BLM Responses to Public Comments

INDIVIDUALS

Table of Contents

A 2
Anderson 4
Armstrong 5
Bagdovitz 6
Bakker 7
Barlow-Irick 8
Bell 9
Bell/Fowler 21
Blackwelder 23
Boeger 24
Bryant 38
Burns 39
Capozzelli 40
Cooper 41
Crews 47
Crone 48
Crowder 49
Curtis 50
DeCarlo 51
Devlin 54
Dufurrena 56
Echeverria 59
Eckert 60
Fall 61
Fernandez 62
Francesconi 64
Frye 66
Gehrig 68
Gelb 70
Gervacio 71
Goodge 72
Gregg 73
Gunther 76
Harders 77
Hardin 78
Hawthorne 79
Hayden 80
Hill, B. 85
Hill, G. 87
Horn 88
Houston 91
Hummel 92
Jackson, A. 94
Jackson, S. 95
Jefferson 97
Jensen 104
Johnson & Pascoe 105
Jones 107
Kilby 108
Kudrna 109
Lacaillade 111
Laravie 112
Little 115
Luke, B. 117
Luke, L. 119
Lynn (Sept. 24, 2010) 120
Lynn (Oct. 19, 2010) 123
MacDonald 127
Martaw 144
Martin 148
McGraw 149
McMaster 150
Melby 151
Moore 159
Morgan 160
Munn 163
Nappe 164
Novotny 167
Nylen 168
Oster 169
Page 171
Perry-Jones et al 172
Peterson 174
Rudnicki 175
Salerno 181
Smith 182
Solis 183
Sparky 185
Spotts 187
Stammers 189
Stripe 193
T 194
Teixeira 196
Trout 197
Van Slyke 198
Vanderstad 200
Weymouth 201
Wicart 202
Wilson, J. 203
Wilson, S. 204
Wong 205
Yates 206

I-A

Comments

Responses

Bureau of Land Management **Winnemucca District RMP/EIS**

For the BLM to formally consider your comments regarding the Draft Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMP/EIS), written comments are required. To assure consideration you should provide your comments ***by September 25, 2010***. Please fax this completed form to (775) 623-1503 or mail it to the following address:

Winnemucca District RMP Comments
c/o Bob Edwards
Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445

You may e-mail comments to wdrmp@blm.gov or complete an online comment form at http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html. **In order to continue receiving information and future mailings about the Winnemucca District RMP, you must ask to be added to the official RMP mailing list by submitting this form by September 25, 2010.**

* Denotes required fields.

Your Name* [redacted] Today's Date* 09-21-2010

Please indicate your affiliation by checking one of the following boxes:

☑ Private Individual (no affiliation)

Confidentiality Request:

Please indicate if you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. This request does not preclude the need to complete the required information below.

A request for confidentiality will be honored to the extent allowed by law. Anonymity is not allowable for submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses.

No selection indicates you do not wish to withhold your information.

☐ Please withhold my name only. ☐ Please withhold my address only.

☑ Please withhold my name and address.

☐ Private Industry ☐ Citizen's Group

☐ Elected Representative ☐ Federal, state, tribal, or local government

☐ Regulatory Agency

Name of company, group, government, agency or organization (if applicable)

Mailing Address* [redacted]

City* [redacted] State* [redacted] Zip Code [redacted]

Telephone (optional) E-mail Address (optional)

Would you like to be added to or remain on the WDO RMP/EIS mailing list to receive future project-related information?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Continued on next page >>>

I-A

Comments

Please mark the appropriate category and write your comments in the space provided below. Feel free to attach additional pages if necessary.

- ☐ Access/Transportation
- ☐ Energy (Wind, Geothermal, Solar, etc.)
- ☐ Fire Management
- ☐ Historic, Cultural & Paleontologic Resources / Traditional Values
- ☐ Land Tenure (Retention/Acquisition/Disposal)
- ☑ Livestock Grazing
- ☐ Minerals (Hardrock, Oil & Gas)
- ☐ Planning/RMP Process
- ☐ Soil / Water / Air / Visual Resources
- ☐ Recreation/OHV (Hunting, Fishing, Hiking, Biking, etc.)
- ☐ Social/Economic Concerns
- ☐ Vegetation/Noxious Weeds
- ☐ Wild Horses & Burros
- ☐ Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas & Other Special Designations
- ☐ Wildlife/Sensitive Species
- ☐ Other Concerns (please define)

I-A-1

I'm writing to voice my concern regarding cattle grazing within the Humboldt River Ranch. I am a property owner in the HRR. There are numerous health concerns, monetary impacts and other consequences of allowing livestock grazing in a residential area with paved roads. It is my understanding that one of the alternatives in the Draft of the BLM RMP Action D-LG 1.3 would successfully assist in achieving the goal of eliminating cattle grazing with the HRR subdivision. I'm in support of any action that the BLM can assist with in regards to the removal of cattle grazing at HRR. Thank you kindly.

As indicated above, please withhold my name and address from public review or disclosure.

Public comments submitted for this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the Winnemucca District Office 5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd, Winnemucca, NV 89445, during regular business hours (8:00 AM to 4:00 PM), Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently in your written comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. Anonymity is not allowable for submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses.

Responses

I-A-1:
Comment noted.

I-Andersen

Comments

Responses

Mike Andersen
<mandersenwinn@business.nv.gov>
09/29/2010 09:53 AM

To "wdrmp@blm.gov" <wdrmp@blm.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject RMP

Dear Sir

I have read your proposals for RMP. It appears to me that you had the opportunity to do this right, either politics or special interest groups has apparently prevented this. As a handicapped person who has spent most of my life hunting, camping, fishing, mining, and just enjoying public lands. My biggest concern is where it appears that C and D will limit my ability to enjoy our public lands, it appears that these two options will close or could close some access road to me. I am no longer 20 and I have lost a leg so I can not walk 20 mile to see some areas that I have enjoyed over the years. I believe you would be violating my constitutional rights when you exclude me from enjoy my public lands. I need the existing roads to do this. If you do this you will be discriminating against all handicap people. I am still young enough to enjoy getting out in the country, but because of my disability can not walk as far as I use too. I do not believe you can legally limit my ability to enjoy public land, which I am supposedly part owner. Every day I see where businesses and government must make public areas handicap accessible, I do not see where you are any different from them, so by closing existing roads you are limiting handicap access to these areas.

I would have pick option A with the way you have written it. Here is why I made this decision. I took a hard look at your preferred plan which is option D. While I had some problem with you limiting 95% of travel to designated routes I maybe able to live with that, but what concerns me about this plan is the possibility you may limit designated routes, or close roads, that I need as a disabled American to enjoy our public lands. I see no mention of how many roads could possibly be closed. I enjoy hunting and because of the fact that I lost a leg, I use and need designed routes when hunting. I am also concerned about the 95% travel restriction to designated routes, as disabled American it is harder for me to recover my animals when hunting. When I do travel off road to recover an animal I try to limit it as much as possible. This plan also has to much disposable Land.

I also look hard at option C. This is the most discriminatory option of them all. It limits or complete stop me from enjoy many of the place I have enjoyed over the years. It also has the biggest impact on our rural economy. There was no way I could agree to this plan.

I look at option B while I like most of this option. As a hunter I did have one problem that it did not allow elk in this area.

In conclusion I have to choose option A. If you had combined A, B, and D options it would have been better, but you have limited things in strange way. What you should consider is taking B and allow elk in this area, do not close any existing routes, and lower the disposable land. That would be a plan I could choose.

Sincerely
Michael Andersen

I-Armstrong

Comments

Lynnett Armstrong <lynnett1945@gmail.com>

10/22/2010 08:08 AM

To "nvsoweb@nv.blm.gov" <nvsoweb@nv.blm.gov>
cc
Subject Winnemucca District RMP

I-Armstrong-1 I am a former 16-year resident of Sparks, Nevada, and a wild horse lover. I am concerned about the adequacy of the above mentioned RMP. It seems the RMP still would utilize mass wild horse roundups and removals. This flies in the face of logic because of the current huge stockpile. Why would cattle still be allowed to graze on designated wild horse and burro areas. Why are dangerous human activities still allowed. It seems the RMP is stacked AGAINST and horses and burros and is not being initiated FOR the their wellbeing. Is this another instance of a turn in government activities that most citizens do not support?

Sincerely,

Lynnett Armstrong
66 Noses Creek Road
Marietta, GA 30064

Responses

I-Armstrong-1:The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock management, up to and including elimination of livestock grazing.

I-Bagdovitz

Comments

Elizabeth Bagdovitz
<ebegdovitz@yahoo.com>
10/22/2010 12:47 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Winnemucca RMP, Edwards

Dear Mr. Edwards:

I-Bagdovitz-1 I'm writing to ask you to protect wild horses and burros in Nevada's Winnemucca District. None of the alternatives described in the proposed Winnemucca RMP adequately protect and preserve wild horses and burros.

The RMP does not change the BLM's reliance on cruel mass wild horse roundups and removals to restrict wild horse populations, especially in light of the fact that it's done to allow more federally-subsidized cattle grazing on public lands. These fiscally irresponsible to taxpayers and inhumane to animals.

If necessary, roundups must be conducted with respect for the social integrity of wild horse herds keeping family bands intact during relocation. The "zeroing out" of Herd Management Areas (removing all horses and permanently closing the land to wild horses) should be prohibited.

For all of the above stated reasons, I respectfully submit this comment and urge the BLM to adopt a responsible RMP for the Winnemucca District that protects and preserves America's wild horse and burro populations. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bagdovitz

Responses

I-Bagdovitz-1:
The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock grazing, up to and including elimination of livestock grazing.

I-Bakker

Comments

USDI, Bureau of Land Management — Winnemucca District EIS/RMP

For the BLM to formally consider your concerns during development of alternatives for the Resource Management Plan (RMP), written comments are required. To assure consideration you should provide your comments ***by September 25, 2010.***

Please fax your completed form to (775) 623-1503 or mail it to the address on the opposite side. You may also e-mail comments to wfoweb@nv.blm.gov, or complete an online comment form at www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp/getting_involved.html

In order to continue receiving information and future mailings about the WD RMP, you must ask to be added to the official RMP mailing list by submitting this form by *September 25, 2010.*

Public comments submitted for this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the Winnemucca District Office, 5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd., Winnemucca, NV 89445, during regular business hours (7:30 AM to 4:30 PM), Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently in your written comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. Anonymity is not allowable for submissions from organizations or businesses or from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses.

Your Name Glenn Bakker Today's Date 7-27-10

Please indicate your affiliation by checking **one** of the following boxes:

- ☒ Individual (no affiliation)
- ☐ Federal, State, Tribal, Local Government
- ☐ Elected Representative
- ☐ Private Organization
- ☐ Citizen's Group
- ☐ Regulatory Agency

Name of organization, government, group, or agency (if applicable) _____

Mailing Address 7405 S. Meridian Rd/Lovelock NV 89419

City/State/Zip _____

Telephone (optional) 775-273-7101 E-Mail Address (optional) _____

Would you like to be added to or remain on the WDO RMP/EIS mailing list to receive future project-related information? Yes ☒ No ☐

Please mark the appropriate category below and write your comments on the lines provided. Feel free to attach additional pages if necessary. (Note: Total mail piece must not exceed 1 ounce to use Business Reply Mail.)

- ☐ Access/Transportation
- ☐ Energy (Wind, Geothermal, Solar, etc.)
- ☐ Fire Management
- ☐ Historic, Cultural, and Paleontologic Resources/Traditional Values
- ☐ Land Tenure (Retention/Acquisition/Disposal)
- ☐ Livestock Grazing
- ☐ Minerals (Hardrock, Oil and Gas)
- ☐ Planning/RMP Process
- ☐ Soil/Water/Air/Visual Resources
- ☒ Recreation/OHV (Hunting, Fishing, Hiking, Biking, etc.)
- ☐ Social/Economic Concerns
- ☒ Vegetation/Noxious Weeds
- ☐ Wild Horses and Burros
- ☐ Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas and Other Special Designations
- ☐ Wildlife/Sensitive Species
- ☐ Other Concerns (*please define*)

1) What is the benefit of closing roads that hunters use as access?

I-Bakker-1 2) There is NO benefit to working-ie. discing Burned land prior to reseeding & rehabilitation

I-Bakker-2 Disturbing Nevada Silt only propagates tumble weed and alkali weed - please contact me.

Responses

I-Bakker-1: BLM has proposed few OHV closed Areas. Action R 10.1

I-Bakker-2: Implementation of emergency stabilization and rehabilitation treatments post fire are determined on a case by case basis subject to objectives established in Emergency Stabilization or Burned Area Rehabilitation plans.—See Objective VR-3. Seeding areas burned would not occur in areas having good potential for natural recovery. See D-VR 5.1.

Comments

I-Barlow-Irick

Patricia Barlow-Irick
<barlowirick@gmail.com>
10/24/2010 08:40 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on the Winnemucca RMP

I-Barlow-Irick - 1

Please include in your plan provisions for adequate numbers of wild horses and burros on the HMAs to maintain genetic viability of the herds. To remove horses down to very small numbers destroys the genetic structure of the populations.

Your online comment form did not work. When I tried to submit, it said there was no such page.
--
Patricia

Patricia Barlow-Irick Ph.D.
PO Box 620
Blanco, NM 87412
505-419-2575 cell
physical address: 2455 Co. Rd. 2455, Lyebrook, NM

Responses

I-Barlow-Irick- 1:
Current AMLs and population estimates are listed in Chapter 3.

I-Bell

Comments

John and Jhona Bell
P.O. Box 8
Paradise Valley, Nevada 89426

September 16, 2010

Bureau of Land Management
Received
SEP 16 2010
Field Office
Winnemucca Nevada

Winnemucca RMP
c/o Bob Edwards
USDI, BLM
5100 East Winnemucca Boulevard
Winnemucca, NV 89445

Gene Seidlitz, Field Manager
Winnemucca Field Office
USDI, BLM
5100 East Winnemucca Boulevard
Winnemucca, NV 89445

RE: Comments to Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft EIS (DRMP/DEIS).

Dear Mr. Edwards and Mr. Seidlitz:

We are grazing permittees within the Mullinix, Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments[1]. We are also permittees within a portion of the Ryepatch Grazing Allotment. All of these grazing allotments lie within the Winnemucca Grazing District, Nevada, and are administered by the Winnemucca Field Office (WFO) of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Relative to the Ryepatch Allotment, we have been, and continue to be, Permitted and licensed to use the area recognized on our licenses as the "East Ryepatch Allotment", i.e., that area of the Ryepatch Allotment east of the Humboldt River (including east of Ryepatch Reservoir). We will therefore refer throughout these comments to our area of use within the Ryepatch Allotment as the "East Ryepatch Allotment".

We provide the following general and specific comments to the DRMP/DEIS:

I-Bell-1

COMMENT 1: The DRMP/DEIS does not propose and analyze a reasonable range of alternatives relative to livestock forage allocation and apportionment within the Field Office in general, and specifically as it pertains to the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments.

Although the DRMP/DEIS purports to contain five alternatives, it actually proposes and analyzes only two alternatives, i.e., the status quo grazing authorization levels (Alternatives A, B, C1 and

[1] We are also, based upon a lease of base property, permittees within the Martin Creek Allotment.

Responses

I-Bell-I:
Specific allotment AUM allocation decisions are addressed at the site specific or allotment level.

I-Bell

Comments

C2) and the elimination of grazing in some areas (Alternative D) with concurrent reduction in livestock AUM allocation and authorization. (See DRMP/DEIS p. 2-121 hard copy version – note the 508-compliant electronic version may have different pagination).

To the extent that ongoing and past "monitoring data, field observations, ecological site inventory or other data" show additional *perennial-species* forage exists on a sustained yield basis within the planning area and/or individual allotments, the DRMP/DEIS is remiss in not analyzing that information and proposing within the DRMP/DEIS to increase forage (AUM) allocation to livestock.

I-Bell-2: Specifically as it pertains to the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments, we are informed that BLM collected "production" data within portions of the allotments in 2009. BLM-collected data and other information demonstrate that additional perennial-species forage may be available on a sustained yield basis within the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments[2].

The 2009 data, and other information made available to us, inform us that:

1. BLM apportions perennial forage on the basis of both production and desirability to livestock. BLM does not apportion (or has not apportioned in the past, to our knowledge) annual forages such as Cheatgrass, Russian thistle, Halogeton, and Filaree. BLM normally apportions no more than a maximum of 50% of the desirable perennial forage production to livestock.

2. The perennial forages within the Humboldt House and Prince Royal Allotments that are consumed by cattle include Sandberg bluegrass, Bottlebrush squirreltail, Shadscale, Bud sage, and Globemallow. See BLM maps and production data sheets, attached to these comments as **EXHIBIT 1**.

3. Within the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments, BLM's 2009 production data show that these perennial forage species produced (244 + 907 =) 1151 AUMs of forage. The active preference for the permittees within those allotments are (153 + 509 =) 662 AUMs. See summary, attached to these comments as **EXHIBIT 2**.

4. Exhibit 2 demonstrates that there exists an apparent "excess" of apportionable forage within the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments, of (1151 – 662 =) 489 AUMs.

I-Bell-3: We respectfully request that the RMP/FEIS decide and analyze the allocation and apportionment of such forage to us and to others who are permitted within those allotments as required by BLM regulations at 43 CFR 4110.3-1. These regulations provide, relative to forage available on a sustained yield basis, the following:

[2] To the extent monitoring data, field observations, ecological site inventory, or other data exist within the records and files of the BLM which demonstrate additional sustained-yield forage availability within the Mullinix and Martin Creek Allotment, we respectfully request allocation and apportionment of that forage to livestock use in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.3-1.

Responses

I-Bell-2:
Specific allotment AUM allocation decisions are addressed at the site specific or allotment level. See D-LG 1.3.

Exhibits 1 and 2 were reviewed and considered by BLM; however, they are not included in this Appendix. These documents are viewable from the link provided for the final EIS and appendices on the Winnemucca RMP website at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html.

I-Bell-3:
Specific allotment AUM allocation decisions are addressed at the site specific or allotment level. See D-LG 1.3.

I-Bell

Comments

"(b) *Additional forage available on a sustained yield basis.* When the authorized officer determines that additional forage is available for livestock use on a sustained yield basis, he will apportion it in the following manner:

(1) First, to remove all or a part of the suspension of preference of permittees or lessees with permits or leases in the allotment where the forage is available; and

(2) Second, if additional forage remains after ending all suspensions, the authorized officer will consult, cooperate, and coordinate with the affected permittees or lessees, the state having lands or responsibility for managing resources within the area, the interested public, and apportion it in the following order:

(i) Permittees or lessees in proportion to their contribution to stewardship efforts that result in increased forage production;

(ii) Permittees or lessees in proportion to the amount of their grazing preference; and

(iii) Other qualified applicants under §4130.1–2.

[71 FR 39504, July 12, 2006]"

(Source: Electronic Code of Federal Regulations, current as of September 9, 2010).

I-Bell-4 Further, to the extent that ongoing or past monitoring data, field observations, ecological site inventory or other data has shown *annual-species* forage to be available on a sustained yield basis relative to all of our livestock grazing allotments, the DRMP/DEIS is remiss in not assessing an alternative to allocating and apportion that additional forage (AUMs) to livestock use, and we request that the RMP/FEIS do so.

COMMENT 2: The DRMP/DEIS "Staff Proposed Alternative" to close portions of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotments to livestock grazing is neither reasonable nor rational.

I-Bell-5 The DRMP/DEIS proposes under the "Staff Proposed Alternative"[3] to close to cattle grazing portions of the Humboldt House Allotment and portions of the East Ryepatch Allotment. We could not find in the voluminous DRMP/DEIS any stated rational basis for the "Staff Proposed Alternative" regarding this specific portion of the Field Office. However, in conversations with BLM, we have been informed of two reasons for such staff proposed alternative:

[3] DRMP/DEIS p. 2-122 (hard copy version – note the 508-compliant electronic version may have different pagination)

Responses

I-Bell-4:
Annual forage is by its nature subject to wide variations in its availability, and can not be assessed as a sustained yield forage.

I-Bell-5:
BLM developed a reasonable range of alternatives that considered areas closed to livestock grazing. Action D-LG 1.3 does not close off Humboldt House and East Rye Patch allotments.

I-Bell

Comments

Responses

I-Bell-5
Cont-d

1) Regarding the portion of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotment west of I-80, between the Right-of-Way fence and the railroad fence (i.e. within Humboldt House Allotment, portions of Sections 16, 20, 28, and 32, Township 31North, Range 33 East, and within Ryepatch Allotment, portions of Section 4 and 8, Township 30 North, Range 33 East), we have been informed that the rationale for the "Staff Proposed Alternative" is that the area has no livestock water and that the area is difficult for BLM to manage and monitor;

2) Regarding the portion of the East Ryepatch Allotment east of the I-80 ROW fence (i.e. all or portions of Sections 2, 4, 10, 14, 16, 23, 26, 34, and 35, T30N, R33E), we have been informed that the rationale is complaints of livestock access to private lands from some individual owners, and from the Board of Directors, of the Humboldt River Ranch Association (HRRA), a development of 2,144 lots, but with only approximately 67 homes actually built.

We contend that these reasons do not warrant the staff-proposed closure of portions of the Humboldt House and East Humboldt Allotment, for at least the following reasons:

A. The portion of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotment west of I-80, between the Right-of-Way fence and the railroad fence should not be closed to cattle grazing, because the area has sufficient water and forage, and because this area's access to manage and monitor do not warrant such closure:

Regarding a perceived (by BLM) lack of livestock water, this is not a rational basis to close the subject portions of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotments. As we have personally discussed with our Rangeland Management Specialist and with Mr. Seidlitz, the perceived lack of water is an erroneous perception. There exists within this portion of the Humboldt House Allotment a pipeline and trough which supply livestock water. Further, we have, and can continue to, haul water to the subject portion of the East Ryepatch Allotment. Additionally, there exists an underpass on the Humboldt House portion that could, even if we didn't have livestock water available west of the freeway, be left open to allow access between the eastern and western portions of the allotment. Finally, we traditionally put a portion the cattle on this west side, close the underpass fences, and open the gates between the two allotments (on the west side) and use the area for a short period (about a month) in the spring. Because this is a relatively small area as compared to the larger portions of the allotments, it affords us better opportunity to concentrate bulls with the cows, and results in improved breeding. Therefore, what the "Staff Proposed Alternative" proposes to close due to lack of livestock water is actually a fundamental and vital part of our ongoing livestock operation.

Regarding difficulty of management and monitoring, this is not a rational basis to close the subject portions of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotments to livestock grazing. "Accessibility" for administration and monitoring is not a rational basis for closing this area to livestock grazing, even if it were not accessible. However, the area is very accessible – it is immediately adjacent to I-80, and is readily viewed for livestock compliance monitoring. It is also accessible for the purpose of conducting rangeland monitoring, via a combination of freeway shoulder or ditch parking, frontage roads, fenceline roads, and other roads and trails. In

I-Bell

Comments

Responses

I-Bell-5 Cont-d

fact, it is superior in access to many BLM-administered lands that are not being proposed in the DRMP/DEIS for closure to livestock grazing.

However, to the extent that BLM concludes that accessibility of the land for public uses is limiting and to the extent that BLM concludes that manageability (difficulty or cost of administration) is limiting, we hereby nominate for disposal by the United States the public sections of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotments that lie west of I-80. We wish to purchase such lands, and they should be made available for purchase under the provisions of the 1999 Lands Amendment of the Paradise-Denio and Sonoma-Gerlach Management Framework Plan, and in conformance with Action CA-LR2.2 as stated at page 2-23 (hardcopy version) of the DRMP/DEIS.

BLM should note that these western portions of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotments have not been the subject of home-owner complaints, discussed under Reason "B", below.

B. The portion of the East Ryepatch Allotment east of I-80 should not be closed to cattle grazing, because the complaints of livestock access to private lands from some individual owners and from the Board of Directors of the Humboldt River Ranch Association (HRRA) are unwarranted, for the following reasons:

1. The Taylor Grazing Act mandates that BLM safeguard our grazing interests. Our grazing interests lie, in part, within the East Ryepatch Allotment. The HRRA was created within the boundaries of the East Ryepatch Allotment, amongst ongoing livestock authorization and use.

2. Nevada is an "open range" and "fence-out" state, meaning that State law requires private landowners to fence their private land if they do not wish to have another's livestock access their property.

3. HRRA sub-development was approved by the Pershing Board of County Commissioners (PBCC), without the PBCC requiring the developer to construct a boundary fence to exclude livestock or to enclose the sub-development. The reason "why" the PBCC did not require the fencing of the perimeter of the sub-development, at that time or any time subsequent, as is now known to us as a result of meetings with PBCC, was that the developer represented to the PBCC that there was no conflict between the development and the permitted livestock grazing (Roger Mancebo, Chairman, various dates in 2010, at Pershing Board of County Commissioners meetings).

4. Notwithstanding the recognized compatibility, the developer of HRRA nevertheless fully informed each purchaser of property that the property was/is in an area of active livestock grazing, and fully informed each purchaser of his/her individual obligation to fence livestock out of their parcel(s). Land purchasers are aware of the status of the open range, and the fact that ranching occurs on the property. In fact, the developer's website humboldtriverranch.com (expired when checked on 9/4/2010) had advertised the fact that "**there is an honest to goodness working ranch on the property.**" Many, if not most,

I-Bell

Comments

purchasers have purchased land in the sub-development because of that attraction. HRRA's website (humboldtriverranchassociation.com) continues to advertise itself as a "**private ranch community**" (website homepage statement as of 9/4/2010), and allows its owner/members to keep horses, cattle, rabbits, sheep, goats, chickens and other ranch animals.

5. Each of the original HRRA purchasers signed a contract which included documents acknowledging the open range situation, and his/her obligation to fence out his/her parcel if he/she did not desire livestock or other animals to enter their property. Further, realtors and their agents are also required to make such disclosure, and we have no reason to believe that secondary purchasers were not fully informed of state law and the individual purchasers' obligations under the law.

6. Although HRRA has a total of 2144 lots/owners, HRRA currently has constructed only approximately 67 homes since its inception as Rye Patch Ranch Association in 1986 (i.e. over the past 24 years). These 67 homes are spread out over approximately 9 sections of HRRA ownership, or about one home for every 80 acres. In addition, these 9 sections are intermingled with all or portions of 9 BLM-administered public land sections, making the overall housing density about one home for every 160 acres. Therefore, this is not a high-density residential neighborhood.

7. To the extent that individual owners of HRRA have complied with State law and fenced their own properties, those individuals have no valid complaint against our livestock accessing their neighbor's unfenced property, and our interests and rights should not be violated or disregarded on the basis of such complaints.

8. To the extent that individual owners of HRRA have ignored State law despite being fully informed of their obligations under the law, those individuals have no valid complaint against our livestock accessing their property, and our interests and rights should not be violated or disregarded on the basis of these complaints.

9. To the extent that individual owners of HRRA plead ignorance of the law when they purchased and signed contracts acknowledging the law, ignorance is no excuse. Now that they are informed of the law, they should act in conformance with their contracts and State law, and fence their properties.

10. To the extent that HRRA Board of Directors has complained on behalf of the all of the owners of HRRA sub-development (i.e., the "owners"), HRRA Board of Directors has no valid complaint, for the reasons stated above and for the further reasons stated below.

    HRRA Board of Directors has no valid complaint, because HRRA could easily fund the construction and maintenance of such perimeter fence for the solitude and pleasure of its owners. If it so chose, HRRA is fully capable of assessing its 2,144 owners a fee for the purpose of constructing a fence to enclose the sub-division. According to HRRA's website humboldtriverranchassociation.com, owner's fees are mandatory, and are required to be paid as long as the landowners own their properties. Further, landowners

Responses

I-Bell

Comments

can be evicted and lose their properties if they fail to pay their ownership fees. Therefore, HRRA has the legal authority to assess fees upon its individual owners.

HRRA already assesses its individual owners for construction and maintenance of numerous miles of HRRA roads, 14 sleeper cabins, a barbeque pavilion, 4 RV sites and 3 tent sites in the "upper area", a comfort/shower station, a lodge (which has common cooking facilities, pool table, children's play area, and television room), a campground bordering the Humboldt River, landscaping, a website, and administrative obligations.

It is our information that approximately 18 miles of fence would surround the subdivision perimeters (the other perimeter areas are already part of allotment boundary fences), including leaving Section 10 and half-Section 16 open to the remainder of our Allotment. At an estimated cost of $8,000 per mile ($1.515 per foot), such perimeter fence would cost $144,000. This equates to a one-time fee of $67.16 to each of the 2,144 HRRA owners. This assessment would be far less money than it would cost each of the owners to fence his/her property individually. Obviously, this ownership fee could also be spread out over several years.

To the extent that some individual HRRA owners have already constructed fence that would serve as part of the perimeter fence, HRRA could act to reimburse those owners on a "per foot of fence" basis, or could alternatively waive the fees for those individual owners.

We find it particularly troublesome that HRRA should complain and/or make any proposal to BLM regarding our grazing allotment, when its owners know or should know the status of the open range and the working ranch on the property, when HRRA has failed to require its owners to follow State law, and when HRRA has failed or neglected to fund such perimeter fence itself for a nominal fee to each owner.

11. HRRA, even without an additional assessment to its members, has sufficient cash on hand to construct a fence around the perimeter of the development. The most recent financial statement for the period ending December 31, 2009, prepared by Kafoury, Armstrong, & Co. for HRRA, showed that HRRA had an "operating fund" balance of $933,851; a "reserve fund" balance of $399,938, and; an "improvements" fund balance of $122,723. Therefore, as of the start of 2010, HRRA has operating, reserve, and improvement funds balances totaling nearly one-and-one-half-million dollars ($1,456,512). This financial statement is attached to these comments as **EXHIBIT 3.**

Even assuming for argument that the HRRA's "operating fund" is unavailable to construct a perimeter fence because it is set aside for their normal yearly operations, nevertheless HRRA has over one-half-million dollars ($522,661) in "reserve" and "improvements" fund balances as of the start of 2010, which is far in excess of the 144,000 a fence would cost.

Responses

Exhibit 3 was reviewed and considered by BLM; however, it is not included in this Appendix. This document is viewable from the link provided for the final EIS and appendices on the Winnemucca RMP website at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html.

I-Bell

Comments

12. We believe further that HRRA has ulterior motives in their stated desire to remove livestock grazing from the East Ryepatch Allotment[4], and their complaints, at least in part, must be viewed by BLM as duplicitous.

Representatives of HRRA have made it known that it is HRRA's long-standing desire to obtain BLM-administered public Section 10 (T30N, R33E) of the East Ryepatch Allotment, for their desired eventual development and use by HRRA as a "recreational area" (Bruce Luke, HRRA, personal communication at Pershing County Commission Meeting, 2010[5]).

13. Livestock, including our cattle, would potentially still access HRRA, even with the livestock closure area as proposed by staff.

The DRMP/DEIS does not state that our cattle would not be permitted within the remainder of the East Ryepatch Allotment, i.e. east of the HRRA properties. Therefore, if cattle were still permitted in the remainder of the allotment[6], they would still access HRRA properties from the eastern portion of the allotment, unless a fence were constructed to prevent such access.

C. Pershing Board of County Commissioners does not support the closure of any part of the East Ryepatch Allotment to livestock grazing.

To the extent that the Pershing Board of County Commissioners (PBCC) has in the past supported the HRRA proposal (as is embodied in the staff-recommended alternative), BLM has been informed by PBCC that PBCC has rescinded/revoked such support, by letter dated July 29, 2010. See **EXHIBIT 4**, attached to these comments. PBCC's decision to rescind/revoke such support followed testimony in Commission meetings regarding:

* the fact that we were not consulted prior to PBCC voicing such support;
* Nevada state law;
* federal law (including Taylor Grazing Act and takings provisions of the Constitution);
* economic value of our livestock operation (discussed herein below);
* wildfire-reduction data and analysis (discussed herein below);
* BLM 2009 production data and analysis (discussed herein above), and;
* BLM regulations relative to the allocation of forage (discussed herein above).

[4] BLM should note that we do NOT oppose HRRA's desire to have THEIR PRIVATE LANDS excluded from livestock grazing within the remainder of the East Ryepatch Allotment. We do oppose HRRA's attempts to eliminate our BLM grazing preference and authorization within the allotment, in whole or in part, for any reason.
[5] This position was stated by Mr. Luke at either the July 7, 2010 or the July 21, 2010 Commission meeting. We believe it was made on July 21, 2010.
[6] We also note that BLM has not made known to us any data which would describe the grazing capacity of the remainder of the allotment as being sufficient to support our 915 AUMS, nor whether a change in grazing season of use would be required.

Responses

Exhibit 4 was reviewed and considered by BLM; however, it is not included in this Appendix. This document is viewable from the link provided for the final EIS and appendices on the Winnemucca RMP website at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html.

I-Bell

Comments

D. Continued livestock grazing within the whole of the East Ryepatch Allotment, including our livestock, has a positive economic value to the communities, which should not be eliminated.

The Nevada Department of Agriculture estimates the total value of an AUM, including indirect and induced impacts, to be $252.00 (Nevada Department of Agriculture, 2009, as reported by USDA-FS FEIS for the Martin Basin Rangeland Project, p. 204).

Using the Nevada Department of Agriculture statistics, our cattle operation of 915 AUMs within the East Ryepatch Allotment has an estimated value to the counties and communities of (915 * $252 =) $230,580.

The DRMP/DEIS is silent as to what would happen to our AUMs, but if they are eliminated[7], such action will result in an immediate and irreparable harm to our livestock operation and our livelihood, and will have the additional immediate and irreparable harm to the counties and communities as stated above.

E. Continued livestock grazing within the whole of the East Ryepatch Allotment by our livestock, has a positive wildfire-reduction value to the communities, which should not be eliminated.

In addition to the economic value to the counties and communities, our cattle operation serves the valuable purpose of wildfire fuel reduction within the allotment, which includes and surrounds the Humboldt River Ranch Association development.

Within the bounds of the area proposed-by-staff for livestock closure, BLM's 2009 production data show that approximately 850,569 pounds of cheatgrass and other annual species were produced in 2009. See BLM map and production data sheets, attached to these comments as **EXHIBIT 5**, and a summary of the BLM data sheets, attached to these comments as **EXHIBIT 6**.

This 850,569 pounds of cheatgrass and other annual species poses a substantial wildfire risk. Our livestock operation annually consumes approximately 732,000 pounds of this annual-species production (915 AUMs x 800 pounds per AUM). This results in an estimated wildfire fuel reduction of (732,000 / 850,569 =) 86.06% annually. Our grazing obviously also prevents a substantially higher build-up of second- and third-year fine fuel accumulation that would occur with an absence of grazing.

F. BLM data does not support a notion of moving our livestock operation to other allotments.

[7] The DEIS states at page 2-122 (hard copy version that staff-proposed closures will result in designating 319,328 acres closed to livestock grazing (215,973 acres of "new" closures over the no action alternative). The DRMP/DEIS states at page 2-121 (hard copy version) that this will be accompanied by a reduction in livestock grazing authorization of 213 AUMs. However, the DRMP/DEIS is not clear as to "where" the AUMS are being eliminated.

Responses

Exhibits 5 and 6 were reviewed and considered by BLM; however, they are not included in this Appendix. These documents are viewable from the link provided for the final EIS and appendices on the Winnemucca RMP website at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html.

I-Bell

Comments

BLM and others have suggested that our livestock operation that would be displaced from the East Ryepatch Allotment, if the "Staff Proposed Alternative" is adopted, will be "moved" to the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments. However, the most recent data provided to us, which is the BLM 2009 production data collected in the Prince Royal and Humboldt House Allotments, particularly in consideration of BLM regulations, do not support this suggestion, for the reasons expressed in COMMENT 1, and for the additional reason that the forage is inadequate to support our 915 AUMs of livestock use.

I-Bell-6:

COMMENT 3. The DRMP/DEIS does not assess a reasonable range of alternatives relative to livestock closure areas within the East Ryepatch Allotment.

Although the DRMP/DEIS purports to contain five alternatives, relative to at least the East Ryepatch Allotment and this issue, the DRMP/DEIS actually assesses only two alternatives, i.e., the status quo grazing (Alternatives A, B, C1 and C2) and the elimination of grazing in the subject areas (Alternative D) – in other words, all or nothing extremes.

However, the DRMP/DEIS is remiss in not providing any "middle of the road" alternatives such as fencing of the perimeter of the HRRA, while leaving our grazing allotment intact. BLM should not adversely impact our grazing rights and interests because of errors or omissions by Pershing County and/or PCC at the time of approval of the HRRA sub-division (or subsequently); or because of negligence, ignorance, or refusal by individual land owners of HRRA to comply with State law; or because of refusal or failure of HRRA Board of Directors to act reasonably on behalf of its owners.

The Final Decision/ROD should not eliminate grazing in the areas of the East Ryepatch allotment as proposed by staff in the DRMP/DEIS. BLM should instead consider the following alternatives in the development, analysis, and decision-making of the RMP/FEIS:

Alternative 1. No Action. This is a rational alternative because:

> BLM has no obligation or rational reason under federal and state law to take the action as described in the "Staff Proposed" Alternative, acting to circumvent State law, and jeopardizing our livestock grazing permit and livestock interests, for the reasons stated above.
>
> The PBCC does not support this onerous proposal. In addition, Pershing County had, and continues to have, the option of fencing the perimeter of the sub-division to rectify any past oversight, without inflicting harm to our livestock operation.
>
> Likewise, because State law does not support the position of HRRA, because Pershing County did not require a perimeter fence, and because the developer fully disclosed obligations in a contract disclosure with each and every purchaser of land, HRRA and its individual owners have no rational reason to complain. The obligation lies with each individual owner to fence his/her own property.

Responses

I-Bell-6:
BLM developed a reasonable range of alternatives that considered areas closed to livestock grazing. Action D-LG 1.3 does not close off Humboldt House and East Rye Patch allotments.

I-Bell

Comments

Responses

Alternative 2. Cooperate with Pershing County and/or HRRA to *fund, construct, and maintain* a fence around the perimeter of the sub-division. This is a rational alternative because:

Notwithstanding the lack of legal obligation to do so on behalf of individual HRRA individual owners, BLM and Pershing County and/or HRRA could cooperate to fund, construct, and maintain the perimeter fence. This could be accomplished in a short period or in phases over several years. This alternative would:

* Satisfy the residents and owners of HRR who have complained, notwithstanding the invalid, unreasonable, and illegal nature of such complaints;

* Rectify a legal and practical failure by Pershing Board of County Commission, which body could reasonably have foreseen a conflict when the PCC approved a residential and recreational sub-division, in the middle of a grazing allotment, in the midst of a Grazing District established by the Secretary of Interior, in the heart of Nevada, which is an open range state;

* Satisfy BLM's obligation to safeguard our grazing interests;

* Negate the need for any litigation to protect our rights and make ourselves whole from the unwarranted and harmful actions or inactions of BLM and/or the actions or inactions of Pershing County and/or PBCC and/or the actions or inactions of HRRA and/or the actions or inactions of the individual owners of HRRA.

Alternative 3. Unilaterally decide to *fund, construct, and maintain* a fence around the perimeter of the sub-division.

Notwithstanding the lack of obligation to do so on behalf of individual HRRA owners, BLM could decide to fund, construct, and maintain the perimeter fence. BLM has the authority to fence pasture and allotment boundaries. Such perimeter fence would effectively create pasture and/or allotment fences at the same time as creating a perimeter fence around the sub-division. This alternative would have the same benefits to all interested parties as does Alternative 2.

COMMENT 4. BLM's RMP/FEIS should not be influenced by a "negative comment campaign" being perpetrated by the Humboldt River Ranch Association Board of Directors.

Regarding comments to the DRMP/DEIS from HRRA landowners, BLM should be, and is hereby, informed that HRRA Board of Directors has embarked on a campaign to solicit comments supporting the "Staff Proposed Alternative" to eliminate livestock grazing from the East Ryepatch Allotment east of I-80. It has done so via a common mailing to all of its owner/members. Because of this "form letter" attack by HRRA Board of Directors. As with all "form-letter" writing campaigns, BLM should consider all comments received from HRRA owners which that adopt the position of the HRRA Board solicitation to be a single comment regarding this issue. We attach HRRA's common mailing solicitation as **EXHIBIT 7** to these comments.

I-Bell

Comments

As we have noted elsewhere herein, we have no objection to HRRA securing the boundaries of their subdivision, but we do oppose them stealing our livestock AUMs from the public lands in order to secure their private boundaries. BLM should be further informed that we have attempted on numerous occasions to meet with the HRRA Board of Directors, and to be placed on their meeting agendas to discuss possible working solutions that would work for them and for our livestock operations. HRRA Board of Directors has, on all occasions, refused to place our requested discussion on their meeting agendas.[8]

****

Thank you for consideration of these comments to the DRMP/DEIS.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely yours,

John Bell Jhona Bell

John and Jhona Bell

Responses

[8] This refusal, to our understanding, is based partially upon pre-2009 representations by certain BLM personnel to HRRA representatives that our livestock operation could simply be moved to another allotment. However, notwithstanding the fact that HRRA Board of Directors and its counsel have been supplied the 2009 BLM data and subsequent analysis of that data (as discussed in this letter, and as discussed in PBCC meetings), HRRA Board of Directors continues to refuse to meet with us.

I-Bell/Fowler

Comments

Responses

RITA D. FOWLER

ATTORNEY AT LAW

85 EAST SIXTH STREET - BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NEVADA 89820 - (775) 304 - 5543

Bureau of Land Management
Received
OCT 25 2010
Field Office
Winnemucca Nevada

October 25, 2010

Bob Edwards
RMP Team Leader
USDI, BLM
5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445

Gene Seidlitz, Field Manager
Winnemucca Field Office
USDI, BLM
5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445

Re: Supplemental Comments to Draft RMP

Dear Mr. Edwards and Mr. Seidlitz:

This letter is intended as a supplement to those comments already submitted by John and Jhona Bell. The Bells have retained my services in order to address the number of legal concerns arising under proposed closure to their grazing permit, most specifically the Ryepatch Allotment referred to herein as the "East Ryepatch Allotment" and the Humboldt House Allotment.

The Bells are strongly opposed to the DRMP/DEIS "Staff Proposed Alternative" to close portions of the Humboldt House and East Ryepatch Allotments to livestock grazing. A member of your staff informed me at a Pershing County Commissioner's meeting that this alternative was based upon different factors, two of which being, public safety concerns and complaints made by the Humboldt River Ranch Association (HRRA) about cattle crossing their private land.

I-Bell/ Fowler-1

It should be noted that it is unlawful for a federal regulatory agency to "police" private property. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management (referred to as BLM) to determine if an issue of public safety exists on a private parcel. Any concern for "public safety" in the above circumstance is under the sole jurisdiction of the State of Nevada as outlined in Nevada Revised Statute 568.300, 568.330 and AGO 98-22 (8-7-1998).

I-Bell/Fowler-1:
BLM developed a reasonable range of alternatives that considered areas closed to livestock grazing. Action D-LG 1.3 does not close off Humboldt House and East Rye Patch allotments. BLM manages public lands in accordance with FLPMA.

I-Bell/Fowler

Comments

I-Bell/ Fowler-2

If the BLM were to give the concerns of the HRRA any weight what-so-ever, it would be openly supporting a violation of Nevada law. Since 1931 it has been a violation of Nevada law to interfere with the grazing rights of a person who grazes by operation of law or custom. (Nevada Revised Statute 568.225 - 568.230 (2009)). The Nevada Supreme Court has determined that it is unlawful to interfere with a customary use of public range for grazing purposes and the legislature has the authority to grant an injunction from doing so. (Itcaina v. Marble, 56 Nev. 420, 55 P.2d. 625 (1936)).

Nevada has supported a livestock industry for many years. As such it is an "open range" state. Buyers of property within the State of Nevada are lawfully bound to respect grazing on open range and are required by law to fence their property if they wish their private property rights to be respected. Every member of the HRRA should have been provided with an 'open range disclosure' form at the date of purchase of their Nevada property. (See attached Exhibit A). Due to issues such as those between the Bells and the HRRA, Nevada Revised Statute 116.065 was recently amended. The new law places an even stricter burden on the buyer of property adjacent to open range. (See attached Exhibit B).

I-Bell/ Fowler-3

The Bells have the support of the Natural Resource Advisory Committee. The Bells have the support of the Pershing County Commissioners. (See attached Exhibit C.) The Bells have the support of the Pershing County Sheriff. (See attached Exhibit D.) Unfortunately, the HRRA is attempting to use the BLM as a pawn to circumvent state law. Such actions are unlawful and do not serve the purpose, nor respect the function of BLM's regulation of grazing. It is anticipated that any further concerns regarding fencing of the HRRA's private property will be litigated civilly. Therefore, the Bells would ask that the law be followed and grazing in the above-referenced allotments continue.

Sincerely,

Rita D. Fowler

Rita D. Fowler

Enc.

Responses

I-Bell/Fowler-2:
Grazing is a privilege under the Taylor Grazing Act 315b and 43 CFR 4130.2(c); and specifies that grazing privileges "shall be adequately safeguarded" but that the creation of a grazing district or issuance of a permit does not create "any right, title, interest, or estate in or to the land,"

Exhibits A through D were reviewed and considered by BLM; however, they are not included in this Appendix. These documents are viewable from the link provided for the final EIS and appendices on the Winnemucca RMP website at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html.

I-Bell/Fowler-3 : Comment noted.

I-Blackwelder

Comments

ALMA F. BLACKWELDER
1707 WOODLAND AVE
BURLINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA 27215

RECEIVED BLM
WINNEMUCCA NV
2010 NOV -1 PM 1:40

October 28, 2010

Mr. Bob Edwards
Winnemucca District Office
Bureau of Land Management
5100 E. Winnemucca Boulevard
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445-2921

Dear Mr. Edwards:

I-Black-welder—1

I am writing to urge the Winnemucca District Office to revise the proposed alternatives outlined in the Drat Resource Management Plan and all other land use documents tiered to it to ensure that wild horse and burro appropriate management levels are increased through equitable distribution of resources.

The Standards and Guidelines must ensure that wild horses can thrive on the range and be treated in a humane and minimally intrusive manner that preserves their wild and free roaming behavior. No proposed alternatives provide sufficient protection for wild horses and burros to be managed on the range. The Wild Free Roaming Horses and Burros Act mandates that wild horses and burros be considered "an integral part of the natural system." This proposed Resource Management Program fails to uphold that mandate.

Sincerely,

Alma Blackwelder

Alma Blackwelder

Responses

I-Blackwelder-1:Setting AMLs is an implementation level decision, not an RMP level decision. During the implementation level planning process a separate public involvement and NEPA analysis will be conducted.

Comments

Responses

I-Boeger

Karen Boeger
5055 Wilcox Ranch Road
Sutcliffe Star Route
Reno, NV 89510

October 23, 2010

Comments on
Winnemmucca District Office
Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement

To Gene Seidlitz, District Manager:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft RMP. The following comments are necessarily lengthy because of my 5 years of service on the RAC sub-committee advising the Winnemmucca BLM as you went through the process of developing this draft RMP. I represented conservation interests. This is a very wide constituency that includes environmentalists, sportsmen, bird watchers, recreationists (motor and non-motor), Wilderness advocates, archeology buffs, native plant organizations and many more. Thus, I felt it my serious responsibility to carefully examine your proposals for each and every resource area. Objectives and Actions in each resource area have the potential to impact conservation interests, adversely or positively.

My involvement in conservation advocacy is as follows: past member of the NW NV RAC representing dispersed recreation, past member of the RAC sub-com for the Winnemmucca Draft RMP, current member of the RAC sub-com. for the Black Rock-High Rock Emigrant Trails NCA, Board member of Friends of NV Wilderness, Secretary and Board Member of the NV Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers and member of the citizen committee advising the Humbolt Co. Commission on a Pine Forest Wilderness proposal. I am also a current member, not only of FNW and BHA, but of the Sierra Club, NV Wilderness Project, NV Conservation League, Great Basin Resource Watch, NV Wildlife Federation, Trout Unlimited and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

This draft RMP is a lengthy document, but very well laid out and organized for the public to clearly understand the several alternatives. My only complaint is that there were no page headings so that one could easily know which section of the document one was in. In other words, it would be helpful to see the words Cave and Karst at the top of each page of that section in case the public did not understand that the CK, prefacing objectives and actions, meant Cave and Karst. Even though I already knew this document rather well, I had to resort to self-labeled tabs at the top of each section for ease of referral.

Thank you for an alternative that included no livestock grazing. As unrealistic as such an alternative might seem, it is useful that potential impacts to the land, both with and without grazing, be analyzed and compared. This is a proactive step that I don't believe I've seen in an RMP to date.

I look forward to the results of this public process and the publication of your Final RMP. It has been such a long time in the process; I'm sure you are eager to get on with the important work of implementation.

Comments

I-Boeger

GEOLOGY

Action D-G 1.5, p. 2-31
Do NOT "encourage" visitation of unique geologic resources through any sort of media. If they are already receiving high visitation, adequate protection measures or closure to motors may be necessary.

SOILS

I -Boeger-1 Action D-S 1.1, p. 2-31
How can the objective to "improve soil processes..." be met by this action to "maintain existing vegetative cover..." ?

WATER RESOURCES

I-Boeger-2 Actions D-WR 1.2 – 1.6, p. 2-34 & 35
These actions related to surface impacts can and should be addressed in other resource areas.
The main question should be: can the volume of water pumped be supported without unintended consequences such as drying up springs and subsidence.

VEGETATION – FOREST/WOODLAND PRODUCTS

In general:

- It is gratifying to see use of prescribed fire and wildland fire as a proposed tool throughout the entire vegetation section. Carefully planned and executed managed fire is one of the most important and effective tools for restoring vegetative health.
- I-Boeger-3 There are no actions specific to aspen alone. Aspen needs it's own stand-alone objective and actions. The loss of aspen state-wide is well documented.
  A special effort and plan to restore aspen, wherever loss has occurred and/or stand health is impaired, is critical and already overdue.

I-Boeger-4 Action D-VF 3.4.1, p. 2-40, salvage harvesting:

- First consider the value of standing dead trees and their importance to stand recovery: Minimizing raindrop impact, protecting from soil loss, shade protection, wind protection.
- Consider also the impacts of roads for harvesting purposes and subsequent need for restoration.

VEGETATION – WEEDS

Prescriptive grazing (re: Action D-VW 2.1, p. 2-45) in general:
Prescriptive grazing is mentioned as a management tool option throughout many sections of this RMP. It should NOT be considered as an effective tool in most, if not all, situations for the following reasons:

- It has a high failure rate.
- While it may be effective in very small, easily managed areas, it is very difficult to implement when applied to large areas.
- It typically requires very tightly controlled on/off dates, rotations and intensive management and thus often fails.
- It should never be used to avoid appropriate livestock reductions.

VEGETATION – RANGELAND 2

Responses

I-Boeger-1: Action D-S1.1 has been modified to reflect comment.

I-Boeger-2: Since water is managed by the state, the BLM must manage watersheds for the benefit of water resources. Assessment of water use impacts is addressed in Objective D-WR 2.

I-Boeger-3: Objective VF1 and Management actions VF 1.1, 1.2 and Objective VF2 and Management Actions VF 2.1 address management action for woodlands including aspen.

I-Boeger-4-: Addressed in RMP, see Action B and D VF 3.4.1. Moreover, a case-by-case analysis would be conducted prior to opening areas to salvage harvesting.

I-Boeger

Comments

Actions D-VR 1.2.1 & 4.3: see prescriptive grazing comments above

I-Boeger-5

Action D-VR 1.3, p. 2-50/51: use of native seed for rehab and reclamation:

- To use the caveat "when effective" is disingenuous, as use of native seed for these purposes have yet to be proven effective since each species requires a special technique which has yet to be developed.
- An action should be proposed for BLM to make an extraordinary special effort to develop effective techniques or successful native plant use will never become routine.
- In the meantime, a mix of native and an appropriate (IE. not crested wheat) nurse crop should be utilized.
- Propose an additional action to develop a dependable market for private native seed growers.

Action D-VR 1.3.1, p. 2-51: collection of seed:
As above, an action should be proposed for BLM to make an extraordinary effort to establish a dependable market for private native seed growers, such as a guarantee to purchase of a certain amount of seed annually and to develop effective storage.

I-Boeger-6

Crested Wheat Grass Seedings, p 2-51:

- The Rangeland GOAL to "protect, maintain, and improve healthy vegetative communities..." does not fit with this proposed objective and action.
- While crested wheat has a potential benefit in a narrow range of situations, too often it has become the answer to every vegetation problem because it's easy to establish and techniques are well known.
- Crested wheat should be eliminated from use as a nurse crop due to it's persistence over time.

Fire Rehabilitation Seedings, p. 2-52-53:

- Obj. D-VR 3: Historic or pre-fire ecosystem:
  Must have emphasis on native plants, not restoring "historic" crested wheat. Direction is needed to use an easy-to-establish nurse crop (without including adversely persistent crested wheat) which will expedite the establishment of native perennials.
- Act. D-VR 3.1: closure of burned areas:
  Add: an arbitrary minimum rest of 2 years before considering any use of prescriptive grazing.

VEGETATION – RIPARIAN AND WETLANDS

I-Boeger-7

- Obj. D-VRW 1, p. 2-62, Improve riparian areas:
  Passage of FLPMA was 35 years ago. BLM has had 35 years to bring riparian areas to proper functioning condition as directed. The goal of improving riparian should be 100%, not from 45% functioning at risk riparian to 85% – this is insufficient.
- Act. D-VRW 1.1, p. 2-63, grazing management objectives:
  Add the objectives developed to the AMP and grazing permit requirements.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

- Act. C-FW 1.1, p. 2-66, Priority 1 & 2 wildlife habitat areas:

3

Responses

I-Boeger-5:
The BLM has developed a range of alternatives - VR 4.1 See BLM Manual 1745 Introduction, Transplant, Augmentation, and Reestablishment of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants and Executive Orders 11987 and 13112.

I-Boeger-6:
The BLM has developed a range of alternatives - VR 4.1 See BLM Manual 1745 Introduction, Transplant, Augmentation, and Reestablishment of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants and Executive Orders 11987 and 13112.

I-Boeger-7:
Lotic and lentic systems are dynamic and constantly in flux. Naturally occurring events, such as fires or floods, and other impacts such as roads, land ownership, multiple use, or actions outside of the discretion of the BLM (ie dewatering, irrigation, etc) can affect PFC ratings and recovery. BLM has provided a realistic range of alternatives and PFC percentages for management actions designed to make progress towards PFC.

Management of allotments are addressed through grazing management decisions at the site specific implementation level. PFC is addressed as a standard for rangeland health in grazing management decisions.

I-Boeger

Comments

This would seem the more appropriate preferred alternative, given the high amenity value of wildlife and the high economic value of wildlife to local and state entities.

I-Boeger-8

- Act. D-FW 2.1, p. 2-69, re-evaluate HMPs:
  This should include, or create a second action for, re-evaluation of AMPs to improve wildlife habitat.
- Act. D-FW 3.2, p. 2-70, shorebird habitats:
  It is unachievable to allow a full range of multiple use while adequately protecting important shorebird habitat.
- Act. D-FW 4.1, p. 2-71, pre-disturbance inventory:
  It is too difficult and unrealistic to "use appropriate mitigation measures .. if active nests are located."

I-Boeger-9

- Obj. D-FW 6, p. 2-71, guzzlers:
  Add: subject to federal law and/or regulation, such as the Wilderness Act.
  Note: In permitting guzzlers, measures must be taken to not attract livestock to important wildlife areas.
- Act. D-FW 8.1, p. 2-73, land health standards:
  This action should clearly state that AMP adjustments are included in avoidance and mitigation measures.
- Act. D-FW 8.3, p. 2-73, irrigation reservoirs:
  Substitute "must" for "should have a minimum pool requirement."
- Obj. D-FW 9 and all Actions under this objective, p. 2-74-76, Improve or maintain aquatic habitats with perennial streams:
  Each action must include direction to update AMPs accordingly to achieve the objective.
- Actions C-FW 9.3.1 & 9.3.2, p. 2-75 & 76: stream bank alteration:
  Re: the comments above on Obj. D-VRW 1: 35 years since the passage of FLPMA must mandate the most conservative allowance of stream bank alteration. The only hope for adequate funding for restoration is to set the highest possible standards.

I-Boeger-10

- Act. D-FW 10.1, p. 2-76, impactive access routes:
  Delete "maintain." Why would it be a responsible action to "maintain" an access route that adversely impacts riparian values?
- Add an action comparable to D-WHB 4.1, p. 2-97: proposed activities (especially ORV) with potential adverse impacts to health and welfare of wildlife may be subject to SOPs and mitigation measures.

ECIAL STATUS SPECIES

I-Boeger-11

- In general, regarding protection of sage grouse habitat:
  All objectives and actions related to this subject refer only to differing mileage set-backs from leks. This completely ignores the even greater importance of the nesting and breeding grounds which are known to often be many miles from the leks.

I-Boeger-12

- Act. D-SSS 1.2.2, p. 2-82-84: surface occupancy or disturbance:
  Delete from WAIVER: "None of the subject conservation actions and guidelines would be construed as mandatory or standards." There is already adequate management flexibility built into the cited guidelines making such a disclaimer unnecessary.
- Act. D-SSS 1.5, p. 2-87, prescriptive grazing in exclosures:
  Any grazing, prescriptive or not, within exclosures completely invalidates any scientific usefulness of that exclosure and must not be allowed.

4

Responses

I-Boeger-8: This is addressed at allotment specific/implementation level decisions. Standards 4 (Plant and Animal Habitat) and 5 (Special Status Species Habitat) of the Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health address these concerns. Refer also to LG 1.

I-Boeger-9: Section 1.6 states the RMP will comply with FLPMA and other applicable laws. Action D-WR 2.3 addresses acquisition of minimum pools. Updating AMPs on implementation plans done on a case by case basis.

I-Boeger-10: Action D-10.1 was revised in the PRMP/FEIS.

I-Boeger-11: The mileage set-backs from leks are based on guidelines recommended by Guidelines to Manage Sage-Grouse Populations and Their Habitats (Connelly et al 2000). The distance from the lek that the majority of the breeding and nesting occurs, was taken into account when the guidelines were developed. BLM has revisited sage-grouse lek management in the Final RMP/FEIS to include management of priority sage grouse habitat. See D-SSS 1.2.1. Management includes no surface disturbance, no surface occupancy applicable to certain uses.

I-Boeger-12: BLM has revisited "exceptions, waivers, and modifications as they affect Special Status Species. BLM deleted the waivers, however, special management criteria was developed to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Prescriptive grazing would be used to achieve land health standards or resource objectives.

I-Boeger	Comments	Responses
	WILD HORSES AND BURROS	
I-Boeger-13	• Act. D-WHB 1.6, p.2-92, gather to low AML: This is a commendable action as well as necessary since gathers cannot realistically be done each year. • Act. D-WHB 1.8.1, p. 2-93, removal of animals if not adequate habitat: If in a grazing allotment, mention needs to be made of a commensurate action related to livestock. • Management tools of gelding, sterilization and birth control must be included as actions.	I-Boeger-13: Action D-WHB 5.2 would gather horses to low– to mid–AML. Decreases in use proportionate to the offending class of livestock are addressed in the RMP. Some areas may not be suitable for WHB as they are there 24/7 but there may be an opportunity for livestock grazing for a short period of time.
	CULTURAL RESOURCES	
I-Boeger-14	• Act. D-CR 1.2, p. 2-99: culturally sensitive areas: Culturally sensitive areas should not only be designated as "limited" for ORV, but also retain the option to CLOSE the area if needed to manage impacts. IE. Similar to Act. D-PR 1.6	I-Boeger-14: This will be further addressed and brought forward in the subsequent Transportation and Travel Management Planning processes.
I-Boeger-15	• Act. D-CR 8.2, p. 2-107: research results made public: Evaluation must first be made to determine of the research site would be more vulnerable to adverse impacts with the increased visitation that publication may engender. If so, the results should either not be made public or the results published, but the location not be made public.	I-Boeger-15: Addressed in RMP. See D-CR 8.2, p. 2-107 results would only be made public "if publication does not promote vandalism or site deterioration or loss as a result of visitation or other related factors."
	PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES / CAVE AND KARST RESOURCES	
I-Boeger-16	Act. D-PR 2.3, p. 2-115: interpretive brochure and Act. D-PR 3.2, p. 2-116: research results made public and Act. D-CK 1.1, p. 2-119: public education: Same as the comments above on Act. D-CR 8.2. Restrict motor access to and/or do not divulge location of sensitive, vulnerable resources.	I-Boeger-16: Addressed in RMP in Alternative C.
	LIVESTOCK GRAZING	
	• Obj. D-LG 1 and subsequent actions: Most actions are statements of what is already required by law and regulation, need not be restated in this RMP and should be eliminated.	
I-Boeger-17	• Act. D-LG 1.4, p. 2-125: grazing permits: 1. Assessment of capability and suitability must be part of the permit renewal criteria. 2. Annual goals must be set for "implementation of actions to move toward meeting land health standards", as well as SOPS.	I-Boeger-17: Action D-LG 1.9.2 includes use of forage banks for livestock including closures for rangeland restoration projects.
I-Boeger-18	• Act. D-LG 1.9, p. 2-129: forage banks: 1. This is a commendable proposed action! 2. Please add to the criteria: forage banks may be used when livestock use is withdrawn from range restoration projects.	I-Boeger-18: Criteria was added in response to comment. See D-LG 1.9.2.
	• Act. D-LG 1.10 & 1.10, p. 2-130-132: Prescriptive grazing and TNR permits: Refer to comments under Vegetation – Weeds: Prescriptive grazing (and some TNR permits) should NOT be considered as an effective tool in most, if not all situations for the following reasons: 1. It has a high failure rate. 2. While it may be effective in very small, easily managed areas, it is very difficult to implement when applied to large areas. 5	

I-Boeger

Comments

3. It typically requires very tightly controlled on/off dates, rotations and intensive management and thus often fails.
4. It should never be used to avoid appropriate livestock reductions.

MINERAL RESOURCES:LEASABLE, LOCATABLE AND SALABLE

I-Boeger-19

In general, all actions throughout this section regarding protection of sage grouse habitat:
All objectives and actions related to this issue refer only to differing mileage set-backs from leks. This completely ignores the even greater importance of the nesting and breeding grounds which are known to often be many miles from the leks.

RECREATION

Goal, p. 2-185:

- BLM's goal must NOT be to satisfy "demands", but rather to determine if opportunities can be provided that are sustainable over time without permanent damage or impairment to the land and other resources, such as wildlife.
- "Build it and they will come" may be appropriate for private lands, but it is not appropriate for BLM public lands.
- Thus, these inappropriate words should be eliminated : "Recognize demand for recreational activities...".
- The rest of the Goal is appropriate: " manage public lands and waters to provide a broad spectrum of recreation experiences and benefits while protecting natural and cultural resources."
- Such a re-stated goal as above would recognize that recreation is not a benign use of the land. It has the potential to do significant damage to the land, resources and/or other uses.

Obj D-R 1, p.2-185:
Hooray! This perfectly states what would be appropriate in the Goal statement: "Further the public's understanding and appreciation of the area's vast, open and undeveloped character."

Throughout Recreation, Alt. D is preferable with the following amendments:

I-Boeger-20

Obj. D-R 3, p. 2-186: Viewing opportunities of natural, cultural, biological resources:

- Add to Alt. D: after consultation with appropriate entities (NDOW, SHIPO, etc.) and evaluation to determine that an increase in visitation and motor access will not impact or degrade resources.
- Also, do not disregard the value of discovery to visitors. These "opportunities" should only be provided in areas already "discovered" and in need of management. Otherwise the BLM violates the objective stated in D-R 1.

Act. D-R 4.1, p. 2-187, Visitor Outreach Programs:
Care must always be taken to not solicit increased recreation use. Current management capabilities for protecting resources are underfunded and inadequate. Use increases should be allowed to develop naturally over time.

Obj. D-R 5, p. 2-187, Adaptive Management:

6

Responses

I-Boeger-19:
BLM currently uses guidelines recommended by Guidelines to Manage Sage-Grouse Populations and Their Habitats (Connelly et al 2000).

I-Boeger-20:
Action D-R 3.1 has been revised in the PRMP.

I-Boeger

Comments

I-Boeger-21

For adaptive management to work effectively, baseline scientific data must first be collected in order to calibrate change and take appropriate corrective action. No direction is given here to collect such information.

Act. D-R 6.2, p. 2-189, Criteria for Dispersed Recreation in ERMA:

- 1.)REQUIRE, not "encourage", visitors to use roads and trails for MOTORIZED recreation activities... except in areas designated open.
  It has been 30 years since the Executive Orders to designate routes and establish the ethic of staying on roads and trails, thus it is long past the time for "encouragement". Consistency in public land use ethics between BLM and the USFS on this ethic will prevent confusion in the mind of the public.
- 3.) Add: Prohibit camping OR MOTOR USE within 300 ft. of spring sources (IE. Alt. C).
  The impacts to springs and wildlife from motors being allowed too close are well known. There is no excuse for allowing continued negative impacts on this vulnerable and precious resource of our desert lands.
- 8.) On playa surfaces, REQUIRE the use of surface protecting devices (IE. Alt. C).
  This is already a requirement on the Black Rock playa and should be made consistent across the District. Consistency will eliminate confusion in the public mind, as well as being the right ethic to promote.

I-Boeger-21

Act. D-R 7.1, p. 2-192, Water-based Recreation:
Develop water-based recreation only after consultation with appropriate entities (such as NDOW) and with full NEPA compliance to determine effects on all other resources and uses dependent on that water.

Act. D-R 7.2, p. 2-192, Water-based Recreation Resources:
Alt. C is more appropriate. Do not SEEK opportunities for development.

Obj. D-R 8, p. 2-192, SRMAs:

General comments:

FIRST DIRECT A SITE AND USE SPECIFIC NEPA PROCESS FOR EACH PROPOSED SRMA AND EACH RMZ WITHIN THEM!

- The need for SRMAs in most of the proposed areas is evident and will provide diverse recreation opportunities along with management tools to keep such recreation sustainable.
- However, the public cannot make informed site-specific comments, nor can BLM speculate, on the appropriateness of specific recreation areas (RMZs), for specific recreation purposes, within each proposed SRMA without the crucial missing site-specific NEPA evaluation.
- This level of detail re: SRMAs is inappropriate for an RMP document which should be generalized by nature. It is not possible for the public to objectively respond to whether an area is appropriate for a certain "recreation niche" without the critical analysis NEPA provides as to potential site-specific impacts on all other resources.
- SRMAs have the same potential for recreation opportunity conflicts and land damage as Travel Management Plans. Both require a site-specific NEPA process.
- Recreation decisions of this detail and magnitude cannot be made by merely assessing subjective recreation "needs". 7

I-Boeger-22

Responses

I-Boeger-21: Action D-R 6.2 has been revised in the PRMP.

I-Boeger-22:
Designation of SRMAs and RMZs are under the scope of the RMP. Decisions as to specific projects, such as campsite locations, etc., are addressed in implementation level plans and associated NEPA. For more information refer to BLM Handbook (H-1601-1 Appendix C).

I-Boeger

Comments

I-Boeger-23

- The Environmental Consequences, Individual Effects of Recreation on all other resource areas (Chap. 4, vol. 3&4), are generalized across the entire district and not of adequate site-specific detail for an informed opinion re: SRMA alternatives.
- **** In my hard copy document, Vol. 3, Chap. 4, Individual effects of recreation on Fish and Wildlife, is completely lacking pages 4-235-250.** Thus, even this amount of key information from which to base comments is lacking.

Obj. D-R 10.1, p. 217, OHV Travel Management Implementation:
This well written section clearly lays out the public process following the direction to designate routes. This is an excellent model for how the proposed SRMAs and SRPs should have been presented to the public for comment in this document!

Specific comments:

Act. D-R 8.1, p. 2-192, SRMAs:
Re: "strategically identified recreation market": The use of market-based terms is offensive, implies intent to commercialize public lands and leads the public to conclude that BLM will "build it and advertise it, so they will come".

Act. D-R 8.1.1, p. 2-194, Market-based strategy for SRMAs:

- Market-based strategy must be appropriately left to the private sector, not public land agencies.
- Eliminate: "The primary market based strategy ..... to target the undeveloped recreation-tourism demand..." for the same reason as above.
- The responsibility of the BLM is to provide opportunities for a spectrum of recreation. It is irresponsible to manage by responding to demand and highly inappropriate to create more demand by targeting the tourism market!

I-Boeger-24

- All "demands" for "increased opportunities" must be assessed and evaluated by site-specific NEPA within the Multiple Use – Sustained Yield Act provisions. "Demands" such as elk introduction, AUM increases, bulldozing for prospecting, etc. must each go through NEPA review – recreation "demands" must be no different.
- Providing "increased opportunities" can only degrade the experience of existing users and unnecessarily impact land resources.
- It IS appropriate for the BLM to respond to management needs where land impacts and/or user-conflicts are developing.

p. 2-196, #3 Bluewing and Winnemmucca Lake playas:

- Bluewing and Winnemucca Lake playas should not be considered for open use without the baseline science site-specific NEPA provides.
- The expensive mistakes of Sand Mountain and the Black Rock playa dunes should be avoided by proactive, site-specific NEPA information gathering.
- If NEPA evaluation determines an open designation is possible and sustainable, consideration should also be given to a closed portion for human-powered activities such as land sailing.

I-Boeger-25

p. 2-201, #2 Water Canyon Zone 2:

- Water Canyon Zone 2 is only 2579 acres. How will it be possible, in such a small area, for hiking, horseback riding and hunting to be accommodated simultaneously with incompatible uses such as motorcycle and ATV riding?

8

Responses

I-Boeger-23: Environmental consequences have been modified in areas of the proposed final RMP/FEIS. See Section 4.3.3 for recreation analysis.

I-Boeger-24: Separate recreation activity or implementation plan would be developed before SRMA management would be implemented.

I-Boeger-25: This RMP will not modify the Water Canyon Recreation Area Environmental Assessment, Management Plan, Record of Decision and Cooperative Management Agreement (August 1997) and the Environmental Assessment of the Water Canyon Implementation Plan Amendment (Aug. 2005).

I-Boeger

Comments

- How can wildlife values and habitat in such a small area be adequately protected while providing hunting opportunity?

p. 2-204, #6 Winnemmucca Sand Dunes:

I-Boeger-26

- Again, like playas, sand dunes are rare and often contain vulnerable resources/features.
- Before a designation of "open" use is considered, a site-specific NEPA analysis is essential to make an informed decision as to appropriate use and to provide baseline data from which to monitor impacts.
- Also, providing a closed portion of the area for quiet and human-powered use, such as sand-boarding, is important for providing a full spectrum of recreation opportunities.

Action D-R 8.1.3, p. 2-205, Pine Forest SRMA:

I-Boeger-27

- This area was proposed by NDOW as an ACEC because of it's high wildlife value and key wildlife habitat. Recreation activities potentially have a negative effect on wildlife.
- Please include an action that provides an ACEC overlay for this area so that wildlife is recognized as a primary use, as is appropriate, and the area managed to minimize or avoid recreation impacts.
- Actions should include immediate response to wildland fires in the lower elevations to protect important wildlife winter range.

Obj. D-R 9, p. 2-212, SRPs in general:

I-Boeger-28

- Just like SMRAs, direction should be given in this RMP to consider SRPs in a site-specific NEPA document.
- The level of detail contained here, such as proposed numbers for each type of permit and size of events, cannot be adequately assessed by the public or considered by BLM without this essential site-specific information.
- For instance: without NEPA information, the public can only subjectively, not objectively, consider whether 1 or 3 large group SRPs (or none) should be located on Bluewing Playa.

Act. D-R 9.1.3.1.1, p. 2-213, Competitive Off-road SRPs:

I-Boeger-29

- Include as an action: a requirement for all participants to attend a Leave No Trace/ Tread Lightly workshop.
- Include as an action: a adequate bonding requirement so that all costs for restoration of impacts are borne by the permittee, not the public.
- NEPA analysis should be required to determine if competitive off-road events are appropriate on public lands. Such events are likely to cause permanent resource damage. They foster and encourage inappropriate "non-renewable use" of public lands. BLM, in effect, condones such behavior by not prohibiting it.
- The notion that public lands must provide recreation opportunities for every type of motorized contraption that is invented is potentially incompatible with the MUSY Act. Any new invention should first be analyzed as to whether it can be appropriately, sustainably used on public lands -- and if so, where. For instance, the use of rock crawlers should have been banned until such an evaluation was made. Not being proactive in this regard unduly causes public money be spent to correct damage and impacts.
- Private lands should be made available for such recreation uses that, by their nature, are consumptive of the land.

9

Responses

I-Boeger-26: The BLM is required to designate OHV management areas as open, limited or closed as part of land use plan decisions. BLM Handbook (H-1601-1) Appendix C – Travel Management.

I-Boeger-27: The Pine Forest ACEC would be managed to protect wildlife habitat. All ACECs are priority suppression areas—see CA-WFM 1 (3).

I-Boeger-28:
These are current laws and BLM policy. See:
1) Legislative Acts
- Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act
- Federal Land & Management Act

2) Rules/Regulations
- 43 CFR 2930

3) Manuals & Handbooks
- BLM manual 2930-Recreation Permits & Fees
- BLM Handbook H-2930

I-Boeger-29: Bonding is required on a case-by-case basis. All applicants of SRPs are already required to incorporate LNT/TL principals in their proposed activities. With regards to off-road events, the BLM is a multiple use agency and off-road events are just one of the multiple uses. Moreover, each event would be be required to go through the NEPA process which could result in specific measures/mitigations to protect sensitive resources.

I-Boeger

Comments

- It is the role of the BLM to provide opportunities for non-consumptive, appropriate recreation in a primitive setting, not to provide opportunities to challenge machines that are "consumptive" of public resources.

Obj. D-R 10, p. 214, OHV Travel Management Areas

I-Boeger-30

- Hooray for beginning this long-overdue process!
- Wouldn't this section have been more appropriate under Transportation and Travel Management, as far more resources than just recreation will be affected by these decisions?
- OHV travel management should not be considered in isolation under recreation, as OHV use has potential to negatively effect nearly all other multiple uses.

Act. C-R 10.1, p.2-212-216, Open, limited and closed areas: Alt. C, with the following amendments:

I-Boeger-31

- First direct a site-specific NEPA process to consider if Winnemucca Lake is appropriate for an open designation. Include an alternative with a section to be non-motorized.
- Bluewing Playa should be limited to designated routes until such time as a Wilderness study of the citizen proposed area and a site-specific NEPA evaluation is concluded.

In general:

I-Boeger-32

- Checkerboard areas must not be sacrificed to an open designation which will result in devaluation of public land. Creative solutions can be sought to the management problems checkerboard poses: seek effective models from other districts with checkerboard and consult with the large private checkerboard owners for co-op agreements.
- Some of the Alt. D proposed checkerboard open areas have qualities that would be made more vulnerable and negatively impacted with increased motor use. The maps of invasive grasslands (3-9), mule deer and antelope habitat (3-11, 12), potential elk habitat (3-13), sage grouse habitat and PMUs (3-15,16), potential biological crust, wind and water erosion (3-3,4,5), all display a degree of correspondence to the proposed "open" checkerboard areas.
- Land exchange may be the best long-term solution for some checkerboard, after full assessment of public values, such as wildlife habitat.
- The proposed closure of Gridley and Continental Lakes in Alt. D is applauded as a visionary step to protect the valuable wetlands, the wildlife they support and the potential scientific data to be gained.

Obj. D-R 10.1, p. 2-217-221, Update the Transportation Plan, Alt. C & D:

- The very clear planning process implementation described in this section is to be commended.
- It is regrettable that a similar process was NOT described for the SRMAs and SRPs; this would have avoided public confusion and/or concern.
- A short time-frame must be applied (1 yr.?) to the pubic process as, in my experience, this process will expand to meet whatever time is allowed.

Re: Off-road game retrieval:

- **Do not allow.** Any exceptions to off-road restrictions creates confusion and conflict with non-motorized hunters, creates new tracks and creates enforcement difficulties when enforcement capability is already stretched.
- Nationally, both the FS and BLM are moving toward no off-road game retrieval. To date, all NV FS Districts are not allowing off-route game retrieval in their final TMPs.

10

Responses

I-Boeger-30: While a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach to transportation and travel management would incorporate concerns of multiple programs, the recreation program has a specific need to recognize and manage non-motorized travel (i.e. foot & equestrian), mechanical (i.e. mountain bike) & motorized (OHV). IM 2008-014.

I-Boeger-31: See Figure 2-53. NEPA would be addressed when development of the Travel Management Plan is launched.

I-Boeger-32: BLM has developed a range of alternatives for OHV. Travel Management planning would include designation of roads and routes within checkerboard areas as being suitable for disposals due to difficulty of managing interspersed public lands. See Figure 2-66.

I-Boeger

Comments

- NV BLM should be proactive in this regard. There will be less confusion in the public mind if all public lands are consistent on this issue.
- As a model, please refer to the joint USFS and BLM OHV EIS and Proposed Plan Amendment for MT, ND and portions of SD, Jan. 2001.
- The selected alternative from the above document, p. 19, states:
  "(The selected alternative will) not allow motorized wheeled cross-country travel for big game retrieval, although use of roads and trails to retrieve big game could continue. This game retrieval restriction would: reduce the conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses during the hunting season; reduce the potential for introducing invasive weeds; reduce the potential for soil erosion; reduce the potential for impacts to wildlife; be more responsive to numerous public concerns that were expressed about the inappropriateness of allowing an exception for game retrieval; and be consistent with the long-term goal of using vehicles on designated routes."

Act. D-R 10.2, p. 2-221-222, Designated routes:

- Ditto all of the above, including no motorized off-road game retrieval.
- Avoidance of habitat fragmentation should be a priority.
- Conserve the roadless character of areas that are currently primarily roadless, WSAs and those with wilderness characteristics.
- On route designation process maps, clearly show (color code?) which areas remain further than 2 miles from any motor route. This will help determine how much of the District remains remote, offers solitude and unfragmented wildlife habitat.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

- Act. C-RE 1.1, p. 2-223, is preferable to Act. D in order to best protect natural resources, especially priority wildlife habitat, by including lease stipulations and/or mitigation measures.
- Act. C-RE 1.2, p. 2-223, is preferable as, together with C-RE 1.3, the avoidance areas best correlate with priority wildlife habitat.
- Act. C-RE 1.3, p. 2-224, is preferable to D as the exclusion zones have far more correlation to critical sage grouse habitat. Transmission lines have adverse effects on a sage grouse. The creation of roads which follow transmission lines impact both sage grouse and big game species.

I-Boeger-33

- There is no mention of adequate bonding for renewable projects. The public must not have to pay for restoration land damage of failed or abandoned projects.
- There is no mention of a minimum number of years of baseline data collection for each type of renewable energy (especially important for wind, which needs a 5 year minimum). This is key to protect the public from scams and un-economically viable projects.
- Data must be provided to the public, from a neutral scientific source independent from the private company, to demonstrate that the project will be economically viable.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

Alt. D with the following exceptions:

Obj. D TA 3, p 2-227, Sign installation:

- Add "as need is demonstrated".

11

Responses

I-Boeger-33: This action is an implementation level decision, not an RMP level decision. During the implementation level planning process a separate public involvement and NEPA analysis will be conducted.

Bond decisions are on a case by case project. The current wind energy policy is to allow for 3 years to complete testing of wind energy potential.

I-Boeger

Comments

- The primitive experience and opportunities for self-direction and discovery are a rare and valuable commodity that BLM lands provide. This quality can easily be sacrificed by unnecessary signage.
- Good maps, readily available, can reduce the need for signs.
- An action should be added re: facilitating availability of maps to the public.

Act. C – TA 3.4, p. 2-228, Signs in WSAs:
This is preferable to Alt. D as every effort must be made to retain the primitive nature of these areas.

LANDS AND REALTY

Alt. D with the following exceptions and/or amendments:

I-Boeger-34

Obj. D-LR 2, p. 2-231, retention of public lands:
- Acquisition of private inholdings in Wilderness, WSAs and lands with wilderness characteristics would have high public benefits. This would enhance both management capability and the wild character of the land.
- All WSAs and lands with wilderness characteristics should be retained in public ownership.

Act. D-LR 5.1, p. 2-249, Utility Corridors:
- The southern-most corridor (Just north of Valmy and Lovelock) should be located along the Hwy. 80 corridor. The proposed route crosses remote areas including key sage grouse habitat and PMUs. Overhead lines are a significant contributing factor in depredation of sage grouse. The corridors also become ORV routes which add additional negative impacts to sage grouse habitat.
- The proposed corridor along the existing underground pipeline should be eliminated for all the same reasons as the one above.

Act. C-LR 5.3, p. 2-250, avoidance areas:
This is preferable to Alt. D because, together with C-LR 5.4, it better protects important resources, especially those of wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Act. C-LR 5.4, p.2-250, exclusion zones:
This is preferable to Alt. D because the exclusion zones have significantly greater correspondence to priority wildlife habitat. This is especially important for sage grouse who are made vulnerable by overhead lines and big game who are impacted by roads.

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN

- The Pine Forest range should have an ACEC overlay of it's current SMRA status, as proposed by NDOW. Refer to the rationale on p. 9 of these comments, under Pine Forest SRMA.
- Special management actions should be proposed for the ACEC candidates meeting both the relevance and importance criteria, but not proposed as ACECs in this draft. These areas are Lovelock Cave/Leonard Petroglyphs, the Humbolt Range, Gridley and Continental Lakes.

BACKCOUNTRY BY-WAYS

12

Responses

I-Boeger: 34. Federal Regulation prohibit the disposal of lands within a Wilderness or WSA.

Please see Action D –LR 4.1.4, prioritization of the acquisition of in-holdings.

The Utility Corridor mentioned is an existing corridor with 2 transmission lines within it. These transmission lines have been in place for approximately 25-30 years.

The proposed underground corridor was eliminated.

I-Boeger

Comments

- Alternative C objective and actions is the most appropriate for this issue.
  The primarily wild and remote character of much of the BLM public lands is a fragile and increasingly rare resource. The public highly values the sense of discovery these lands offer. Development and increased visitation to areas currently receiving little visitation should not be encouraged or promoted. The result could be unintended negative consequences to other resources.
- Act. D-BCB 1.1.1, p. 2-255, to consider certain BCBs:
  This action is appropriate as long as need is first determined and collaboration includes not only the local communities, but also NDOW, conservation groups and other interested parties.

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

I-Boeger Wild & Scenic River-35a

- Alt. C which provides protection for and develops special management for eligible sections of No. Fork Little Humbolt, Washburn and Crowley is the most appropriate approach to the long-term health and sustainability of these rare and valuable Great Basin resources.
- The LCT habitat, as well as the highly scenic nature of these segments, alone make them worthy of designation.
- Potential controversy and opposition are not appropriate reasons for non-designation.
- The long-term public good should be the primary criteria for designation.
- Like Wilderness designation, this category begs for BLM proactive education of the public as to what actually is and isn't allowed under this designation. WSR designation calls for management "in a manner which maintains or improves forage production, maintains or enhances riparian vegetation …. and minimizes conflict between livestock and recreationists (p. 16, Appendix G)". For these reasons, livestock operations would improve and be made more sustainable over the long-term. Thus, with adequate information provided them, working in partnership with BLM, conservationists and sportsmen, livestock operators should come to recognize the value of such a designation.

WSAs AND LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISITCS

Alt. D with the following exceptions and/or amendments:

Act. D-WSA 2.1, p. 2-257, 258

I-Boeger-35

- Use a combination of Alt. C & D to adequately protect wilderness characteristics. Add to D: limit travel to designated routes, class #1 VRM, closed to mineral leasing, entry and disposal, rights-of-way exclusion area, retain in public ownership, priority 1 wildlife habitat.
- The identified areas should be managed to preserve their wilderness characteristics.
- These areas will provide solitude and primitive unconfined recreation opportunities, filling an important niche on the recreation opportunity spectrum.
- Protecting their wilderness character will also provide protection of important wildlife habitat.
- Add to the list of lands with wilderness characteristics: the Snow Creek drainage south of the Blue Lakes WSA and the core ridge and western flank of the Lava Beds. Both have high scenic and wildlife values.

WATCHABLE WILDLIFE VIEWING SITES

13

Responses

I-Boeger-35a:
No W&SR segments have been identified for designation.

I- Boeger-35: The Pershing County Wilderness Working Group recommendations have been carried forward for the wilderness characteristics included in this RMP. The Pine Forest working group recommendations are being considered by Congress and are likely to be enacted on prior to the finalization of this RMP/EIS. Ultimately WSA status and boundaries would be determined by Congressional action.

The Citizens Proposal put forward by the Pershing County Checkerboard Lands Committee for Wilderness Characteristics Inventory has been adopted by this RMP. This Citizens Group and the BLM determined that the Lava Beds did not meet the criteria for Wilderness Characteristics.

I-Boeger

Comments

Act. C-WWW 1.1, p. 2-258-259, best protects potential areas, currently remote and little visited, from potential unintended negative consequences of increased visitation.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

This is an innovative and appropriate idea for beneficial post-operational land use. This idea should be encouraged, with 1 exception:
Obj. C-SD 1, P. 2-263 adds the key important proviso of " if rehabilitation would not provide a higher public benefit." The highest long-term public benefit should always be the bottom-line criteria in any management decision in order to conform with the sustainability mandate of the MUSY Act.

Responses

14

I-Bryant

Comments	Responses
Max Bryant <maxbryant1952@sbcglobal.net> 07/26/2010 10:06 AM wfoweb@nv.blm.gov To cc B&C Harkreader <harkreader@hughes.net> Subject winnemucca RMP Edwards	
I-Bryant-1 I am writing in response to the open cattle at HRRA. I am opposed to having cattle roaming freely within the area of HRRA, as well as my own personal property. Please, consider making HRRA cattle free. Thank you	I-Bryant-1: Comment noted.
<>< *Max and Susan*	

I-Burns

Comments

Anne Burns
<aplomb90427@mypacks.net>

10/25/2010 05:33 PM

Please respond to
aplomb90427@mypacks.net

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Winnemucca RMP, Edwards

Dear Winnemucca District Office,

The following comments are submitted for consideration with respect to the Bureau of Land Management's proposed public land management policies set forth in the draft Winnemucca Resource Management Plan (RMP).

I-Burns-1 Each of the alternatives in the RMP is "expected to result in higher probabilities for adverse impacts" on wild horse and burro (WHB) populations. Please include plans that prioritize the welfare and protection of WHB in herd management areas (HMA), taking into consideration the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971, with the goal of managing WHB on public lands.

I-Burns-2 - Devote HMAs to the welfare of WHB, rather than all other interests at the expense of WHB;

I-Burns-3 - Implement land improvement strategies for the benefit of WHB, including but not limited to: restoration and/or improvement of water sources, fair access and allocation of prime water and forage sources to WHB, restoration of natural predator/prey relationships, elimination of livestock grazing without lowering appropriate management levels for WHB; and

- Cease the current practice of rounding up, removing, and stockpiling WHB in holding facilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Burns
4511 Stallion Way
Antioch, CA 94531

Responses

I-Burns-1: Comment noted.

I-Burns-2: BLM is mandated by FLPMA to allow for multiple use.

I– Burns 3: The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock grazing, up to and including elimination of livestock grazing. Acquisition of water is addressed through action D-WR 2.2.

I-Capozzelli

Comments

October 21, 2010

RECEIVED BLM
WINNEMUCCA NV
2010 OCT 25 PM 2:16

Winnemucca District RMP
Winnemucca District Office
5100 East Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445

RE: Bureau of Land Management Winnemucca District Office

I-Capozzelli-1 I am writing to urgently ask for a responsible Resource Management Plan that protects wild horse and burro populations in Nevada's Winnemucca District. None of the alternatives described in the proposed Winnemucca RMP adequately protect and preserve wild horses and burros.

The policies presented in the proposed RMP do not change the BLM's reliance on mass wild horse roundups and removals to restrict wild horse populations and allow more federally subsidized cattle grazing on public lands. These are fiscally irresponsible and inhumane policies that have resulted in the stockpiling of approximately 40,000 wild horses in government holding facilities--more than are left free on the range.

A responsible policy must include:

I-Capozzelli-2
- Eliminating livestock grazing within designated wild horse and burro areas.

I-Capozzelli-3
- Minimizing or eliminating harmful activities within wild horse and burro areas, including gas and oil exploration, mining and recreational vehicle activity.

I-Capozzelli-4
- Fairly allocating forage and water resources for wild horses and burros within designated herd management areas.

I-Capozzelli-5
- Increasing appropriate management levels for wild horses and burros based on scientific data.

I-Capozzelli-6
- Enhancing range conditions, including restoration and improvement of water sources for wild horses and other wildlife species.

I-Capozzelli-7
- Protecting predators in an effort to restore natural population control mechanisms.

I-Capozzelli-8
- Supporting public/private partnerships for the creation of wild horse preserves to manage horses on the range without mass removals.

I-Capozzelli-9 Roundups of wild horses and burros should only be conducted in verifiable emergency situations. If necessary, roundups must be conducted with respect for the social integrity of wild horse herds keeping family bands intact during relocation. The "zeroing out" of Herd Management Areas (removing all horses and permanently closing the land to wild horses) should be prohibited.

I-Capozzelli-10 In the past, BLM has set herd management levels so low that entire herds of wild horses have been eliminated or reduced to numbers that guarantee eventual extinction. Wild horses are rounded up by the thousands, ripped from their families and herd groups, and stripped their freedom.

For all of the above stated reasons, I respectfully submit this comment and urge the BLM to adopt a responsible RMP for the Winnemucca District that protects and preserves America's wild horse and burro populations. Thank you for your help on behalf of America's treasured and irreplaceable horses and burros.

Yours truly,
J. Capozzelli, New York

Responses

I-Capozzelli-1: Comment noted.

I-Capozzelli-2: There are no designated wild horse and burros areas. HMAs are areas where burros and wild horses were found in 1971 that we manage for horses but not exclusively. Alternative C-LG 1—option 2 proposes elimination of livestock grazing throughout the WD.

I-Capozzelli-3: The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock management, up to and including elimination of livestock grazing. The BLM has revisited the WH&B management actions and environmental analysis in the final RMP/FEIS.

I-Capozzelli-4: The amount of forage available to allocate to WH&B shall be determined through in-depth evaluation of resource monitoring data and following a site-specific environmental analysis decision process. Forage for WH&B (AUMs) is allocated based on the AML upper limit.

I-Capozzelli-5: Specific allotment AUM allocation decisions are addressed at the site specific or allotment level.

I-Capozzelli-6: This is achieved by maintaining herds at AML and through properly managed livestock grazing.

I-Capozzelli-7: Management of big game species and populations are under the jurisdiction of the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) and is outside the scope of this analysis . See section 1.6 Planning Criteria and Legislative Constraints #3. The BLM works in cooperation with NDOW in the management of big game habitat. Under a multiple-use mandate, the BLM strives to achieve a balanced management of public land resources.

I-Capozzelli-8: Comment noted.

I-Capozzelli-9: Habitat for WH&B is composed of four essential components: forage, water, cover, and space. These components must be present within the HMA in sufficient amounts to sustain healthy WH&B populations and healthy rangelands over the long term. If they are not present in sufficient amounts, the authorized officer should consider amending or revising the LUP to remove the area‘s designation as an HMA. If the decision is made to return a designated HMA to HA status, the total population of WH&B should then be gathered and removed. See BLM Manual Section 4710.3.

I-Capozzelli-10: Comment noted.

I-Cooper

Comments

October 22, 2010

Dave Cooper
PO Box 147
Gerlach NV 89412

Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District
55100 E. Winnemucca Blvd
Winnemucca, NV 89445

Attn: RMP Team

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Winnemucca RMP. I am a member of the RAC Subgroup for the Black Rock NCA and the following are my comments on the Draft RMP.

Recreation Management:

I-Cooper-1 All four of the proposed SRMAs under Alternative D should be designated as such to help provide for a diversity of recreation opportunities and resulting experiences on the public lands. These areas will help diversify local economies through tourism as well as benefit local residents by providing recreation opportunities in close proximity to home.

The Nightingale SRMA as proposed will expand a diversity of recreation opportunities and resulting experiences and benefits that will complement those offered in the adjacent Black Rock NCA. Providing OHV opportunities in the SRMA will provide a much needed place for these activities outside the protected NCA. RMZ 1 including the Selenite and Mount Limbo Mountain WSAs should be managed to provide for the protection of wilderness characteristics and motorized travel should be limited to designated routes rather than existing routes. Management and enforcement of motorized use in these areas will be much easier with designated routes that are well marked. At the same time other routes that have been created by motorized vehicle use since the areas were designated as WSA's need to be closed and rehabilitated. The SRMA will also make it easier to manage competitive motorized events that are taking place in this area.

The Pine Forest SRMA should be expanded and managed as outlined in Alternative D. This is a very unique area within the Winnemucca District and northern Nevada and deserves special

Responses

I-Cooper-1: Action D-R 8.1 includes delineation of four SRMAs.

I-Cooper

Comments	Responses
management and protection of resources. This important area should be withdrawn from all mineral entry, including fluid and solid minerals.	
I-Cooper-2 The Granite Range SRMA will provide for a diversity of recreation opportunities and compliment recreation opportunities provided in proximity to the Black Rock NCA and community of Gerlach. In order to properly manage recreation uses and provide opportunities, the Granite Range SRMA should be expanded to encompass more of the mountain range. Expanding the area will provide for well defined boundaries that are both manageable and identifiable on the ground and can be described. The SRMA boundaries should be expanded to the north to the Winnemucca District boundary, on the west to the existing north – south powerline right of way and/or private lands (or Highway 447) and on the south and east to County Road 34 and/or private land boundaries. Expanding the area will allow for better management of ingress and egress routes as well as management of areas used for different types of recreation pursuits. This will also enhance enforcement as well as allow the recreating public to more easily identify where the boundaries located. The RMZs already identified will also be expanded to more efficiently provide for the types of recreation opportunities appropriate for the SRMA. The entire Granite Mountain SRMA should be withdrawn from all mineral entry including fluid and solid minerals.	I-Cooper-2: BLM identified areas for withdrawal in Action D-MR 9.2
Proposed Areas With Wilderness Characteristics:	
I-Cooper-3 All 6 roadless areas identified in Appendix A, Figure 2-80, need to be managed to preserve their wilderness characteristics, provide for primitive unconfined recreation opportunities, and provide for solitude. These important areas are the last remaining roadless areas with wilderness characteristics left in the Winnemucca District and should be designated as special management areas. Managing these areas to protect wilderness character will help provide for a diversity of primitive recreation opportunities, protect important wildlife habitats, and protect other natural and cultural resources occurring in these undisturbed areas in northern Nevada. Once these areas are lost to roads and development they are gone forever. If these areas are not protected the resulting loss of naturalness, recreation resources and fragmentation of wildlife habitats will result in a greatly reduced, or loss of, recreation opportunities and natural resources (wildlife, vegetation, soil, etc.) into the future.	I-Cooper-3: Seven areas identified as having wilderness characteristics has been brought forward. See D-WSA-1.
Visual Resource Management Areas:	
In addition to the VRM classes outlined in Alternative D the following changes should be made:	
I-Cooper-4 The viewshed in and around Gerlach, Empire, and the Highway 447 travel corridor are high value, very sensitive, and should be designated VRM Class II so that any development will blend in with the landscape instead of contrast to it. The viewshed including the foreground and	I-Cooper-4: The parts of the Selenite Range and the Mount Limbo areas that are in designated WSAs are in a VRM Class I. With regards to Granite Range, Razor Back and the Nightingales, the BLM has developed a range of alternatives that address VRM.

I-Cooper	Comments	Responses
I-Cooper-4 Cont-d	middle ground in all the surrounding mountains: Selenite Range, Fox Range, Granite Range, Old Razor Back Mountain, Mount Limbo and the Nightingale Mountains, are extremely important and of high value to local residents as well as recreation users and visitors to this remote region.	
I-Cooper-5	The proposed utility corridor along the south boundary of the Black Rock NCA should be eliminated and should be designated VRM Class II to protect very important and high value viewsheds. This will insure the integrity of the Black Rock Desert NCA and WSAs in this area remains intact and avoids significant adverse impacts to this special area. The lack of development in this area is a key reason people come to visit and live in the Black Rock region. The sensations of remoteness and solitude on these vast undeveloped public lands contribute to the experiences people seek when they visit or live in this remote area of northwestern Nevada.	I-Cooper-5: This corridor was designated in the 2008 Programmatic EIS for the Designation of Energy Corridors in the 11 Western States. This designation amended the exiting Land Use Plans for the NCA and the Winnemucca District.
	OHV Management:	
I-Cooper-6	Alternative D outlines the most logical OHV designations for the Winnemucca District with a few proposed changes as follows: Closed areas should include the Bluewing Mountains as proposed in Alternative C (Appendix A, Figure 2-9) for a total of 61,427 acres closed to OHV use. This will protect one of the last important roadless areas left in the District while the surrounding area will be managed for motorized recreation and other uses.	I-Cooper-6: This will be further addressed and brought forward in the subsequent Transportation and Travel Management Planning processes.
I-Cooper-7	All of the WSA's in the District should be either closed to OHV use or limited to motorized use that is confined to designated routes as they existed when the areas were designated as WSA's. Routes must be designated to allow for ease of management and enforcement. It will be difficult to manage and enforce OHV use without specifically identifying and marking routes on the ground that can be used for motorized travel. This is also the time to close and rehabilitate vehicle routes that are causing resource damage, are redundant and go to the same locations, or are not necessary for access or transportation purposes. This will help eliminate damage to wildlife habitats or fragmentation of habitats, soil, water, and other natural and cultural resources.	I-Cooper-7: See response to I-Cooper-6.
	Salable Minerals:	
I-Cooper-8	Salable minerals should be allowed as outlined in Alternative D with the following modifications: Areas in and immediately adjacent to the communities of Gerlach and Empire should be protected from impacts associated the extraction of salable minerals. The adjacent lands within at least 1 mile should be closed to new sales or require special stipulations to avoid impacts to the high value viewshed, health and safety of residents, as well as air and water quality.	I-Cooper-8: Areas closed to saleable minerals are identified at D-MR 2.2

I-Cooper

Comments

Fluid Mineral Leasing:

Alternative C provides the most protection for sensitive and valuable natural and cultural resources in the Winnemucca District. The areas in and immediately adjacent to the communities of Gerlach and Empire should be closed to fluid mineral leasing in order to provide for the health and safety of residents, protect air and water quality and provide for an unspoiled high value viewshed.

Solid Mineral Leasing Areas:

I-Cooper-9

Alternative D provides a reasonable availability of lands for solid mineral leasing. However, in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to local communities, the areas in and immediately adjacent (within 1 mile) to the communities of Gerlach and Empire should be closed to new leasing to protect the health and safety of residents, provide for air and water quality, and protect the high value viewshed. In addition, areas within sight and sound of the Black Rock NCA and designated wilderness boundaries should be included in the area that is open with standard and special stipulations in order to help mitigate and protect the integrity of the NCA, national historic trails and wilderness resources. Sights and sounds from construction, road building, and mining activities in close proximity to theses sensitive special areas would disrupt the recreation experiences and solitude that is an integral part of the of the NCA and wilderness areas.

General Mining Law of 1872:

I-Cooper-10

Alternative C provides a reasonable management approach to areas available for mining under the general mining law of 1872. Sensitive lands with sensitive resources should be closed to entry including the Pine Forest SRMA and expanded Granite Mountain SRMA. In addition to the areas outlined in Alternative C, the lands in and immediately adjacent to the communities of Gerlach and Empire should be closed to entry in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to these local communities. This will help provide for resident health and safety, protect quality of life in these communities, protect air and water quality as well as protect the surrounding high value viewshed. In addition, areas within sight and sound of the Black Rock NCA and designated wilderness boundaries should be open with special mitigation on operations in order to protect the integrity of the NCA, wilderness resources, and national historic trails from the sights and sounds of development and mining activities as well as provide for protection of sensitive natural and cultural resources and very important, high value viewsheds. Any large developments in close proximity will have significant long term adverse impacts from sights and

Responses

I-Cooper-9:
The proposed RMP incorporates many of the objectives and management actions proposed in alternative D in the Draft RMP.

I-Cooper-10:
Please note that withdrawals of over 5000 acres must have Congressional approval.

I-Cooper	Comments	Responses
I-Cooper-10 Cont-d	sounds of development and especially from long term mining activities, increased traffic, new and permanent road, utility, and infrastructure developments, etc.	
	Proposed Utility Corridors:	
I-Cooper-11	Alternative C contains reasonable utility corridor routes through the District. Alternative D shows a route adjacent to the south boundary of the Black Rock NCA that should be eliminated. Any large scale utility development in this area, such as a major powerline, will cause significant long term adverse impacts to the integrity of the NCA, the historic Applegate Lassen Trail, and the Seleinte WSA. The adjacent mountains and viewshed are high value and extremely important to the integrity of the Black Rock NCA, wilderness, and national historic trails. Irretrievable impacts will occur to the California National Historic Trail if any large scale development disturbs the trail corridor. The integrity of the relatively undeveloped primitive nature of the trail corridor will be lost with construction of a major power line or pipeline in this location.	I-Cooper-11: See response to I-Cooper-5.
	Lands and Reality:	
	Alternative D, figure 2-74 provides a reasonable plan for land tenure. Sensitive lands and resources should be retained in federal ownership. Environmentally sensitive private lands and resources should be purchased from willing sellers as the opportunity arises. Important private inholdings within WSAs, wilderness areas, ACECs, SRMAs and other special areas should be considered for acquisition to be managed the same as the adjacent public lands. This will protect important resources, enhance management of lands in these areas, provide for public access and enhance recreation opportunities.	
I-Cooper-12	An area of public lands adjacent to the south side of Gerlach should be identified for disposal. This small area of public lands should be given to the Gerlach General Improvement District, under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, for the public purpose of continued use and expansion of the sewer holding ponds.	I-Cooper-12: Lands designated for possible disposal around Gerlach were coordinated with Washoe County.
	Right of Way Avoidance and Exclusion Areas:	
I-Cooper-13	Alternative D provides for protection of sensitive areas and, in addition, the public land areas immediately within and adjacent to Gerlach and Empire should have special stipulations that will provide for resident health and safety and protect the surrounding high value viewshed as well as protect soil, water, air and other natural and cultural resources.	I-Cooper-13: Gerlach does not meet the criteria for avoidance or exclusion areas. Gerlach residents will be given the opportunity to comment on any project as specified in the NEPA process.

I-Cooper	Comments	Responses
	Wild and Scenic Rivers:	
I-Cooper-14 Wild & Scenic Rivers	I support recommending the eligible segments of the North Fork Little Humboldt River, Washburn Creek, and Crowley Creek (for a total of 19 miles) for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. The outstandingly remarkable resources must be protected in these special areas.	I-Cooper-14: BLM developed a range of alternatives.

I-Crews

Comments

"Janna M. Crews" <janna@moday.oc>

09/16/2010 07:41 PM

To "wfoweb@nv.blm.gov" <wfoweb@nv.blm.gov>
cc
Subject Winnemucca RMP, Edwards

To whom it may concern:
As a Friend of Nevada Wilderness, I support the following regarding identification and management of Wilderness Characteristics Areas, as well as Wilderness Study

Areas.
Wilderness Characteristics Areas

- We support the RMP's identification of the following areas as having wilderness characteristics: Fencemaker, North Sahwave Mountains, Tobin Range and the two units in the Granite Range (Buckhorn Peak and Granite Peak).
- In addition, we request that you add these areas to the list of Wilderness Characteristics Areas:
  - the area directly south of the Blue Lakes WSA to the Sage Hen drainage, and
  - the highly-scenic core ridge of the Lava Beds including its western flank.

I-Crews-1

Management of Wilderness Characteristics Areas
We would ask that you more clearly define the management actions for protecting the Wilderness Characteristics Areas as follows. These areas should be:

- designated as "limited to designated routes,"
- classified as a Class I for Visual Resource Management,
- closed to mineral material disposal, mineral leasing and mineral entry,
- included in rights-of-way exclusion areas, and
- retained in public ownership.

I-Crews-2

Wilderness Study Areas

- We support designating all WSAs as "limited to designated routes" and we stress that a high priority should be given to identifying these routes with signs and on maps;
- high priority also should be given to promptly restoring wilderness character from damage created by vehicle incursions within the WSAs, and
- we support the acquisition of private inholdings in WSAs, Wilderness and in Wilderness Characteristics Areas to enhance wild character.

Thank you for considering these comments and working to protect wild places in Nevada.

Sincerely,
Janna M, Crews, PhD
Reno, NV 89519

Responses

I-Crews-1:
Comment noted.

I-Crews:2: BLM has identified lands having wilderness characteristics in the RMP. The Pershing County Wilderness Working Group recommendations have been carried forward for the wilderness characteristics included in this RMP. The BLM also included eligible lands with wilderness characteristics as identified in the Ruby Pipeline EIS. The Pine Forest working group recommendations are being considered by Congress and are likely to be enacted on prior to the finalization of this RMP/EIS. Ultimately WSA status and boundaries would be determined by Congressional action.

I-Crone

Comments

Responses

comments@wdo.mrp
09/06/2010 02:46 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

```
TodaysDate = (0: '09/06/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Donald')
LastName = (0: 'Crone')
Address = (0: '21555 Old Victory Hwy')
City = (0: 'Lovelock')
ZipCode = (0: '89419')
State = (0: 'NV')
Telephone = (0: '')
email = (0: 'donald_crone@yahoo.com')
MailingList = (0: 'Yes')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Livestock Grazing'; 1: 'Minerals (Hardrock, Oil &
Gas)')
Comment = (0: 'I  am in favor of Aternative D under livestock grazing.
Perticularly the :"Action D-LG 1.3".
```

I-Crone-1

```
I think under Mineral Resources, there should be a restriction of all mining
operations within 2 miles of a domestic water well, for pubilc health and
safety reasons.
```

I-Crone-1:
Comment noted.

```
')
```

I-Crowder

Comments

comments@wdo.mrp
09/23/2010 06:24 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

```
TodaysDate = (0: '9/23/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Mark')
LastName = (0: 'Crowder')
Address = (0: '2816 Appaloosa Court')
City = (0: 'Pinole')
ZipCode = (0: '94564')
State = (0: 'CA')
Telephone = (0: '')
email = (0: '')
MailingList = (0: 'No')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Livestock Grazing')
Comment = (0: 'I own one parcel on the Humboldt River Ranch and would like to
see the grazing of cattle stopped on my property as well as on the
developement at large.  The cattle complicate the maintenance of roads on the
property and are a safety concern for owners.  It also increases the assesment
of my property by the owners association.  I do not like the manure left
behind by the cattle.  They also eat whatever vegetation I try to establish on
my property.

I would like to see the grazing rights of the cattle be terminated on the
Humboldt River Ranch property.')
```

I-Crowder-1

Responses

I-Crowder-1:
A range of alternatives for closing areas to livestock grazing was provided in LG 1.3.

I-Curtis

Comments

Responses

jan2curtis@aol.com

09/22/2010 03:20 PM

To wfoweb@nv.blm.gov
cc
Subject WINNEMUCCA EDWARDS

Wilderness Characteristics Areas:

- We support the RMP's identification of the following areas as having wilderness characteristics: Fencemaker, North Sahwave Mountains, Tobin Range and the two units in the Granite Range (Buckhorn Peak and Granite Peak).
- In addition, we request that you add these areas to the list of Wilderness Characteristics Areas:
  - The area directly south of the Blue Lakes WSA to the Sage Hen drainage, and
  - The highly-scenic core ridge of the Lava Beds including its western flank

I-Curtis-1:

Management of Wilderness Characteristics Areas:
We ask that you more clearly define the management actions for protecting the Wilderness Characteristics Areas. These areas should be:

- Designated as "limited to designated routes,"
- Classified as a Class I for Visual Resource Management,
- Closed to mineral material disposal, mineral leasing and mineral entry,
- Included in rights-of-way exclusion areas, and
- Retained in public ownership.

Wilderness Study Areas:

- We support designating all WSAs as "limited to designated routes" and we stress that a high priority should be given to identifying these routes with signs and on maps;
- High priority also should be given to promptly restoring wilderness character from damage created by vehicle incursions within the WSAs, and
- We support the acquisition of private inholdings in WSAs, Wilderness and in Wilderness Characteristics Areas to enhance wild character.

I-Curtis-1:
See Action C-WSA 2.1

I-DeCarlo

Comments

October 24, 2010

Winnemucca RMP
c/o Bob Edwards
Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445

RE: Winnemucca District Office Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Bob Edwards:

Background

I-DeCarlo-1

I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Winnemucca District Office Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. My background is in equine reproductive immunology and wildlife conservation. At this time, I do not support the proposed action as outlined in Alternative A, Alternative B, or Alternative D. The rationale for this decision is described in detail below but hinges on two important fallacies made throughout BLM literature. It is not true that Porcine Zona Pellucida (PZP) contraception is completely reversible. It is also not true that putting 80-90% of breeding age mares on PZP is a slow population growth plan. It is a negative population growth plan. Furthermore, it important that the definition of population growth be understood as the number of live foal births minus the number of deaths (from all sources).

Porcine Zona Pellucida (PZP) Contraception

I-DeCarlo-2

Porcine Zona Pellucida (PZP) contraception is not completely reversible in mares depending on the length of use. Contraception can only be reversed when the antibody titer decreases to 50-60% of the positive reference sera.[1] Mares treated for 7 consecutive years do not return to viable fertility.[2, 3] The issue of reversible contraception is very important to be able to maintain wild equines in the United States. Long term treatment with PZP has inherent negative potential for the Winnemucca herds. Table 2-3 on page 2-93 says that longer than four year cycles are preferred for use of fertility control inhibitors (PZP). This plan would insure that the mares taken out of the herd, administered PZP, and returned, may never reproduce. Since the plan would capture 80%-90% of the herd, and vaccinate all mares returned to the range, this would be catastrophic to sustaining the herd but also to the genetic variation of the species. There is absolutely no specific selection plan outlined for the mares returned to the range, only those removed.

There is a lag time for returning to fertility after PZP for consecutive use in mares of less than the aforementioned 7 years. Even 3 consecutive years of PZP treatment can mean a delay in pregnancy of 1-8 years (mean of 3.7 years).[2, 3] In domestic mares, it took 8.5 months to reverse

Responses

I-DeCarlo-1: Comment noted.

I-DeCarlo-2: The commenter is looking at a study where mares were treated 7 consecutive years in a row, or back to back. BLM does not treat mares for seven consecutive years.

I-DeCarlo

Comments

I-DeCarlo-3

effects of PZP after only one year of treatment.[4] Because equines are a seasonally polyestrous species with long days (May, June, July in North America) being their natural breeding season, this equates to a minimum of one year to a maximum of 8 years without new foals for the mares taken off PZP. However, the longer mares are kept barren the greater the risk of being permanently incapable of reproducing. This, combined with the plan to vaccinate all sexually mature mares, 19 years of age and younger, will contribute to an aging barren mare population. The anatomy of the female reproductive organs is strongly influenced by age.[5] Young, healthy mares (3-12 years) ensure the highest per-cycle pregnancy rate and the lowest pregnancy loss rate.[6-10] Estimates of the embryonic loss rate between fertilization and day 10 post fertilization is 9% for young mares compared to 60 to 70% for aged mares.[8, 11-13] Older maiden mares (> 12 years) are susceptible to post-breeding endometritis and are therefore difficult to get pregnant.[14] Endometrial glandular degenerative changes and stromal fibrosis (endometrosis) are an inevitable consequence of aging.[15] Often, an older maiden mare has an abnormally tight cervix, which fails to relax properly during estrus so that fluid is unable to drain and accumulates in the uterine lumen.[16] Once the mare is bred, the fluid accumulation is aggravated because of poor lymphatic drainage and impaired myometrial contraction compounded by the tight cervix.[14] The group with the greatest reduction in fertility is older maiden mares.

I-DeCarlo-4

The current Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D plans in relation to mare PZP contraception will egregiously affect any future reproductive capacity of preserving our national heritage species (PL 92-195). Specifically, the herd in the Winnemucca District is in peril of any future reproductive viability if PZP is administered to the quantity of mares, combined with the number of years, proposed in this plan. It is important to note that Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D are not slow growth, nor zero population growth, plans. Analogous to the Assateague Island National Seashore herd plan, Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D are negative population growth plans.[17] Combined with removal of wild horses to the lower limits of the Appropriate Management Levels, the contraceptive plans in Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D are unwarranted for this herd.

Sincerely,

Christine DeCarlo

Christine DeCarlo, Ph.D.
1721 O Street, Apt. 6
Sacramento, CA 95811
tuacakyd@netzero.net
916.833.7930

1. Liu, I.K., Turner, J.W., Jr., Van Leeuwen, E.M., Flanagan, D.R., Hedrick, J.L., Murata, K., Lane, V.M. & Morales-Levy, M.P. (2005) Persistence of anti-zonae pellucidae antibodies following a single inoculation of porcine zonae pellucidae in the domestic equine. *Reproduction* 129, 181-190.

Responses

I-DeCarlo-3:
Use of PZP is directed by BLM policy.

I-DeCarlo-4:
Use of PZP is directed by BLM policy.

I-DeCarlo

Comments

Responses

2. Kirkpatrick, J.F. & Turner, A. (2002) Reversibility of action and safety during pregnancy of immunization against porcine zona pellucida in wild mares (Equus caballus). *Reprod Suppl* 60, 197-202.
3. Kirkpatrick, J.F., Rowan, A., Lamberski, N., Wallace, R., Frank, K. & Lyda, R. (2009) The practical side of immunocontraception: zona proteins and wildlife. *J Reprod Immunol* 83, 151-157.
4. Liu, I.K., Bernoco, M. & Feldman, M. (1989) Contraception in mares heteroimmunized with pig zonae pellucidae. *J Reprod Fertil* 85, 19-29.
5. Dyce, K.M., Sack, W.O. & Wensing, C.J.G. (1987) *Textbook of Veterinary Anatomy*. (W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphila, PA).
6. Hearn, F.P.D. (2000) Reproductive Efficiency, in *Equine Breeding Management and Artificial Insemination*, Edn. 1st. (ed. Samper, J.C.) 267-281 (W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, PA).
7. Ginther, O.J. (1992) *Reproductive Biology of the Mare*, Edn. Second. (Equiservices, Cross Plains, WI).
8. Ball, B.A., Little, T.V., Weber, J.A. & Woods, G.L. (1989) Survival of day-4 embryos from young, normal mares and aged, subfertile mares after transfer to normal recipient mares. *J Reprod Fertil* 85, 187-194.
9. Waelchli, R.O. (1990) Endometrial biopsy in mares under nonuniform breeding management conditions: Prognostic value and relationship with age. *Can. Vet. J.* 31, 379-384.
10. Evans, M.J., Hamer, J.M., Gason, L.M. & Irvine, C.H. (1987) Factors affecting uterine clearance of inoculated materials in mares. *J Reprod Fertil Suppl* 35, 327-334.
11. Ball, B.A. (1988) Embryonic loss in mares. Incidence, possible causes, and diagnostic considerations. *Vet. Clin. North Am. Equine Pract.* 4, 263-290.
12. Ball, B.A. (2000) Reduced Reproductive Efficiency in the Aged Mare: Role of Early Embryonic Loss, in *Recent Advances in Equine Reproduction*. (ed. Ball, B.A.) Document No. A0201.0300 (International Veterinary Information Service, Ithaca, NY).
13. Brinsko, S.P., Ball, B.A., Miller, P.G., Thomas, P.G. & Ellington, J.E. (1994) In vitro development of day 2 embryos obtained from young, fertile mares and aged, subfertile mares. *J Reprod Fertil* 102, 371-378.
14. Pycock, J.F. (2000) Breeding Management of the Problem Mare, in *Equine Breeding Management and Artificial Insemination*, Edn. 1st. (ed. Samper, J.C.) 195-228 (W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, PA).
15. Ricketts, S.W. & Alonzo, S. (1991) The effect of age and parity on the development of chronic endometrial disease. *Equne Vet. J.* 23, 189.
16. Pycock, J.F. (1993) Cervical function and uterine fluid accumulation in mares. *Equine Vet J Suppl* 25, 191.
17. Kirkpatrick, J.F. & Turner, A. (2008) Achieving population goals in a long-lived wildlife species (*Equus caballus*) with contraception. *Wildlife Research* 35, 513-519.

I-Devlin

Comments

MARYBETH DEVLIN
<marybethdevlin@bellsouth.net>
10/25/2010 08:56 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc Chair@ceq.eop.gov, FN-CEQ-OpenGov@ceq.eop.gov, in.approp@mail.house.gov, INT@appro.senate.gov, feedback@ios.doi.gov, Director@blm.gov
bcc
Subject Winnemucca RMP c/o Bob Edwards

October 25, 2010

Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445

Subject: **Winnemucca RMP -- Comments on Appendix K**

Attention: Bob Edwards

These comments pertain to Appendix K -- **Wild Horse and Burro Standards and Guidelines** -- of the draft Winnemucca Resource Management Plan (RMP).

I-Devlin-1

The draft RMP needs to be amended to provide for a fair distribution of animal unit month (AUM) grazing allocations and appropriate management levels (AMLs) for wild horses in the Winnemucca District. The Standards and Guidelines must ensure that wild horses can thrive on the range with minimal interference. The Bureau of Land Management needs to focus on managing **the land** -- specifically the forage and water resources -- per the multiple-use mandate. Monitoring is not management. Deficiencies disclosed through monitoring reflect a failure of management. BLM needs to relinquish its misguided focus on ridding the range of wild horses as the solution to every problem. The RMP, in its current form, merely perpetuates the incompetent management-by-removal method that BLM has been practicing for the past 30 years. A complete change in strategy is long overdue.

The RMP needs to establish Standards and Guidelines for Wild Horses and Burros that meet the following criteria:

- Allocation of grazing resources must be equitable. Commercial livestock should have no more grazing rights than wild horses and burros.
- Herd management areas (HMAs) should be designated for the primary use of wild horses and burros and only secondarily for livestock grazing.
- Zeroing out wild horses and burros must stop, and HMAs previously closed to wild horses must be re-opened, even if that means closing those areas to livestock grazing.
- AMLs must be generous so as to ensure genetic viability without the need to import horses from other

Responses

I-Devlin-1:
The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock grazing, up to and including elimination of livestock grazing.

I-Devlin

Comments

Responses

I-Devlin –1 Cont-d

areas.

- Management of the range needs to be active and should include, but not be limited to:
  -- range-pasture rotation;
  -- reseeding with ricegrass, wheatgrass, and other indigenous forage;
  -- installation of guzzlers to provide drinking water for all animals;
  -- placement of guzzlers to keep animals away from riparian areas;
  -- exclusionary temporary fencing to protect areas being reclaimed
- Wild horses and burros that inadvertently cross the invisible borders of the HMAs should be guided back into the HMA, not permanently removed.
- Removals of wild horses and burros should be restricted to outbreaks of contagious diseases. Drought, fire, and other such emergency situations should specify only temporary removal, with the animals returned to the HMAs promptly when conditions improve.
- Helicopter gathers must be abolished. Gentle, humane roundup methods must be adopted.
- All roundups must be conducted in a manner that keeps horse and burro family bands intact.
- Racing of motor vehicles and aircraft should be banned without exception.
- Predators should be reintroduced to provide population control.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

Marybeth Devlin
5880 SW 27th ST
Miami, FL 33155

I-Dufurrena

Comments

Responses

comments@wdo.mrp
10/03/2010 11:07 AM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

```
TodaysDate = (0: '10/3/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Tim')
LastName = (0: 'Dufurrena')
Address = (0: '385 Denio Hwy 140')
City = (0: 'Winnemucca')
ZipCode = (0: '89445')
State = (0: 'NV')
Telephone = (0: '')
email = (0: '')
MailingList = (0: 'Yes')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Wildlife / Sensitive Species')
Comment = (0: 'I support Alternative B in Action B-FW1.5. I do NOT think
pioneering elk should be allowed to become established in the planning area.

I support Alternative D Objective D-FW6.  establishing guzzlers



')
```

I-Dufurrena-1

I-Dufurrena-1: Comment noted.

I-Dufurrena

Comments

Comments from Tim Dufurrena

Winnemucca District RMP 2010

October 3, 1020

NOTE: When we tried to submit this document online, we got a 404 Not found message. Therefore, we are submitting this by email; we will also deliver in person to Zwaantje Rorex at the Winnemucca office.

I support Alternative B, Action B-LG 1.4.

I-Dufurrena-1 I Strongly support Alternative B, Action B-LG 1. 9. Providing for multiple use by not retiring grazing permits and not providing forage banks. I question the following:

1) Who will maintain improvements (fences, waters) in years when the forage bank is not in use?

2) How will permittees be fairly chosen in a drought or fire year? when multiple requests are received?

3) Forage banks which lie fallow for several years will become heavy fuel load, fire-prone areas themselves.

I strongly support Alternative B Action B-LG 1.11 Allowing TNR on a case by case basis. Why restrict agency personnel's decision making ability by placing more criteria on their decision? Alternative D lists multiple criteria and then says we can still do TNR on a case by case basis. Keep it simple. Don't muddy the waters.

I support Alternative B Action B-LG 1.12. Allowing continuous season-long use where it has been demonstrated to be consistent with achieving land health standards. Why change this when it's been proven to be working?

I support Alternative B, Action B-LG 4.1 Support conversion from cattle to sheep if adverse impacts are mitigated, why not? Buffer zones will prevent contact with other species.

I strongly support Alternative D, Action D-LG 5.2.

I strongly support alternative B, Action B-LG 5.4. Where new waters are developed for livestock in big game habitats, provide water for wildlife only when livestock are present. I do not think that the rancher needs to be liable for providing water for wildlife if livestock have been removed.

Wild Horse and Burro Management

I strongly support Alternative B, Action B-WHB 3.2 and 3.3. Do NOT acquire water rights as beneficial use for wild horses and burros. Do not develop alternative waters to support a population which is already unmanageable. There are multiple Supreme Court decisions which affirm that the federal government has no business appropriating private water rights for wildlife.

Responses

I-Dufurrena-1: Maintenance and identification of eligible users for forage banks users would be addressed in an implementation level plan.

I-Dufurrena

Comments

Responses

ACECs

I strongly support Alternative B Action B-ACEC 1.1.

Fish and Wildlife

I support Alternative B, Action B-FW 1.5. Do not allow pioneering elk herds to become established in management areas.

Special Status Species

I support Alternative B, Action B-SSS1.2.1.

Comments

Sally Echeverria
<sfancherech@yahoo.com>
08/16/2010 08:25 PM

To BLM <wfoweb@blm.gov>
cc
Subject Rye Patch Grazing

BLM
Winnemucca, NV 89445 August 16, 2010

Gentlemen:

I-Echeverria-1 I am a 65 year resident of Pershing County - Lovelock. I am a product of a cowboy/miner. I know about mining and about cattle grazing. I just want to inform you that the Rye Patch Estates was not very well thought out in the beginning - because there was and are mining and open range cattle grazing in that area and has been forever. Because the RPE did not do their homework in the first place - the cattle ranchers are in jeopardy of loosing their grazing rights. Rights that they bought and paid for.

People choose where they want to live - it is their responsibility check out the area and be sure that they do want to share the space with the ongoing businesses.
Rye Patch Estates established their subdivision, sold out and went on their merry way without being held responsible. These people are now demanding no mining, no cattle, police protection, paved roads, etc. etc. Demanding, not willing to compromise, not willing to fence themselves off.
This is truly a travisty that the current cattle ranchers are reduced not only for paying for the grazing rights but now having to hire lawyers to defend the OPEN RANGE laws that are currently in force. Please do not give the RPE the satisfaction of resinding the current law and find in favor of the Cattle Ranchers.
Thank you for you re-consideration.
Sincerely
Sally Echeverria
P.O. Box 556
Lovelock, NV 89419
P.S. This was first sent in error - in a incomplete manner.

Responses

I-Echeverria-1: Action D-LG 1.3 does not close grazing in areas near Rye Patch Estates.

I-Eckert

Comments

RECEIVED BLM
WINNEMUCCA NV

2010 NOV -1 PM 1:44

October 28, 2010
5620 Robert Scott Dr. N.
Jacksonville, Florida 32207

Bob Edwards
Winnemucca District Office
Bureau of Land Management
5100 East Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445-2921

REF: Winnemucca RMP/Wild horses and burros

Dear Mr. Edwards:

I-Eckert –1 Please revise the proposed alternatives in the Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) to ensure that appropriate management levels are increased through fair distribution of resources .

Wild horses must be treated humanely and be given realistc space to behave normally and to thrive on the ranges. Due to peoples' desire to control use of property for our own ends, we have punished and driven out thousands of wild horses and burros. The wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act mandates that wild horses and burros be considered an "integral part of the natural system'. The proposed RMP fails to uphold that mandate.

I-Eckert –2

I-Eckert –3 I urge the following:
Designate all Herd Management Areas to be managed mainly for wild horses or burros as stated under 43C.F.R.4710.3-2.

Do not give ranching industry or other commercial interests more resources over wild horses and burros.

Immediately cease hauling off these animals, and instead use appropriate means such as range rotation and temporary fencing to restore compromised range areas.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Eckert

Jacqueline Eckert

Responses

I-Eckert-1:
Specific allotment and HMA AUM allocation decisions are addressed at the site specific or allotment level.

I-Eckert-2: Management of WH&B on the public lands is limited to herd areas (HAs), consistent with the WFRHBA (16 USC § 1339) which states: ―Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to relocate wild free-roaming horses or burros to areas of the public lands where they do not presently exist.

I-Eckert –3: Consistent with 43 CFR 4710.3-1, Herd Management Areas (HMAs) shall be established for the maintenance of WH&B herds. In delineating each HMA, the authorized officer shall consider the appropriate management level for the herd, the habitat requirements of the animals, and the relationships with other uses of the public and adjacent private lands, and the constraints contained in § 4710.4.

I-Fall

Comments

comments@wdo.mrp
09/03/2010 04:43 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

```
TodaysDate = (0: '09/03/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Peter')
LastName = (0: 'Fall')
Address = (0: '13745 Chamy Dr.')
City = (0: 'Reno')
ZipCode = (0: '89521')
State = (0: 'NV')
Telephone = (0: '')
email = (0: 'fallmartreno@gmail.com')
MailingList = (0: 'No')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Livestock Grazing')
Comment = (0: 'I am a landowner in the Humboldt River Ranch Association.  The
is a developement on the Southwest side of the Rye Patch Resovoir. I would
like to voice  my opposition to the open range grazing on the Humboldt River
Ranch association property. This is a residential community and the private
roads are damaged by the grazing and unhealthy conditions result as a result
of the grazing. Also, damage can be done to flower bed and other landscaping
projects. I would like to see grazing end in this area.
Peter Fall')
```

I-Fall-1

Responses

I-Fall-1:
A range of alternatives for closing areas to livestock grazing was provided in LG 1.3.

I-Fernandez

Comments

"ponydoc \(Dr Donna\)" <ponydoc@abqglobal.net>

10/21/2010 09:17 PM

To wfowebl@blm.gov
cc
Subject RMP Comment - Winnemucca Burros & Wild Horses

Dear *BLM,* Re: Winnemucca District RMP

As an avid user of public, state and federal lands who is also an equine veterinarian, outdoor enthusiast, camper, hiker, horseback rider, mountain-biker, conservationist, and concerned citizen, I am writing to urge you to adopt a more responsible Resource Management Plan that protects wild horse and burro populations in Nevada's Winnemucca District. Unfortunately, none of the alternatives described in the proposed Winnemucca RMP adequately protect and preserve wild horses and burros.

I-Fernandez-1

Regrettably, the policies presented in the proposed RMP do not change the BLM's reliance on mass wild horse roundups and removals to restrict wild horse populations. Unlike many opponents I feel that careful monitored grazing by domesticated herbivorous species is vital to keeping range areas from suffering overgrowth which can increase fire hazards. I know there are many pros and cons but this is not the place for that particular discussion.
I personally feel that a more responsible policy would include:

- Restriction of livestock grazing within designated wild horse and burro areas which are considered highly arid/low vegetation areas in order to let those animals which were there first, (the wild population), survive.

I-Fernandez-2

- More careful monitoring of flora and fauna where species must co-exist in order to better assess impact on the land under the use by such species and thereby establish better information in order to regulate the land and its use in a more natural manner.

- Minimizing or improving regulations of harmful activities within wild horse and burro areas, including gas and oil exploration, mining and recreational vehicle activity.

- Fairly allocating forage and water resources for wild horses and burros within designated herd management areas.

- Increasing appropriate management levels for wild horses and burros based on scientific data.

- Enhancing range conditions, including restoration and improvement of water sources for wild horses and other wildlife species.

- Protecting predators in an effort to restore natural population control mechanisms.

- Utilizing PZP fertility control, where necessary, to control wild horse reproduction; and

- Supporting public/private partnerships for the creation of wild horse preserves to manage horses on the range without mass removals.

Responses

I-Fernandez-1:
The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock grazing, up to and including elimination of

I-Fernandez-2:
Allocation of forage and identification AML are done at the implementation planning level on a case by case basis. Managing of predators falls under jurisdiction of the Nevada Department of Wildlife. Use of PZP is identified at D-WH&B 5.3

I-Fernandez

Comments

I firmly agree with the ASPCA's stance that roundups of wild horses and burros should only be conducted in verifiable emergency situations. The current methods employed are very unfortunate when one considers the innate herd instinct of these animals and their highly social behavior. Animals are separated from their social groups, weaned abruptly or incorrectly and often suffer such intense anxiety due to these and other factors that they may never emotionally or physically recover. This may not be as evident in those re-released but it is seen often in adopted animals.

There is no reason that when necessary, roundups couldn't be carefully conducted with respect for the social integrity of wild horse herds keeping family bands intact during relocation.

Also, the "zeroing out" of Herd Management Areas (removing all horses and permanently closing the land to wild horses) should be prohibited.

I am merely a concerned citizen who is both educated and knowledgeable with respect to animal science, veterinary medicine, soil/land management, wildlife resources, as well as being an intense advocate for responsible use and preservation of all precious resources. I have great respect for the BLM and what you are charged with doing. Unfortunately politics, lobbyists, and sometimes just poor management often gets in the way and obstructs even a well intentioned organization. Please, to truly save some of the last wild places and a huge part of our founding heritage as well as just plainly and simply taking a more humane stance, I strongly request that the BLM entertain the consideration of adopting a more responsible RMP for the Winnemucca District that protects and preserves America's wild horse and burro populations.

I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Donna K. Fernandez, C.V.A., B.V.Sc., D.V.M.
PO Box 907
Twenty-nine Palms, CA 92277
760-367-9560

God Bless our military, especially the Marines from 29 Palms M.C.A.G.C.C. who sacrifice to fight for our freedom and safety.

>>This e-mail message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipients and may contain proprietary and/or confidential information which may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you

Responses

I-Francesconi

Comments

comments@wdo.mrp
09/07/2010 11:15 AM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

```
TodaysDate = (0: '9/7/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Gisela')
LastName = (0: 'Francesoni')
Address = (0: '22025 Chimney Creek Rd')
City = (0: 'l')
ZipCode = (0: '89419')
State = (0: 'NV')
Telephone = (0: '')
email = (0: '')
MailingList = (0: 'No')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Livestock Grazing')
Comment = (0: 'I am writing to give my support to Humboldt River Ranch
Association for grazing rights to be WITHDRAWN  from this Community.  Since
the cattle are  dropped off to graze in a community that has homes and
property that has been negatively affected by the cattle.  It is also very
dangerous for the members of HRRA since the cattle jump out of nowhere right
onto the roads, it is especially dangerous at night, and many a time I have
almost hit one of these cows.  Not to mention that they destroy our roads,
their mire our roads to the point that we have to spend extra money to keep
them navigatable.  I am sure there are others places that BLM can provide for
these cow to graze, rather than in this subdivision. ')
```

I-Francesconi -1

Responses

I-Francesconi-1:
A range of alternatives for closing areas to livestock grazing was provided in LG 1.3.

I-Francesconi

Comments

Responses

---- Forwarded by Lisa Ross/WFO/NV/BLM/DOI on 08/13/2010 09:04 AM ----

gisela francesconi <gillakenn@gmail.com>

08/12/2010 09:52 AM

To wfoweb@nv.blm.gov
cc
Subject Re: Cattle Free Zone for HRRA

I-Francesconi - 2

I don't usually address these situations, but I feel I must support our community in this endeavor. We have lived on HRR property for 11 years, and as soon as we moved here we put up a BLM Approved Fence, as we felt the need to protect our property. Because the cows are so destructive, however, our roads were mired in churned up mud from the hoofs of cow prints. No to mention since we don't have street lights, many a time we almost hit one coming home at night... they just pop out of nowhere, a very dangerous situation. Since it's such a simple fix to make this area a cattle free zone, putting up a fence to surround the property seems very cost **ineffective,** I am sure there are other places for these animals to graze, without all these **foolish attempts** to fix this problem, and all the expenses that it would entail.

This is a residential community, and the cattle should not be allowed to roam at will to destroy our property.

Please note: I understand there will be a meeting on July 27th, and since I am handicapped, I find it difficult to attend, so please take this response as if I were there, and adding my 2cents worth. Please do not make this harder than it has to be, by simply making HRRA a cattle free zone.

Thank-you,

G. Francesconi

22025 Chimney Creek Rd.

Lovelock, NV 89419

I-Francesconi - 2: BLM has revisited areas opened and closed to livestock grazing in the FEIS/RMP. The PRMP does not close allotments near Rye Patch Estates.

I-Frye

Comments

Leslie Frye
<kyfilly75@aol.com>
10/25/2010 08:43 AM
Please respond to
kyfilly75@aol.com

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Winnemucca RMP, Edwards

Dear Winnemucca District Office,

As an American citizen and taxpayer, I am greatly displeased with the DOI / BLM handling of PUBLIC lands with regard to the wild horse herds, which I believe borders on criminal abuse of the animals, mismanagement of public lands, and waste of taxpayer dollars (holding pens).

Therefore, please accept these comments on the draft Winnemucca Resource Management Plan (RMP).

I-Frye-1 The alternatives described in the Winnemucca RMP do not adequately protect and preserve wild horses and burros.

Under the scenarios presented, BLM would still rely on on mass wild horse roundups and removals every four or so years to maintain population numbers. This fiscally irresponsible and cruel policy has resulted in the stockpiling of more wild horses (~40,000) in government holding facilities than are left free on the range (<33,000) and costs taxpayers tens of millions of dollars annually.

This RMP must set a policy that breaks the unsustainable cycle of roundups and removals in favor of managing horses on the range in a humane and cost-effective manner. This policy must include:

I-Frye-2 • Reducing or eliminating livestock grazing within designated wild horse and burro areas;

I-Frye-3 • Minimizing or eliminating harmful activities within wild horse and burro areas, including gas and oil exploration, mining and recreational vehicle activity.

I-Frye-4 • Fairly allocating forage and water resources for wild horses and burros within designated herd management areas.

I-Frye-5 • Increasing Appropriate Management Levels for wild horses and burros.

I-Frye-6 • Enhancing range conditions, including restoration and improvement of water sources for wild horses and other wildlife species.

I-Frye-7 • Protecting predators in an effort to restore natural population control mechanisms.

I-Frye-8 • Utilizing PZP fertility control, where necessary, to control wild horse reproduction.

I-Frye-9 • Supporting public/private partnerships for the creation of wild horse preserves and to implement alternative, in-the-wild management strategies.

Responses

I-Frye-1: BLM manages WH&B in accordance with the Wild Horse and Burro Action and through applicable policies.

I-Frye-2: There are no designated wild horse and burros areas. HMAs are areas where burros and wild horses were found in 1971 that we manage for horses but not exclusively. Alternative C-LG 1—option 2 proposes elimination of livestock grazing throughout the WD.

I-Frye-3: The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the use of rangelands to livestock grazing, the Wild Horse & Burro Act established HMAs and provided protection for WH&B. The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM administered land be managed for multiple uses. Livestock grazing and WH&B are both uses authorized to occur on BLM administered land. The RMP analyzes several proposed levels of livestock management, up to and including elimination of livestock grazing. The BLM has revisited the WH&B management actions and environmental analysis in the final RMP/FEIS.

I-Frye-4: The amount of forage available to allocate to WH&B shall be determined through in-depth evaluation of resource monitoring data and following a site-specific environmental analysis decision process.

I-Frye-5: Specific allotment AUM allocation decisions are addressed at the site specific or allotment level.

I-Frye-6: This is achieved by maintaining herds at AML and through properly managed livestock grazing.

I-Frye-7: Management of big game species and populations are under the jurisdiction of the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) and is outside the scope of this analysis . See section 1.6 Planning Criteria and Legislative Constraints #3. The BLM works in cooperation with NDOW in the management of big game habitat. Under a multiple-use mandate, the BLM strives to achieve a balanced management of public land resources.

I-Frye-8: Alternatives A, B, and D allow use of birth control methods for WH&B including PZP.

I-Frye-9: Comment noted.

I-Frye

Comments

I-Frye-10 Roundups should only be conducted in verifiable emergency situations. If necessary, roundups must be conducted with respect for the social integrity of wild horse herds; family bands should be relocated intact.

I-Frye-11 The zeroing out of Herd Management Areas (removing all horses and permanently closing the land to wild horses) should be prohibited. In addition, already zeroed out Herd Areas should be re-evaluated for potential re-introduction of wild horses and burros.

Over the last four decades, BLM has removed 20 million acres of wild horse habitat. This trend must be reversed.

I urge you to incorporate these important principles into the Preferred Alternative designated in the RMP.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie Frye
943 Burning Springs Circle
Louisville, KY 40223

Responses

I-Frye-10 and 11: Habitat for WH&B is composed of four essential components: forage, water, cover, and space. These components must be present within the HMA in sufficient amounts to sustain healthy WH&B populations and healthy rangelands over the long term. If they are not present in sufficient amounts, the authorized officer should consider amending or revising the LUP to remove the area‘s designation as an HMA. If the decision is made to return a designated HMA to HA status, the total population of WH&B should then be gathered and removed. See BLM Manual Section 4710.3.

I-Gehrig

Comments

Responses

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

Getting Involved

Print Page

The BLM has implemented a collaborative, community-based planning process for the RMP/EIS and public input is critical to its success. Issues raised through public participation have driven the different management options that are considered in the RMP which will ultimately lead to how BLM public lands are managed.

For the BLM to formally consider your comments on the Draft Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, written comments are required. To assure consideration, you should provide comments by **September 25, 2010**. To submit comments, you may complete the following on-line form or you may open, fill out and print the mail-in (or fax-in) comment form. E-mail comments can also be sent to wdrmp@blm.gov . Please include your name and mailing address in your e-mail (see privacy notice). Comments are welcomed, reviewed, and considered throughout the planning process.

Please direct comments to:

Winnemucca RMP
c/o Bob Edwards
Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, NV 89445
Fax: (775) 623-1503 (Attn: Winnemucca RMP)

Public comments submitted for this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the Winnemucca Field Office, 5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd., Winnemucca, NV 89445, during regular business hours (7:30 am to 4:30 pm), Monday through Friday, except holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. ***If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently in your written comments.*** *Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.*

Open House Meetings

The BLM Winnemucca District Office will host open house meetings on the following dates. These meetings are offered to provide the general public with more information on the Draft RMP/EIS.

All meetings will be held between 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

Monday, July 26, 2010
Winnemucca Convention Center
50 W. Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, Nevada

Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Lovelock Community Center
826 Street
Lovelock, Nevada

Wednesday, July 28, 1010
Gerlach Community Center
410 Cotton Wood Street
Gerlach, Nevada

Thursday, July 29, 2010
Hyatt Place Hotel, Reno
1790 East Plumb Lane
Reno, Nevada

ON-LINE COMMENT FORM:

Date 14-Sep-2010
Today's Date

First Rick
First Name

Last Gehrig
Last Name

Please indicate your affiliation by checking one of the following boxes:

No Affiliation X Private Individual

Confidentiality Request:

Please indicate if you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. This request does not preclude the need to complete the required fields below.

A request for confidentiality will be honored to the extent allowed by law. Anonymity is not allowable for submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses.

No selection indicates you do not wish to withhold your information.

I-Gehrig

Comments

Responses

Getting Involved

Page 2 of 3

☐ Please withhold my name only.
☐ Please withhold my name and address.
☒ Please withhold my address only.

Affiliation - Non-Private Sector
☐ Private Industry
☐ Elected Representative
☐ Regulatory Agency
☐ Citizen's Group
☐ Federal, state, tribal, or local government

Name

Name of company, group, government, agency, or organization (if applicable):

Address Information

[redacted]
Street Address

City

[redacted]
City

State

[redacted]
State

Zip

[redacted]
Zip Code

Telephone (Optional)

[redacted]
E-Mail Address (optional)Please enter e-mail address.

Would you like to be added to or remain on the WDO RMP/EIS mailing list to receive future project-related information?

☑ Yes
☐ No

Please mark the appropriate category and write your comments in the space provided below.

Comment Category:
☐ Access / Transportation
☐ Fire Management
☐ Land Tenure (Retention / Acquisition / Disposal)
☐ Minerals (Hardrock, Oil & Gas)
☐ Soil / Water / Air / Visual Resources
☐ Social / Economic Concerns
☐ Wild Horses & Burros
☐ Wildlife / Sensitive Species
☐ Energy (Wind, Geothermal, Solar, etc.)
☐ Historic, Cultural & Paleontological Resources / Traditional Values
☑ Livestock Grazing
☐ Planning / RMP Process
☐ Recreation / OHV (Hunting, Fishing, Hiking, Biking, etc.)
☐ Vegetation / Noxious Weeds
☐ Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, & Other Special Designations
☐ Other Concerns (please define)

Comment

I-Gehrig -1

I own property at Humboldt River Ranch in Nevada, but I live in Utah.

I believe that cattle should graze freely on unfenced land. If the property owner does not like cattle, or is afraid of them, he/she should fence his/her property.

Cattle are not dangerous, nor are they a public health hazard, nor do they destroy the gravel roads.

* Denotes required information.

I-Gehrig-1: Comment noted.

http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp/getting_involved.html 9/14/2010

I-Gelb

Comments

Jan Liverance
<jan@atpeacemedia.com>
10/24/2010 07:27 AM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Winnemucca District RMP

Please accept these comments on the draft Winnemucca Resource Management Plan (RMP).

I-Gelb-1 The alternatives described in the Winnemucca RMP **do not adequately protect and preserve wild horses and burros.**

Under the scenarios presented, BLM would still rely on on mass wild horse roundups and removals every four or so years to maintain population numbers. This fiscally irresponsible and cruel policy has resulted in the stockpiling of more wild horses (~40,000) in government holding facilities than are left free on the range (<33,000) and costs taxpayers tens of millions of dollars annually.

This RMP must set a policy that breaks the unsustainable cycle of roundups and removals in favor of managing horses on the range in a humane and cost-effective manner. This policy must include: Reducing or eliminating livestock grazing within designated wild horse and burro areas.

It seems pretty obvious that water issues, cattle grazing rights tied to ranch land values, and high unemployment in Nevada are driving the decisions here instead of what's fair, what's legal, and what's right. Madeleine Pickens has purchases a large tract of land that she will turn into an eco-preserve for the wild horses. Why not look ahead to the future and realize that eco-tourism linked to these wild and beautiful animals is going to get the state of Nevada back on the road to recovery a lot faster than clinging desperately to outdated grazing rights that have been abused by ranchers who fence off watering holes and allow wild horses to dies of dehydration. Please stop the insanity - stop the wild horse roundups right now!

- Janice Gelb

Responses

I-Gelb-1: Comments noted.

I-Gervacio

Comments

comments@wdo.mrp
09/08/2010 12:15 AM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

```
TodaysDate = (0: '09/07/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Allen')
LastName = (0: 'Gervacio')
Address = (0: 'Lot 164, Woods Lane')
City = (0: 'Lovelock')
ZipCode = (0: '89419')
State = (0: 'NV')
Telephone = (0: '808-375-0127')
email = (0: 'gervacior002@hawaii.rr.com')
MailingList = (0: 'Yes')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Livestock Grazing')
Comment = (0: 'I feel that cattle coming onto my property will depreciate the
value of my land. It will also lead to me paying higher assessments and risk
factors due to health and safety reasons. ')
```

I-Gervacio-1

Responses

I-Gervacio-1: Comment noted.

I-Goodge

Comments

Responses

comments@wdo.mrp
09/04/2010 02:20 PM

To wdrmp@blm.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on RMP

I-Goodge-

```
TodaysDate = (0: '09/04/2010')
FirstName = (0: 'Gary')
LastName = (0: 'Goodge')
Address = (0: '20775 Old Victory Hwy')
City = (0: 'Lovelock')
ZipCode = (0: '89419')
State = (0: 'NV')
Telephone = (0: '775-442-0123')
email = (0: 'rocksrus@hughes.net')
MailingList = (0: 'Yes')
CommentCategory = (0: 'Livestock Grazing')
Comment = (0: 'We live in Huboldt River Ranch.  Cattle are moved in yearly for
grazing.  This is a planned residential development (since 1986).  Cattle
roaming through residential areas is not appropriate.  This poses health and
safety issues to the residents.  It is also causing expensive increases in our
homeowner assesments to repair roadways damaged by the cattle.  This area
should be closed to further livestock grazing.  We support Action D-LG 1.3 in
the draft of the Blm Resource Management Plan.')
```

I-Goodge-1: Comment noted.

I-Gregg

Comments

October 24, 2010

Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
5100 East Winnemucca Blvd.
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445-2921
Attn: Mr. Robert Edwards
Robert_Edwards@blm.gov
wfoweb@blm.gov

Dear Mr. Roberts:

I encourage Winnemucca District of the Bureau of Land Management to adopt a responsible Range Management Plan for northwestern Nevada. This can certainly be accomplished but after reading the proposed RMP, it is more than obvious that none of the alternatives are acceptable. The BLM's stated mission is to "Sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. None of the proposed options that have been outlined follow this "mission" of the BLM.

I-Gregg-1 I urge the Winnemucca District Office to revise the proposed alternatives outlined in the Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and all other land-use documents tiered to it to #1 ensure that wild horse and burro appropriate management levels (AML) are increased through equitable distribution of resources and that #2 all sales of any of these public lands are immediately stopped until it can be proven that the sales are for the benefit of future generations.

Re: #1 The Standards and Guidelines must ensure that wild horses can thrive on the range and be treated in a humane and minimally intrusive manner that preserves their wild and free-roaming behavior. No proposed alternatives provide sufficient protection for wild horses and burros to be managed on the range. The Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act mandates that wild horses and burros be considered "an integral part of the natural system." This proposed RMP fails to uphold that mandate.

I urge that the following tenets be incorporated into Alternative C2 in the RMP:

- Designate all Herd Management Areas (HMAs) to be managed principally for wild horse or burro herds as allowed under 43 C.F.R. 4710.3-2. Decrease or eliminate livestock grazing in HMAs pursuant to 43 C.F.R. 4710.5(a).

- Base AMLs on scientific and rational principles that provide adequate herd size for genetic viability.

Responses

I-Gregg-1:
A range of alternatives were developed identifying land suitable for disposal, subject to requirements of FLPMA. See LR 2.1 and Figure 2-66.

I-Gregg	Comments	Responses
I-Gregg –1 Cont-d	- Allocate resources equitably. Ranching and other commercial usages should not be allocated more resources or given preference over wild horses and burros. - No "zero-ing out" of wild horse or burro herds. Range rotation, re-seeding, and temporary fencing should be among the tools used to protect and restore any areas that do not meet habitat or rangeland standards. - Re-evaluate "zero-ed out" herd areas for horse/burro reintroduction. - Utilize range management to address wild horses and burros that wander across the borders of Herd Management Areas (HMAs), instead of permanently removing them. - Removals of any kind should be rare and minimal. Other methods of management must be employed first and given a fair opportunity to succeed. If a limited removal is necessary, it must be done in a humane manner that respects horse social structure and keeps families intact. - Range management on the range should be the cornerstone of management of wild horses and burros. As such, the development of water resources, such as a system of guzzlers, should be a prominent feature of the RMP. I support the removal of fencing impediments and the enhancement of water resources. - Support public-private partnership for on-the-range management of wild horses and burros and the creation of wild horse preserves (i.e. Soldier Meadows proposal). - Incorporate protection for predators in and around herd management areas as a part of managing wild horses and burros. - Ban vehicular intrusions for the purposes of racing.	
I-Gregg-2	Re: #2 The sale of any of these public lands will be a significant loss to an area of outstanding desert landscape that is currently available to the public for their pure enjoyment of the land. I personally think that the northern Nevada desert is quite extraordinary and I have visited it throughout my life with much satisfaction – including the Winnemucca area. The sale of any of this land would prevent others and myself from ever enjoying this public land again. The sale or disposal of this land would cause the following detrimental effects. - Future historical and biological studies on this land will forever be off-limits to the scientific community. - Significant negative impact on local and migratory wildlife including deer, pheasant, quail, cougar, rabbit, dove and tortoise as well as wild horses and burros.	I-Gregg-2: Land tenure adjustments are driven by requirements of FLPMA. Objectives and management actions addressing disposal are located at LR 3 and include criteria applicable before land is disposed.

I-Gregg

Comments

- Recent BLM sales are documented and verified that public lands are being sold to large energy corporations for the purpose of mining, natural gas and oil exploration. These corporations are known not only to temporarily scar the land in their pursuits but it is widely believed by the scientific community that their actions cause long term and permanent detrimental effects on the land that cannot be reversed. Your proposed sales of public land does not guarantee how this land would be used and obviously could be sold or resold to energy corporations.

- Recent sales of our public land are sold at prices that are drastically under evaluated. I refer in particular to the BLM sale of September 10, 2010 when the public land sold for prices ranging from $2 to $18.50 per acre. At that time, comparable unimproved property in the area was currently being offered at approximately $500 per acre. [See example: Frontier Properties USA, 80 acre parcel, lots 4&5, section 17, township 29N, R 36E]

- There would be no benefit to the citizens of the United States whose taxes pay for the maintenance of this land. There is no justification for the selling or disposal of public land to be in the public's best interest.

BLM is selling off public treasured land that is of great historical and natural significance. I am completely opposed to any future sales or disposal of BLM land.

Please sustain, vacate or modify this RMP action immediately. Your receipt of this written notice of objection is requested in addition to your written response. Thank you for allowing me to respond to this RMP proposal and please allow me to supply you with more information on these subjects at your request. I am confident you will consider my correspondence in the manner it is sent - very seriously

Sincerely,
Kathy Gregg
530-676-7206

Cc: Bob Abbey, Director BLM BLM
Dean Bolstead, National Wild Horse Mgmt. Specialist BLM
Debbie Collins, National WH&B Marketing Specialist BLM
Don Glenn, Division Chief WH&B Team BLM
Janet Neal, National WH&B Team BLM
Ruf Ross, National WH&B Specialist BLM
Sally Spencer, Supervisory WH&B Marketing Specialist BLM
Lili Thomas, WH&B Team BLM
Bea Wade, WH&B Specialist BLM
Jenna Whitlock, Management Analyst WH&B Team BLM
Ron Wenker, Nevada Director BLM
Mike Holbert, Nevada Deputy State Director BLM
Gene Seidlitz, Winnemucca District Manager BLM
Ashley Whitman, Nevada WH&B Specialist BLM

Responses