



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Uncompahgre Field Office
2465 S. Townsend Avenue
Montrose, CO 81401

RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SUBGROUP MEETING #7

Friday, May 13, 2011 (9:00 AM – 12:00 PM)

Meeting Location:

Holiday Inn Express (Jordan Room)
1391 South Townsend Avenue, Montrose, CO

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Angie Adams (EMPSi), Robbie Baird-LeValley, Shelby Bear, Walt Blackburn, Bill Day, William Ela, Barbara Hawke, Bruce Krickbaum (BLM Uncompahgre Field Office), Peter Mueller, John Reams, Barb Sharrow (BLM Uncompahgre Field Office), Steven Weist, Kathy Welt (via phone), Kate Wynant (EMPSi)

Handouts: Agenda; Highlights of the Resource Management Planning Process to Date

1. Welcome (Bruce Krickbaum)

- We've been working on alternatives and it's taken longer than we thought which is why we had to delay the last meeting.

2. Introductions (all present)

3. Planning Process to Date (Angie Adams and Kate Wynant)

- The bulk of what BLM has been doing is working on alternatives. *Action:* We will send you an email with a roadmap of what's to come in the next year and when you'll be involved. The next thing for you is Draft Chapter 2 for your review which we'll provide at the June 24 meeting. At that meeting we'll talk about the alternatives and how you can provide comments. You'll have three weeks to review and provide comments. Your review is concurrent with the cooperating agencies review and BLM interdisciplinary team review. The BLM has not seen all of the alternatives together in one package even though they've been working on it, so you'll see it when they see it. This one will have maps and acreages so you have context for the alternatives. This will be the first crack at a solid draft but it's still a draft and an internal draft. We're not ready for it to be released to the public. We wanted to give you some insights into it so you can provide feedback so when it's at the public draft stage it's in the best shape it can be.
- *Action:* Before the June 24 meeting we'll give you response to comments you provided on the January rough alternatives. What you reviewed in January was a range of five alternatives from current management with no discussion of the preferred alternative. Since then the BLM has developed the preferred alternative and then combined/condensed some of the alternatives so there are now four alternatives, current management plus three action alternatives (including the preferred alternative). So it'll look a little different but we kept the range of alternatives so that the "edges" are still there.

- *Question:* Some of us had wanted to see the preferred mixed and matched. I have a concern that when you combine the alternatives is that they become polarized extremes. How are you trying to avoid that? *Answer:* Well we developed the preferred from the range of alternatives so it's a mixture of everything, not just exactly in the middle. Some things are the same as existing situation and some are on the other side. Each alternative will have a theme because the whole alternative has to fit together. In that sense, the challenge is to create alternatives that all make sense together. However because we developed the preferred alternative after developing a good range of alternatives, the preferred is hopefully a better outcome.
- *Question:* Once you come out with the preferred, that will go to Barb Sharrow for the Record of Decision (ROD)? You have not lost your independence at that point have you? *Answer:* There will not be a ROD just based on the alternatives. The ROD won't come for three or so years. Barb makes the recommendations to the state director and she's actually the signatory on the ROD. We'll lay out that general process in an e-mail so you can see it all in writing.
- Air quality report is now expected in winter 2011/2012
- The wilderness characteristics report is on hold because of the federal funding bill that had specific language not to do wilderness characteristics inventory. Report is on hold until we get guidance from Secretary Salazar on how to carry out FLPMA within the budget parameters.
- *Question:* Where does wild and scenic come in? *Answer:* Wild and scenic rivers is a separate topic from wilderness, wilderness study areas, national conservation areas. The eligibility and draft suitability studies have been done and those outcomes will be part of the range of alternatives. The BLM is mandated to consider an alternative that considers all eligible segments as suitable, one that considers all eligible segments as not suitable, and the preferred is whatever the suitability study actually finds, and this group was a large part of that.

4. Internal Draft Alternatives – Group Feedback on:

See attachment: Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback from Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19, 2011).

- a. Renewable Energy
- b. Communications Sites
- c. Utility Corridors
- d. Hunting Permits (Outfitters)
- e. Organized Group Permits
- f. Target Shooting
- g. North Delta OHV Open Area
- h. Ouray County's plans for gravel pit northeast of Ridgway and potential Ridgway Trails SRMA?
- i. Colorado State/CDOW's thoughts on having state lands open or closed to oil/gas leasing and no surface occupancy?

5. Public Comments

- Shannon Borders (BLM): Consider fiber optic needs in utilities.
- Lee Gelatt (Western Colorado Congress):
 - Renewable energy: Consider putting in already disturbed areas and protect areas.

- North Delta OHV Open Area: Probably okay as long as it does not bleed into the adobe badlands.

6. Other Items Not on the Agenda

7. Action Items / Next Meeting

- Next meeting: Friday, June 24, 2011, 9:00am–12:00pm, Holiday Inn Express, Montrose
- *Action:* Shelby Bear will send rough maps showing the areas of potential future transmission corridors (Doughspoon substation to Cedaredge and East Montrose substation along South Canal).
- *Action:* BLM will send you an email with a roadmap of what's to come in the next year and when you'll be involved.
- *Action:* Before the June 24 meeting BLM will give you response to comments you provided on the January rough alternatives.

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics**

April 19, 2011, email from Bruce Krickbaum, BLM UFO, to all Cooperating Agency Representatives and RAC Subgroup Members:

...We need to discuss several topics at the May 12/13 meeting. The following are issues we want your opinions on. There will most likely be an array of thoughts on each, but the discussion will help us frame the alternatives and potential preferred action. Please think about these issues and be prepared to discuss during the meeting. Written information and/or maps would also be welcomed.

****Renewable Energy.** During several of our initial meetings, we discussed renewable energy and asked for information regarding potential renewable energy sites or projects. We are at the stage that we need to know if communities, counties or agencies know of any renewable energy projects that are being discussed, or locations that have been identified as having potential over the next 20 - 30 years. Note: we can be very general in the decision, and say projects would be allowed throughout the planning area. However, it would be great to also list specific areas as renewable energy emphasis areas (wind, solar).

****Communications Sites.** Are there any specific areas communities or counties know of that have been discussed as potential communications sites? If there are known potential sites, it would make the future NEPA analysis less complex if identified in the RMP.

****Utility Corridors.** Are there any specific areas that should be identified as utility corridors? Are you speaking with the utility companies? Have you identified places in your master plans that we should emulate?

****Hunting Permits (Outfitters).** We are discussing how to handle the number of permits issued to hunting outfitters. Should we limit the number of permits, or not? If we do not limit the number of permits, we would issue a permit to all outfitters that qualify, and let the market and hunting conditions regulate the number that remain in business. Or, we could limit to number of outfitters permits to improve the chances of a quality hunting experience for the clients. If we limit the number of permits, one number we are considering is limiting permits to eight (8) big game outfitter permits per game management unit, and to ten (10) mountain lion guide/outfitter permits in the planning area.

****Organized Group Permits.** We are discussing the numbers associated with Special Recreation Permits. We issue Special Recreation Permits to protect natural and cultural resources, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for visitor health and safety. We are considering Special Recreation Permits for organized groups expecting more than 40 vehicles or 80 people, including spectators. What are your thoughts?

****Target Shooting.** We would like your thoughts on prohibiting target shooting within 0.25-mile of a residence and developed facilities (e.g., power substations, powerlines, communication sites). This is primarily for safety concerns.

****North Delta OHV Open Area.** We would like your thoughts regarding limiting all travel in North Delta OHV Open Area to designated routes, and designating all routes.

****For Ouray County.** What are Ouray County's plans for the gravel pit northeast of Ridgway, and within the potential Ridgway Trails SRMA? We would like to know about the County's desires for continuing the pit as it is now permitted, as well as desires for future expansion. Is the area better suited for a trails system, which could have positive impacts on tourism and economics? This knowledge will reduce conflict with future trails if the Ridgway Trails SRMA is in the preferred alternative.

**For Colorado State/CDOW (primarily, but others as well). What are the State's thoughts on having state lands open or closed to oil/gas leasing (where federal minerals underlay the lands)? What about "No Surface Occupancy"?

BLM would also like to discuss the alternatives-development process since January 2011. By the way, thank you to all of you for the great comments you submitted on the draft alternatives. Comments have been helpful to us.

Regards, Bruce

Bruce Krickbaum
Planner, Environmental Coordinator
BLM Uncompahgre Field Office
2465 South Townsend Avenue
Montrose, CO 81401
970.240.5384

**BLM – UNCOMPAGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
1.	Walt Blackburn, RAC Subgroup member, via letter	<p>Renewable Energy. The Forest Service is doing extensive work with Bio-Mass renewable energy. There are a few areas on BLM lands that this possibly could be an option. Please see Additional information below.</p> <p>Dear Woody Biomass Working Group Members: We are hosting several up-coming events in support of our Uncompahgre Plateau Woody Biomass Supply and Feasibility Assessment.</p> <p>UP Woody Biomass Public Meeting in Montrose: Wednesday, June 8, 7-8:30 pm at the DMEA Office, 11925 6300 Road, Montrose, CO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the meeting is to provide general information to local community members on the woody biomass feasibility study with the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Everyone is welcome to attend! <p>UP Woody Biomass Public Meeting in Delta: Thursday, June 9, 7- 8:30 pm at the Performing Arts Center, 822 Grand Ave., Delta, CO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the meeting is to provide general information to local community members on the woody biomass feasibility study with the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Everyone is welcome to attend! <p>UP Woody Biomass Working Group Meeting: Thursday, June 9, 9 am - 12 pm at the Delta Forest Service Office, 2250 Highway 50, Delta, CO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Nate Anderson, RMRS, will present an update on the woody biomass feasibility study. Everyone is welcome to attend but the content of the meeting will be more technical. 	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
		<p>UP Woody Biomass Public Field Trip: June 10, 9 am - 5 pm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet at the Montrose Public Lands Center. We will tour several on-going fuels treatments on the Uncompahgre Plateau and discuss biomass utilization. Please bring your own lunch 	
2.	Walt Blackburn, RAC Subgroup member, via letter	<p>Communications Sites.</p> <p>It is my understanding that there will be more need for cell phone towers in the area as demand for better service continues to force the providers to install more towers. Would suggest that contact be made with the different providers for such discussions of future plans and needs.</p>	
3.	Walt Blackburn, RAC Subgroup member, via letter	<p>Utility Corridors</p> <p>Specifically, power lines in and around Air Port facilities on BLM lands should have written in planning options.</p>	
4.	Walt Blackburn, RAC Subgroup member, via letter	<p>Hunting Permits (Outfitters)</p> <p>Outfitting is a very competitive business. The market and success ratio will regulate the number that remains in business. The BLM is not in the business of being concerned about a quality hunting experience for paid outfitter clients. It appears to me that we are entering into an area that is not in call for correction. This has the potential to open a real can of worms.</p>	
5.	Walt Blackburn, RAC Subgroup member, via letter	<p>Target Shooting.</p> <p>It appears we are trying to create a solution for a problem that does not exist.</p> <p>Impossible to enforce. If there is a problem, it would fall under the law enforcement of the County Sheriff . BLM is not a safety patrol agency. A :} mile corridor on power lines? That would mean you couldn't target shoot about anywhere on BLM lands. There are power lines servicing most commercial target shooting sites. Most residences of commercial target shooting ranges live nearby on the property much close that -1- mile.</p> <p>Communications sites would include cell towers, repeater towers, telephone lines etc.</p>	
6.	Walt Blackburn,	North Delta OHV Open Area	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
	RAC Subgroup member, via letter	WHY??? That is the whole premise of the area and has been since it was created. It is even more important now that Homeland Security has forced the GJ airport to fence off a big chunk of OHV open BLM land. The North Delta OHV open area is very family orientated riding place. Many OHV families use this area to train & teach the younger OHV enthusiast to ride. Remember that riding OHV's is potentially risky by nature of the sport. Each individual takes that responsibility on himself when participatating. Isn't there verbiage in the original decision notice on the North Delta OHV area to keep it open?	
7.	Walt Blackburn, RAC Subgroup member, via letter	<p>Re: State's thoughts are on having state lands open or closed to oil/gas leasing (where federal minerals underlay the lands), as well as thoughts on "No Surface Occupancy".</p> <p>What difference does it make to CDOW unless there are wildlife issues? Itis my understanding that present law covers wildlife concerns. Sounds like the BLM is butting into something that is none of their business. Let the state (COGC) decide if and when it becomes an issue. Having a "No surface Occupancy" would only enhance the access of a much needed resource.</p>	
<i>Via RAC Subgroup Meeting (5/13/2011)</i>			
		<i>Renewable Energy: These issues weren't in our old plan but they're getting more and more important every year. In this plan there is an option to leave the FO open to renewable energy unless it's excluded to protect certain resources or we can identify specific areas for development. This is not to say that if there is a wind emphasis area wind is excluded everywhere else. If we don't designate emphasis areas, we can still get proposals but if we know of areas now we can overlay those areas with what we have now and make sure it would be compatible with what we're proposing. If you know if any areas where local governments or companies are interested in developing for renewable energy development, let us know.</i>	
8.	Walt Blackburn	Would biomass production be allowed?	Yes, it's an option but this plan doesn't identify

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
			specific areas to be set aside for biomass production. The BLM does not have very high potential for good biomass production. We do have language in the plan that would make biomass possible if there was a proposal. It's not included.
9.	Walt Blackburn	A lot of the burn areas would be good for cleanup.	When we have those type of projects we do permit interested people to utilize the biomass. In the past we've encouraged people to use the product before the treatment and that will continue. There just isn't much interest. The Forest Service has a lot of trees that they're waiting for people to take away and if you're in that business you're more interested in those trees. There was some discussion about the coal plant in Nucla using some of the product but nothing has come of it.
10.	Shelby Bear	What about solar? There's been discussion of solar in Ridgway.	John Reams: It's just been difficult and there isn't much interest in industry building a solar field where it isn't very feasible. BLM (Barb Sharrow): We had a representative from Ridgway and there was some controversy over the project because people don't want it in the viewshed.
11.	Barbara Hawke	If there is any way for the BLM to coordinate with local governments to use BLM and non-BLM land together to make some of these projects more feasible. If people are concerned about viewscape, that is important on public land, so maybe we can put some pieces of land together to make such projects more feasible. I would encourage the use of emphasis areas and maybe taking it further. I think there are benefits of looking at the zoning concept like they did on the national level. It's going to be different for each resource. There's also geothermal, such as in Ouray County.	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
12.	Shelby Bear	We've been looking at a hydro project on the South Canal with the BLM.	
13.	Bill Ela	When we went out on a field trip they were using a hydro axe under the transmission line. If there is enough hydro there, could it be suitable for biomass?	Shelby Bear: I'm not sure about biomass, but we're working on it. The Tri-County project is working on the dam which is a huge project. I think the more emphasis we place on renewable energy the more projects we'll have, so more general language might be better.
14.	Walt Blackburn	Is the reason this is on the agenda because there have been inquiries?	No, actually it's been silent so we just don't know where people might be interested in developing.
15.	Bill Day	In the GJFO when they had comments about this at least one front range environmental group wanted to put solar panels where there are kit fox and burrowing owls. I don't think we should do that.	When an application comes in requesting a solar ROW, the BLM has to do NEPA review and look at the resources, including T&E species, and screen all of that. So the RMP just sets the stage. The RMP could say that renewable would be available where there is not ROW exclusion and would be discouraged in ROW avoidance. At the application level there is site-specific NEPA.
16.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	If that was put in there, does that give the latitude to the BLM, in the future, to develop projects even if they are not identified now?	Yes. When we get applications we'll go to our RMP and see what it says.
17.	Barbara Hawke	Another way to go about it would be to have criteria. What are some places that would have good potential and would be suitable. Some would be suitable and some would be not as suitable. As long as all the effort was going in to the RMP, pre-planning should be done for renewable emphasis areas. (Barbara sent sample criteria for Renewable Energy Zones via e-mail 5/21/11) Shelby Bear: Sometimes it's hard to do that because it requires so much study. We don't know what the politics of the future is going to be.	
		<i>Communication Sites: We have a few existing communication sites for radio transmission for emergency correspondence, radio stations, internet, cell towers. If you know of any areas that might need more towers or if</i>	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
		<i>there is interest in them.</i>	
18.	John Reams	The northern portion of UFO near the border with GJFO needs cell reception.	
19.	Bill Ela	There was a lot of activity about drilling in that area, south of Whitewater, and there's a utility line. If you put up a drill site can you put solar panels in between them? North of Delta on Highway 50.	Shelby Bear: You don't really want to put anything under a transmission line in a ROW, but adjacent to that would be ok.
20.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	Ouray CC (Alan Staley) showed a map of sites for emergency preparedness. It would be a good idea to get with the emergency people at each of the counties.	
21.	Shelby Bear	We don't know of any new sites that we need but you might check with WAPA. Check with sheriff's office.	
		<i>Utility Corridors: Right now we just have West-wide.</i>	
22.	Shelby Bear	What we do is dependent upon load growth. Right now growth in the area is slow. Doughspoon substation to Cedaredge. East Montrose substation along South Canal. Action Item: Shelby will send rough maps showing the areas.	
23.	Barbara Hawke	I've been told that part of the West-wide Energy Corridor goes through sage-grouse habitat. Is there any opportunity to fix it so that there isn't such resource conflict.	BLM (Barb Sharrow): We had to verify the corridors that were selected at the national level. We kept the corridors out of the sage-grouse leks by a certain distance. I can't remember what the exact distance is right now. The West-wide Energy Corridor is a wide corridor, a mile or so, so there is room in the corridor for siting.
24.	Bill Day	Grouse move several miles away from the lek so you could have a transmission line a mile away from a lek and that's where the population are raising their young.	Missy Siders has put that information in the plan so there is a lot of protection for sage-grouse.
		<i>Hunting Permits (Outfitters): Limiting permits per DAU would require more enforcement by BLM.</i>	
25.	Walt Blackburn	Seems like we are looking for solution to non-existing problem. Outfitting business tends to limit itself. Need to take a hard look at this before putting numbers on it.	BLM (Barb Sharrow): Some outfitters have requested limiting permits (would increase value of their existing permits).
26.	Steve Weist	Do not put limit on permits.	
27.	Peter Mueller	Do not put limit on permits. Are there tools BLM has to evaluate	BLM (Barb Sharrow): BLM does have annual

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
		permits annually? As private hunter, experience can be either enhanced or diminished by outfitters.	permit evaluation process. Permits are issued/re-issued every year. If outfitter has good standing for two years, then they are awarded five-year permit.
28.	Peter Mueller	Could RMP put limit on numbers with annual growth rate so numbers of permits could grow over time?	
29.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	If permits limited by game management unit, need to consider existing outfitters who work in specific unit; do not want to disrupt business. Consider having range of outfitter permit numbers.	
30.	Shelby Bear	Do not limit outfitter numbers.	
31.	Bill Ela	Would be challenging to enforce limiting permits.	
32.	Bruce Krickbaum (BLM)	Cooperating Agencies suggested yesterday that BLM consider having criteria for limiting the number of future permits rather than specifying numbers in the RMP.	
33.	John Reams	Let CDOW manage numbers; do not limit number of permits.	
		<i>Organized Group Permits:</i>	
34.	Barbara Hawke	Use criteria instead of specific numbers. For example, the season may determine numbers because of potential resource damage. See Price, Utah, RMP as example. (note: Barbara sent example from Price, Utah via e-mail on 5/13/2011)	
35.	John Reams	If everything is regulated, then BLM cannot enforce everything.	BLM (Barb Sharrow): Organized group permit would require group to have insurance.
36.	Peter Mueller	40 vehicles and 80 people seems like a lot of impact; number should be smaller.	
37.	Barbara Hawke	Are there other examples for State Parks, etc. that we could consider?	BLM (Barb Sharrow): BLM staff looked at other BLM Field Offices for examples.
38.	Bill Ela	Range of numbers look good.	
39.	Bill Day	40 vehicles is a lot; would limit it to something like 25.	
40.	Shelby Bear	Consider criteria.	
41.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	Some range tours (including CDOW) have up to 40 or 50 vehicles.	
42.	John Reams	Some contractor tours may have too many vehicles too.	BLM (Barb Sharrow): Businesses could be

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
			excepted from permit requirements.
43.	Peter Mueller	Criteria could include duration of event, number of vehicles, etc. so that group has to then find support facilities such as toilets.	
		<i>Target Shooting</i>	
44.	Steve Weist	Have designated target shooting areas and prohibit target shooting everywhere else.	BLM (Barb Sharrow): There are problems with setting up target shooting areas on public lands because of hazardous waste issues associated with lead, etc., and because BLM is not in the business of managing and enforcing shooting areas. If outside entities want to set up such areas, then BLM could work with them on recreation leases or agreements.
45.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	How does BLM address residences adjacent to BLM land who want to target shoot in their backyard?	Barb: Those landowners would have to be more than 0.25-mile (or whatever distance is in RMP) from their residences to target shoot.
46.	Peter Mueller	0.25-mile seems reasonable. 1 mile is too far.	
47.	Walt Blackburn	0.25-mile is not enforceable; there would still be issues outside that 0.25-mile buffer. How would BLM enforce it?	Barb: Would be complaint driven.
48.	Shelby Bear	There has been damage to insulators from target shooting. Do not want to force a lot of target shooters into smaller areas.	
49.	Kathy Welt	0.25-mile buffer from residences in residential areas makes sense. But for some residences abutting BLM lands in more-remote areas, it does not make sense.	
50.	Barb Sharrow (BLM)	Does it make sense to have buffers around developed recreation sites such as trailheads and boat ramps?	RAC Subgroup: Yes.
		<i>North Delta OHV Open Area:</i>	
51.	Peter Mueller	Has BLM consulted with OHV community in Delta?	Barb: That is what Walt Blackburn is here for.
52.	Walt Blackburn	This is one of the only Open areas in the state. There are millions of acres that are restricted to OHV travel, such as wilderness, other quiet use areas, etc. It is very concerning to OHV community. Open areas are where families go for outings. People from all over the state come to North Delta OHV Open Area. Could OHV community help BLM with public education, such as signing area with	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
		educational information, such as environmental concerns? Could post signs in specific parts of overall area to restrict travel for resource concerns. Do not want the Open area changed.	
53.	Shelby Bear	During transmission projects, we have found that cactus moves.	Barb: During route-designation process, biologists would survey cactus locations.
54.	Bill Day	What is magnitude of selenium in this area?	Barb: Selenium is big issue in UFO and this area in general. US Geological Survey just completed two- or three-year selenium study. Big way that selenium gets into waterways is via irrigation on non-public lands.
55.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	North Delta is 8-inch precipitation zone.	
56.	Barbara Hawke	My greatest concern is about the adjacent area, the Adobe Badlands and ACEC area. There are very sensitive and important resources there. If keeping North Delta area open. If keeping area Open helps preserve and protect adjacent or other areas, then that is worth considering. OHV recreation needs its place.	
57.	Shelby Bear	If we have to close this area, is there another area we can open?	
58.	John Reams	Is selenium contribution small in the larger scope of total areas contributing to selenium? Do not close area.	
59.	Walt Blackburn	Does not seem like limiting area would solve the problem.	
60.	Robbie Baird-LeValley	The selenium issue does not warrant closing or limiting the area; keep it open.	
61.	Bill Day	With current high density of roads, it does not seem like it would get much worse/roaded if left open. Okay to leave it open.	
62.	Peter Mueller	Seems like we are trying to make decisions without all the information. Need to do surveys to work with OHV community to develop necessary education to mitigate potential impacts.	
63.	Bill Ela	Preservation is important in BLM; support preservation as sustainable objective. Need some form of erosion control. RMP needs to have more focus on sustainability, especially in North Delta OHV Open Area more than remainder of planning area because of erosion from trails.	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
64.	Bill Ela	In many retention ponds, mother nature creates spillway so ponds fail, which creates other issues.	
65.	Kathy Welt	In North Delta, annual precipitation is very low. To rule out a retention pond in that area because of fear of it not being able to contain runoff is probably not substantiated if pond is properly engineered. Selenium is predominant in Mancos Shale, which is what North Delta OHV Area is. Regardless of how OHV area is managed, selenium will be an issue. Agree with other comment questioning if restrictions would have any effect on overall selenium issues/contributions.	
		<i>Ouray County's plans for gravel pit northeast of Ridgway and within potential Ridgway Trails SRMA:</i>	
66.	Barb Sharrow (BLM)	Because of a gravel pit moving forward, the area will no longer be considered as an SRMA. Gravel pit was permitted by BLM in 2003. Mountain bike user group in Ridgway area would like mountain bike trail system in vicinity of gravel pit. Gravel pit permit has expired and needs to be renewed before RMP is complete. BLM is working on with Ouray County and Ridgway on solution to permit gravel pit and to also develop trail system of some sort, but not through pit itself (which is prohibited).	
67.	Bill Ela	Pit should be far from streams.	Barb: It is.
68.	Peter Mueller	Makes sense to develop an impacted area for two different uses.	
69.	Barbara Hawke	This area is important to trail planning for single-track, quiet recreation potential; and there is lots of potential in the area as a key connector trail. The goals of a planned and managed recreation area should go forward as much as possible, even when working with the gravel pit operation.	
70.	Barb Sharrow (BLM)	Ouray County indicated that both uses are vital to their economy.	
		<i>Colorado State/CDOW lands open or closed to oil/gas leasing, or having No Surface Occupancy on those lands:</i>	
71.	Angie Adams, Barb Sharrow, and Kate	Angie: CDOW suggested most wildlife areas be NSO. Barb: Applies to Ridgway and Paonia State Parks, as well as wildlife	

**BLM – UNCOMPAHGRE FIELD OFFICE, COLORADO
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Internal Rough Draft Alternatives – Feedback Received from
Cooperating Agency and RAC Subgroup Members on Specific Topics (April 19–May 11, 2011)**

Cmt #	CA / RACSG Commentor	Comment	Response (To be completed by EMPSi/BLM)
	Wynant (background info)	area (portions of Billy Creek and Escalante). Kate: CDOW suggested that occupied sage-grouse habitat be closed to leasing. Barb: Governor’s office will review the RMP.	
72.	Bill Day	Miramonte should be closed to leasing.	
73.	Peter Mueller	Agreed that mapped occupied habitat be closed to leasing.	
74.	John Reams	Consider NSO on State lands with a buffer outside of State lands. Need to carefully consider viewshed.	
75.	Barbara Hawke	Need to also consider stipulations for riparian and wetland areas.	
76.	Kathy Welt	Do not necessarily need to close State Parks because there are other protections for resources, such as riparian and wetlands. Minerals are also a resource that belongs to the US, in addition to natural resources. Consider State lands and parks on a case-by-case basis rather than globally applying certain closures or stipulations to all areas.	