

**State Office Quality Review Table**

The Content and Quality Review Standards below are not intended to be all encompassing, but highlight key considerations in determining the overall quality of the document. For example, the standards do not address consistency with applicable program guidance. It is assumed that State Director’s will review all documents for consistency with applicable laws, regulation, and policy.

<b>Review Points</b>	<b>Contents and Quality Review Standards</b>	<b>State Director Comments on Quality</b>
<p><b>Preparation Plan</b></p>	<p>Consistent with WO IM No. 2001-038:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Budget</li> <li>* Timeframes</li> <li>* Data needs– standards and scale</li> <li>* Preliminary Issues to be addressed</li> <li>* Decisions to be considered</li> <li>* Collaboration</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Notice of Intent (NOI)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Planning criteria (see below)</li> <li>* Statement of purpose and need</li> <li>* Strategy for providing public involvement and consultation</li> <li>* Proposed Federal Register Notice (43 CFR 1610.2 (c))</li> <li>* Overview of major multiple use decisions being considered</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Planning Criteria (if not included in the NOI)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Tailored to address issues identified</li> <li>* Reasonableness of standards, rules, and other factors</li> <li>* Consistency with BLM mission, Strategic Plan, President’s Energy Policy, National Fire Plan, other national strategies or initiatives</li> <li>* Inventory/data management</li> </ul>	

Review Points	Contents and Quality Review Standards	State Director Comments on Quality
<p><b>Notice of Availability (NOA) for Draft Plan/Draft EIS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Documentation – format, standards</li> <li>* Consistency with other plans as appropriate</li> <li>* Clear statement of proposed action with a statement of need that justifies the proposal to take action</li> <li>* Reasonable range of alternatives and accompanying analysis</li> <li>* A statement of “no action” that forms the basis for a comparison between meeting the need and not meeting the need</li> <li>* Collaboration and public involvement with constituent and interest groups</li> <li>* Documentation with sufficient discussion of the issues and opposing viewpoints</li> <li>* Discussion of factors used in selecting the preferred alternative (if identified)</li> <li>* Reasonableness of the preferred alternative (if identified)</li> <li>* Sufficient discussion of monitoring or need for additional analysis</li> <li>* Approach to unresolved issues</li> </ul>	
<p><b>NOA for Proposed Plan/Final EIS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Changes from draft EIS to Final EIS with rationale for change, including public comment responses, new data, alternative impact analysis, and inconsistencies with other government agencies.</li> </ul>	

Review Points	Contents and Quality Review Standards	State Director Comments on Quality
<b>Following Protest Period and Record of Decision (ROD)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Decisions reasonably supported by Final EIS</li> <li>* Resolution of issues identified during Governor’s consistency review</li> <li>* Resolution of Protests</li> <li>* Discussion of factors used in making the decision</li> <li>* Reasonableness of the decisions</li> <li>* Approach to deferred decisions</li> </ul>	

I certify that the [*fill in name of planning document*] is consistent with laws, regulations, and policy and was reviewed in accordance with the Content and Quality Review Standards documented above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
State Director’s Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date