

Public Comments and BLM Response Table
(BLM responses refer to revised EA)

Proposed Installation, Use And Maintenance Of The
Sheep Hole Mountains S.D. Big Game Artificial Water Source
San Bernardino County, California
CA-690-EA05-25

	Comment # with page #	Comment	BLM Response
Letter #1 (CBB)	C1, P3	The BLM must ... Yet, page 61 of the EA states "As these new guzzlers are proposed in detail by CDFG, BLM will analyze potential ways to mitigate the impacts of each on a site-specific basis in a separate EA and will reanalyze cumulative impacts to wilderness values." We would like to remind the BLM that page 6 of the IBLA's August 27, 2003 decision on the initially proposed S.D. Guzzler stated clearly that "Significance cannot be avoided by breaking a proposed action down into small component parts." The BLM should stop trying to breakdown their long-term plans for six new guzzlers into component EAs that fail to address or mitigate significant impacts to the Sheephole Valley wilderness and its biological diversity.	The paragraph in the revised EA has been clarified by the replacement of the word "as" with the word "should".
Letter #1 (CBB)	C2, P3	BLM must also consult with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service regarding the impacts of the proposed action on listed species in the area including the threatened desert tortoise. The biological opinion for the West Mojave Plan expressly states that it does not provide take authorization for "future actions that require separate review and authorization by the Bureau." Biological Opinion for the California Desert Conservation Area Plan [West Mojave Plan] 6840(P) CA-063.50)(1-8-03-F-58) issued January 9, 2006 ("WEMO BiOp") at 171.	The Bureau formally consulted with the USFWS pursuant to the Biological Opinion for Small Projects Affecting Desert Tortoise Habitat in Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, California (1-8-97-F-17). The Service concurred with the BLM's determination that the proposed project is within the scope of this BO.

Letter #1	C3, P4	While we ... Without adequate forage, the whole stated purpose for this new guzzler is defeated. It is incumbent upon BLM to provide evidence as to forage quality and quantity.	Suitable habitat was determined by CDFG in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness (See Pauli and Bleich 1991). This reference material has been included in the revised EA.
Letter #1	C4, P5	BLM's obligation is to uphold federal purposes, and one of those purposes is to preserve the wilderness character of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness	<p>The 1964 Wilderness Act (c) (4) under the definition of wilderness provides that wilderness may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. These are referred to as supplemental values and BLM considers the presence of Desert Bighorn Sheep an important wildlife supplemental value of wilderness (EA Sec. 16.12).</p> <p>Section 4(b) under Use of Wilderness Areas in the Wilderness Act Section 4(c) states, "each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area... Except as otherwise provided in this Act, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use.</p> <p>Section 4 (c) of the Wilderness Act" addresses the "minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act..." and The CDPA further states in Section 103(f), "management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support such populations may be carried out within wilderness areas designated by this title and shall include the use of motorized vehicles..." (EA Sec 14)</p>
Letter #1	C5, P5	Fifth, the fact that CDFG plans construction of numerous other guzzlers in the metapopulation	As identified in the revised EA, a need of the project is "a. To encourage use of additional habitat

		area contradicts the contention that the S.D. guzzler on its own will be sufficient to achieve its game management goals even within the Sheephole Mountains deme. This is why CDFG also wants to construct five additional guzzlers in the same wilderness. Therefore, if no other future guzzlers were ever constructed, clearly there would be no compelling need to construct the S.D. guzzler. The EA fails to fairly analyze the likely "need" for the S.D. guzzler if it were to stand alone and none of the other five proposed guzzlers were constructed.	within the Sheep Hole Mountains where the lack of available water is a limiting factor. Through increased distribution of sheep and anticipated population growth, the likelihood of movement of sheep between the mountain ranges composing the South Mojave Sheep Metapopulation Area would be increased. Intermountain movement would increase the probability of sheep persistence in this desert region."
Letter #1	C6,P6	The EA assumes ... The EA fails to demonstrate that water is the controlling factor determining the viability of sheep populations.	Critical components of habitat include water, cover, forage, and special distribution of each. The revised EA clarifies this in Section 14..." b. To enhance the stability of the Sheephole deme and the South Mojave metapopulation, where feasible and appropriate, through increased dispersion and interaction of the herds throughout their ranges. The proposed action would encourage the Sheephole deme to increase its range and utilization of available forage."
Letter #1	C7, P6	The EA ... CDFG does not explain how transplanted populations will fare elsewhere or why this is a better goal than improving overall conditions where populations already exist.	The proposed action does not include transplantation of Big Horn Sheep.
Letter #1	C8, P6	The EA also" And yet the EA does not explain how new water sources alone would increase the likelihood of intermountain movement of sheep between mountain ranges separated by roads, military and residential use. We presume the explanation is that CDFG plans to land helicopters in the future within the Sheephole Valley Wilderness to capture and aeriually transplant individuals from the Sheephole deme to other locations. The EA does not consider the likelihood of future helicopter intrusions in the cumulative impact analysis if, as CDFG claims, the	As identified in the revised EA, a need of the project is "a. To encourage use of additional habitat within the Sheep Hole Mountains where the lack of available water is a limiting factor. Through increased distribution of sheep and anticipated population growth, the likelihood of movement of sheep between the mountain ranges composing the South Mojave Sheep Metapopulation Area would be increased. Intermountain movement would increase the probability of sheep persistence in this desert region."

		<p>construction of new guzzlers successfully boosts the herd population to a level where it can serve as a “feeder population” for other areas. In other words, there is likely no correlation whatsoever between constructing artificial waters and helping the sheep to naturally resume migrations between mountain ranges. We ask that the EA be modified to acknowledge this point.</p>	<p>The proposed action does not include transplanted of Big Horn Sheep.</p>
	C9, P6	<p>The EA fails to substantiate that construction of this or other guzzlers would mitigate “the historical effects of habitat fragmentation by highways, mining on Bristol, Dale and Cadiz Dry Lakes, past and present military use, and residential use and development in Wonder Valley”, which is listed as a need for the project on Page 8 of the EA. Nor does the EA provide documentation or analysis of the impact that each of these “historical effects” has had on Nelson bighorn sheep. Indeed, all of these factors will continue to impact the bighorn, whether the water developments are constructed or not. Only the elimination or mitigation of some or all of these factors will change or lessen their impacts on bighorn.</p>	<p>The EA has been revised to clarify that “The loss of available natural water sources, loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation by human developments such as communities, commercial and agricultural enterprises, and barriers such as interstate highways and canals, have contributed to desert bighorn decline.”</p>
Letter #1	C10, P7	<p>Yet the EA provides no data on existing natural water sources in the Sheep Hole Mountains and nearby ranges. Nor does the EA explain how big horn sheep with access to water at the S.D. Guzzler would overcome the historical habitat fragmentation from nearby highways, military bases, mining sites and residential development. The EA fails to state how the proposed location of the S.D. Guzzler will “enhance the potential for intermountain movement” when this project fails to mitigate other contributors to habitat fragmentation.</p>	<p>The EA (Sec 15.2) considered natural water sources however this alternative was eliminated from detailed analysis.</p>
Letter #1	C11, P7	<p>The S.D. Guzzler would be within sight of and within three-quarters of a mile of Amboy Road, a paved thoroughfare. The EA fails to consider that</p>	<p>The proposed action in the revised EA includes the installation of bighorn sheep crossing signs that would notify motorists prior to reaching the general</p>

		placing water so close to a busy road may endanger the population. ...	project area.
Letter #1	C12, P7	The EA is deficient because it proposes a project to meet the South Mojave Metapopulation Management Objectives without first completing a metapopulation plan. The EA states...	The completion of a metapopulation plan is not required by the CDCA Plan as amended.
Letter #1	C13, P10	The EA also fails to present any evidence that the bighorn population in the California Desert is in danger. A statewide metapopulation study might reveal this, but such a study has never been done. The reintroduction of sheep since the 1940s has been enormously successful, so successful that it has reached its end. There is no longer a need to expand sheep populations in the California Desert. As the figures for the Sheephole Valley Wilderness deme show, the sheep are maintaining their population well, even expanding it, under current management practices (Appendix A).	The EA analysis relies in part on Epps et al. 2003 for State wide and metapopulation level sheep information.
Letter #1	C14, P11	The EA fails to consider a sufficient range of alternatives....	The EA properly addresses the proposed action alternative, the no action alternative, as well as five alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed analysis.

Letter #1	C15, P12	Since permanent man-made structures are prohibited in designated wilderness areas, the EA should consider an alternative that does not violate the Wilderness Act of 1964.	CDPA Title 1, Sec 103 (e) and (f) provides BLM guidance for state wildlife management in BLM wilderness. (e) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—As provided in section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act, nothing in this title shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction of the State of California with respect to wildlife and fish on the public lands located in that State. (f) FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.— Management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support such populations may be carried out within wilderness areas designated by this title and shall include the use of motorized vehicles by the appropriate State agencies.
Letter #1	C16,P13	Moreover, for each alternative BLM must thoroughly analyze the impacts from construction and maintenance and should consider placing reasonable limits on all construction and maintenance activities at any guzzlers in designated wilderness areas in order to ensure no motorized access is allowed into wilderness under a minimum tool analysis	Motorized access is permitted if analysis in the Minimum Requirements Decision Guide (MRDG) shows it to meet the minimum requirements tool. The MRDG has been included in the EA's Appendix D.
Letter #1	C17,P13	The EA Does not Adequately Analyze Cumulative Impacts	The cumulative impact analysis addresses the extent to which additional stresses associated with the proposed action and, past, present, and future foreseeable actions have consequential cumulative effects.
Letter #1	C18,P14	The "S.D. Guzzler" is anticipated as only the first step in the conversion of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness into an area that includes construction of six new manmade permanent water sources for big game in an area that currently has only two, and no natural permanent water sources, although there are numerous ephemeral and sometimes longlasting rain pools (tinajas). These numbers demonstrate the extent to which the	The EA supports a decision relative to the SD Guzzler specifically. The additional guzzlers are considered future foreseeable projects and analyzed in the cumulative impacts chapter of the EA. No decisions are being made on the future foreseeable projects at this time.(EA Sec 21)

		BLM will impair the desert wilderness by creating numerous water sources.	
	C19,P16	The Analysis of Potential Impacts to the Desert Tortoise is Incomplete	See the response for C2 above. Consultations based on the small projects programmatic biological opinion individually and collectively do not reach the jeopardy threshold as defined under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The biological opinion notes a number of examples of small projects which include “construction of a guzzler or spring development for wildlife” when that project would be installed in non-critical habitat.
Letter #1	C20,P18	How many artificial water sources are under consideration for other wildernesses within the metapopulation area, and how many miles of motorized access would be established by their construction and maintenance?	The EA supports a decision relative to the SD Guzzler specifically. The additional guzzlers are considered future foreseeable projects and analyzed in the cumulative impacts chapter of the EA. No decisions are being made on the future foreseeable projects at this time.(EA Sec 21) The cumulative impacts analysis estimates the number of miles of access routes that would be needed to reach the sites.
Letter #1	C21,P18	The EA reveals that the addition of six new guzzlers in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness would increase the number of miles traversed by motor vehicles inside the wilderness from the 14 miles currently traversed to 37 miles of motor vehicle routes traversed annually within the wilderness. This is almost a 300% increase in the total miles of motorized routes in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness.	BLM recalculated that 6 new guzzlers would require approximately 46 miles of motorized ways. BLM agrees that there would be an increase in percentage of total miles. BLM removed % (percentage) calculations from EA as they provide misleading analysis.(EA Sec 21) No decisions on the additional sites are being considered at this time.
Letter #1	C22,P18	The EA further indicates that motor vehicles would traverse these 37 miles of “on at least a semi-annual basis” (EA p. 60). With six new guzzlers the CDFG (or its designees) would likely be	The revised EA clarifies that routine maintenance of the SD Guzzler would occur once every 5 years with additional visits for emergencies.(EA Sec 15.1,8)

		driving motor vehicles in this wilderness on 22 - 34 days/year for routine monitoring and maintenance (EA, p. 60). This represents at least a 100% increase in the number of days that motor vehicles would be in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness each year to check on guzzlers. In addition, BLM estimates that there will be 3-15 motor vehicle trips each year to refill guzzlers (EA p. 61).	Also see the response for C18.
Letter #1	C23, P18	<p>The cumulative effects analysis is improperly silent regarding how many administrative motor vehicle trips are conducted by BLM and/or CDFG each year for administrative purposes unrelated to management of water sources for game species.</p> <p>The EA is required to make clear whether other motor vehicle intrusions for administrative purposes are also occurring in this wilderness since its designation in 1994. As we've done in previous comments, we again request that this information be revealed and incorporated into the cumulative impacts analysis.</p>	<p>BLM and all other Federal, State and local authorities are prohibited from driving into wilderness unless there is an emergency need for the protection of life and/or property.</p> <p>The EA did not reference the entry of emergency vehicles as this is an irregular occurrence and cannot be predicted.</p> <p>CDFG routinely notifies BLM of agency activities related to game management that occur within wilderness.</p> <p>See the response to C15 above.</p>
Letter #1	C24, P18	When illegal motorized trespass is added to the number of motorized trips for guzzler management, BLM estimates that there may be motor vehicles within the Sheephole Valley Wilderness on 78-124 days a year, or between 21% - 34% of each year.	<p>Authorized trips into the wilderness by the CDFG is not included in the count of "illegal" intrusions.</p> <p>The revised EA addresses the concern.(Sec 20.12) BLM anticipates that an increased management presence coupled with other BLM management actions should decrease illegal OHV use in this area.</p>
Letter #1	C25, P18	...here we raise strong objection to multiple motor vehicle trips to each guzzler every year. For example, the proposed action says that CDFG agents will walk into the S.D. guzzler for monitoring purposes. This seems to contradict the cumulative impacts analysis that estimates that every guzzler will have motor vehicle access at	<p>In consultation with CDFG the number of trips has been reduced to one motorized trip every five years for the Lesica type guzzlers will clarify inconsistencies in the EA.</p> <p>No changes have been made to the maintenance schedule of the two existing non-Lesica type</p>

		least 2-3 times each year.	guzzlers, Suds Hole and Bearclaw. Also see the response for C19.
Letter #1	C26, P18-19	We further object to statements in the EA suggesting that motor vehicle access for monitoring and maintenance is necessary. On page 7 the EA states: "For those sites that are more difficult, the CDPA specifically allows for vehicle access to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support such populations." The simple fact is that if a guzzler is difficult to access on foot for monitoring purposes, it most certainly is not physically accessible by vehicle!	The purpose and need for the project has been clarified, and this statement has been removed from the revised EA.
Letter #1	C27,P19	Given the disturbing numbers of vehicle trips and motorized route mileage within wilderness the BLM cannot legally issue a FONSI, and must instead find this level of motorized intrusion to be a significant negative impact on both the tangible and intangible components of the area's wilderness character, thereby requiring an EIS.	The SD guzzler is a stand alone project, which after construction, may require .5 miles of motorized access once every 5 years. For the cumulative impact analysis, BLM recalculated that the reasonably foreseeable five additional guzzlers would require approximately 46 miles of motorized ways and also clarified that only one motorized trip every 5 years to each guzzler might be necessary. The future could bring technological advances that may improve construction/maintenance techniques.
Letter #1	C28,P19	We agree with the EA that opportunities for solitude will be diminished by the presence of motor vehicles in the wilderness for wildlife management. The addition of new structures and developments in wilderness will also diminish the quality of solitude. The Wilderness Act intends for wilderness to provide outstanding opportunities for	Measures been added in the proposed action to minimize impacts to solitude.

		solitude from the technologies, conventions, and contrivances of modern civilization.	
Letter #1	C29,P19	<p>We disagree with the EA's assertions that the presence of additional permanent water sources will benefit wilderness values by encouraging visitors to spend more time and explore more remote portions of the wilderness. This is an incorrect interpretation of the Wilderness Act's mandate to preserve "wilderness character." Wilderness character is not measured by how long or how often visitors choose to visit an area. Wilderness character, like personal character, is a complex mix of qualities that is intrinsic to a place or a person. It is not something we bestow on an area through our visits.</p> <p>For this reason BLM is obligated to preserve the wilderness character of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness at all times, not just when visitors are present. For example, there are a number of wildernesses that are completely closed to the public for all or part of each year in order to preserve certain critical components of those areas' wilderness character. Clearly, wilderness character is not derived from visitor use, and therefore whether or not visitors take advantage of artificial water sources to extend their explorations is irrelevant to the proposed project's impacts on wilderness character.</p>	<p>BLM concurs that the presence of additional permanent water sources will not benefit wilderness values by encouraging visitors to spend more time and explore more remote portions of the wilderness and the reference text has been removed in the revised EA.</p>
Letter #1	C30,P19	<p>We also disagree with the EA's assertions that wilderness values are improved by the presence of more sheep or increased chances to see sheep due to greater dispersal throughout the Sheephole Valley Wilderness. Zoos are designed as places to "see more animals," but in wilderness the value of wildlife viewing is based on opportunities to experience, observe, and study wild creatures in a context where they are not artificially manipulated and where natural conditions of the area (climate, forage, water, etc) shape their behavior,</p>	<p>The SD guzzler is necessary for long term survival of desert bighorn sheep, most essentially during drought conditions.</p> <p>The opportunity to view Bighorn sheep is an important supplemental value (wilderness characteristic) in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness.</p> <p>Therefore the proposal maintains or improves, does not harm, the wilderness character of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness.</p>

		movements, and population numbers. For this reason, seeing more bighorn sheep because their numbers and distribution patterns have been intentionally and artificially induced is not an enhancement of a wilderness experience, or wilderness character, or the values for which wilderness is set aside.	
Letter #1	C31,P21	The Project Violates the Wilderness Act BLM has no authority to authorize actions that harm wilderness character unless there is a genuine and demonstrated “need” that complies with section 4 (c) of the Wilderness Act. The placement of installations (which includes guzzlers) is specifically prohibited by section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act, unless they are demonstrated to be the minimum necessary to protect wilderness for the purpose (singular) of the Wilderness Act, i.e. necessary to protect some aspect of an area's wilderness character.	<p>Section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act addresses the “minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act...” Section 4(b) states, “each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area...”</p> <p>The CDPA states in Section 103(f), “management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support such populations may be carried out within wilderness areas designated by this title and shall include the use of motorized vehicles...” The use of the word ‘may’ in this section of the CDPA has been interpreted to give the BLM the authority, as the land management agency, to determine if an action is appropriate.</p> <p>The SD guzzler is needed for the survival of the desert bighorn sheep in dry conditions, which also protects an important component (wilderness characteristic) in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness. Therefore the proposal maintains or improves, does not harm, the wilderness character of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness.</p>
Letter #1	C 32,P22	The EA fails to cite to or include a completed Minimum Requirements Analysis even though the BLM is required to consider whether a proposed action is the minimum necessary and required under the Wilderness Act. We believe that artificially dispersing and/or augmenting non-threatened species populations are clearly not the minimum actions necessary to protect and	<p>The MRDG (worksheets) has been included as the revised EA Appendix D. Providing Bighorn essential water, especially in dry conditions, would provide for their survival, which in turn, would contribute a supplemental wilderness value to the area.</p> <p>BLM's authority to allow new guzzler construction</p>

		<p>preserve the wilderness character of the area, and therefore BLM has no legal authority to allow construction of new guzzlers within the Sheephole Valley Wilderness. Construction of new guzzlers has no compelling wilderness-related purpose, and therefore cannot be justified under section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act.</p>	<p>has been delineated under response # 1.</p>
Letter #1	C 33,P22	<p>While scientific research and conservation activities are allowable “public purposes” (uses) of wilderness as described in section 4(b) of the Wilderness Act, these uses are only allowed if they do not harm wilderness character. See <i>Wilderness Watch v. Mainella</i>, 375 F.3d 1085 (11th Cir. 2004); <i>Olympic Park Associates et al. v. Mainella</i>, 2005 WL 1871114 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 1, 2005). This means that allowable public uses (including CDFG’s wildlife management activities) must be conducted in a manner that is compatible with wilderness and the wilderness character of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness—i.e. no unnecessary manipulations of wildlife and no motorized intrusions. CDFG’s proposal fails these tests and therefore the BLM has no grounds for approving CDFG’s request.</p>	<p>In this case, BLM has analyzed the alternatives including the proposed action in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), including impacts to wilderness values.</p> <p>The revised EA describes why the SD guzzler is needed for the persistence of desert bighorn sheep which in turn protects an important component (wilderness characteristic) in the Sheephole Valley Wilderness. Therefore the proposal maintains or improves, does not harm, the wilderness character of the Sheephole Valley Wilderness. The authority for these actions are delineated in response to C1.</p>
Letter #1	C34,P22	<p>Further, the proposal to construct and maintain the S.D. and other guzzlers in wilderness is illegal because the ongoing monitoring and maintenance would establish permanent roads in wilderness. Both the courts and the Interior Board of Land Appeals have found that establishing permanent motor vehicle routes in wilderness constitutes the establishment of a permanent road and is illegal under the Wilderness Act (see <i>Barnes v. Babbitt</i>, 329 F.Supp.2d 1141 (D. Az. 2004); <i>Alleman v. United States</i> 2005, 168 IBLA 37, 38, 39 (2006). This finding has been held true regardless of how many motor vehicle trips per year will occur over the established routes.</p>	<p>The access to the SD Guzzler would consist of an existing way. During the final phase of the SD Guzzler construction all tracks from motorized vehicles would be raked out and barricades would be installed to prevent un-authorized use. This route would not be used in a continuous and regular fashion, nor would it be bladed.</p> <p>When possible, hiking to monitor the guzzlers would be the preferred method of travel.</p> <p>Access routes or means to access future foreseeable guzzlers were not analyzed for specifics other than determining mileage for the cumulative impacts. Future foreseeable guzzlers were not part of the proposed action.</p>

Letter #1	C35,P23	<p>Section 103(f) does not give the CDFG the broad authority it presumes. First, the legislative history of this Act indicates that motor vehicle maintenance of guzzlers in wilderness was intended to apply only to guzzlers that pre-existed wilderness designation. Congress did not intend to allow ongoing construction of an expansive system of new guzzlers throughout wildernesses in the California Desert.</p> <p>The legislative history of section 103(f) shows that Congress expressly intended to authorize the maintenance of existing waterholes in the California desert, but Congress did not intend this provision to authorize construction of new permanent guzzlers in wilderness, except under very specific and limited circumstances.</p>	<p>The CDPA does not explain its intent, it states in Section 103(f), “management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support such populations may be carried out within wilderness areas designated by this title and shall include the use of motorized vehicles...” .</p> <p>The CDPA does not exclude the construction and maintenance of new guzzlers to accomplish the objectives as outlined.</p>
Letter #1	C36,P23	<p>Second, this section of the CDPA allows the State to use motorized vehicles to “maintain or restore” fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support such populations. However, the Act does not grant permission for the State to use motor vehicles to enhance or augment wildlife populations in wilderness. And yet the intent of the proposed new guzzler(s) is to increase the bighorn sheep population within the Sheephole Mountains and four other surrounding mountain ranges. The current population is already higher than it has been on a number of occasions in the past, so the proposed guzzlers cannot be demonstrated as “necessary” to maintain or restore sheep populations. The sheep have been doing just fine without any new guzzlers.</p>	<p>The Department’s effort in this matter is focused on restoring sheep population in the South Mojave Metapopulation; this action is allowed for in the CDPA.</p>
Letter #1	C37,P23	<p>Third, this section of the CDPA provides only for the use of motorized vehicles, and only for limited purposes that are not represented by this current guzzler proposal. In contrast, the CDPA does not authorize the State to utilize motorized equipment</p>	<p>The CDPA does not define what a motorized vehicle is. The MRDG supports the potential use of motorized equipment for construction and maintenance activities in wilderness.</p>

		such as cement mixers and earth-moving equipment inside wilderness for purposes of guzzler construction and augmentation of game species populations. The EA fails to consider or disclose this distinction.	
Letter #1	C 38,P24	Finally, section 103(f) does not trump the strictures of section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act regarding the use of motorized equipment, and the placement of installations within wilderness. We have raised this issue in previous comments, yet BLM has still failed to address this point.	BLM is obligated to follow the direction of the CDPA and the Wilderness Act. BLM does not view the SD Artificial Water Source proposal as a conflict between the two Acts. BLM can allow motorized vehicles and equipment when it is determined to be the minimum tool.
Letter #2	C1, P1	"I believe the Environmental Assessment document is insufficient in certain aspects and requires additional information in order to fully evaluate the proposal." (Insufficient drawings of the site, no description of training and accident preventions procedures, no description of borrow site reclamation)	We inadvertently omitted the attachment with a Site Specific Health and Safety Plan for the project. It was added to the revised EA. The plan covers project management, hazard assessment, mitigation measures, field attire, training, personal protective equipment, daily safety inspections, emergency procedures and medical response, visitors, emergency equipment, site map, communication, emergency services, bio hazards, physical hazards, UXO, heat stress, equipment hazards, and trench and excavation safety and fill containment.
		The following comments were duplicated in 700 comment letters.	BLM Response
		The BLM should fully consider alternatives to this project....removing invasive weeds, building highway overpasses, administer temporary or existing guzzlers to ensure no motorized access inside the wilderness area.	BLM has considered alternatives to the proposed action and these alternatives do not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action.
		...building structures in a wilderness would mean, ipso facto, that the area is no longer a	The CDPA states in Section 103(f), "management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife

		wilderness; it would thus destroy the area's Wilderness status.	populations and the habitats to support such populations may be carried out within wilderness areas designated by this title and shall include the use of motorized vehicles...” . The CDPA does not exclude the construction and maintenance of new guzzlers to accomplish the objectives as outlined.