

**LITTLE SNAKE DRAFT AMS COMMENT FORM  
PUBLIC COMMENT MASTER**

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
T. Wright Dickinson					<p>Jeremy            Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this AMS. I wish to preface my comments by saying that I understand that this was a rough draft and usually something that the BLM dose not show until it's cleaned up. With that said I am great full for the opportunity to review and provide these suggested changes. Unfortunately If my comments seem a bit harsh they are intended to be I am deeply disturb by the apparent lack of professionalism mainly derived from the lack of balance in most of the CHACTERAZATIONS in chapter #3 whether intended or not the very real perception of biases for and against certain uses is just the reason why the public has come to not trust these processes. If this document is to serve any useful purpose then it must accurately reflect the situation not be full of editorials and half truths. There seems to be a complete or very nearly so absence of Data presented by many of us in previous comments. This document I understand is not intended to resolve the issues and I am not asking that it do that What I believed it would do is report the range of views contributed so that everyone can move forward with a common understanding of how all contributors see the situation. To those who may be irritated by my comments well you irritated me with this document so perhaps now we might rather try to pull people together rather poking each other in the eye which hurts but is not very productive. I have said enough thanks again</p>	<p>No response.            Thank you for your input.</p>
T Wright Dickinson	1-1	2	1 purpose and need	6	<p>importance of retaining grazing on BLM lands to sustain private land openspace local economy and culture</p>	<p>This statement is not a purpose and need statement for either the AMS or RMP.</p>

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
Wilderness Society	Purpose and Need for the RMP revision	1-1		38	This bullet-point should read: "Management of lands containing wilderness character <b>and oil and gas potential</b> , including non-WSA areas such as the Vermillion Basin, where a 2001 BLM inventory found over 77,000 acres of wilderness character."	Change as indicated.
Julander Energy		1-1			In the purpose and need section (1-1) under major issues to be addressed in the RMP revision the Canadian Lynx should not be listed. We agree with the need to support numerous wildlife species, but the habitat for Canadian Lynx should not be considered in the plan for the Little Snake RMP. The State of Colorado DOW set out a plan for reintroduction of the Lynx and distribution of the Lynx is in the southern portion of the state, Rio Grande County. Although Rout County Forest Plan lists the Rout National Forest as habitat for Canadian Lynx, we do not agree with extending the habitat for Lynx into the Little Snake Resource Area. That was not the intent of the Division of Wildlife with the reintroduction.	We have LAU's for lynx designated by USFWS so have to address. Just because lynx is an issue doesn't mean we are making decisions pro/against.  Make list of species an (e.g., ....) instead of it being interpreted as exhaustive list.
Julander Energy		1-1			Valid Existing Rights should be listed as an issue and the overriding importance they have within the Resource Management Plan. Valid Existing Rights are oil and gas leases, right-of-way authorizations such as utility corridors, pipelines and power lines, valid mining claims, easements, grazing permits and private water rights.	Will include and strengthen language on valid existing rights; however this is not the appropriate place to discuss.  Including language under "BLM Planning Process" heading from FLPMA, etc.
Julander Energy		1-1			Another major issue is protection of multiple use of public lands. Multiple use of public lands is an integral part of the custom and culture of Moffat County.	Mention wording in FLPMA under "BLM Planning Process" heading; multiple use a matter of law statements
Wilderness Society	Purpose and Need for the	1-2		3	Add "and citizens" after "local levels of government"	Incorporate

Deleted: ,

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
	RMP revision					
Wilderness Society	General Description of Planning Area...	1-2		40	Add "Browns Park National Wildlife Refuge" after "Dinosaur National Monument"	Change on the west portion to just "Utah State line"
T Wright Dickinson		1-3	Key findings	14	Standards for public land health apply to all uses and users not just grazing. "If they don't then their application to them is major part of revision of LSRMP"	Discussion of 1996 amendment. End sentence at "land health".
Wilderness Society	General Description of Planning Area...	1-3		1; Table 1.1	This table should also include LSFO-managed split-estate minerals (1.1 million acres) as percentage and total acreage by county.	Do not have information broken down by county; will try and obtain information. Information to be incorporated into Chapter 1 of the DEIS.
Wilderness Society	General Description of Planning Area...	1-3		4	Add "wilderness" or "lands with wilderness character" to this paragraph of resources and/or resource uses discussed in the AMS	Keep as is. Do not want to have that as separate section in NEPA documents. Feel would set precedence in NEPA docs.
Wilderness Society	General Description of Planning Area...	1-3		6	Add "resources" after "cultural and heritage"	Incorporate.
Wilderness Society	Key Findings	1-3		31	Replace lines 31-34 with: " <b>Status of Vermillion Basin and Other <del>Public Wilderness Proposals</del></b> , Vermillion Basin has been recognized by <del>the</del> BLM as possessing wilderness character. Concurrently, the area may also be valuable for production of oil and gas resources. BLM has suspended oil and gas leasing decisions pending an RMP review of the existing values. Six other areas, including additions to existing WSAs, have been proposed for wilderness protection by citizens since 1994; management of these areas will also be considered in this planning process."	Change as indicated.

- Deleted: Non-WSA
- Deleted: Character Lands
- Deleted: the public and confirmed through
- Deleted: inventory

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
T Wright Dickinson		1-3	Stautus of vermilion basin	31	Failed to mention that other publics, industries and Moffat county disputes wilderness character in vermilion "Biased paragraph"	Change language as above.
T Wright Dickinson	2.1	2-6	LSRA 89	36	these numbers were never based on carrying capacity or range sustainability	Cannot change language, this is word for word from 1989 ROD.
Wilderness Society	Energy and Minerals	2-14		4	This section (or the appropriate resource section) ought to include descriptions (along with maps) of existing lease stipulations and Conditions of Approval utilized within the LSRA, lease stipulations in place and location of existing leases, and frequency and criteria for waiver and modification of lease stipulations.	Map 23 of AMS shows location of existing leases. Will include an EPCA analysis in Chapter 3 of existing situation.
Moffat County	Chapter 3 general				Moffat County is aware the oil and gas industry and consultants who monitor grazing allotments have submitted respective data on geology I gas potential and vegetation / land health data. Moffat County requests this data be included as pertinent to the AMS. If it is "combined" with other BLM data, we request this clarification in each area of the AMS where combining occurs.	BLM has rereviewed all data submitted by third parties. Vegetation information, land health data, geology, and oil and gas information submitted was already presented in the AMS in the vegetation, geology, and oil and gas sections.
Moffat County	Chapter 3 general				Moffat County requests all known valid existing rights are documented or listed in the AMS. Cooperation with the cooperating agencies can identify most known valid existing rights. We also request maps that document the location of these rights. For example Map 28 currently shows many known transportation mutes but doesn't appear to include the County's Secondary Road System, which includes many RS 2477 rights of way.	Have added language on consideration of valid existing rights in the beginning of Chapter 1. Field manager does not want to go into this much detail on location, etc. of

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
						valid existing rights.
Julander Energy	Chapter 3 general				Incorporate third party information that was provided to your office by the oil and gas industry, the ranching community and others should be incorporated into this document or referenced in the AMS as to where this information is used in the BLM.	BLM has rereviewed all data submitted by third parties. Julander Energy submittal information was determined too broad for AMS; however it will be used in development of the RFD. Information pertaining to the LSFO was already presented in the AMS in the geology and oil and gas sections.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.1.2	3-4		16	This is wrong the stands apply to all users equally and the blm has same mandate to act	BLM modified text with comments. Also, other uses are discussed in the next paragraph.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.2	3-4	Air quality		Left out that fire suppression has created unnaturally clear skies a return to natural ecological functions will bring air quality down but back into the natural range of variation	No response. Not critical to planning process.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.3.1	3-11	Landscape health	20	Should state clearly that not all acres of land are required to meet the standard they are assessed on landscape level basis	Language is adequate as is.
T Wright Dickinson				49	Misleading to say problem areas exist, not every acre can meet the standard, if its working on landscape basis then its meeting the standard	Language is adequate as is.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.4.1	3-17	Water	4	"Paucity" use lay terms so that they can be understood when read don't baffle us with-----	Change "paucity" to "scarcity"
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.5.1	3-18	Ecological provinces	39	Keep it politically neutral if its ideal for wildlife then it's the same for livestock	Language is adequate as is.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
T Wright Dickinson		3-22	Shrub communitis	17	Hedging is the result of Over utilization by wildlife the plants are in danger	Remove "a notable characteristic" sentence.
T Wright Dickinson		3-23	Sage brush basin big	25	Just had to take a swipe at livestock why, "poor livestock management" take it out please	Change to "livestock overgrazing". Core team felt statement is factual.
T Wright Dickinson		3-24	Salt desert shrub	29	Important winter range for livestock as well	Add "and livestock".
T Wright Dickinson					General comments of this section Most if not all of the vegetation health assessment provided by vermilion was not used or reflected in this draft. Was it ignored? These veg types of most class show over maturity little if any note was made of this and its impact on livestock or wildlife carrying capacity. Why was this not reflected in the current condition	No change. BLM used their vegetation health assessment data which Vermillion participated in.
T Wright Dickinson	Table 3-11	3-31			Vermillion disputes the validity of chanelization created by livestock in dry creek and vermilion creek	Dispute noted.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.5.2	3-33	characterization	28 and 29	Now someone is starting to make me mad. the Blm has the responsibility to mange range lands to sustain the livestock industry SEE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT AND PUBLIC RANGE LAND MANAGEMENT ACT AND MULIPE USE AND SUSTAIN YEILD ACT NOT" CUT" THE INDUSTRY OUT OF BUSINESS The BLM has the authority to create a desired plant community and seral stage that fully provide the necessary AUMs	Add "through managing for desired plant communities and/or adjusting"
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.6.1	3-35	Table 3-12	2	?? "recent sharp decline" in sage grouse cdow and moffat working group data show stable to upward trend in a very bad drought	Remove "recent severe population declines" in table.
T Wright Dickinson		3-35		10	There aren't any big horn sheep present	No change. There are big horn sheep in the general planning area.
T Wright Dickinson					General comments of this section if wildlife can be listed as economically important why was grazing not given the same emphasis I hope there is not any basis here	Under Table 3-12, Turkey...remove "economic and" to state "high

Deleted: 4

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
						recreational value".  Waiting until socioeconomic section complete.
T Wright Dickinson		3-38	Terrestrial resources	49	Should say from over utilization by wildlife	No change. Statement neutral.
T Wright Dickinson		3-39		28	Vermillion disputes causal by " possible longer grazing season" prove it this document should not be editorializing which there seems to be through out	No change. Noted.
T Wright Dickinson		3-42		14&24	Raptors presence has increased in the last 10 years they have not been adversely affected by oil and gas or any other activity drought maybe but that was not mention	No change. Information from LHAs.
T Wright Dickinson		3-43		12	See bighorn or lack there of above	Bighorn are within planning area, just not on BLM-administered land.
T Wright Dickinson			elk	14	This paragraph is really of base, elk are found all over Coldspring mtn. the production area is almost exclusively on private and state land then they escape the hunters on the south side during hunting	Update made to limited use areas based on latest CDOW data.
T Wright Dickinson		3-44		11	Strike the editorializing on livestock grazing in spitz allotment try drought instead	No change. Information from LHAs.
T Wright Dickinson				21	Historically there never were elk in dry creek they have only moved in there in the last 8-10 yrs and yes they are over utilizing the brouse	No change. Information from LHAs.
T Wright Dickinson		2-46	Prong horn	33	Strike continuous grazing by cattle that has never happened	No change. Information from LHAs.
T Wright Dickinson		3-49		32	Strongly object to the inference that livestock control is the only management action available to the blm	Included a range of options, livestock control not the only one listed.
Wilderness Society	Current Conditions	3-49		48-49	This sentence, and the species assessment to which it refers, should include data from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and data from the U.S. Geological Survey's GAP Analysis Project. These data indicate that	The BLM Colorado State Director's sensitive species list takes input from

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					there are many other species to which BLM should be giving special attention in the RMP.	other entities into account; therefore we feel these lists are not appropriate for the AMS.
T Wright Dickinson		3-51	fish	17	Yes beaver creek is in good condition but the colo cut throat were reintroduced by the cdow after a die off and are lake cut throat although of aaa strain from nanita lake in rocky mountain natioal park	Change sentence to "Beaver Creek is considered to be in above average condition and has been stocked with Colorado river cutthroat trout."
Rick Hammel		3-51		16-18	<p>There is an error about Beaver Creek on page 3-51, lines 16-18.</p> <p>In 1993, Beaver Creek had a winter fish kill. In 1994 or 5, Jake Bennett, fisheries biologist, restocked Beaver Creek with A+ CRCT fingerlings from the broodstock in Nanita Lake, in Rocky Mountain National Park. These fingerlings of bethnic origins, adapted well to this fluvial environment. The following year, Mr. Bennett added more fingerings to the stream.</p> <p>In 1998, I started a habitat restoration project on private land , neat the headwaters spring on Beaver Creek. This project lasted through 2002. During that time, CDOW did a population inventory. There was young of the year through year 6-7. The largest fish was 14 inches. There were four station suveyed. There were 203 fish per acre, average over the four stations. BlllcElmblad did the work for CDOW.</p> <p>I also did a macroinvertebrate sampleing, that was analysed by Utah State University. This steam had a strong population of almost all macroinvertebrates, particularly scuds and caddis. Missing were stoneflies.</p>	Noted, see change above.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					Of concern, at the lower reaches of Beaver Creek, are brook trout. The BLM must do something to prevent upstream migration of these fish. While they do not hybridize with CRCT, they outcompete them for forage. Also, there has been speculation that brook trout eat CRCT eggs and fingerlings. A migration barrier must be set in place.	
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.7.1	3-53	birds	9	See sage grouse above they are not declining in Moffat county see sage grouse working group data	It is sage grouse stronghold in state.
T Wright Dickinson					You are still trying to pick a fight the 64 data is highly suspect and should not be used. the population levels could in fact be in balance since the historic predator controls that occurred back then are not occurring now. there has not been large scale brush spraying . everything in the last 10 years occurred in cooperation with the cdow The blm lands are in a decadant state with over mature sage brush stands that are drying up riparian areas from lack of fire and impacting brood rearing and roosting habitat	Removed reference to large scale spraying. 1964 data reference correct.
T Wright Dickinson		3-54	Dry creek	9	What heavy "grazing that's" out of line and what "wet meadows" in vermilion the rye grass flood plains have all been created in the last 10 years from proper grazing management and willow reestablish that has been from proper functioning condition	No change. Information from LHAs.
T Wright Dickinson		3-55	Black footed ferrets	4	This paragraph should clearly state the experimental nonessential designation for the ferret reintroduction efforts and area. the the reintroduction plan clearly states there will not be any adverse impact to other land uses by the ferrets.	Incorporated.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.9.1	3-58	fire	46	If you cant prove it why say it " illegal use of fire etc.."	Delete sentence.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.9.2	3-61	characterization	26	Add coldsprings diamond and middle mtn.	Remove "moderate to high areas include" sentence.
Wilderness Society	Characterization: 3.1.12	3-66		1-2	As described in the AMS, wilderness resources exist outside designated WSAs within the Little Snake Resource Area. As such, the AMS should present	Keep as is. Do not want to have that as separate section in

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					"Wilderness Resources" as a separate and distinct set of resources within Chapter 3 Area Profile: Current Resource Condition and Trend.	NEPA documents. Feel would set precedence in NEPA docs.
Wilderness Study Areas	Characterization	3-69		40	Add "two" after "these". The AMS should note impairment status of other non-recommended WSA as well.	Make change. Added status of non-recommended WSAs.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.12.1	3-70	Wilderness characterization	1	Wilderness character not wilderness	Change as noted: <del>Wilderness character</del> can be identified through BLM as a part of managing the public lands or through external nominations by the public. Both methods require the same type of review to determine whether the area has wilderness characteristics. <del>Deleted: Potential w</del> <del>Deleted: and land use planning,</del> <del>Deleted: , and if the area is manageable as wilderness</del>
Wilderness Society	Characterization	3-70		8	Change "citizen's" to "citizens"	Make change.
Wilderness Society	Characterization	3-70		10-11	Replace these two lines with: "In 1994, Colorado conservationists presented to BLM a bound volume entitled " <i>Conservationists' Wilderness Proposal for BLM Lands</i> " that included the compilation of numerous citizen wilderness inventories and the area-by-area justification for the statewide Citizens' Wilderness Proposal (CWP). The 1994 CWP included seven areas within the LSRA: Cold Spring Mountain, Cross Mountain, Diamond Breaks, Dinosaur Adjacent (which includes 6 units, also referred to as Dinosaur Wilderness Additions), Pinyon Ridge, Vermillion Basin and Yampa	Make change.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					River. In 2001, based on new citizen inventories, the CWP was expanded to include new areas found to be eligible for wilderness protection around the state, including adding additional acreage added to the existing CWP areas in the Little Snake Resource Area. Table 3-20 identifies the seven proposed wilderness areas and acreages within the Little Snake Resource Area."	
Wilderness Society	Characterization	3-70		Table 3-20	In the Table, change "Dinosaur Adjacent" to "Dinosaur Adjacent (includes 6 units)".	Make change.
Wilderness Society	Characterization	3-70		14	<p data-bbox="852 440 1451 548">In order to reflect accurately the history of wilderness inventory and citizen proposals in the LSRA, add the following at Line 14, before the existing paragraph starting "In accordance with BLM policy..."</p> <p data-bbox="852 573 1451 1089">"In November 1995, the Colorado BLM issued BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM-CO-96-010) requesting field managers review certain CWP areas to determine if further analysis is needed for wilderness values. In December 1995, BLM Field office response indicates portions of Vermillion may warrant additional wilderness evaluation. In May and June, 1997, respectively, Colorado BLM released policy (IM CO-97-044) to address CWP areas and hold discretionary irreversible or irretrievable actions in temporary abeyance until Wilderness issues raised by the CEC can be resolved through the BLM planning process, and CO policy (IM-CO-97-051) Colorado Wilderness Review Procedures to be used in conjunction with IM-CO-97-044. Pursuant to these policies, BLM began a multi-step process of reviewing six CWP areas on Colorado's western slope. <u>The Little Snake Field Office inventoried the Vermillion Basin and Yampa River CWP areas. The White River Field Office inventoried Pinyon Ridge, which lies within both Field Office boundaries.</u></p> <p data-bbox="852 1114 1451 1192">The BLM found the majority of all three CWP areas in the LSRA to be roadless, but concluded that only Vermillion Basin warranted additional review.</p>	Incorporated as indicated.

**Deleted:** , including three CWP areas within the Little Snake Resource Area (Vermillion Basin, Yampa River, and Pinyon Ridge).

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>Specifically, the BLM concluded that Yampa River was eligible for wilderness consideration, but was already protected well enough in the interim by its Special Recreation Management Area designation. In a contested decision, the <b>White River Field Office</b>, found that Pinyon Ridge was indeed roadless, but concluded that it failed to meet other criteria for wilderness.</p> <p>In June 2001, the Little Snake Field Office released its Final Wilderness Character Inventory for the Vermillion Basin, concluding that 77,067 acres out of 81,028 total inventoried roadless acres in the Vermillion Basin Area have wilderness character, and stated that this finding warranted a Land Use Plan amendment. BLM has suspended oil and gas leasing decisions within the Vermillion Basin pending an RMP review of the existing uses and values. The majority of the Vermillion Basin is currently designated as "Open" to OHV use.</p> <p>In November 2004 and January 2005 during this planning process, the Colorado Wilderness Network re-submitted information to BLM on the seven CWP units within the Planning Area."</p>	
Wilderness Society	Characterization	3-70		23	<p>Add the following descriptions of the citizen-proposed wilderness areas:</p> <p>Description Summaries of CWP Areas and WSA Additions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Cold Spring Mountain</b> – A proposed addition of 54,010 acres to the existing 17,682-acre WSA, Cold Spring Mountain is dominated by Limestone Ridge at the eastern end, which drops into Irish Canyon, providing spectacular geological formations and habitat for an array of wildlife. The expanded boundary would encompass ecologically important areas on Cold Spring Mountain as well as scenic canyon walls and riparian habitat in the upper reaches of Beaver Creek canyon and east of Cold Spring Peak. The additions would create a logical</li> </ol>	<p>Added map of proposed areas.</p> <p>Descriptions of areas are not appropriate as BLM has not determined values in these areas.</p>

Deleted: agency

Deleted: o

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>topographic and ecological boundary. Also, the new boundary acknowledges the changed circumstances of this area, where former deteriorating grazing improvements have now blended into the area, as documented in the CWP submission.</p> <p>b. <b><u>Cross Mountain</u></b> – A proposed addition of 18,027 acres to the existing 14,081-acre WSA, Cross Mountain provides habitat for big game and for endangered fish in a gorge that also provides excellent opportunities for primitive recreation. There is also extensive evidence of prehistoric human occupation. The additions would maintain topographic continuity on the west side of Cross Mountain and extend a logical boundary to encompass the southern end of mountain area.</p> <p>c. <b><u>Diamond Breaks</u></b> – A proposed addition of 42,961 acres to the existing 36,430-acre WSA, Diamond Breaks contains an impressive variety of topography and vegetation, with rugged ridges and peaks covered by pinon juniper broken by open draws and stands of aspen leading ultimately to sagebrush in the valleys. The area also provides critical winter range for deer and elk and habitat for pronghorn and sage grouse. The proposed additions include approximately 1200 acres recommended by BLM for protection in 1991 in order to bring the boundary up to the boundary of the Browns Park National Wildlife Refuge, as well as the south half of Pitt Draw in order to complete the protection given to the north half included in the WSA. A final addition would incorporate a major drainage between Allen and Marshall Draws, which would improve access into Diamond Breaks from the west side.</p>	

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>d. <b>Dinosaur Additions</b> – A proposed addition of 57,207 acres to the existing 23,744-acre WSAs (four total), Dinosaur Additions includes roadless areas that share almost 20 miles of boundary with Dinosaur National Monument, providing habitat for deer, elk, pronghorn and mountain lions. The area also makes up the scenic vistas that are viewed from the national monument. The additions would provide critical buffers to protect and enhance habitat and views.</p> <p>e. <b>Vermillion Basin</b> – Vermillion Basin consists of 86,570 acres that hosts rare plant species and communities, a desert canyon surrounded by delicate badlands, and one of the most spectacular collections of petroglyphs found in the State of Colorado. In its own inventory, completed in 2001, BLM found that most of this area had wilderness character.</p> <p>f. <b>Yampa River</b> – This 12,414-acre area includes a wild stretch of river that provides winter habitat for bald eagles and critical winter range for deer and elk, while also providing numerous opportunities for primitive recreation such as rafting, camping, canoeing and hunting. In its own inventory, completed in 2001, BLM found that the Yampa River CWP area had wilderness character.</p> <p>g. <b>Pinyon Ridge</b> – This area contains 20,853 acres that make up one of the very few undeveloped areas of the lower White River drainage and provide habitat for eagles and other raptors to build nests along ridge outcrops and prey on the extensive prairie dog populations. Larger mammals such as deer, coyotes, and mountain lions also inhabit the forested slopes, creating prime hunting opportunities that are enhanced by</p>	

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					the scenic vistas and rugged access on overgrown ways, which would be properly limited to foot and horse trails. The area is bounded by jeep trails and oil and gas development, although the steep topography effectively shields the proposed area from the impacts of oil and gas development.	
T Wright Dickinson	Wilderness				General comments for this section there is no mention of the very real potential of valid exiting rights of way and of the many multiple uses and man made structures existing in these areas as well as the reems of data submitted by Moffat county refuting the blm reinventory. a full and balanced description should be made here.	Added language relative to Moffat County letter on Vermillion wilderness character inventory.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.12.2	3-71	Table 3-21	1	Better re think rna designation for elk they are in conflict for sustaining rare plant communities	No change, appropriate background information. Could be considered in alternatives development process.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.12.3	3-71	Wild and senic		General comments why do you not mention that most of the lands in question are private and how will the blm address that	Added sentence before last sentence of first paragraph under "Characterization": "During the suitability process, consideration will be given to the amount of private land involved and associated or incompatible uses."
Wilderness Society	Characterization	3-72		27	The AMS should clarify whether the RMP will indeed "...inventory and analyze all intermittent and perennial river segments in the RMPPA..." including, for example,	Text changed to match BLM IM 2004-196 WSR

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>Vermillion Creek, Fourmile Creek and Spring Creek or only at the eight segments on the Yampa River or Little Snake River listed in the chart. (We believe the BLM is obliged to look at all intermittent and perennial river segments throughout the planning area).</p> <p>The AMS should state whether the new RMP will redo the Yampa River eligibility study or just proceed with the suitability study.</p>	Policy for types of streams inventoried.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.13.2	3-75		48	General comments of VRM no mention is made of the adverse impacts to the economic development that vrm designations can have and how will class1 areas respect the limits of their boundaries no coloring outside of the lines please. This should be a balanced characterization as such it is not sentence 47 dose not get it	Impacts to all resources and resource uses will be evaluated as part of the alternatives impact analysis for VRM.
Wilderness Society	Oil and Gas	3-80		1: Footnote 6	We are concerned that the AMS has been prepared prior to completion of the Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for the LSRA. If the RFD indicates resource levels that are significantly different than those reflected in this document, we fully expect BLM to thoroughly incorporate the new information into its assumptions and assessments regarding energy resources in the LSRA.	RFD is in the process of being finalized and will be incorporated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS.
Wilderness Society	Oil and Gas	3-81		4-6	The Energy Policy and Conservation Act Amendments (EPCA) do not direct the Department of Interior to reassess and modify constraints to oil and gas leasing as these lines state. Rather, it is the Vice President's National Energy Policy Development Group that <i>recommended</i> that the Department make such modifications. This is a critical distinction, as it demonstrates that BLM is not mandated by statute to modify existing constraints on energy leasing. Line 4 should read as follows: "...federal lands. The Vice President's National Energy Policy Development Group has recommended that the Department of the Interior reassess and modify any constraints to oil and gas leasing 'where opportunities exist (consistent with the	Language corrected as presented as stated in E.O. 13212.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
Wilderness Society	Oil and Gas: Current Conditions	3-81		16	<p>law, good environmental practice, and balanced use of other resources)'."</p> <p>We are curious why BLM has included this reference to the EPCA Focus Areas that the LSRA includes, but does not make reference in this document to the energy resource data contained in the EPCA Inventory. To the best of our knowledge, the EPCA Inventory is the most recent source of data on energy resources in the LSRA. It seems a substantial oversight that BLM has not made reference to this data, and we fully expect to see EPCA data on the accessible energy resources in the Uinta-Piceance and the Greater Green River Basins reflected in the Draft RMP/EIS (this data is available at <a href="http://www.blm.gov/nhp/spotlight/epca/EPCA_fact_sheet_draft06.htm">http://www.blm.gov/nhp/spotlight/epca/EPCA_fact_sheet_draft06.htm</a>). For example, according to the EPCA Inventory, 94% of all natural gas on federal public lands in the Uinta-Piceance Basin is currently available for leasing. For the Greater Green River Basin, 90% of all natural gas on federal public lands is currently available for leasing.</p> <p>When EPCA data are incorporated into the Draft RMP, estimates of energy resources should distinguish between "technologically recoverable" resources and "economically recoverable" resources.</p>	This information will be included in the RFD and incorporated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS.
Wilderness Society	Oil and Gas: Current Conditions	3-81		29	These data on leasing levels in the LSRA should specify the number of acres that are currently leased. Additionally, they should indicate how many leased acres and individual leases are under production—in raw numbers and as percentages of the total leased acres and numbers of leases.	This information will be included in the RFD and incorporated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS.
Wilderness Society	Coalbed Methane: Current Conditions	3-83		1-2: Footnote 8	As with the lack of a completed RFD, we are concerned that the AMS has been prepared prior to completion of an assessment of coalbed methane (CBM) in the LSRA. Should the forthcoming CBM assessment indicate economically-recoverable resource levels that are significantly different than those projected in this document, we expect BLM to thoroughly incorporate the	RFD is in the process of being finalized and will be incorporated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					new information into its assumptions and assessments regarding CBM in the LSRA.	
Wilderness Society	Coalbed Methane: Characterization	3-84		22-25	We encourage BLM to establish resource development requirements for CBM that provide specific and sufficient protections to preserve availability of water and to safeguard water quality in the LSRA.	Noted.
Wilderness Society	Coal: Characterization	3-85		36	Despite BLM's claims to the contrary, the coal suitability analysis prepared for the 1989 RMP is <b>not</b> sufficient for the current RMP revision. These data are 15 years old, and building a management strategy upon such outdated information is not acceptable. BLM must do a new suitability assessment using current technology.	Noted.
Wilderness Society	Oil Shale: Characterization	3-86		34-36	We are shocked to see that BLM has based its characterization of oil shale resources in the LSRA on a study conducted in 1962. Should the RFD indicate economically-recoverable oil shale resources that are significantly different than those reflected in this document, we fully expect BLM to thoroughly incorporate the new information into its assumptions and assessments regarding oil shale in the LSRA.	Noted. Any new information obtained will be incorporated.
T Wright Dickinson				35	General comments on wind and solar this paragraph should point out that the major areas for development according to the maps are vermilion basin coldsprings and diamond peak and mountain	BLM feels that the map is adequate representation.
Western Watersheds Project	3.1.17	3-90			Pay particular attention to the AUM value. Your draft AMS gives an AUM as 680# for a mature cow, but you ignore the fact that FLPMA defines an AUM as the amount of forage consumed by a mature cow or its equivalent in one month. Recently, Utah BLM in its AMP for the Duck Creek allotment here gave the weight of a mature cow as 1200 pounds. When you figure that the calves on summer range come off at up to 10 months of age, you cannot ignore their forage consumption. If you refer to the attached writeup, you will see that a more accurate value for current cattle weights and including calves at around 400# gives a value of 1000 lbs of forage consumption per month for a cow/calf pair.	BLM calls a cow & her calf an AUM, They are billed this way and not charged by weight. Table 3-27 is what we billed as AUMs.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.17.2	3-92	Livestock grazing	22	Buying aums for wildlife is strictly prohibited under the grazing regs and by TGA these sentences should be dropped	BLM caught sentence and suggested changes.
T Wright Dickinson					General comments for this section Why is no mention made of the significant contribution of grazing to the economic cultural and atheistic of the RMPA. Why are we not give at least equal credit as was give to wildlife. Grazing directly keeps significant portions of private land in the RMPA in OPENSOURCE or are you not cognizant of that. as was stated before TGA PRIA MUSYA say support the industry reference that please. manipulate the resource just as you said you would to provide for wildlife, why is my industry continually short shifted, is there a basis against grazing here because this sure is not a balanced characterization please make these all balanced	Economic, cultural, and aesthetic values of grazing will be addressed in socioeconomic section of Chapter 3 of the DEIS.
Moffat County	3.1.21				<b><i>The following discussion on Valid Existing Rights is authored by Brooks and Associates:</i></b>  Valid existing rights arise on public lands by operation of statute or an act of secretarial discretion. Solicitor's Opinion, 88 Int. Dec. 909 (1981). As such, they are not limited to Moffat County's R.S. 2477 rights-of-way, but may include oil and gas leases, right-of-way authorizations such as utility corridors, pipelines and power lines, valid mining claims, easements, grazing permits and private water rights. See e.g., <i>Hoge v. United States</i> , 35 Fed. Cl. 147 (1996); Solicitor's Opinion, 88 Int. Dec. at 914; Solicitor's Opinion, 86 Int. Dec. 89, 116 (1979); BLM Land Use Planning Manual 1601, ch.06G; 50 Fed. Reg. 31777, 31778 (1985). Valid existing rights are immune from denial or extinguishment by the exercise of secretarial discretion and may be developed to the extent authorized by the issuance of the approval document. They may not be regulated to the point where the regulation unreasonably interferes with enjoyment of the benefit of the right. 88 Int. Dec. at	BLM response to your RS 2477 assertions are documented in letter sent. Information on RS 2477 issues presented in Section 1.3, BLM planning process.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
				914.	<p>One of BLM's key objectives for the Little Snake RMP is to establish an active travel management program with "baseline of data describing the existing transportation routes within the planning area in order to actively manage and gauge travel, access and OHV use within the planning areas for the benefit of the public and the natural resources." Draft Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS), p. 3-103.</p> <p>While the process will "include consideration" of Moffat County's RS 2477 inventory protocol, maintenance protocol and Resolution 2003-05 (January 2003), BLM claims that "[resolution of RS 2477 assertions is a legal issue beyond the scope of this RMP effort." BLM asserts that it will establish management for the transportation system "in accordance with existing policies and guidelines and with existing available information." <i>Id.</i> at 3-105. Existing agency policy, however, requires BLM to recognize and integrate the It. S. 2477 rights-of-way claimed by Moffat County in the planning process.</p> <p>All decisions made in land use plans must be subject to valid existing rights, which include rights-of-way. Land Use Planning Manual 1601, ch.06G. State law is used to determine whether a public right of way has been established, and under Colorado law, acceptance of the R.S. 2477 right of way is determined by use prior to withdrawal from the public domain, not construction. <i>Barker v. Board of County Commissioners of the County of La Plata, Colorado</i>, 49 F. Supp.2d 1203, 1214 (D. Colo. 1999); <i>Wilkenson v. DOI</i>, 634 F. Supp. 1265, 1272 (D. Colo. 1986); <i>Leach v. Manhart</i>, 77 P.2d 652, 653 (Colo. 1938).</p>	

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>Given the record evidence Moffat County has compiled in demonstrating perfected rights-of-way, the BLM must account for the County's claimed R.S. 2477 rights-of-way in the Little Snake RMP. <i>See Sierra Club v. Hodel</i>, 848 F. 2d 1068, 1088 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) (R.S. 2477 rights-of-way are "valid existing rights"). This is not to say that BLM must adjudicate or resolve Moffat County's R.S. 2477 assertions; rather, BLM must identify and recognize the claimed rights-of-way in developing comprehensive travel management.</p> <p>Otherwise, BLM's objective to "actively manage and <i>gauge</i> travel, access and OHV use" cannot be achieved. Without the recognition of county roads, for example, how else could BLM determine what roads and trails should be designated and added to the official road system, or what roads and trails should be maintained, upgraded, abandoned, or constructed. Preparation Plan Analysis for the Little Snake Field Office RMP Revision, p. 20.</p> <p>Recognition of Moffat County's claimed <i>R.S. 2477</i> rights-of-way is entirely consistent with BLM travel management policy which recognizes that "most existing roads and trails on public lands were created by use over time, rather than planned and constructed for specific activities or needs." As a result, "BLM is directed to consider a broader range of possibilities for <i>management</i> of individual roads and trails" in the land use planning process. BLM Instruction Memorandum No. 2004-005, <i>Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the BLM Land Use Planning Process</i>, Attachment 2-3 (October 1, 2003).</p> <p>In this context, "Road and trail access (and OHV management) guidance will be incorporated in every RMP to ensure public and resource needs are met." Thus, BLM must "use road and trail inventory information from all available sources including counties</p>	

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>in identifying a transportation network. <i>Id.</i> at 1, Attachment 2-3. In Colorado, such transportation planning specifically includes the consideration "all valid, existing rights including RS 2477." Response to Public Comment to the Recreation Management Guidelines to Meet Public Land Health Standards on BLM Lands in Colorado, p.9. (December 11, 2000).</p> <p>Consequently, Moffat County believes that BLM must incorporate the identified R.S. 2477 rights-of way in the development of comprehensive travel management for the Little Snake Resource Area. To ignore such claims not only contradicts BLM policy but contravenes federal law requiring BLM to assure that its land use plans are consistent with local plans, to the extent they conform to federal law. 43 U.S.C. §1712(c)(9).</p> <p>In this regard, the congressional moratorium pertaining to the recognition, management or validity of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way is limited to rule or regulation, and does not prohibit BLM from addressing public road issues in the planning process. Moreover, as previously stated, the record developed by Moffat County is based on and consistent with federal law, including Colorado federal case law regarding roads across federal land. To the extent Moffat County's claims may be inconsistent with Secretary Babbitt's 1997 R.S. 2477 direction, it is merely policy, not law.</p>	
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.21	3-103	Transportation and access	47	Need to mention the need to address other valid existing rights such as roads, trails, ditches etc..	BLM feels valid existing rights have been adequately addressed.
T Wright Dickinson	3.1.21.2	3-105	access	33	This issue is not beyond the scope of this RMP FLPMA requires the BLM to address all new information which Moffat has provide the BLM must address the impacts such rights of ways would have on Managing the RMPA	BLM response to your RS 2477 assertions are document in letter sent to Moffat

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
Moffat County	Socioeconomic	3-107			Moffat County requests that the 2004 Economic Development Report (completed by Colorado State University), the 2005-2006 Community Indicators Project, and the regular Northwest Colorado Economic Reviews from the Associated Governments of Northwest Colorado be incorporated in the Socio Economic section of the AMS. We see it vital that cooperating agencies and NWCOS guide additional analysis than is typically performed in traditional RMP' s. We request the BLM and its contractors fully engage NWCOS and the Cooperating Agencies in supplementing the traditional types and extent of socio economic analysis performed in RMP's after the immediate data has been included in the AMS.	County. These will be included in the socioeconomic section of Chapter 3.
Julander Energy	Socioeconomic				We recognize your comment that the socio-economic section was not complete. We ask the BLM with the cooperation of NWCOS to conduct a thorough socio-economic study to incorporate into this document Several documents have already been completed and we ask for more analysis. We request that the 2005-2006 Community Indicators Project, the 2004 Economic Development Report, the Northwest Colorado Economic Reviews from the Associated Governments of Northwest Colorado be analyzed and incorporated into the AMS. In the economic section we would request an evaluation of the effect that increased oil and gas production would have on direct local employment, the tax base from royalties redistributed to Moffat County, and the increase in property tax revenues.	These will be included in the socioeconomic section of Chapter 3.
T Wright Dickinson	Chapter 4	4-1	adequacy	18	Standards apply to all users equally	The Standards and Guidelines provide the management direction for soil, vegetation, water, <del>jivestock, and other</del> resources within the Little Snake Resource

Deleted: primary

Deleted: and

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
						Management Plan Area (RMPPA).
T Wright Dickinson	4.1.4	4-5		2	Don't forget the valid existing rights of ways their impact to the WSAs must be analyzed	BLM response to your RS 2477 assertions are documented in letter sent to Moffat County
Wilderness Society		4-5		47	As described above for Chapter 3, the AMS should present in a separate section in Chapter 4 (Management Adequacy and Opportunities) entitled "Wilderness Resources Management" as wilderness resources exist outside designated WSAs within the LSRA.	Keep as is. Do not want to have that as separate section in NEPA documents. Feel would set precedence in NEPA docs.
Wilderness Society		4-6		20	The AMS should include the history of the Yampa River eligibility finding, and any other eligibility determinations that have been completed for the Yampa River, or for any other streams, since 1989.	Addressed in Chapter 3 of DEIS.
Wilderness Society		4-6		31-33	BLM's objectives for energy and minerals include "environmentally-sound" exploration, and we believe there is room for improvement in the LSRA in this regard. For this reason, the second sentence on Line 31 should read, "However, the RMP revision process should serve to resolve resource conflict and management inconsistencies and incorporate best management practices and best available technology in minerals development."	Make change.
Wilderness Society		4-6		41	Add "Opportunities for limiting resource conflicts between energy development and other multiple uses and management concerns might be accomplished through BMPs and strict, limited criteria for waiver, exception, and modification of lease stipulations."  This section should also specifically describe the types of stipulations available and should include stipulations	Not necessary, all options will be considered. Discussion of stipulations will be included in RFD.

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					developed since the 1991 Record of Decision that reflect advances in scientific knowledge and technology.	
Julander Energy		4-6			Page 4-6 under heading Energy and Mineral management it should be recognized that the demand for natural gas continues to grow significantly and we need to resolve issues in order to increase the supply.	BLM will recognize demand for natural gas in socioeconomic section of Chapter 3
Wilderness Society		4-6		44-46	The first sentence of this bullet-point should read: "The administrative withdrawal of the Vermillion Basin Wilderness Study Area (80,000 acres) or other non-WSA citizen-proposed wilderness areas could preclude energy related activities within these areas."	This bullet relates to existing administrative withdrawal on Vermillion. Other areas have not been withdrawn.
T Wright Dickinson	4.1.5	4-6	ACECs	16	Balance this sentence acec's may not be needed	As part of the RMP revision process, the current ACECs will be evaluated to determine maintenance of relevant and important values and whether ACEC designation is still necessary to protect values.
T Wright Dickinson				22	Add bullet full grazing preference AUMs will be Maintained And grazing supported and enhanced as a vital diversity component of BLM's multiple use mandate	BLM cannot guarantee full grazing preference.
Julander Energy	Chapter 5				All local plans should be included in the AMS, including when completed the sage grouse management plan	Which plans were missed? Relative to the sage grouse management plan, it will be included in Chapter 3 of the DEIS.
Moffat County	Chapter 5				a) Although the AMS highlights the Moffat County Master Plan, the Moffat County Land Use Plan is not included in its entirety in the Mofftt County Master Plan. The Master	Included Land Use Plan as separate summary item.

Deleted: Will not include in it's entirety.¶

NAME	SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	COMMENT	Review/Response
					<p>Plan simply highlights portions of the Land Use Plan. The Land Use Plan (Chapter 1 : Public Lands) is not referenced or <i>highlighted</i> and we request it be highlighted. TheMoffat County Land Use Plan, in its entirety, can be found at <a href="http://www.co.moffat.co.us/NaturalResources">www.co.moffat.co.us/NaturalResources</a>.</p> <p>On the same website are the three phases of the Moffat County Wildland Fire and Fuel Management Plan and four community specific Pre-Emergency Plans and Fuel Reduction Plans. All three phases have different authors and firms that prepared them, and a fourth author and firm prepared the Pre-Emergency Plans for Bakers Peak, Knez Divide, Wilderness Ranch, and Greystone. We request the referenced authors be corrected and request each plan be incorporated into Tabel 5-1.</p> <p>Moffat County requests you incorporate the 1991 Undesirable Plant Management Plan which can be obtained by contacting Gary Brannon or Jackie Goodnow at (970)824-9180. Or may be picked up at 539 Barclay Street, Craig CO 81625 (the Moffat County Extension Office).</p>	<p>Did not receive 1991 Undesirable Plant Management Plan from BLM.</p>
T Wright Dickinson		6-5	MOUs	45	You have a MOU with Moffat County too	Inserted "MOU with Moffat County concerning weed management dated 1994."