INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of the tool is to help determine the degree of analysis needed for a research or scientific activity proposal. It is not an analysis of the merits of the proposal itself but it can be used as a quick look to help determine if a project is obviously appropriate, and therefore little analysis is warranted, or obviously inappropriate as proposed and more information or a detailed analysis. A determination of “more analysis” typically leads to a request to the proponent for more information or changes in the initial proposal.

This tool should not be used as a substitute for an analysis or authorization of the proposal if one is warranted. The policies and authorization process required by each agency must still be followed.

Please note that any proposal that includes a Wilderness Act Section 4c prohibited use (motorized equipment, mechanical transport, landing of aircraft, structures, installations, or temporary roads) may also trigger a minimum requirements analysis, depending on agency policy. The purpose of the minimum requirements analysis would be to determine the necessity of the project in wilderness and, if so, identify any safe and feasible alternatives that do not include or minimize any of the prohibited uses.

To use the tool the reviewer will pick a point on each of the 4 sides of the graph based on a review of the proposal. Remember that this is a quick assessment based on the information provided in the proposal and picking the points on the graph is more art than science at this stage. A proposal that is dependent on wilderness, provides benefits to wilderness, has no prohibited uses and minimal impacts to wilderness character should land in the green area. Proposals that are not wilderness dependent and provide little benefit, involve prohibited uses and cause impacts to wilderness character will be in the red area. A proposal with impacts but also benefits and is worthy of more study should end up in the shaded or yellow
areas. The tool can also help provide a visual display of the evaluation process and major considerations for discussions with both proponents and reviewers and help streamline the review process.

Begin by evaluating the project and picking a point on the left Minimum Activity axis. Note that if a Wilderness Act Section 4c prohibited use is part of the proposal the point will be somewhere above the mid-point of the left access. The degree to which it is high or low reflects how minimum the activity is. For example, a proposal that includes 2 helicopter landings would be above the mid-point but rank lower than a proposal with 20 landings and a permanent structure would rank lower than a temporary one. The same rating scheme would apply to the non-prohibited uses (e.g. 2 shovel holes vs. 200, etc.).

Next pick a point on the right axis to reflect impacts to the qualities of wilderness character (untrammeled, undeveloped, natural, and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation)—impacts, not benefits. Draw a line between the points on the left and right axis.

Then pick a point on the top axis to indicate how wilderness dependent the proposal is. Can all or some of it be done outside wilderness without compromising the quality of information to be collected? Finally, pick a point on the bottom axis to indicate the degree of benefits to wilderness stewardship (either the specific local area or wilderness in general). Draw a line between the points on the top and bottom axis.

Look at where the two lines intersect. This should reflect the degree of analysis required. A proposal that includes a prohibited use and is unnecessary should be in or towards the red while a wilderness dependent proposal with few impacts should be in the green. If it ends up in the shaded area then either more information or an adjustment of the proposal is necessary or further detailed analysis is needed. This analysis may include the worksheets provided in the framework and a minimum requirements analysis if a prohibited use is proposed.