analysis of the Management Situation**

Prepared by the Dillon Field Office  
for the Dillon Resource Management Plan

# READERS GUIDE

The *RMP Digest* provides a summary of portions of the formal Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMP EIS) being prepared by the Bureau of Land Management's Dillon Field Office and scheduled for release in 2004. The *RMP Digest* is organized the same way that the Draft RMP/EIS will be organized. Much of the format is based on BLM guidance issued in 2001 that is meant to provide a common look and feel to RMP planning documents being prepared by BLM across the west. This document is a work-in-progress. Portions of it should be expected to be adjusted, especially as alternatives are developed and the *Chapter 3—Affected Environment* is refined.

**Chapter 1** contains background information on the planning process and sets the stage for the information that is presented in the rest of the document. There are nine main sections in Chapter 1, which include the Introduction, Purpose and Need for the Plan, Planning Area and Map, Scoping and Issues, Planning Criteria and Legislative Constraints, Planning Process, Related Plans, Policy and Overall Vision.

In the formal Draft RMP/EIS, **Chapter 2** provides the Description of the Alternatives. In this *Digest* document, Chapter 2 contains a table organized by resource/program area that delineates the current management that would continue under a "No Action Alternative". This information has been compiled from a variety of sources, including the 1979 Management Framework Plan (MFP), the 1981 Mountain-Foothills Grazing EIS, and various other subsequent planning documents, authorities, and policy statements. The table has been formatted with a separate column to the right of the current management so it can be used as a worksheet by the reader to identify suggestions on alternative management.

**Chapter 3** provides background information on the various resources and resource programs administered by BLM and

describes their condition and trend. This chapter is organized into five sections including Resources, Resource Uses, Fire Ecology, Special Area Designations and Social and Economic Conditions. Each of these five sections is then split into resources or program areas that are presented in alphabetical order. Each section begins with a list of relevant authorities and policies which guide management of the resource or program area. Brief descriptions of the cited laws can be found in **Appendix A**.

**Tables** and **Figures** have been included throughout the document to display and summarize pertinent information. **Maps** have been included at the back of the document for ease of reference and to familiarize the reader with the format that will be used in the formal Draft RMP/EIS of a separate map volume. **Appendices** with lengthier but important information have been placed at the back of the Digest for reference. An **Acronym List** and **Glossary** have also been provided for reference. This document has been reproduced in black-and-white; visit our website at [www.mt.blm.gov/dfo/rmp](http://www.mt.blm.gov/dfo/rmp) to see color versions of figures and maps that may be easier to read.

Acreages displayed in this document are derived from a number of sources, and should all be considered estimates and approximations. Most acreage figures were calculated from 1:24,000 GIS coverages created for a variety of resource programs. Consequently, discrepancies may occur with in regard to total acres in the Dillon Field Office. For example, calculations for some of the resources did not separate the estimated 12,380 acres of public land managed by the Butte Field Office along the Big Hole River. Other descriptive sections used information from sources that used maps at grosser scales. For the purposes of field office-wide planning, the discrepancies are minor.