

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
AD 1	10	According to the January 8, 2010 BLM press release announcing the Ruby FEIS, the clock began then and will end on February 8, 2010. However according to page 3 of FERC's cover letter for the EIS, the clock will begin "within 30 calendar days from the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the Notice of Availability of the Ruby Pipeline Project final EIS." As of today, January 13, 2010, the EPA has not published this notice.
AD 1	11	The Final EIS fails to describe the methodology used in mapping quantified vegetation within 20 miles centered along the pipeline, it fails to adequately described sage grouse habitat, and it fails to provide any of the resulting hard data.
AD 1	29	Ruby continues to submit materials to this docket after the issuance of the FEIS, which raises the issue of whether the FEIS stands as a complete and adequate document, meeting all the requirements under NEPA, whether the BLM has all the information necessary to prepare an ROD, and whether the public has had the opportunity for informed participation in the EIS process.
AD 1	30	Ruby submitted voluminous quantities of multiple filings of the same or slightly revised documents with missing or blank attachments. Many of these filings since the DEIS have been released for public review, but are delinquent or provide no actual information, leading to extremely limited opportunities for the public to effectively review and comment on them.
AD 1	51	Many of the documents filed to form the basis of understanding for what Ruby's effects and threats to watersheds, species and wild lands really are and that are to be used to develop and apply mitigation and conservation actions are incomplete. The documents are either missing attachments or the attachments are left blank.
AD 1	56	Impacts to Modoc County, California are completely absent in the DEIS. We find the FEIS has not improved that. In the FEIS some mention is made of Modoc County, but the issues associated with Modoc County have not been analyzed in the EIS as is required by NEPA.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
AD 2	29	The document does not recognize major discrepancies between the proposed conservation agreements and the FEIS in regard to ROW maintenance. The FEIS in Section 2.6.1 states that "Ruby would not need to maintain vegetation within the 50 foot wide permanent ROW in most land use types, including open land, agricultural land, developed land, and open water." However, in the conservation document submitted by Ruby LLC on December 17, 2009, pages 1-8: <i>Voluntary Conservation Measures in Furtherance of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and Executive Order No. 13186</i> describes activities within the 50' ROW that Ruby could carry out as: removal of shrubs up to 25' wide; removal or cutting of trees up to 20' wide; removal of vegetation in wetlands up to 30' wide; above maintenance would occur on a "regular" basis (but no time frame is given). It remains unclear precisely what will be allowed within the permanent 50' ROW and what authorization Ruby must seek before performing maintenance activities
AD 3	11	The Alternatives analysis never explains why mitigation measures found to reduce impacts caused by the proposed route could not be applied to reduce the impacts of any alternative route.
AD 3	11	The Final EIS did not consider the road network for various alternatives and did not clearly disclose or analyze the impacts for the proposed route network. Because the access roads are both longer in total length than the pipeline and cross through a wider variety of areas, these impacts should have been analyzed in great detail.
AD 3	30	The pledged mitigation does not address the biological impacts and mitigation requirements of future projects' utilizing the Ruby pipeline Right of Way (ROW) nor of future climate change impacts on sagebrush habitats.
AD 3	46	The FEIS admits there will be significant and highly adverse impacts to many species, but proposes conservation and mitigation measures to lessen the impacts. However, we ask that FERC reconsider options to eliminate impacts to these and other species, and at a minimum implement strong monitoring standards to ensure the efficacy of mitigation and conservation measures in limiting the population and habitat declines that will result from the project.
AD 3	95	Ruby's mitigation plan is not complete and not presented in the FEIS. The Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife recommends the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) include a condition in the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (Certificate) stating that the mitigation plan be completed and approved by appropriate state and federal agencies prior to the start of construction.
AD 4	11	WWP and other commenter's have described how the Ruby Project purpose and need statement has foreclosed adequate consideration of alternatives including No Action, Energy, System, and the Major Route Alternatives.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
AD 6	36	The FEIS asserts that FERC and the DOI have authority to authorize the pipeline even if it violates the LRMP. This is incorrect. NFMA requires that the use and occupancy of the National Forests are consistent with LRMPs. 16 USC 1604(i).
AD 6	51	The Surprise ROD places a considerable segment of the Ruby route in a VRM II Category, and Ruby's route violates this. It also appears to violate the right-of-way provisions of the RMP: 2.7.2 Rights of Way - 2.7.2.1 Desired Future Condition and 2.7.2.2 Goal. Ruby would cause adverse impacts to all of these values.
ALT	29	Impacts analysis of alternative routes was greatly expanded in the FEIS, it did not include either a baseline analysis or an impacts analysis of the WWEC route.
ALT	36	The environmental analysis does not adequately compare the effects of different alternatives or compare the effects of the proposed pipeline compared to no action. This is a core purpose of NEPA.
ALT	44	The route that was selected in the FEIS will have greater impacts on sage-grouse, pygmy rabbits, and other sage-brush obligate species compared to the alternative route through the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge (Sheldon).
ALT	44	Although the northern Sheldon route would go through a National Wildlife Refuge, the pipeline would mostly follow highway rights-of-way and would have much less impact on the wilderness quality lands in Nevada.
ALT	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as it contains inadequate analysis of comparative evaluation of alternative routes sites, and thus no adequate comparative analysis of potential impacts has been conducted.
ALT	94	The text seems to suggest to the reader that the Sheldon Route Alternative might be environmentally preferable to the Proposed Route, and the Service could potentially approve the Sheldon Route Alternative by merely taking some simple administrative actions. This is not the case.
AN	5	There are no real studies of the cumulative impact of the huge amount of water required for hydrostatic testing, compaction and dust control.
CC	36	The climate change analysis in the FEIS leaves much to be desired as it fails to answer basic questions such as how much carbon would be emitted by different construction activities, land use changes, and gas deliveries.
CC 1	30	Our review could find nothing in the post-dEIS documents filed by Ruby, including the mitigation agreements, MOA, or measures which address the Department of Interior's new initiative (Order No. 3289) issued on September 14, 2009 by Secretary Ken Salazar to protect our country's water, land, fish, and wildlife and cultural heritage and tribal lands and resources from the dramatic effects of climate change.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
CI	80	The FEIS has not adequately addressed the cumulative impact to sage-grouse and other species.
CUL	54	The EIS nowhere states what steps will be taken to protect cultural resources within and near the pipeline construction corridor. The data presented is inconclusive as to the adequacy of the site-discovery methods employed. The number of sites discovered and recorded per linear mile surveyed varies widely from state to state. While this may be a result of actual site distribution, one wonders whether the various segments received equal scrutiny. The EIS does not state where artifacts will be curated.
CUL	92	FERC's approach to Section 106 of the NHPA- i.e., to complete the Section 106 process after final approval of the applicant's certificate--clearly violates the letter and spirit of Section 106 in several respects. First, it fails to meet the specific timing requirements. Second, the proposed deferred conditions are ineffective and impermissible.
CUL	92	It is clear from the Ruby Pipeline FEIS that the applicant has begun the survey process and knows where it intends to locate and complete survey activities. Therefore, FERC and BLM should require completion of the process before approving the project.
CUL	92	The National Trust is concerned that FERC's FEIS is deficient because it fails to include adequate baseline information about historic and cultural resources. This information is necessary for the agency and the public to understand and evaluate the impacts of the proposed project. The NEPA regulations require federal agencies to "describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration." 40.C.F.R. 1502.15.
CUL	95	From the initial documentation the Oregon SHPO has received on the TCP study, the Office feels that there are deficiencies to be addressed. First the study was only conducted for the area within the very narrow project corridor, which is too narrow an area to adequately address tribal concerns with regard to TCPs. The TCP study needs to clearly identify the boundaries through detailed background research and consultation with the tribe. The established boundaries do not appear to be appropriate to the Office. The boundaries should accurately reflect the specific area the tribe sees as sacred and important and not be limited to the project corridor.
CUL 1	48	In your Appendix A, the Western Shoshone National Council is listed incorrectly. We are the Western Shoshone National Council, traditional government of the Western Shoshone Nation, successors to the Treaty of Ruby Valley of 1863. We are not a "federally recognized tribe." Treaty is the Supreme law of the land according to the U.S. Constitution. Our federal recognition comes from the Treaty. That treaty was never abrogated. Our treaty rights remain.
CUL 1	54	The EIS includes a statement from the Fort Bidwell Indian Community that the survey missed rock art sites of which they are aware, an issue which is not directly addressed in the EIS.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
EC	29	There is no documentation in the FEIS or in FERC's response that it made any attempt to comply with its Congressionally mandated responsibility to balance the costs of the estimated environmental harms of the project's preferred route with any additional financial or other costs of other less damaging alternative routes.
ER	51	The FEIS lacks a risk analysis of potential erosion events and further irreversible effects of increased gullyng, further loss of ability of drainage networks to hold and slowly release runoff, further reductions in any mesic or meadow vegetation and further losses of intermittent or perennial flows in the > 1000 watershed areas crossed by Ruby.
FB	22	The Arimo Corporation & C Bar Cattle Company have reviewed Section 2.3.1.7 (Page 2-17; Cleanup and Restoration) in the FEIS and its associated Appendix L (Restoration and Revegetation Plans). In neither of these documents do we see the requirement to fence off at least one side of the Ruby ROW to prevent livestock from using the ROW while the reseeding is given a chance to establish.
FB	51	There is no map and analysis of the fencing across the Footprint of Ruby.
FB	51	There is no analysis of adverse effects of fencing on wildlife, hydrological processes, increased concentrations of livestock resulting in more losses or reductions in flows and functioning conditions in sections of watersheds, and of course the adverse effects on sage-grouse, antelope, wintering mule deer, of more fence hazards.
FIRE	5	Because of the low population, all of Nevada is a Class 1 location, and thus there are lower safety requirements in pipeline design, testing, and operation. "Pipe wall thickness, pipeline design pressures, hydrostatic testing pressures, MAOP, inspection and testing of welds, frequency of pipeline patrols, and frequency of leak surveys" can meet a lower standard. How resistant are the thinner-walled pipes to wildfire? The pipeline goes through isolated areas of pinyon-juniper which burn very hot. How can the pipeline be monitored through desolate areas?
GEN	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as it contains no adequate baseline of vegetation communities, waters and watersheds, degree of weed infestation or dominance, condition and effects of existing roads and other infrastructure, etc. BLM collected no data on bat use of sites, or bird migration, and will have no baseline data for comparison.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
GRA	51	WWP has submitted a grazing science review report by Dr. John Carter to support a broad range of current science on the serious adverse effects of grazing use at levels of 40 or 50% that are typically applied by agencies, high stocking rates, forage depletion, sacrifice areas, and other range-related information. This Report "Range Science Review and Recommendations" includes abundant scientific literature, including range science, and other information that was not addressed in the EIS. WWP's previous comments and scientific literature submissions have detailed the highly degraded and depleted conditions across much of the sagebrush and salt desert shrub communities traversed by the Ruby route. BLM (the Forest Service is included here as well) must consider and address the large amount of current scientific ecological and range information related to the significant adverse effects of grazing use, and the importance of proper and conservative use levels in any area where grazing occurs in addressing Ruby impacts, and acting to mitigate impacts of the tremendous Ruby disturbance across this landscape.
GRA	51	Substantial issues related to livestock grazing disturbance across the Footprint of Ruby must be addressed and resolved to satisfy NEPA's required "hard look," sensitive species concerns, T & E species concerns, to comply with FLPMA, and other requirements.
GRA	51	Across many of the allotments in the Footprint of Ruby, there is no current Ecological Site Inventory, with the last ESI having typically been conducted and on-the-ground data collected 25-30 years ago.
GRA	51	A full analysis of the economics of public lands ranching, including in the gold mine belt of Nevada –is necessary to allow informed understanding of the setting and ecosystem stressors. See: www.biologicaldiversity.org/publications/.../assessing_the_full_cost.pdf < http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/publications/.../assessing_the_full_cost.pdf >
GRA	51	Ruby's EIS has not adequately identified "high value" and unique/irreplaceable lands and landscapes. Ruby did not conduct inventories and analysis over a significant enough area to understand the context and significance of its irreversible disturbances.
GRA	51	There is no current existing forage "baseline" for lands across nearly all the Footprint. Many allotments have no current rangeland health processes; old grazing decisions were put in place with minimal to no NEP; significant changes in forage and facilities for livestock have occurred since any analysis has occurred

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
GRA	51	All engineering, mitigation and other plans and info provided to date fail to contain sufficient info and analysis to understand the degree and severity of impacts. Ruby's POO and other plans do not provide the necessary detail to understand the effects of additional disturbances on livestock-damaged landscapes, ESA species watersheds, lands where any remaining water source is critical to sage-grouse brood rearing, wildlife, wild horses, etc.
HHS	51	There has been no analysis of the safety factors involved in road upgrades.
HHS 1	5	While protection from terrorists is not included in the EIS for obvious reasons, terrorist threat is a huge potential danger that should be noted.
HHS 2	95	The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries notes that the proposed pipeline route will cross dozens of faults in Oregon alone and so the number of faults identified by Ruby is expected to be too low and thus inaccurate.
HHS 2	95	Fault crossings may require specialized design to accommodate fault rupture.
MIN	43	While the FEIS identifies some potentially impacted mining operations(Table 4.1.2-1), it fails to identify Newmont's potentially impacted properties and operations.
MIN	46	As of the date of the FEIS, Ruby had not yet fully developed plans regarding abandoned mines, both known and unknown that may lie in the path of the pipeline. Ruby has stated it would address such mines on a site-specific basis. Because of the risks of construction activities (digging, blasting, seismic activity) dislodging old mine wastes and polluting watersheds, FERC should concur with any plans proposed by Ruby ahead of time, not just after construction activities have uncovered such a mine.
RDS	43	The FEIS also fails to adequately address potential mitigation measures for impacts to existing roadways from construction and operation of the proposed pipeline.
RDS	51	There is no detailed mapping and analysis of the effects of all roading that now exists in these landscapes, including its relation to livestock facilities and activities. All of this is essential to understanding the specific and cumulative threats that wildlife, recreation, and other users already face.
RDS	51	There was no valid inventory and detailed analysis of all roads over a reasonable range of alternatives in the FEIS, including Jungo-Tuscarora and Black Rock that would have allowed reasonable and informed decision making on road "improvement", and the adverse effects of alternatives to wildlife.
RDS	51	It is still unclear exactly what roads Ruby will be using, where gravel may be hauled from, the disturbance and spatial footprint of where materials would be hauled away to if roads are down-graded or closed, how much dust abatement water will be used where, how livestock will be kept off several hundred miles of down-graded or rehabbed roads, and where livestock would end up being displaced to.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
RDS	51	There is no analysis of what entity or entities actually control the access roads. Ruby has provided no information on how difficult it will be or what factors determine how and when to effectively rehab or “downgrade” each section and area of each of the proposed access routes or by whom this is to be completed by.
RDS	51	Road and vehicle disturbance is certain to persist permanently in most if not all of the Ruby Footprint. There is no adequate plan to address this threat.
RDS	91	It is my understanding that the pipeline will be routed through Utah along an existing county road and will cause no additional surface disturbance to the surrounding landscape. I also understand that the pipeline will follow a boundary road which is maintained by the county along the areas identified with wilderness characteristics. This is not reflected in the document. I also understand that no additional acreage will be disturbed based on this routing of the pipeline. This is not reflected in Appendix W.
SOIL	51	There is no adequate site-specific “look” at current soil conditions – in relation to livestock, roads or other disturbances.
VEG	51	There has not been updated vegetation information provided to the public in the EIS process so informed comments can be made. The EIS vegetation mapping of the landscape targeted by Ruby is the Potential Vegetation Community mapping. This is divorced from the reality on the ground in large areas of Utah and Nevada at present, where exotic species and weedlands have replaced sagebrush and salt-desert shrub arid sites. Ruby claims there is no need for LUP amendments - yet it is basing its impacts analysis on vegetation communities that were present 25 years ago in the Great Basin.
VEG 1	11	The Final EIS identifies "other best management practices to improve sage brush reestablishment" developed by Ruby, but which Ruby "has not specified where these practices would be applied." By merely eluding to "other" practices in unspecified locations the EIS does not "discuss mitigation measures with sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated."
VEG 2	6	Although the FEIS states that the removal of riparian vegetation for pipeline construction across coldwater streams in New York and Alberta did not result in any significant temperature increases (FEIS page 4-119) we would argue that the small desert streams crossed by the Ruby Pipeline are more vulnerable due to low summer flows and high summer temperatures. Recent localized removal of riparian vegetation in the Truckee River, where LCT are native, altered habits enough to allow non-native bass and several native fishes typically residing in warmer waters to move up river into the construction site (NDOW, unpublished data 2009).
Veg 3	46	The FEIS states that Ruby is currently developing a plan to deal with noxious weeds. FERC and cooperating agencies should provide substantive input to avoid long-lasting damage.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
VEG 3	51	Prevalence of cheatgrass, and the threat of cheatgrass with Ruby disturbance is not addressed.
VEG 4	36	The FEIS and Revegetation and Mitigation Plans do not adequately account for the loss of mature forests and the time and difficulty required to re-establish them.
VIS 1	5	There is no discussion in the EIS of light pollution and its effects on wildlife and humans.
WA	29	Table 4.3.2-6 lists the volumes needed in Wyoming, Utah, and Oregon. Nevada is NOT listed here. Neither is there any discussion here of where they will get the large volumes of water they need in Nevada. BLM has no water rights itself in the area along the route, and water withdrawals will be decided upon by the State Engineer of Nevada. Because the location and amounts of water withdrawal in Nevada are yet to be determined, BLM needs to consider the impacts along certain routes used for transportation of water to the construction sites where it will be used. It seems likely that all the necessary facts will not be known before the ROD is schedule to be released. This is a critical missing piece of information in the FEIS. BLM must obtain this information in order to make an informed decision on the ROW grant.
WA	51	There is no analysis that shows the relative scarcity of springs, seeps, springbrooks, wetted drainages (including areas with intermittent or ephemeral flows).
WA	51	There is no analysis of the magnitude of runoff events in all areas in the Footprint of Ruby. Worst case runoff and erosion effects must be examined.
WA	51	The FEIS unfortunately continues to provide no adequate data and analysis on the status of local and regional aquifers and hydrological systems.
WA	95	The OR Department of Fish & Wildlife did not analyze surface water impacts to fish & wildlife. If Ruby proposes to use surface water, the department will need to further analyze potential impacts to fish and wildlife resources. The department supports Ruby using well water for these activities.
WA 2	5	The EIS further describes water return after hydrostatic testing. "If required to do so, the hydrostatic testing portion of this water could be brought back and discharged on the decreed lands, and used the same as has been done historically." This is inappropriate. Large quantities of water dumped on high desert land would cause erosion and non-point source pollution of ground and surface water. The EIS provides a list of biocides which might be used. None of these are appropriated for return to ground water. Chemical pollution of groundwater by the biocides is undesirable. All of the biocides listed have negative impacts and many have never been tested.
WA 3	6	Trout Unlimited is concerned with increased public access to water bodies that have not previously been road accessible.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
WA 4	6	Many wetlands are already degraded due to land management practices so every effort should be made to prevent any further degradation or loss of these critical environments. Construction should avoid wetlands whenever possible and full restoration should be mandated for any wetland areas impacted by the pipeline.
WDN	91	Appendix W identifies the areas with wilderness characteristics will be impacted by this pipeline. If there will be no impact based on the pipeline being re- routed along the county maintained road, this needs to be reflected in the document. If this is true, the Record of Decision must state that there will be no impact on wilderness characteristics and that the approval and construction of this pipeline will not affect BLM's ability to designate these wilderness characteristics lands as wilderness.
WDN	91	The map in Appendix W which is titled "Ruby Pipeline East Areas with Wilderness Characteristics" has SWCA's name on it. This needs to be removed since it is not their document.
WDN	91	The map for Appendix W which is titled "Ruby Pipeline East Areas with Wilderness Characteristics" found on the CD does not pull up correctly. There is a large piece of land missing which should be showing Terrace Basin, Coyote Hills and S Matlin.
WL	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as it contains inadequate analysis of impacts to a broad array of wildlife populations and does not even require any valid systematic surveys for many imperiled and sensitive species (sage-grouse, migratory birds, bats), or of cumulative impacts to their populations and habitats.
WL	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as it contains inadequate recommendations to minimize impacts: Arbitrary distance from leks and arbitrary measures varying from state to state or area to area, minimal to non-existent avoidance periods for a host of rare or imperiled species and migratory birds.
WL	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as it will result in many negative impacts to wildlife, aquatic species, and other rare biota that were not assessed.
WL	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as Ruby sprawls across documented locations for special status species, and avoidance (temporal, spatial) is meager.
WL	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as the EIS is based on very limited studies on migratory birds, hardly any info on bats and many other species, and conditions of habitats and status of populations for an array of species were not adequately taken into account – including salt desert shrub species.
WL 1	2	The protected American Mustang should not be exterminated for the sake of the pipeline.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
WL 2	11	The Final EIS correctly notes that "The greater sage-grouse commonly utilizes multiple habitats for multiple purposes throughout the year." However, the FEIS fails to explain adequately the interrelationship of these habitat types to the persistence of the species. (Footnotes available)
WL 2	30	The project and its pledged mitigations violate the Nevada Sage Grouse Conservation Strategy developed by Governor Guinn's Sage Grouse Conservation Planning Team which can be found on the website of the Nevada Department of Wildlife.
WL 3	11	The BLM must incorporate the findings of the revised 90-day finding that listing of Pygmy Rabbits "may be warranted." The BLM's right of way should include stipulations that require additional conservation measures should the Pygmy be listed under the ESA.
WL 4	5	Exclusion fencing will be installed on a case-by-case basis. What effect will this have on migratory patterns? The location of fencing should be described in this document.
WL 4	11	The FEIS does not explain why the BLM only requires fencing in Box Elder County, Utah, but not other places. Moreover, the FEIS does not discuss the impacts additional fencing will have on wildlife. Because the FEIS only discusses fencing in Box Elder County, WWP believes the Ruby POD should not authorize fences in other areas.
WL 5	6	Ruby has indicated that it will require 89-158 acre-feet of surface water for hydrostatic testing and dust control. Given the limited flows associated with many of the stream systems along the pipeline, a few cubic feet per second may make a significant difference to native fish populations. Surface water withdrawals should not be taken from stream systems that support native fishes, particularly during the low flow periods.
WL 5	6	Complete electro-shocking surveys have not been completed on the Shoestring Canyon portion of that drainage for native LCT. This system produces the best perennial water flow in concert with good habitat, within the entire High Rock Canyon drainage. Until such time that it has been established that native LCT or other species of concern do not occupy this drainage, every effort should be made to NOT take water from Cottonwood Creek or disrupt the flow.
WL 6	30	"All reasonable measures..." to comply with the laws protecting migratory birds and eagles (p.5). "Reasonable" is undefined and apparently left up to Ruby with provisions for exemptions to environmental protection measures for eagles and raptors built into these documents and mitigation funds proposed for projects which will have little to no application to habitats adversely affected by pipeline construction and operation in Nevada.

Ruby Pipeline
Post FEIS Comment Examples

Comment Code	Document #	Comment
WL 6	51	The Proposed Action is flawed, as it conflicts with BLM sensitive species policy, MBTA, golden eagle protections and new guidance, and other raptor “take” protections. BLM is to manage habitats or sensitive species so as to avoid ESA listing. BLM policy or special status species directs BLM to ensure that activities authorized, funded, or carried out do not contribute to the need to list any species. BLM did not ensure this.
WL 6	51	There remain no adequate surveys for many important and sensitive migratory and birds of Conservation Concern along the Proposed Route or any of a range of valid alternatives.

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
1	Michael	Tice			0				1																	
2	Ariela	Valdez																							1	
3	Aaron	Brown																			1				2	
4	Abby	Smith Rumsey					0	0,1																0	0,2,3	
5	James	Moss		1,2	0	0	0		0				0	0		0,1			0			1	0,2		0,2,4,6	
6	Amy	Haak	Trout Unlimited	3																	2		1,2,3		5	
7	Anne	Valdez																							1	
8	Raymond	Royer																							0	
9	Beatrice	Hamilton																							0	
10	Benjamin	Otto	Advocates for the West	1																						
11	Benjamin	Otto	Advocates for the West	1,3,4	0			1	0						0			0				1,3			0,2,3,4	
12	Betty Jean	Herner																							1	
13	Bonnie	Bates																							1	
14	Brendan	Hughes			0									0												
15	Brian	Beffort		1	0		0	1							0				0		1	0		0	0,2,3	
16	Carol	Poole																							1	
17	Carol	Poole																							1	

Note: 0 indicates general comment

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
18	Catherine	Ritlaw																							1	
19	Catherine	Ritlaw																							1	
20	Cathy	Adams												0											1	
21	Paul	Goldsmith																							0	
22	Chris	Robinson	Arimo Corporation & C Bar Cattle Co									0														
23	Chris	Robinson	Arimo Corporation & C Bar Cattle Co	3										0											4	
24	Christopher	Stanton																						0		
25	Carol	Walker																							1	
26	Dan	Heinz																0						0		
27	Karen	Boeger		1	0			0	1										0					0	0	
28	Vince	Herman	Backcountry Hunters and Anglers		0																					
29	David	Hornbeck	Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club	1,2	0					0												0				
30	David	Seggern	Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club	1,3	0		1		0,1	0								0							2,3,6	
31	Reed	Secord												0												
32	Ted	Roundy																								0
33	Denise	Shirey																							1	

Note: 0 indicates general comment

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
34	Dian	Wright																							1	
35	Heather	Domanski																							1	
36	Doug	Heiken	Oregon Wild	6	0		0				0	0		0	0						4					
37	Bonnie	Eberhardt Bobb	Corporation of Newe Sogobia	1					1			0				0,2							0,2		0,2	
38	Chris	Floyd	University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire						0,1														0		2,3	
39	Ginger	Kathrens	The Cloud Foundation		0																				1,2,3,4	
40	Greg	Juhl																							0	
41	Bill	Campanelli																							1	
42	Jayme	Krupar																			1				2	
43	Jeff	White	Newmont Mining Corporation														0	0								
44	John	Tull	Nevada Wilderness Project	1,3	0					0				0												
45	John	Koehm			0																					
46	John	Persell	Biodiversity Conservation Alliance	2,3	0				0,2					0			0				3		0,1		0,2	
47	John	Machese		2				0	0,1															0	0	
48	Johnnie	Bobb	Western Shoshone National Council						1																	
49	Julie	Ryder		2					1															0		

Note: 0 indicates general comment

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
50	Julie	van Niekerk																							1	
51	Katie	Fite	Western Watersheds Project	1,2,6	0						0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0,3		0		0,6	
52	Kristen	Wright		2				0	1															0		
53	Tina	Nappe		3						0				0	0			0							1	
54	Linea	Sundstrom	American Rock Art Research Association	3					0,1																	
55	Lisa	Koehl																							1	
56	Sophie	Sheppard	The North West Great Basin Association	1	0					0													0			
57	Marjorie	Sill												0												
58	Maureen	VanDerStad			0																		0		1	
59	Melinda	Hyatt																							1	
60	Billo	Comola	Washoe County Commissioners	1,3	0			0																		
61	Delaine	Spilsbury			0																				0	
62	Delaine	Spilsbury			0				1																	
63	Delaine	Spilsbury			0																				0	
64	Delaine	Spilsbury			0																			0		
65	Nancy	Roberts																							1	

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
66	Reese	Tietje	Nevada State Clearinghouse					1																		
67	Billy	Howard	Green Party of Nevada																				0			
68	Clinton	Kawanishi			0																					
69	Karen	Quigley	Legislative Commission on Indian Services																						0	
70	Randall	Largent	Newmont Mining Corporation													0									see 43	
71	Randy	McNatt		6	0													0					0			
72	Rebecca	Schwendler	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1																						
73	Rebecca	Schwendler	National Trust for Historic Preservation					0																	see 92	
74	Reggie	Benz	API Fence, Inc						0																	
75	Richard	Barons		2			0	1															0	0	see 49,5	
76	Rodolfo	Valdez																						1		
77	Ron	Johnny	Summit Lake Paiute Tribe		0			1																		
78	Ross	Dick							0																	
79	Schaun	Tanner																							0	
80	Shaaron	Netherton	Friends of Nevada Wilderness	1,6			0	1										0			0		0	0		
81	Shari	Welsh																						1		

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
82	Ellen	Hickey																							1	
83	Steve	Hardie																								0
84	Monika	Courtney																							1	
85	Monika	Courtney																							1	
86	Thelma	Matlin		1																					0,5	
87	Gary	Kauther								0																
88	Zach	Woodbury		1																						
89	Randy	Largent	Newmont Mining Corporation														0									
90	Linea	Sundstrom							0,1																	see 54
91	Bunny	Sterin	Utah National Landscape Conservation Systems															0						0		
92	Rebecca	Schwendler	National Trust for Historic Preservation						0																	see 73
93	John	Emmerich	Wyoming Game and Fish Department																							0
94	Willie	Taylor	United States Department of the Interior		0				0																0	
95	Theodore	Kulongoski	Governor of Oregon	3					0		0					0,2							0		0	
96	Billy	Bell	Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of Oregon						0																	
97	Stacy	Dixon	Susanville Indian Rancheria						1																	

Note: 0 indicates general comment

Ruby Pipeline
FEIS Public Comments Received

Doc No.	Commenter - First Name	Commenter - Last Name	Affiliation	AD	ALT	AN	CC	CI	CUL	EC	ER	FB	FIRE	GEN	GRA	HHS	MIN	RDS	REC	SOIL	VEG	VIS	WA	WDN	WL	OTHER
				Administrative	Alternatives	Air/Noise	Climate Change	Cumulative Impacts	Cultural	Economics	Erosion	Fencing & Barriers	Fire	General Resources	Grazing	Health/Human Safety	Mining	Roads	Recreation	Soil	Vegetation	Visual	Water	Wilderness	Wildlife	Other
98	Dean	Barlese	Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe					1																		
99	Pete	Bradley			0																			0	0	

Note: 0 indicates general comment

Ruby FEIS Comment Codes REVISED

Code	Description
AD	Admin General
AD1	Process
AD2	ROW
AD3	Mitigation
AD4	Purpose and Need
AD5	Construction
AD6	Conformance
ALT	Alternatives
AN	Air/Noise
CC	Climate Change
CC1	DOI Order #3289
CI	Cumulative Impacts
CUL	Cultural
CUL1	Tribal
EC	Economics
ER	Erosion
FB	Fencing/Barriers
FIRE	Fire
GEN	General Resources
GRA	Grazing
HHS	Health and Human Safety
HHS1	Terrorism
HHS2	Fault Lines/Earthquakes
MIN	Mining
NS	Non-Substantive
RDS	Roads
REC	Recreation
SOIL	Soil
VEG	Vegetation
VEG1	Sage Brush
VEG2	Riparian
VEG3	Weeds
VEG4	Old Growth Forests
VIS	Visual
VIS1	Light Pollution
WA	WATER
WA1	Wetlands
WA2	Hydrotesting

Ruby FEIS Comment Codes REVISED

Code	Description
WA3	Impact of New Roads
WDN	Wilderness
WL	Wildlife
WL1	Wild Horses and Burros
WL2	Sage-Grouse
WL3	Pygmy Rabbit
WL4	Fencing
WL5	Fish
WL6	Birds other than Sage-Grouse