
PROPOSED CASPER
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

APPENDIX Y

Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact
Statement Comment Analysis

**Appendix Y
Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact
Statement Comment Analysis**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	Y-1
2.0	Content Analysis Process	Y-1
3.0	Summary of Public Responses to the Draft RMP/EIS.....	Y-3
	Geographic Representation	Y-4
	Organizational Affiliation	Y-4
	Public Response Document Format and Method of Delivery	Y-5
4.0	Analysis of Comments.....	Y-5
5.0	Conclusion.....	Y-14
	Addendum 1: Summary Comments Organized by Comment Number	Y-15
	Appendix A – Public Response User’s Guide	
	Appendix B – Public Response Documents	
	Appendix C – Individual Comments and Responses	
	(Appendices B and C can be accessed on the Casper RMP Revision website at www.blm.gov/rmp/casper/ .)	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Comment Codes	Y-2
Table 3-1.	Geographic Representation of Respondents.....	Y-4
Table 3-2.	Number of Responses per Affiliation.....	Y-5
Table 3-3.	Number of Public Response Documents by Format	Y-5

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	Best Management Practices
CWI	Citizen’s Wilderness Inventory
DEQ	Department of Environmental Quality
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPS	Economic Profile System
IMPLAN	Impact Analysis for Planning
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
RMP	Resource Management Plan
ROD	Record of Decision
SMA	Special Management Area
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WGFD	Wyoming Game and Fish Department
WYPDES	Wyoming Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

This page intentionally left blank.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On July 21, 2006, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register announcing publication of the Casper Field Office Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMP/EIS). This NOA initiated the beginning of a 90-day public comment period. The BLM accepted comments on the Draft RMP/EIS between July 21, 2006 and October 19, 2006. During the 90-day public comment period, the BLM hosted four public meetings to gather testimony on the Draft RMP/EIS and to answer questions from the public. This report provides a summary of public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS during the 90-day comment period. During this period, the Casper Field Office received 123 public responses, including letters, e-mails, website submittals, and public meeting testimony.

Although this report attempts to capture the full range of public issues and concerns, it should be used with caution. Respondents are self-selected; therefore, their comments do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the public as a whole. However, this summary does attempt to provide fair representation of the wide range of views submitted. In consideration of these views, it is important for the public and decision makers to understand that this process makes no attempt to treat input as if it were a vote. Instead, the comment analysis process ensures that every comment is considered at some point in the decision process.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- **Content Analysis Process** – Describes how the BLM receives, records, and categorizes response documents and comments.
- **Summary of Public Responses to the Draft RMP/EIS** – Provides an overview of response document demographics.
- **Analysis of Comments** – Outlines the parameters for substantive and non-substantive comments and provides a brief summary of comments and responses.
- **Appendix A: Public Response User's Guide** – A user's guide to assist respondents in identifying their response document, comments, and how the BLM responded.
- **Appendix B: Public Response Documents** – Copies of all response documents are included in this appendix.
- **Appendix C: Individual Comments and Responses** – Includes a table of individual comments and BLM responses organized by response document number, comment number, and summary comment number. The respondent will use the guide in Appendix A to identify their response document.

2.0 CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCESS

Comment content analysis for this document is defined as a systematic method of compiling, categorizing, and evaluating written comments made by individuals, federal and state agencies, Tribal governments, elected representatives, and other organizations on the Draft RMP/EIS in order to identify substantive issues for review and response by the BLM decision makers. Additionally, through the content analysis process, BLM supplemented the project mailing list of respondents and compiled demographic information on the geographic distribution of respondents (see Section 3 of this report).

Public responses include oral testimony given at the public meetings and written responses postmarked or delivered within the 90-day public comment period. Methods of receiving responses included U.S. mail,

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

e-mail, website submittals, and public meetings. All individuals attending public meetings were encouraged to submit responses in writing. Note that a public response document refers to the written submission or oral testimony from a respondent (e.g., letter, e-mail, etc.), whereas a comment refers to an identifiable expression of interest or issue statement included within a public response document. For example, a letter (i.e., public response document) received within the public comment period may contain one or more identifiable comments.

Analysis Process

Upon receipt of a public response, a member of the comment analysis team logged the response into a register, assigned a unique identifier, and converted the response to a searchable electronic (i.e., PDF) document. A team member then entered all pertinent respondent information (e.g., name, affiliation, address, and type of response) into a spreadsheet.

The first step in the analysis process is to identify and code individual comments within a public response. In accordance with the BLM’s National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Handbook (H-1790-1), the team categorized each individual comment as substantive or non-substantive and assigned a numerical code to identify the type of comment as listed below. Comments that fall into categories 1 through 4 are considered substantive comments whereas categories 5 and 6 are non-substantive.

1. Comments on Inaccuracies and Discrepancies
2. Comments on the Adequacy of the Analysis
3. Comments Which Identify New Impacts, Alternatives, or Mitigation Measures
4. Disagreements With Significance Determinations
5. Personal Preferences
6. Other: Beyond the scope of this RMP/EIS; request for mailing list or copy of document, etc.

The team further categorized each comment by the topic that most closely captured the comment intent (e.g., Air Quality, Special Designations, Alternative A). The topics identified during this step of the process are identified in Table 2-1. Once all comments were coded, the BLM Interdisciplinary Team provided individual responses to all substantive comments. The comment analysis team then used the individual comments and responses to analyze, group, and summarize comments, and to write responses to summary comments.

Table 2-1. Comment Topics

Description	Description	Description
Mitigation Measures	FLPMA	Wilderness Study Areas
Definition of Terms	State Laws, Acts, and Policies	Special Management Areas
Cumulative Impacts	Environmental Management General	National Historic Trails
Irreversible/Irretrievable Impacts	Soils and Geology	Heritage and Visual Resource Management
Appendices	Water Resources	Archaeology
Mailing List/Copy DEIS	Air Quality	Paleontological Resources
Editorial Corrections	Visual Resources Management	Natural Resources Management General

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

Table 2-1. Comment Topics (Continued)

Description	Description	Description
Purpose and Need for Proposed Action	Climate, Weather, and Atmospheric Processes	Timber Resources Management
Role/Authority	Biological Elements Management, General	Allowable Sale Quantity
Role/Influence of Interest Groups	Ecosystem/Habitat Composition and Function	Harvest Methods
Environmental Groups	Grassland/Shrubland	Forested Vegetation Management
Multiple Use/Wise Use Groups	Riparian	Forest Structure/Mosaic
Industry/Business Groups	Invasive Nonnative Species	Age Composition
Use of Public Involvement/Comment	Wildlife Management General	Fire Management
Extension Needed	Wildlife Population Management	Domestic Livestock Management
Other Federal Agencies	Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat	Livestock Grazing
State or Local Governments/Officials	Fisheries and Aquatic Wildlife	Fences, Water Troughs, Facilities
Relation to or Consistency with Other Plans, Directives, etc.	Special Status Species	Mineral Resources Management
Agency Rules and Regulations	Wildlife Structures (Guzzlers, Barriers)	Leasable (Oil and Gas)
Use of Science in Decisionmaking General	Special Status Species	Directional Drilling
Best Available Science	Transportation System Management (Infrastructure)	Leasable (Coal)
Funding for Implementation of Proposed Action	Roads Infrastructure Management General (Use Resource Codes for Specific Use or Type Access)	Locatable (Hardrock)
Alternatives General	Road/Removal/Decommissioning	Salable (Gravel, Rock, etc.)
Alternative Development/Range	User-created Roads and Trails	Special Use Facilities Management
Alternatives Not Considered in Detail	Recreation Management General	Communication Sites and Facilities
Alternatives Developed by Others	Motorized Recreation and Access General	Utility Corridors
Alternative A	Mechanized Recreation	Utility Access and Rights-of-Way
Alternative B	Landownership	Renewable/Wind Energy
Alternative D	Land Exchanges and Disposal	Social Values Management
Alternative E	Special Land Designations General	Public Health and Safety
Relation to Laws, Act, Policies General	Designated Wilderness	Economic Values Management
Federal Laws, Acts, and Policies	Wild and Scenic Rivers	Employment
NEPA	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	

The results of the comment analysis process are included in the appendices of this document. Appendix A includes a user’s guide to assist respondents in finding their response documents and comments, Appendix B includes copies of all response documents, and Appendix C presents all individual comments, their associated codes, and individual responses.

3.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

This section provides a summary of the response demographics. Demographic analysis allows the BLM to form an overall picture of issues, as well as better understanding of who is submitting comments, the geographic distribution of respondents, their affiliations, and the format of the public responses.

The demographics presented below are based on public response documents received during the 90-day comment period. Note that separate comments are not treated as votes, and the outcome is not determined by a majority opinion. Every comment is considered individually. While demographic

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

information can provide insight into public concerns, the comments are not a random representative sample of public opinion; therefore, the demographics presented in this report do not necessarily represent the opinions of society as a whole.

Geographic Representation

Geographic representation is tracked for each public response document received during the course of the public comment period. Table 3-1 identifies the origin of respondents filtered to the city and state of the respondent.

Table 3-1. Geographic Representation of Respondents

City	State	Number of Respondents
Boulder	Colorado	2
Denver	Colorado	3
Florham Park	New Jersey	1
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	2
Houston	Texas	1
Logan	Utah	2
Salt Lake City	Utah	2
Basin	Wyoming	1
Big Horn	Wyoming	3
Casper	Wyoming	40
Cheyenne	Wyoming	21
Cody	Wyoming	5
Douglas	Wyoming	6
Kelly	Wyoming	1
Laramie	Wyoming	8
Powder River	Wyoming	3
Sheridan	Wyoming	10
Shoshoni	Wyoming	2
Sundance	Wyoming	1
Thayne	Wyoming	1
Wapiti	Wyoming	1
Wheatland	Wyoming	1
Wilson	Wyoming	6
Unknown	Wyoming	1

Organizational Affiliation

The BLM received responses from various organizations and unaffiliated individuals including local governments, preservation/conservation organizations, private industry, and unaffiliated individuals (Table 3-2). Only those public responses received on official letterhead, received by an official e-mail address, or announced during public testimony are considered as affiliated with an organization or government entity. All others are classified as unaffiliated individuals. Organization types were tracked for each comment document.

Table 3-2. Number of Responses per Affiliation

Affiliation	Number of Public Response Documents
Federal Agency	4
State Agency	11
Local Government	7
Non Governmental Organization	35
Private Industry	9
Unaffiliated Individual	57

Public Response Document Format and Method of Delivery

BLM received public response documents in various formats and through a variety of delivery systems. Table 3-3 identifies the number of documents received by format (e.g., e-mail, letter, website). All public response documents received were unique comments; no form letter responses were received during the 90-day comment period.

Table 3-3. Number of Public Response Documents by Format

Response Document Format	Number
E-mail	1
Website	72
E-mail with a letter attached	0
Letter	47
Postcard	0
Comment Form	1
Public Hearing Testimony	2
Total	123

4.0 ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS

The BLM received 123 public responses to the NOA for the Casper Draft RMP/EIS during the 90-day comment period. This section describes the categories of comments, summarizes like comments, and provides responses to comments. The 123 public responses received contained substantive and non-substantive comments. Representative non-substantive comments include requests to be added to the project mailing list, requests for a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS, personal preference or opinion, and comments which are outside the scope of the Draft RMP/EIS. Representative substantive comments generally relate to accuracy or adequacy of the analysis.

In accordance with the BLM’s NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1), comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS are addressed in this report if they “are substantive and relate to inadequacies or inaccuracies in the analysis or methodologies used; identify new impacts or recommend reasonable new alternatives or mitigation measures; or involve substantive disagreements on interpretations of significance.” (See 40 Code of Federal Regulation 1502.19, 1503.3, 1503.4, 1506.6, and 516 DM 4.17)

BLM’s NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1) identifies the following examples of comment categories and appropriate responses (listed in Section 2.0 of this report).

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

- **Comments on Inaccuracies and Discrepancies.** Factual corrections should be made in the EIS in response to comments that identify inaccuracies or discrepancies in factual information, data, or analysis.
- **Comments on the Adequacy of the Analysis.** Comments that express a professional disagreement with the conclusions of the analysis or assert that the analysis is inadequate may or may not lead to changes in the EIS. Interpretations of analyses should be based on professional expertise. Where there is disagreement within a professional discipline, a careful review of the various interpretations is warranted. In some cases, public comments may necessitate a reevaluation of analytical conclusions. If, after reevaluation, the manager responsible for preparing the EIS does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.
- **Comments Which Identify New Impacts, Alternatives, or Mitigation Measures.** If public comments on a draft EIS identify impacts, alternatives, or mitigation measures which were not addressed in the draft, the manager responsible for preparing the EIS should determine if they warrant further consideration. If they do, that official must determine whether the new impacts, new alternatives, or new mitigation measures should be analyzed in either: the final EIS; a supplement to the draft EIS; or a completely revised and recirculated draft EIS.
- **Disagreements with Significance Determinations.** Comments may directly or indirectly question determinations regarding the significance or severity of impacts. A reevaluation of these determinations may be warranted and may lead to changes in the EIS. If, after reevaluation, the manager responsible for preparing the EIS does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.
- **Expressions of Personal Preferences.** Comments which express personal preferences or opinions on the proposal do not require further agency action. They are summarized whenever possible and brought to the attention of the manager responsible for preparing the EIS. Although personal preferences and opinions may influence the final selection of the agency's preferred action, they generally will not affect the analysis.
- **Other.** In addition to the 5 categories from the NEPA Handbook described above, a sixth category named “other” was added for this report. Requests for copies of the Draft RMP/EIS, requests to be added to the project mailing list, and comments which are outside the scope of the project are classified as “other” comments. These comments are considered non-substantive and do not require further agency action.

A total of 1,339 individual comments were identified in the 123 response documents. Of these 1,339 comments 620 comments were identified as substantive. Individual comments and agency responses are provided in Appendix C of this document. However, in an effort to provide a user friendly method of understanding the broad themes or topics of concern expressed in the comments, the analysis team grouped individual comments with similar concerns and developed 29 summary comments and responses. The 29 summary comments and responses are presented below, and generally are organized by BLM resource program and other applicable categories (e.g., purpose and need). A summary comment that addresses several resource programs is listed under the heading Multiple Resource Programs. Addendum 1 contains the same summary comments and responses, but is organized by comment number.

PURPOSE AND NEED

Summary Comment #1: Several respondents raised questions or requested clarification on the purpose and need as written for the Draft RMP/EIS as it relates to mineral resources.

Summary Response: As stated on Page 1-5, new data have become available, new policies have been established, and old policies have been revised. This, along with emerging issues and changing circumstances, resulted in the need to revise the existing plan. This section is not arguing that energy minerals development has become the priority use on public land. Rather, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act Reauthorization of 2000 coupled with the Nation's growing demand for domestic energy is simply listed as an example of the many emerging issues and changing circumstances resulting in the need to revise the existing plan. See Page 1-5, New Data; Page 1-6 New and Revised Policy, and Page 1-7 Emerging Issues and Changing Circumstances.

AIR QUALITY

Summary Comment #20: A number of respondents submitted comments requesting a change, alteration or clarification of air quality (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure) or requested additional information.

Summary Response: BLM recognizes that activities in the RMP may or may not affect areas outside the planning area, such as the Bridger Wilderness. The Draft RMP/EIS simply illustrates previous analysis indicating far ranging potential impacts. For the air quality analysis, NEPA does not require a quantitative study. The inter-agency air quality team (including air quality staff from Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality [Wyoming DEQ – Air Quality Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Forest Service [USFS], National Park Service, and BLM) agreed to the “emissions-based” method. BLM has used this approach on other NEPA projects. Quantitative air quality analysis will be performed at the project level. BLM recognizes the primacy of the State of Wyoming in regulating air quality. Emission factors and parameters will be revised as necessary.

WATER

Summary Comment #2: Numerous respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of water resources (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information regarding water resources.

Summary Response: Mitigation measures protecting water resources were based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. BLM does not issue Wyoming Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WYPDES) permits authorizing surface water discharge. These permits are issued by Wyoming DEQ. WYPDES permits contain effluent limits and (or) non-degradation standards unique to each authorization.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Summary Comment #16: Some respondents requested the use of directional drilling or pitless drilling, additional information regarding directional drilling or pitless drilling, or asked that the BLM re-consider use of such drilling techniques.

Summary Response: Site-specific NEPA analysis indicates when directional drilling should be used to protect other resources. The analysis considers the effectiveness, cost, public benefit, and the availability of other mitigation measures. The text in Section 2.3 *Alternatives Considered, but Not Carried Forward for Detail Analysis*, Mandate Directional Drilling will be revised. Pitless drilling is a method currently considered viable by BLM.

Summary Comment #22: Respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of salable and leasable minerals (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information regarding salable and (or) leasable minerals.

Summary Response: The Reasonable Foreseeable Development is the base document used and describes how the document was developed. The document can be found at <http://www.blm.gov/rmp/casper/>. Clarification of salable and leasable mineral conditions will be considered as appropriate during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. Additional information or clarification will be provided in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS where necessary.

VEGETATION – FOREST, WOODLANDS, AND FOREST PRODUCTS

Summary Comment #15: Some respondents recommend additional management of commercial forestry activities.

Summary Response: For questions regarding viability of data used in the analysis, BLM submits a list of supporting scientific documents (see individual responses, Appendix C). BLM implements several types of prescriptions throughout the planning area. For soil disturbing activities, measures such as the Best Management Practices (BMPs) outlined in Appendix K of the FEIS, will be implemented to minimize impact.

VEGETATION – RIPARIAN AND WETLAND COMMUNITIES AND GRASSLAND AND SHRUBLAND COMMUNITIES

Summary Comment #5: Respondents submitted requests to set standards, verify effectiveness of management activities, or clarify information regarding vegetation in the planning area.

Summary Response: The preferred alternative identifies a wide range of management actions to protect important habitat types throughout the planning area. A variety of tools, including fire, are used to meet habitat objectives. In addition, fragmentation blocks were identified to prevent further fragmentation of intact native vegetation. Vegetation habitats are assessed by BLM and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) to determine if their condition supports wildlife objectives.

FISH AND WILDLIFE – WILDLIFE

- Summary Comment #19:** Some respondents commented on the need for additional information on big game, or clarification of potential discrepancies in alternatives or the analysis on big game.
- Summary Response:** BLM notes that it only applies conditions of approval to protect a resource value when the resource is present. The WGFD is responsible for establishing herd objectives through a public process. WGFD was a cooperator who participated in the preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS. Appendix E identified management challenges to meeting herd objectives. Many of these challenges are outside BLM's authority to manage (i.e., intermingled land ownership, agricultural conversion, drought conditions, etc.).

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

- Summary Comment #21:** Numerous respondents requested a change, alteration, or clarification of special status species (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure), or they requested additional information regarding special status species.
- Summary Response:** This analysis considers numerous management actions to reduce indirect impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, including options to reduce habitat fragmentation. Mitigation measures protecting sensitive species were based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. BLM maintains compliance with all federal laws and guidance as identified in Appendix B.

HERITAGE RESOURCES

- Summary Comment #24:** A few respondents requested changes, alterations, or clarification of heritage, paleontological, and (or) cultural resource management (analysis, management action, mitigation measure), or requested additional information regarding management of heritage, paleontological, and (or) cultural resources.
- Summary Response:** BLM always conducts inventories prior to any ground-disturbing activity. The likelihood of “bumbling” onto sites is no greater or lesser than if a block survey had been conducting prior to leasing. While the setting of the resource may be compromised, other factors such as physical integrity may warrant classifying a feature, such as a trail segment as contributing. BLM considers setting only a portion of significance. Mitigation measures are based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B.

NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS AND VISUAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

- Summary Comment #13:** Respondents expressed concern or requested additional information regarding Visual Resource Management (VRM) classifications in the planning area.

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Summary Response: The purpose of visual resource management is to manage the quality of the visual environment and to reduce the visual impact of development activities while maintaining the viability of all resource programs. The inventory included visual quality, distance zones, and sensitivity of the landscape. See BLM Manual Handbook 8410-1, the 2004 VRM Inventory on the RMP website (<http://www.blm.gov/rmp/casper/>), and Washington Office Information Bulletin No. 98-135 for further guidance.

LANDS AND REALTY

Summary Comment #7: Numerous respondents request or object to, the designation of land parcels for retention, disposal, exchange, or acquisition.

Summary Response: The Casper RMP revision undertakes to incorporate a land tenure adjustment strategy by specifically identifying all of the individual parcels potentially affected. Once identified in the RMP and as opportunities arise, these identified parcels can then be considered for adjustment using the available tools including sale, exchange, Recreation and Public Purposes, acquisition, withdrawal, etc. Prior to any action, site-specific analysis will be conducted and will consider public access and the natural and cultural resources on the land. Further, BLM does not intend to undertake a wholesale disposal of public lands in Goshen, Platte, and Converse counties.

OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES, RECREATION, AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

Summary Comment #14: Many respondents requested clarification of the use or management of motorized and mechanized recreation in the planning area, including snowmobiles. Respondents also included requests to change, alter, or clarify motorized recreation and general access (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure). In addition, a respondent submitted a specific request for the BLM to adopt recommendations from the Travel Management Planning Process Template.

Summary Response: Travel management areas and travel planning criteria will be defined in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. A travel management plan for the planning area will be completed within 5 years of signing the Record of Decision (ROD) for the revised RMP. Your comments will be considered at that time. A number of referenced documents as well as updated BLM policy will be considered during this process so the most up-to-date scientific data is used.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Summary Comment #11: Some respondents expressed concern about the possibility of an anti-livestock bias in the Draft EIS and (or) disagreed with or objected to the assertion that livestock grazing is a consequential factor in the production of air emissions.

Summary Response: Comment has been noted. Appropriate text in Proposed RMP and Final EIS will include information addressing the importance of grazing management practices as related to rangeland health. On page 3-7, Table 3-3 livestock grazing is listed as a minor emissions source.

Summary Comment #25: Respondents also requested clarification of the status of range condition in the planning area and asked BLM to indicate steps taken to improve range condition.

Summary Response: Clarification of range conditions will be considered as appropriate during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. Additional information or clarification will be provided in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS where necessary. Where livestock grazing was contributing to an allotment failing, standards, guidelines, or BMPs have or will be implemented.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Summary Comment #6: Numerous respondents expressed interest for the BLM to consider and support a citizen's proposal for the designation of the South Fork of the Powder River as a wilderness area.

Summary Response: The South Fork of the Powder: A Citizen's Wilderness Inventory (CWI) was submitted during the 90-day public comment period on the Casper Draft EIS and RMP. The CWI provided new information on wilderness characteristics within a portion of the South Fork of the Powder River drainage. BLM reviewed this new information. Based on compiled existing resource information from files in the Casper Field Office and a field review, the South Fork of the Powder inventory area does not have wilderness characteristics requiring preservation, and no additional protection beyond those already proposed in the Draft EIS for the area is warranted.

Summary Comment #27: Some respondents formally request additional protection, either under Special Management Area (SMA) or Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) provisions, for a specific area.

Summary Response: A full range of alternatives were developed and considered. Those areas not selected under the preferred alternative as ACECs or SMAs can adequately be protected by implementing the management actions identified for those areas.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Summary Comment #8: Respondents request a change, alteration, clarification, or broadening of the socio-economic impact analysis. Requests included that the specific considerations from the following documents be incorporated into the economic analysis: "Socio-Economic Framework for Public Land Management Planning: Indicators for the West's Economy" and "The Economic and Social Impacts of Oil and Gas Development."

Summary Response: BLM recognizes the importance of quantifying non-market values; however, this type of analysis is beyond the scope of this effort. BLM also recognizes the fact that resources such as oil and gas are a function of where those resources are found. BLM submits that the Sonoran Institute-produced document titled "Prosperity in the 21st Century West 2004" presents quantifiable economic data. This document further illustrates the importance of protected public lands to the economic viability of

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

communities throughout the west and text from this document will be incorporated in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

Summary Comment #18: One respondent made a recommendation for use (or omission of) specific economic modeling tools.

Summary Response: BLM used the most up-to-date and (or) relevant modeling tools available for analysis. The Economic Profile System (EPS) and Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) were two such models used. While BLM recognizes there are some limitations to IMPLAN, it is commonly used by other federal agencies such as the USFS to quantify economic impacts.

MULTIPLE RESOURCE PROGRAMS

Summary Comment #3: Numerous respondents request clarification of terminology, a correction in language or grammar, or a reevaluation of a section of text for accuracy.

Summary Response: Requests will be evaluated on an individual basis and text will be clarified or corrected as appropriate in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

Summary Comment #4: A few respondents requested to broaden the scope of the cumulative impacts analysis, range of alternatives, or requests to widen the overall scope of the EIS.

Summary Response: An alternative considering no additional surface disturbance in the planning would not meet Federal Land Policy and Management Act requirements that include BLM’s obligation to manage public lands and resources in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, including recognizing the Nation’s need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber. With that in mind, a full range of alternatives were developed and analyzed. BLM took extensive measures to ensure the scope, content, and analysis of cumulative impacts was thorough and appropriate for resource areas potentially affected by the actions proposed in the document. In the Draft EIS, page 4-296, 6th paragraph, first 2 sentences, clearly defines limiting cumulative impact analysis to “meaningful impacts.” For further guidance as to direction, approach, and methodology for cumulative impacts, please refer to the following sections in the Draft EIS: Page 4-296, 6th paragraph, Page 4-297, 4th paragraph, first sentence, and Cumulative Issue 4, page 4-305.

Summary Comment #9: Some respondents requested verification that the recommendations set out in the document are in compliance with applicable laws, acts, regulations, policies, plans, directives, standards, or guidelines.

Summary Response: BLM complies with all applicable laws, policies, and regulations. All recommendations are taken into consideration and evaluated with relevant documents. Language and management actions will be reviewed and corrected, as appropriate, to ensure compliance with applicable laws, acts, regulations, policies, plans, directives, standards, or guidelines in the Final EIS. Lists of new and revised policies will be amended as appropriate for the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

- Summary Comment #10:** A number of respondents request the inclusion of additional baseline information (such as more data or a map) or further analysis in a resource area.
- Summary Response:** BLM will include additional baseline data where further explanation or clarification is necessary in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.
- Summary Comment #12:** Respondents requested the inclusion or adoption of provisions or data from reports, guidelines, or recommendations.
- Summary Response:** BLM considered and incorporated peer-reviewed, relevant scientific literature where applicable. Mitigation measures were based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. Upon completion of the Casper RMP revision, an implementation strategy will be developed. This process occurs after the ROD and is not a part of the Draft EIS.
- Summary Comment #17:** A few respondents submitted an expression of concern over effectiveness of mitigation measures or a request to implement specific mitigation measures.
- Summary Response:** Mitigation measures are based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. A wide range of reasonable mitigation measures are included in each alternative as management actions, including measures suggested by individuals and organizations in their scoping comments.
- Summary Comment #23:** Respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of surface-disturbing activities (analysis, management action, mitigation measure), or requested additional information regarding surface-disturbing activities.
- Summary Response:** BLM strives to minimize all surface-disturbing activities. The preferred alternative minimizes activities on areas sensitive to surface disturbance. Appendix M discloses the amount of anticipated surface disturbance for each activity. Where avoidance is not possible, more extensive mitigation techniques would be employed.
- Summary Comment #26:** Some respondents requested an extension of the comment period or to be added to the mailing list in order to receive a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS.
- Summary Response:** Request was addressed during the set 90-day comment period for the Draft RMP and EIS (July 21, 2006 to October 19, 2006).
- Summary Comment #28:** Numerous respondents expressed personal preference or opinion regarding alternatives, resources, or mitigation measures.
- Summary Response:** While your comment has been categorized as non-substantive, it has been thoroughly reviewed and considered during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. A copy of the DEIS has been submitted to the address provided.
- Summary Comment #29:** A large number of respondents submitted comments beyond the scope of current document.

Summary Response: While your comment has been categorized as non-substantive, it has been thoroughly reviewed and considered during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

5.0 CONCLUSION

In summary, respondents voiced a range of concerns relative to the revision process and land management issues. The most frequently discussed topics in the public comments were special status species, land tenure adjustments, off-highway vehicles and travel management, air quality, and water resources.

The remainder of this document is divided into three appendices.

- Appendix A: Public Response User’s Guide
- Appendix B: Public Response Documents
- Appendix C: Individual Comments and Responses

Appendix A is included with this publication and begins on page Y-25. Due to the size of Appendices B and C, they have been placed on the RMP revision website for public viewing (www.blm.gov/rmp/casper/).

Appendix A: Public Response User’s Guide:

The tables in Appendix A are designed to assist respondents in determining how their comments were considered by the BLM. Table A-1 provides a list of respondents, the response document number (e.g., letter or e-mail), and the comment numbers associated with each public response document. Table A-2 identifies summary comments by comment number. To use these tables:

1. Locate your name and associated response document number and comment numbers in Table A-1.
2. Using the comment numbers from Table A-1, find your summary comment numbers in Table A-2.

With this information (Response Document Number, Comment Numbers, and Summary Comment Numbers), a respondent can locate a copy of their original document in Appendix B, their individual comments and agency responses in Appendix C (both posted on the Casper RMP revision website), and the summary comment and response assigned to their comment.

ADDENDUM 1: Summary Comments Organized by Comment Number

This page intentionally left blank.

- Summary Comment #1:** Several respondents raised questions or requested clarification on the purpose and need as written for the Draft RMP/EIS as it relates to mineral resources.
- Summary Response:** As stated on Page 1-5, new data have become available, new policies have been established, and old policies have been revised. This, along with emerging issues and changing circumstances, resulted in the need to revise the existing plan. This section is not arguing that energy minerals development has become the priority use on public land. Rather, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act Reauthorization of 2000 coupled with the Nation's growing demand for domestic energy is simply listed as an example of the many emerging issues and changing circumstances resulting in the need to revise the existing plan. See Page 1-5, New Data; Page 1-6 New and Revised Policy, and Page 1-7 Emerging Issues and Changing Circumstances.
- Summary Comment #2:** Numerous respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of water resources (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information regarding water resources.
- Summary Response:** Mitigation measures protecting water resources were based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. BLM does not issue Wyoming Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WYPDES) permits authorizing surface water discharge. These permits are issued by Wyoming DEQ. WYPDES permits contain effluent limits and (or) non-degradation standards unique to each authorization.
- Summary Comment #3:** Numerous respondents request clarification of terminology, a correction in language or grammar, or a reevaluation of a section of text for accuracy.
- Summary Response:** Requests will be evaluated on an individual basis and text will be clarified or corrected as appropriate in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.
- Summary Comment #4:** A few respondents requested to broaden the scope of the cumulative impacts analysis, range of alternatives, or requests to widen the overall scope of the EIS.
- Summary Response:** An alternative considering no additional surface disturbance in the planning would not meet Federal Land Policy and Management Act requirements that include BLM's obligation to manage public lands and resources in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, including recognizing the Nation's need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber. With that in mind, a full range of alternatives were developed and analyzed. BLM took extensive measures to ensure the scope, content, and analysis of cumulative impacts was thorough and appropriate for resource areas potentially affected by the actions proposed in the document. In the Draft EIS, page 4-296, 6th paragraph, first 2 sentences, clearly defines limiting cumulative impact analysis to "meaningful impacts." For further guidance as to direction, approach, and methodology for cumulative impacts, please refer to the following sections in the Draft EIS: Page 4-296, 6th paragraph, Page 4-297, 4th paragraph, first sentence, and Cumulative Issue 4, page 4-305.

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Summary Comment #5: Respondents submitted requests to set standards, verify effectiveness of management activities, or clarify information regarding vegetation in the planning area.

Summary Response: The preferred alternative identifies a wide range of management actions to protect important habitat types throughout the planning area. A variety of tools, including fire, are used to meet habitat objectives. In addition, fragmentation blocks were identified to prevent further fragmentation of intact native vegetation. Vegetation habitats are assessed by BLM and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) to determine if their condition supports wildlife objectives.

Summary Comment #6: Numerous respondents expressed interest for the BLM to consider and support a citizen's proposal for the designation of the South Fork of the Powder River as a wilderness area.

Summary Response: The South Fork of the Powder: A Citizen's Wilderness Inventory (CWI) was submitted during the 90-day public comment period on the Casper Draft EIS and RMP. The CWI provided new information on wilderness characteristics within a portion of the South Fork of the Powder River drainage. BLM reviewed this new information. Based on compiled existing resource information from files in the Casper Field Office and a field review, the South Fork of the Powder inventory area does not have wilderness characteristics requiring preservation, and no additional protection beyond those already proposed in the Draft EIS for the area is warranted.

Summary Comment #7: Numerous respondents request or object to, the designation of land parcels for retention, disposal, exchange, or acquisition.

Summary Response: The Casper RMP revision undertakes to incorporate a land tenure adjustment strategy by specifically identifying all of the individual parcels potentially affected. Once identified in the RMP and as opportunities arise, these identified parcels can then be considered for adjustment using the available tools including sale, exchange, Recreation and Public Purposes, acquisition, withdrawal, etc. Prior to any action, site-specific analysis will be conducted and will consider public access and the natural and cultural resources on the land. Further, BLM does not intend to undertake a wholesale disposal of public lands in Goshen, Platte, and Converse counties.

Summary Comment #8: Respondents request a change, alteration, clarification, or broadening of the socio-economic impact analysis. Requests included that the specific considerations from the following documents be incorporated into the economic analysis: "Socio-Economic Framework for Public Land Management Planning: Indicators for the West's Economy" and "The Economic and Social Impacts of Oil and Gas Development."

Summary Response: BLM recognizes the importance of quantifying non-market values; however, this type of analysis is beyond the scope of this effort. BLM also recognizes the fact that resources such as oil and gas are a function of where those resources are found. BLM submits that the Sonoran Institute-produced document titled "Prosperity in the 21st Century West 2004" presents quantifiable economic data. This document further illustrates the

importance of protected public lands to the economic viability of communities throughout the west and text from this document will be incorporated in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

Summary Comment #9: Some respondents requested verification that the recommendations set out in the document are in compliance with applicable laws, acts, regulations, policies, plans, directives, standards, or guidelines.

Summary Response: BLM complies with all applicable laws, policies, and regulations. All recommendations are taken into consideration and evaluated with relevant documents. Language and management actions will be reviewed and corrected, as appropriate, to ensure compliance with applicable laws, acts, regulations, policies, plans, directives, standards, or guidelines in the Final EIS. Lists of new and revised policies will be amended as appropriate for the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

Summary Comment #10: A number of respondents request the inclusion of additional baseline information (such as more data or a map) or further analysis in a resource area.

Summary Response: BLM will include additional baseline data where further explanation or clarification is necessary in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

Summary Comment #11: Some respondents expressed concern about the possibility of an anti-livestock bias in the Draft EIS and (or) disagreed with or objected to the assertion that livestock grazing is a consequential factor in the production of air emissions.

Summary Response: Comment has been noted. Appropriate text in Proposed RMP and Final EIS will include information addressing the importance of grazing management practices as related to rangeland health. On page 3-7, Table 3-3 livestock grazing is listed as a minor emissions source.

Summary Comment #12: Respondents requested the inclusion or adoption of provisions or data from reports, guidelines, or recommendations.

Summary Response: BLM considered and incorporated peer-reviewed, relevant scientific literature where applicable. Mitigation measures were based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. Upon completion of the Casper RMP revision, an implementation strategy will be developed. This process occurs after the ROD and is not a part of the Draft EIS.

Summary Comment #13: Respondents expressed concern or requested additional information regarding Visual Resource Management (VRM) classifications in the planning area.

Summary Response: The purpose of visual resource management is to manage the quality of the visual environment and to reduce the visual impact of development activities while maintaining the viability of all resource programs. The inventory included visual quality, distance zones, and sensitivity of the landscape. See BLM Manual Handbook 8410-1, the 2004 VRM Inventory on the RMP website (<http://www.blm.gov/rmp/casper/>), and Washington Office Information Bulletin No. 98-135 for further guidance.

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

- Summary Comment #14:** Many respondents requested clarification of the use or management of motorized and mechanized recreation in the planning area, including snowmobiles. Respondents also included requests to change, alter, or clarify motorized recreation and general access (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure). In addition, a respondent submitted a specific request for the BLM to adopt recommendations from the Travel Management Planning Process Template.
- Summary Response:** Travel management areas and travel planning criteria will be defined in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. A travel management plan for the planning area will be completed within 5 years of signing the Record of Decision (ROD) for the revised RMP. Your comments will be considered at that time. A number of referenced documents as well as updated BLM policy will be considered during this process so the most up-to-date scientific data is used.
- Summary Comment #15:** Some respondents recommend additional management of commercial forestry activities.
- Summary Response:** For questions regarding viability of data used in the analysis, BLM submits a list of supporting scientific documents (see individual responses, Appendix C). BLM implements several types of prescriptions throughout the planning area. For soil disturbing activities, measures such as the Best Management Practices (BMPs) outlined in Appendix K of the FEIS, will be implemented to minimize impact.
- Summary Comment #16:** Some respondents requested the use of directional drilling or pitless drilling, additional information regarding directional drilling or pitless drilling, or asked that the BLM re-consider use of such drilling techniques.
- Summary Response:** Site-specific NEPA analysis indicates when directional drilling should be used to protect other resources. The analysis considers the effectiveness, cost, public benefit, and the availability of other mitigation measures. The text in Section 2.3 *Alternatives Considered, but Not Carried Forward for Detail Analysis*, Mandate Directional Drilling will be revised. Pitless drilling is a method currently considered viable by BLM.
- Summary Comment #17:** A few respondents submitted an expression of concern over effectiveness of mitigation measures or a request to implement specific mitigation measures.
- Summary Response:** Mitigation measures are based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. A wide range of reasonable mitigation measures are included in each alternative as management actions, including measures suggested by individuals and organizations in their scoping comments.
- Summary Comment #18:** One respondent made a recommendation for use (or omission of) specific economic modeling tools.
- Summary Response:** BLM used the most up-to-date and (or) relevant modeling tools available for analysis. The Economic Profile System (EPS) and Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) were two such models used. While BLM recognizes

there are some limitations to IMPLAN, it is commonly used by other federal agencies such as the USFS to quantify economic impacts.

- Summary Comment #19:** Some respondents commented on the need for additional information on big game, or clarification of potential discrepancies in alternatives or the analysis on big game.
- Summary Response:** BLM notes that it only applies conditions of approval to protect a resource value when the resource is present. The WGFD is responsible for establishing herd objectives through a public process. WGFD was a cooperator who participated in the preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS. Appendix E identified management challenges to meeting herd objectives. Many of these challenges are outside BLM's authority to manage (i.e., intermingled land ownership, agricultural conversion, drought conditions, etc.).
- Summary Comment #20:** A number of respondents submitted comments requesting a change, alteration or clarification of air quality (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure) or requested additional information.
- Summary Response:** BLM recognizes that activities in the RMP may or may not affect areas outside the planning area, such as the Bridger Wilderness. The Draft RMP/EIS simply illustrates previous analysis indicating far ranging potential impacts. For the air quality analysis, NEPA does not require a quantitative study. The inter-agency air quality team (including air quality staff from Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality [Wyoming DEQ – Air Quality Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Forest Service [USFS], National Park Service, and BLM) agreed to the “emissions-based” method. BLM has used this approach on other NEPA projects. Quantitative air quality analysis will be performed at the project level. BLM recognizes the primacy of the State of Wyoming in regulating air quality. Emission factors and parameters will be revised as necessary.
- Summary Comment #21:** Numerous respondents requested a change, alteration, or clarification of special status species (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure), or they requested additional information regarding special status species.
- Summary Response:** This analysis considers numerous management actions to reduce indirect impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, including options to reduce habitat fragmentation. Mitigation measures protecting sensitive species were based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B. BLM maintains compliance with all federal laws and guidance as identified in Appendix B.
- Summary Comment #22:** Respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of salable and leasable minerals (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information regarding salable and (or) leasable minerals.
- Summary Response:** The Reasonable Foreseeable Development is the base document used and describes how the document was developed. The document can be found at <http://www.blm.gov/rmp/casper/>. Clarification of salable and leasable

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

mineral conditions will be considered as appropriate during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. Additional information or clarification will be provided in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS where necessary.

Summary Comment #23: Respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of surface-disturbing activities (analysis, management action, mitigation measure), or requested additional information regarding surface-disturbing activities.

Summary Response: BLM strives to minimize all surface-disturbing activities. The preferred alternative minimizes activities on areas sensitive to surface disturbance. Appendix M discloses the amount of anticipated surface disturbance for each activity. Where avoidance is not possible, more extensive mitigation techniques would be employed.

Summary Comment #24: A few respondents requested changes, alterations, or clarification of heritage, paleontological, and (or) cultural resource management (analysis, management action, mitigation measure), or requested additional information regarding management of heritage, paleontological, and (or) cultural resources.

Summary Response: BLM always conducts inventories prior to any ground-disturbing activity. The likelihood of “bumbling” onto sites is no greater or lesser than if a block survey had been conducting prior to leasing. While the setting of the resource may be compromised, other factors such as physical integrity may warrant classifying a feature, such as a trail segment as contributing. BLM considers setting only a portion of significance. Mitigation measures are based on the best available science as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance referenced in Appendix B.

Summary Comment #25: Respondents also requested clarification of the status of range condition in the planning area and asked BLM to indicate steps taken to improve range condition.

Summary Response: Clarification of range conditions will be considered as appropriate during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. Additional information or clarification will be provided in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS where necessary. Where livestock grazing was contributing to an allotment failing, standards, guidelines, or BMPs have or will be implemented.

Summary Comment #26: Some respondents requested an extension of the comment period or to be added to the mailing list in order to receive a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Summary Response: Request was addressed during the set 90-day comment period for the Draft RMP and EIS (July 21, 2006 to October 19, 2006).

Summary Comment #27: Some respondents formally request additional protection, either under Special Management Area (SMA) or Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) provisions, for a specific area.

Summary Response: A full range of alternatives were developed and considered. Those areas not selected under the preferred alternative as ACECs or SMAs can adequately be protected by implementing the management actions identified for those areas.

***Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis***

Summary Comment #28: Numerous respondents expressed personal preference or opinion regarding alternatives, resources, or mitigation measures.

Summary Response: While your comment has been categorized as non-substantive, it has been thoroughly reviewed and considered during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. A copy of the DEIS has been submitted to the address provided.

Summary Comment #29: A large number of respondents submitted comments beyond the scope of current document.

Summary Response: While your comment has been categorized as non-substantive, it has been thoroughly reviewed and considered during preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS.

This page intentionally left blank.

CASPER DRAFT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
COMMENT ANALYSIS

APPENDIX A

Public Response User's Guide

This page intentionally left blank.

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

The tables presented in Appendix A are designed to assist respondents in determining how their comments were considered by BLM.

Table A-1 provides a list of respondents, the response document number, and the comment numbers associated with each public response document. Table A-2 (page A-6) identifies summary comments by comment number. To use these tables:

3. Locate your name and associated response document number and comment numbers in Table A-1.
4. Using the comment numbers from Table A-1, find your summary comment numbers in Table A-2.

With this information (Response Document Number, Comment Numbers, and Summary Comment Numbers), a respondent can locate a copy of their original document in Appendix B, their individual comments and agency responses in Appendix C, and the summary comment in Section 4 of the main document.

Table A-1. Public Response Index

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Anderson	Arthur	Individual	00113	682 – 688
Andress	Beth	Individual	00048	240 – 247
Andress	David	Individual	00096	489 – 496
Barbe	Ken	Individual	00067	329
Begger	Jason	Petroleum Association of Wyoming	00101	512 – 559
Bitner	Albert Richard	Individual	00024	57 – 61
Bloom	Gregory	Individual	00043	210 – 217
Bonney	Lorraine	Individual	00120	709
Cronk	Rick	Individual	00037	116 – 121
Culpepper	Bob	Individual	00016	37 – 38
Culpepper	Bob	Individual	00017	39
Culpepper	Bob	Individual	00018	40
Culver	Nada	The Wilderness Society	00099	504 – 506
Daniels	Bettie Marie	Individual	00093	448 – 453
Dobos	Barbara	Alliance for Historic Wyoming	00039	125 – 128
Dobos	Barbara	Alliance for Historic Wyoming	00060	300 – 303
Downing	Jonathan	Wyoming Contractors Association	00106	575 – 596
Durst	Tom	Individual	00084	424 – 426
Eathorne	Frank	Converse County Commissioners	00008	16 – 25
Eathorne	Frank	Converse County Commissioners	00030	80
Eathorne	Frank	Converse County Commissioners	00031	81
Eathorne	Frank	Converse County Commissioners	00032	82
Eathorne	Frank	Converse County Commissioners	00033	83 - 84
Eckhardt	Cheryl	National Park Service, Intermountain Region	00036	115

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Table A-1. Public Response Index

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Emmerich	John	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	00041	134 – 204
Emmerich	John	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	00104	570 – 571
Emmerich	John	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	00117	705
Emmerich	John	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	00118	706 - 707
Etchepare	John	Wyoming Department of Agriculture	00073	372 – 413
Freudenthal	Dave	Office of the Governor	00116	699 – 704
Guthrie	Linda	Devon Energy Production Co., LP	00071	366 – 369
Guthrie	Linda	Devon Energy Production Co., LP	00097	497 – 500
Hanlin	David	Individual	00119	708
Herbst	Lois	Herbst Lazy TY Cattle Co.	00072	370 – 371
Hill	Greg	Wyoming State Snowmobile Association	00002	3 – 9
Hittel	F. Earline	Individual	00102	560
Howard	Jim and Gina	Individual	00023	52 – 56
Ingalls	Alaine	Individual	00068	330
Ingalls	Dan	Individual	00086	429
Ingalls	Dan	Individual	00087	430
Johnson	Greg	Individual	00003	10
Johnson	Joseph P.	Scissors Ranch Co.	00009	26
Johnson	Kim	Individual	00019	41
Johnson	Kim	Individual	00020	42 – 43
Johnson	Kim	Individual	00021	44 – 45
Jones	Melanja	Individual	00013	33 – 34
Jones	Melanja	Individual	00014	35
Jones	Melanja	Individual	00015	36
Kelly	Brian T.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	00035	89 – 114
Keyser	Samantha	Individual	00061	304 - 306
Keyser	Samantha	Individual	00062	307 - 312
Keyser	Dennis	Individual	00065	322 – 327
Koepsel	Katya	Individual	00005	12
Koepsel	Katya	Individual	00006	13
Koepsel	Katya	Individual	00007	14 – 15
Koepsel	Kirk	Sierra Club	00054	265 – 272
Koepsel	Kirk	Sierra Club	00055	273 – 277
Koepsel	Kirk	Sierra Club	00056	278 – 281
Koepsel	Kirk	Sierra Club	00057	282 – 286

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

Table A-1. Public Response Index

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Koepsel	Kirk	Sierra Club	00058	287 – 291
Koepsel	Kirk	Sierra Club	00059	292 – 299
Krakov	Jere	National Park Service	00094	454 – 460
Kuhl	Dwight	Individual	00066	328
Lee	Richard C.	Individual	00040	129 – 133
Leman	John T.	Individual	00105	572 – 574
Madsen	Jon and Ginnie	Individual	00038	122 – 124
Martin	Frank	Natrona Weed & Pest District	00109	669
Maxon	Nathan	Individual	00070	364 – 365
McBride	David J.	Anadarko Petroleum Corporation	00121	710 – 726
McNiece	James	Individual	00011	31
Miller	Jennifer S.	Individual	00112	680 – 681
Moline	Brett	Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation	00026	62 – 67
Moline	Brett	Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation	00027	68 – 70
Moline	Brett	Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation	00028	71 – 74
Molvar	Erik	Individual	00004	11
Molvar	Erik	Biodiversity Conservation Alliance	00122	727 – 743
Molvar	Erik	Biodiversity Conservation Alliance	00125	953 – 1332
O’Leary	Daniel	Individual	00050	255 – 257
O’Leary	Daniel	Individual	00051	258 – 261
O’Leary	Daniel	Individual	00052	262 – 263
O’Leary	Daniel	Individual	00053	264
Osgood	John	Individual	00010	27 – 30
Parfitt	Todd	Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality	00103	561 – 569
Parmely	Keith	Casper Dirt Riders	00049	248 – 254
Pendery	Bruce	Wyoming Outdoor Council	00098	501 – 503
Pendery	Bruce	Wyoming Outdoor Council	00123	744 – 952
Phibbs	Henry	Individual	00088	431
Phibbs	Henry	Individual	00089	432
Phibbs	Henry	Individual	00090	433 – 435
Raynolds	Linda	Individual	00115	696 – 698
Reading	Harvey	Individual	00012	32
Reaves	Lindall	Individual	00063	313
Reaves	Lindall	Individual	00064	314 – 321
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00074	414
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00075	415

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Table A-1. Public Response Index

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00076	416
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00077	417
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00078	418
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00079	419
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00080	420
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00081	421
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00082	422
Reece	Bryce	Wyoming Wool Growers Association	00083	423
Richards	Jeff	Pacificorp	00095	461 – 488
Riggins	J.R.	Motorized Recreation Council of Wyoming	00034	85 – 88
Riggins	J.R.	Motorized Recreation Council of Wyoming	00044	218 – 223
Riggins	J.R.	Motorized Recreation Council of Wyoming	00045	224 – 231
Riggins	J.R.	Motorized Recreation Council of Wyoming	00046	232 – 234
Riggins	J.R.	Motorized Recreation Council of Wyoming	00047	235 - 239
Rugotzke	Barbara E.	Individual	00111	675 – 679
Sachau	B.	Individual	00001	1 – 2
Scott	Hustace “Stacey”	Bates Hole/Shirley Basin Sage-Grouse Working Group	00114	689 – 695
Spurrier	Margo	Individual	00085	427 – 428
Stewart	Jay	Individual	00029	75 – 79
Stewart	Jay	Individual	00042	205 – 209
Svoboda	Larry	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	00091	436 – 441
Vanderhoef	Tyler H.	Gene R. George & Associates, Inc.	00107	597 – 640
Ver Ploeg Jones Binder	Alan Nick Joan E.	Wyoming State Geological Society	00100	507 – 511
Walgren	Bruce L.	Murie Audubon Society	00110	670 – 674
Williams	Tracy	Wyoming State Parks, Historic Sites & Trails	00092	442 – 447

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

Table A-1. Public Response Index

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Wolf	Judy	Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office	00022	46 – 51
Zimmerman	Kathleen C.	National Wildlife Federation	00069	331 – 363
Zimmerman Winland	Kathleen C. Mark	National Wildlife Federation and Wyoming Wildlife Federation	00108	641 – 668
NA	NA	NA	00025	NA
NA	NA	NA	00124	NA

NA Not Applicable

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
1	00029	49	00028	98	00021	145	00007
2	00029	50	00028	99	00021	146	00007
3	00014	51	00028	100	00028	147	00007
4	00014	52	00028	101	00028	148	00007
4.1	00014	53	00028	102	00028	149	00007
5	00003	54	00028	103	00028	150	00007
6	00014	55	00006	104	00028	151	00007
7	00014	56	00028	105	00028	152	00007
8	00014	57	00028	106	00028	153	00007
9	00029	58	00029	107	00009	154	00007
10	00028	59	00028	108	00003	155	00007
11	00029	60	00006	109	00028	156	00007
12	00029	61	00028	110	00028	157	00007
13	00028	62	00028	111	00028	158	00007
14	00028	63	00028	112	00009	159	00007
15	00006	64	00028	113	00028	160	00007
16	00028	65	00028	113.1	00028	161	00007
17	00028	66	00028	114	00028	162	00007
18	00003	67	00028	115	00009	163	00007
19	00003	68	00028	116	00029	164	00007
20	00003	69	00028	117	00028	165	00007
21	00003	70	00028	118	00028	166	00007
22	00003	71	00028	119	00006	167	00007
23	00003	72	00028	120	00028	168	00007
24	00003	73	00028	121	00028	169	00007
25	00003	74	00028	122	00006	170	00007
26	00028	75	00028	122.1	00028	171	00007
27	00028	76	00028	123	00028	172	00007
28	00028	77	00028	124	00028	173	00007
29	00028	78	00028	125	00028	174	00007
30	00028	79	00028	126	00028	175	00007
31	00028	80	00028	127	00029	176	00007
32	00028	81	00028	128	00028	177	00007
33	00029	82	00021	129	00029	178	00007
34	00028	83	00028	130	00029	179	00007
35	00028	84	00021	131	00028	180	00007
36	00028	85	00020	132	00006	181	00007
37	00029	86	00010	133	00029	182	00007
38	00028	87	00028	134	00007	183	00007
39	00028	88	00028	135	00007	184	00007
40	00028	89	00029	136	00007	185	00007
41	00028	90	00028	137	00007	186	00007
42	00028	91	00003	138	00007	187	00007
43	00006	92	00028	139	00007	188	00007
44	00029	93	00028	140	00007	189	00007
45	00028	94	00028	141	00007	190	00007
46	00024	95	00021	142	00007	191	00007
47	00023	96	00029	143	00007	192	00007
48	00013	97	00021	144	00007	193	00007

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
194	00007	244	00028	294	00016	344	00010
195	00007	245	00029	295	00028	345	00028
196	00007	246	00028	296	00016	346	00012
197	00007	247	00028	297	00016	347	00028
198	00007	248	00028	298	00016	348	00017
199	00007	249	00028	299	00028	349	00028
200	00007	250	00028	300	00028	350	00009
201	00026	251	00029	301	00028	351	00028
202	00003	252	00028	302	00028	352	00028
203	00009	253	00028	303	00028	353	00028
204	00021	254	00028	304	00028	354	00025
205	00028	255	00028	305	00028	355	00028
206	00028	256	00028	306	00028	356	00028
207	00028	257	00007	307	00028	357	00028
208	00028	258	00028	308	00028	358	00028
209	00028	259	00028	309	00028	359	00028
210	00028	260	00028	310	00028	360	00028
211	00028	261	00028	311	00028	361	00028
212	00028	262	00028	312	00028	362	00025
213	00028	263	00028	313	00028	363	00028
214	00028	264	00028	314	00028	364	00028
215	00014	265	00028	315	00028	365	00028
216	00014	266	00028	316	00028	366	00003
217	00028	267	00028	317	00028	367	00028
218	00028	268	00028	318	00028	368	00028
219	00014	269	00028	319	00014	369	00003
220	00028	270	00028	320	00014	370	00006
221	00021	271	00028	321	00028	371	00028
222	00021	272	00006	322	00028	372	00028
223	00028	273	00028	323	00028	373	00003
224	00028	274	00028	324	00028	374	00003
225	00014	275	00010	325	00028	375	00003
226	00028	276	00021	326	00028	376	00011
227	00028	277	00021	327	00028	377	00011
228	00028	278	00003	328	00028	378	00028
229	00028	279	00015	329	00028	379	00028
230	00029	280	00015	330	00028	380	00028
231	00028	281	00010	331	00001	381	00011
232	00028	282	00007	332	00009	382	00011
233	00028	283	00028	333	00016	383	00011
234	00028	284	00028	334	00028	384	00028
235	00028	285	00029	335	00016	385	00011
236	00028	286	00028	336	00028	386	00028
237	00028	287	00027	337	00028	387	00028
238	00028	288	00027	338	00028	388	00028
239	00028	289	00010	339	00010	389	00028
240	00028	290	00010	340	00010	390	00028
241	00028	291	00010	341	00010	391	00021
242	00028	292	00010	342	00010	392	00028
243	00028	293	00010	343	00010	393	00028

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
394	00028	443	00014	492	00028	541	00028
395	00028	444	00028	493	00028	542	00028
396	00028	445	00028	494	00028	543	00028
397	00028	446	00014	495	00028	544	00028
398	00028	447	00028	496	00029	545	00028
399	00028	448	00029	497	00028	546	00028
400	00025	449	00029	498	00003	547	00028
401	00028	450	00029	499	00021	548	00028
402	00011	451	00029	500	00003	549	00028
403	00011	452	00028	501	00006	550	00028
404	00011	453	00028	502	00006	551	00028
405	00011	454	00028	503	00029	552	00028
406	00028	455	00028	504	00006	553	00028
407	00003	456	00003	505	00028	554	00028
408	00003	457	00009	506	00006	555	00028
409	00003	458	00028	507	00009	556	00024
410	00003	459	00003	508	00010	557	00009
411	00003	460	00007	509	00003	558	00028
412	00003	461	00028	510	00003	559	00028
413	00020	462	00028	511	00002	560	00028
414	00028	463	00028	512	00028	561	00020
415	00028	464	00028	513	00019	562	00020
416	00028	465	00028	514	00028	563	00020
417	00028	466	00028	515	00028	564	00020
418	00028	467	00028	516	00003	565	00020
419	00028	468	00028	517	00003	566	00020
420	00028	469	00028	518	00020	567	00020
421	00028	470	00028	519	00028	568	00020
422	00028	471	00028	520	00029	569	00020
423	00028	472	00028	521	00016	570	00028
424	00028	473	00028	522	00016	571	00028
425	00028	474	00003	523	00028	572	00028
426	00028	475	00028	524	00016	573	00028
427	00028	476	00028	525	00023	574	00028
428	00028	477	00028	526	00002	575	00028
429	00028	478	00014	527	00003	576	00028
430	00028	479	00028	528	00021	577	00028
431	00028	480	00028	529	00003	578	00028
432	00028	481	00028	530	00021	579	00028
433	00028	482	00028	531	00003	580	00028
434	00029	483	00028	532	00028	581	00028
435	00028	484	00029	533	00028	582	00028
436	00010	485	00028	534	00024	583	00028
437	00023	486	00028	535	00024	584	00028
438	00023	487	00028	536	00028	585	00028
439	00021	488	00028	537	00028	586	00002
440	00029	489	00028	538	00028	587	00002
441	00029	490	00014	539	00028	588	00002
442	00028	491	00028	540	00028	589	00002

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
590	00028	640	00028	690	00021	740	00029
591	00028	641	00001	691	00028	741	00029
592	00028	642	00009	692	00026	742	00006
593	00009	643	00016	693	00028	743	00029
594	00002	644	00016	694	00028	744	00028
595	00028	645	00010	695	00029	745	00028
596	00028	646	00021	696	00029	746	00028
597	00028	647	00028	697	00028	747	00028
598	00028	648	00028	698	00028	748	00009
599	00028	649	00010	699	00003	749	00028
600	00003	650	00010	700	00007	750	00028
601	00002	651	00010	701	00023	751	00028
602	00003	652	00010	702	00014	752	00028
603	00003	653	00028	703	00026	753	00001
604	00021	654	00012	704	00028	754	00028
605	00003	655	00028	705	00003	755	00001
606	00021	656	00017	706	00028	756	00001
607	00003	657	00028	707	00026	757	00012
608	00016	658	00009	708	00029	758	00009
609	00016	659	00028	709	00028	759	00009
610	00024	660	00009	710	00017	760	00028
611	00024	661	00009	711	00028	761	00009
612	00028	662	00028	712	00028	762	00028
613	00028	663	00028	713	00028	763	00028
614	00028	664	00028	714	00020	764	00028
615	00028	665	00028	715	00028	765	00028
616	00028	666	00028	716	00021	766	00009
617	00028	667	00028	717	00010	767	00020
618	00028	668	00028	718	00027	768	00009
619	00028	669	00028	719	00028	769	00028
620	00028	670	00028	720	00028	770	00012
621	00028	671	00007	721	00007	771	00016
622	00028	672	00028	722	00003	772	00016
623	00028	673	00028	723	00003	773	00020
624	00028	674	00006	724	00003	774	00009
625	00028	675	00029	725	00003	775	00020
626	00028	676	00028	726	00028	776	00009
627	00028	677	00028	727	00006	777	00028
628	00028	678	00006	728	00006	778	00028
629	00028	679	00028	729	00006	779	00028
630	00028	680	00028	730	00028	780	00009
631	00028	681	00028	731	00006	781	00028
632	00024	682	00028	732	00028	782	00023
633	00020	683	00028	733	00006	783	00023
634	00028	684	00029	734	00028	784	00023
635	00029	685	00028	735	00006	785	00009
636	00028	686	00028	736	00006	786	00009
637	00028	687	00028	737	00006	787	00009
638	00009	688	00006	738	00028	788	00028
639	00028	689	00009	739	00006	789	00028

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
790	00028	839	00028	888	00009	937	00027
791	00028	840	00028	889	00009	937.1	00027
792	00028	841	00028	890	00028	938	00004
793	00029	842	00028	891	00028	939	00028
794	00016	843	00003	892	00028	940	00028
795	00022	844	00020	893	00028	941	00028
796	00003	845	00020	894	00028	942	00028
797	00029	846	00020	895	00021	943	00028
798	00028	847	00020	896	00028	944	00028
799	00029	848	00028	897	00028	945	00028
800	00028	849	00020	898	00028	945.1	00009
801	00003	850	00020	899	00028	946	00003
802	00004	851	00009	900	00028	947	00029
803	00004	852	00028	901	00013	948	00029
804	00003	853	00029	902	00010	949	00004
805	00021	854	00028	903	00013	950	00028
806	00028	855	00028	904	00013	951	00028
807	00003	856	00028	905	00028	952	00008
808	00003	857	00015	906	00028	953	00028
809	00003	858	00005	907	00028	954	00028
810	00028	859	00005	908	00009	955	00028
811	00005	860	00003	909	00009	956	00019
812	00028	861	00025	910	00009	957	00021
813	00028	862	00028	911	00009	958	00021
814	00028	863	00028	912	00009	959	00021
815	00028	864	00021	913	00028	960	00021
816	00028	865	00028	914	00028	961	00021
817	00028	866	00028	915	00028	962	00028
818	00012	867	00005	916	00009	963	00022
819	00021	868	00028	917	00028	964	00028
820	00028	869	00012	918	00009	965	00006
821	00028	870	00028	919	00028	966	00028
822	00003	871	00012	920	00028	967	00028
823	00013	872	00028	921	00004	968	00028
824	00028	873	00009	922	00023	969	00028
825	00028	874	00028	923	00010	970	00028
826	00028	875	00003	924	00004	971	00028
827	00028	876	00009	925	00003	972	00028
828	00003	877	00021	926	00010	973	00028
829	00007	878	00009	927	00023	974	00028
830	00007	879	00028	928	00021	975	00009
831	00007	880	00028	929	00021	976	00028
832	00028	881	00028	930	00004	977	00019
833	00028	882	00021	931	00004	978	00019
834	00028	883	00009	932	00004	979	00028
835	00009	884	00021	933	00028	980	00017
836	00028	885	00028	934	00004	981	00010
837	00028	886	00009	935	00004	982	00009
838	00028	887	00009	936	00028	983	00029

**Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis**

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
984	00010	1034	00028	1084	00020	1134	00024
985	00028	1035	00028	1085	00020	1135	00024
986	00021	1036	00028	1086	00027	1136	00022
987	00028	1037	00028	1087	00028	1137	00028
988	00021	1038	00028	1088	00028	1138	00012
989	00021	1039	00009	1089	00010	1139	00021
990	00028	1040	00028	1090	00028	1140	00028
991	00028	1041	00028	1091	00028	1141	00021
992	00028	1042	00028	1092	00021	1142	00028
993	00021	1043	00028	1093	00028	1143	00028
994	00021	1044	00028	1094	00010	1144	00028
995	00028	1045	00028	1095	00028	1145	00028
996	00028	1046	00028	1096	00028	1146	00028
997	00028	1047	00021	1097	00028	1147	00012
998	00028	1048	00028	1098	00028	1148	00028
999	00028	1049	00028	1099	00028	1149	00028
1000	00028	1050	00028	1100	00028	1150	00028
1001	00028	1051	00013	1101	00021	1151	00028
1002	00028	1052	00009	1102	00004	1152	00028
1003	00021	1053	00010	1103	00004	1153	00028
1004	00028	1054	00028	1104	00004	1154	00028
1005	00027	1055	00010	1105	00028	1155	00028
1006	00028	1056	00010	1106	00028	1156	00010
1007	00021	1057	00012	1107	00004	1157	00028
1008	00021	1058	00021	1108	00004	1158	00028
1009	00028	1059	00010	1109	00028	1159	00016
1010	00009	1060	00010	1110	00028	1160	00028
1011	00021	1061	00029	1111	00004	1161	00016
1012	00012	1062	00010	1112	00021	1162	00016
1013	00028	1063	00029	1113	00004	1163	00009
1014	00010	1064	00010	1114	00021	1164	00016
1015	00010	1065	00029	1115	00020	1165	00016
1016	00010	1066	00028	1116	00028	1166	00016
1017	00010	1067	00010	1117	00028	1167	00016
1018	00028	1068	00028	1118	00004	1168	00016
1019	00028	1069	00014	1119	00028	1169	00028
1020	00028	1070	00028	1120	00017	1170	00028
1021	00028	1071	00010	1121	00028	1171	00016
1022	00021	1072	00028	1122	00028	1171.1	00029
1023	00028	1073	00028	1123	00028	1172	00016
1024	00028	1074	00009	1124	00028	1173	00016
1025	00028	1075	00021	1125	00006	1174	00028
1026	00028	1076	00021	1126	00028	1175	00028
1027	00021	1077	00021	1127	00028	1176	00028
1028	00028	1078	00022	1128	00028	1177	00028
1029	00021	1079	00019	1129	00023	1178	00028
1030	00028	1080	00019	1130	00004	1179	00015
1031	00028	1081	00020	1131	00004	1180	00015
1032	00028	1082	00020	1132	00028	1181	00028
1033	00028	1083	00020	1133	00020	1182	00015

Appendix Y – Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis

Table A-2. Summary Comment and Response Index by Individual Comment

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number	Comment Number	Summary Comment Number
1183	00028	1231	00014	1280	00028	1329	00012
1184	00028	1232	00014	1281	00028	1330	00028
1185	00015	1233	00014	1282	00008	1331	00028
1186	00015	1234	00014	1283	00008	1332	00029
1187	00015	1235	00014	1284	00028		
1188	00028	1236	00014	1285	00018		
1189	00015	1237	00014	1286	00018		
1190	00015	1238	00014	1287	00029		
1191	00015	1239	00014	1288	00008		
1192	00015	1240	00014	1289	00008		
1193	00028	1241	00014	1290	00028		
1194	00028	1242	00014	1291	00028		
1195	00028	1243	00014	1292	00028		
1196	00028	1244	00014	1293	00028		
1197	00028	1245	00014	1294	00028		
1198	00028	1246	00014	1295	00028		
1199	00028	1247	00014	1296	00028		
1200	00028	1248	00014	1297	00028		
1201	00003	1249	00014	1298	00028		
1202	00028	1250	00029	1299	00027		
1203	00028	1251	00014	1300	00010		
1204	00028	1252	00029	1301	00028		
1205	00028	1253	00029	1302	00028		
1205.1	00006	1254	00029	1303	00010		
1206	00028	1255	00029	1304	00028		
1207	00028	1256	00029	1305	00004		
1208	00028	1257	00029	1306	00028		
1209	00006	1258	00029	1307	00028		
1210	00028	1259	00029	1308	00012		
1211	00006	1260	00029	1309	00026		
1212	00028	1261	00029	1310	00006		
1213	00028	1262	00029	1311	00012		
1214	00028	1263	00029	1312	00012		
1215	00004	1264	00029	1313	00012		
1216	00029	1265	00008	1314	00012		
1217	00029	1266	00008	1315	00014		
1218	00028	1267	00008	1316	00028		
1219	00028	1268	00028	1317	00028		
1220	00003	1269	00008	1318	00012		
1221	00003	1270	00028	1319	00012		
1222	00028	1271	00008	1320	00012		
1223	00028	1272	00028	1321	00012		
1224	00028	1273	00018	1322	00012		
1225	00012	1274	00008	1323	00012		
1226	00012	1275	00008	1324	00012		
1227	00010	1276	00008	1325	00012		
1228	00014	1277	00008	1326	00012		
1229	00014	1278	00008	1327	00012		
1230	00014	1279	00028	1328	00012		