

Appendix D

Casper Field Office
Sand Hills Comprehensive Transportation and Travel Management Plan,

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SAND HILLS COMPREHENSIVE TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN – PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comments Received on the Environmental Assessment

The following lists of comments were taken from letters, phone calls and emails received during the 30 day public comment period. Comments have been paraphrased and grouped by topic in order that all relative topics could be addressed in an organized and concise manner. Full comment letters are part of the public record and are available at the Casper Field Office, 2987 Prospector Drive, Casper Wyoming, 82604.

1. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department s commended the BLM on the proactive approach to travel management within the Sand Hills management area, especially given the potential for a substantial increase in user-created roads resulting from the pending development of adjacent private lands.

Response: The BLM will continue to the best of our ability to be proactive with additional transportation plans that will be conducted in the near future.

2. Support for the preferred alternative B was given as it would provide recreational opportunities while minimizing impacts to other resources and resource users.

Response: BLM would like to thank all those who have given their support to our planning efforts and the BLM will continue to strive to balance resource uses, including recreational opportunities with resource protection as we work through additional transportations plans.

3. There were no aquatic concerns from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

Response: Comment noted.

4. Increasing motorized access to the Sand Hills MA is also increasing damage to the natural resources on federal land. Before the subdivision of the adjacent ranch provided controlled access. Lessees could limit access to the sportsmen who acted in a responsible manner. Now there is no way to control the behavior of the public and we have observed vandalism to existing BLM signs and noticed tracks where four-wheel drive vehicles have driven over $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile off an existing road into the sand dunes. Sportsmen seemed to be determined to extend and connect existing roads by driving past the end point of these roads.

Response: Comment Noted. Information will be added to the existing environment section under OHV section.

5. The preferred alternative seems to be the most viable plan but without the additional manpower and resources necessary to provide a significant presence by the BLM ranger, it is doubtful that the plan will be successful.

Response: The BLM is aware of the importance of allocating additional resources for the implantation of this plan and is working diligently to acquire the resources and manpower necessary to educate the public of the changes and to enforce regulations.

6. A full time ranger would be required to ensure compliance with any transportation plan. Without daily on-site enforcement the imminent destruction of this beautiful landscape will be conducted by operators of OHVs, dunebuggies, motorcycles, four-wheelers and other unauthorized traffic. Therefore, the BLM must specify in this FONSI its specific plan to field enforcement personnel. With such specify information, the Plan and FONSI are both hypothetical and incomplete.

Response: The BLM is aware of the importance of law enforcement personnel, especially in relationship to implementation of transportation plans. The High Plains District has recently hired a second ranger. However, it is outside the authority of any transportation plan to hire additional personnel or to mandate daily patrols for any specific area. These decisions by management are based on available resources and need of all public lands within the field office boundaries.

7. The BLM no longer marks the boundaries between public and private lands in the area, extending the developed road, this gives the public the false impression that all the land is open to the public and will increase trespassing.

Response: After implementation of the transportation plan signs would be installed at certain access points and at road junctions within the boundaries Sand Hills MA. Designated roads entering the Sand Hills would have signs that explain road designations. The Casper RMP outlines signing implementation for travel management areas. These guidelines have been carried into the Environmental Assessment and Decision Record for the Sand Hills MA from the Casper RMP, *Appendix R – Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel management in the Bureau of Land Management Land Use Planning Process*. This can be found under management guidelines common to alternatives beginning on page 12. However, it is still the responsibility of private land owners to mark their private land boundaries when they feel that there is a need.

8. Question whether the EA conflicts with Decision 7054 of the RMP (Pursue obtaining legal access and limit use to non-motorized access). This decision or action was not referred to in the EA. Given the preferred alternative allows for some motorized use,

there is concern how the BLM will limit use of the Sand Hills MA to non-motorized activities should public access be obtained as described in the RMP.

Response: Decision 7054 was listed in Appendix A –Decisions Affecting the Sand Hills Transportation Management Plan”. This decision has been placed at the beginning of the document and discussed in detail in the EA. RMP decision 7054 is limited to future easements and does not affect private land owner’s rights to allow motorized use through private properties.

9. With the emphasis on a trail across private land does the BLM anticipate condemning such access?

Response: Decision 6011 in the 2007 Casper RMP states: easements will be acquired only from a willing landowner; therefore the BLM would not consider condemning access to the Sand Hills.

10. The proposed trail, parking lot and hiking trail across private lands is not a very workable solution. The lack of water on BLM in the Sand Hills, the difficulty in constructing and maintaining a trail in the sand, and the likelihood that the public will leave the trail and trespass on adjacent private land are just a few of the problems a successful trail will have to overcome...

Response: Access would be acquired across private land if an acceptable agreement could be reached with a willing party. The proposed non-motorized trailhead would be located on public lands; however, without a specific site location the trailhead could not be approved without a site plan and additional NEPA analysis in order to mitigate the potential problems identified in the comment above. This plan only allows also for the possibility it does not grant approval for the construction of a trailhead.

11. If the public was to use horses and or other pack animals on the trail, it would cause significant biosecurity/animal health issues for the grazing lessees. Lost and abandoned horses, introduction of noxious weeds, and increased wildland fire risk are additional issues are likely to create conflicts.

Response: Decision 6041 of the 2007 Casper RMP states that in areas limited to existing or designated roads and trails, the following is allowed: (1) both motorized and non-motorized transportation on existing and designated roads and trails, unless indicated otherwise at site location; (2) non-motorized cross-country or off-route travel as long as new routes are not created and resource damage does not occur; (3) cross-country or off-route travel by over-snow vehicles when snow cover is sufficient to prevent resource damage; and (4) cross-country or off route travel during hunting season by individuals possessing a valid WGFD disabled hunter permit or disabled hunter companion permit.

Management actions in the Sand Hills MA are in accordance with this decision and the accompanying NEPA analysis.

12. We have on several occasions verbally offered the BLM a proposal to provide public access through our land holdings. This would have allowed the generally public to also enjoy the public lands in the area.

Response: The RMP decision 7054 states that the BLM will pursue access and limit it to non-motorized. This decision precludes the BLM from obtaining motorized access to the Sand Hills MA. However, non-motorized access agreements can be acquired by the BLM. Additionally, there are no restrictions preventing private landowners from allowing access across private lands. This type of access is granted by the landowner and can be done without charge to the public.

13. Proposal B would hinder any such access agreement as it would congest and concentrate activity in a confirmed area by eliminating some pre-existing roads and trails, thereby detracting from the overall outdoor experience for users.

Response: Comment noted

14. It is important that responsible grazing leases be able to continue to operate in their historic manner under any new plan developed. Roads closed to the public should still be available for use by lessees because much of the Sand Hills is used for winter grazing and spring calving. Driving on existing roads during times when the ground is frozen or snow covered is much less damaging than in the fall during the driest time of the year. It is vital that adjacent landowners have the ability to check on livestock and have reasonable access across federal land to reach state and private lands.

Response: The BLM supports responsible grazing practices and worked closely with grazing leases in order to obtain the information necessary to make informed decisions about road designations within the Sand Hills MA without causing undue hardships to lessees. The preferred alternative provides a number of primitive routes that are limited to “authorized users only”. These routes provide access to range land improvement projects including water sources and fence lines roads. Reasonable access for livestock management would be provided under all the alternatives including the preferred.

15. The option to use all terrain vehicles to gather livestock is also needed. Winter conditions do create emergencies grazing at times which make it necessary to gather and feed livestock impacted by deep snow. Such emergency off road use is rare and has little long term impacts.

Response: Off road travel specific to management of existing resource uses including livestock grazing management is addressed under those actions that are common to all alternative (page 11), management action 2 e.

Other necessary tasks that require off-route travel would be allowed as long as resource damage does not occur. These tasks include but are not limited to, activities such as maintaining rangeland improvement projects, animal husbandry activities by grazing lessee and his or her agents, and surveying ROW or other work-related tasks authorized by, or which lead to the issuance, of a permit or authorization. The authorized officer may allow necessary tasks without the issuance of a formal permit.

16. Livestock absolutely should not be allowed access to the Sand Hills in the study area.

Response: RMP Decision 6083 states that the BLM will manage livestock grazing to maintain a protective cover of vegetation and litter with emphasis on the condition of allotments with acreages of highly erosive soils. Target forage utilization levels will be established for highly erosive soils and grazing management objectives will be developed to meet those objectives. Management techniques may include herding, fencing, rotational grazing, or limiting season of use to meet the target utilization levels on highly erosive soils. These decisions are beyond the scope of the document.

17. The module that is used to determine holding capacity for animal units within a given grazing lease needs to take in consideration the available water supply and the accelerated damage due to trailing in various soil compositions, as in this case sot sandy soil.

Response: Livestock manuals and grazing capacity issues are beyond the scope of this document.

18. The lack of water in the study area creates extensive damage from livestock travel and the resultant trail rutting through the Sand Hills, leading into and out of the few available water holes. Satellite photos clearly show this damage on an unprecedented scale due to the sandy soil. Cattle concentrate in bedding areas at the base of the sand dunes, rooting out vegetation and thereby causing massive sand blowouts. The damage done by livestock over utilization exceeds motorized use present on the trail system. To assure protection of the Sand Hills area it is vitally important that this usage be reexamined, curtailed or stopped all together.

Response: RMP Decision 6083 states that the BLM will manage livestock grazing to maintain a protective cover of vegetation and litter with emphasis on the condition of allotments with acreages of highly erosive soils. Target forage utilization levels will be established for highly erosive soils and grazing management objectives will be developed to meet those objectives. Management techniques may include herding, fencing,

rotational grazing, or limiting season of use to meet the target utilization levels on highly erosive soils. These decisions are beyond the scope of the document.

19. There are only four waterholes within the study area on the BLM public land. Wildlife concentrate at these areas for the available water supply, so it should be no surprise that these are vital areas for hunting operations. The road and trail restrictions in Proposal B deny us motorized access to these areas which we have used for years, while at the same time providing access to the other landowner/outfitters providing them with an unfair advantage through unequalled access to the public lands.

Response: The construction and maintenance responsibilities of water developments are completed on a case by case basis in accordance with RMP decision 6025 and therefore require motorized access by the responsible party. Use of these roads is limited to that travel that is necessary to maintain the development. There is no alternative in the Sand Hills CTTMP EA that allows for motorized use of roads —limited to authorized use only” in association with Special Recreation Permits.

20. Proposal B accomplishes the agenda of the competing landowners by protecting certain areas for their operation only and it will not provide equal access to public lands for our activities, which is a violation of our rights. The proposed closures will provide competitors with an unfair advantage, which is a violation of our rights.

Response: While the BLM strives to issue SRP in an equitable manner, there are no permanent easements or access rights granted with a Special Recreation Permit.

21. The competing landowners/ outfitters in the area were very upset that my company gained access. These public lands were kept landlocked and inaccessible by the few surrounding landowners for decades, restricting any use by the general public.

Response: Comment Noted

22. A permanent bow hunting blind has been built beside watering holes. These are unsightly and left standing year-round cause blow-outs. On occasion, when we accommodate we use a low impact self-standing blind. These are removed immediately after the hunt and leave no visual trace.

Response: Specific issues related to SRP administration and other authorized uses, not directly associated with transportation are beyond the scope of this plan. Current BLM authorizations would be reviewed during their normal renewal process and the RMP decisions and mitigations measures described both in the RMP and in the Sand Hills Transportation Plan would be implemented. Authorized location for permanent and temporary blinds in conjunction with a Special Recreation Permit near water

developments would be managed under RMP decision 1036 which requires controlled surface use within 500 feet of water wells, springs, or artesian and flowing wells and would be managed at the individual permit bases.

23. Anticipated wind energy development in the area should also be considered in the transportation and travel plan. If the BLM is going to allow intensive wind energy development on the nearby federal land, then the Sand Hills will be affected if all aspects of wind energy development and their associated transmission lines, along with the high standard of roads required, are not considered by the Sand Hills plan. If no surface occupancy rules in place for the sand hills, such rules should be referenced in the travel plan.

Response: Wind energy development is seeing a substantial growth throughout Wyoming. Concern over the impacts to natural resources is expected. The ~~“No surface Occupancy”~~ rule was not applied to the Sand Hills. The RMP decisions that would affect wind energy development in the Sand Hills MA are located under the Conformance to Land Use Planning section (page 2) and again in Appendix A. These decisions include:

- No new corridors will be established within the Sand Hills MA, right-of-ways would be allowed when management objectives for the area could still be achieved.
- A watershed plan that is to be developed for the area in coordination with wildlife and range resources. This plan is to clarify any mitigation required to reduce impacts associated with surface disturbing activities.
- The ~~“Controlled Surface Use”~~ stipulation is applied to all highly erosive soils (including the Sand Hills MA).

In addition, Appendix C ~~“Mitigation Measures for All Surface Disturbing Activities”~~ would be applied to all future developments within the area. Most importantly, wind energy would not be developed within the boundaries without full public involvement.

24. There are a few information errors in the Sand Hills Transportation Plan....
- The named creek Sand Creek needs to be correctly identified as ~~“Sand Springs Creek”~~.
 - The EA implies all hunting is done on a fee basis; motorized access for hunting is allowed 90% of the time by some private 90% without a fee or charge of any kind.
 - Outfitters are also allow to access through the same private land owners for those hunters wanted a full range of services that can be accommodated.
 - The plan failed to mention that pronghorn antelope which is quite popular occurs at the same time as deer hunting.
 - In addition to these errors additional information was provided by the commenter on historical use of the Sand Hills and archeological sites.

Response: The information is greatly appreciated and all necessary corrections will be addressed in the new Sand Hills CTTMP EA.

25. A specific fence line road provides a traditional motorized access to the area and follows the fence leaving the interior of the pasture undisturbed with little or no impact. This trail has been in existence hence the mid 1900's.

Response: The final designation of the route will be reevaluated. Final designation for this road will appear in the Decision Record.

26. All the objectives for the study area could have been more easily met by restricting any new roads or access points. Restricting motorized travel to pre-existing roads and trails, as is the case on other BLM public lands. Closing redundant roads and trails that is immediately parallel to and on each side of the fence lines. This would have provided the area with the necessary protection needed while at the same time equal access and opportunities for all multiple use.

Response: The alternative described in this comment is the same as designating the Sand Hills MA as "Limited to Existing Roads and Trails". This alternative was rejected during the Casper Field Office RMP revision due to the highly erosive soils in the area. The Record of Decision for the Casper Field Office requires that the Sand Hills be "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails". Additionally, decision 1020 requires that the BLM minimize the disturbance to highly erosive soils and that proposed surface disturbing activities are modified to avoid highly erosive soils to the greatest extent practical.

Alternative A analyzed the impacts of providing equal access to land owners that border the Sand Hills and was not selected.

27. The pre-existing roads and trails in question, vital to our company's success and personnel pleasure, account for a little over 3.5 linear miles and provide the only access to this particular area from within the study area, allowing multiple use on 6,500 acres of public lands.

Response: Comment noted

28. Pre-existing key roads and trails should be left open as they provide a circuitous access route through the area, rather than a one-way in and one way out travel route as in proposal B. A circuitous route offers a safer option should the original route become unsafe due to weather conditions.

Response: Looping travel routes are used by the BLM where appropriate for recreational purposes so long as resource concerns including highly erosive soils are not impacted. Surface disturbing activities are to be minimized whenever possible in areas of highly erosive soils in accordance with RMP decision 1020 in order to protect natural resources and the ecosystem health. It is for this reason looping travel routes were not selected.

29. ...there were several miles of roads and trails that are within the study area that were overlooked and not included in the scoping process.

Response: BLM personnel used aerial photography and field checked all linear disturbances that were detected. The route inventory was completed by volunteers with no reason for bias or presumed favor. All linear disturbances that could not be validated were rechecked. In addition the BLM formed a working group with grazing lessees and larger land owners that are familiar with the area. Inventory maps were reviewed several times during the process in order to insure that the best available information was used for planning. Not all privately owned roads or those outside the boundaries of the Sand Hills MA were inventoried and were therefore not included in the final document. This was a result of not obtaining permission to access private lands.

30. It is very important that the scoping and assessment process consider the impact road closures within the study area would have regarding the continued access to 38,000 plus acres of additional public lands which border but are outside the study area to the north. This scoping and access document completely overlooks these impacts.

Response: Access to roads and trails outside the boundaries of the Sand Hills MA were evaluated to verify all routes that would be impacted from management actions described in the environmental assessment. There is no legal motorized or reasonable access by the public to BLM administered lands immediately to the north of the Sand Hills MA. Therefore closures within the MA would not affect access to the north.

31. It is difficult to determine from reading the plan if an extension of the Ormsby Road (in Converse County around private land) will take place as mentioned in earlier conversation with agency personnel. Such extension certainly would create problems. The last four miles of the Ormsby Road has not been maintained by Natrona County in the past fifty years. In the 1970's Amoco Oil Company rebuilt and moved portions of the road for an oil well they were drilling in Converse County. In 1990's Yates Petroleum made additional changes to the road and all current use occurs on the road they built, much of which is off of the county's 66 ft wide right-of way. The BLM should not build any new section of road without resolving the issues as to the proper location of the road, lack of maintenance of Natrona County, and the absence of cattle guards, culverts and other necessary improvements for increased use by the public. Extending the road would create conflicts with private landowners as the public will continue to drive off-road

around mud holes, fail to shut gates, and be confused by nay new fork added in the road. Extending the road will give the false impression in the public's mind that all the land is open to the public and lead to increasing trespassing.

Response: The Ormsby Road was not specifically addressed in the EA as it connects to public lands north of the boundary of the Sand Hills MA. The extended analysis area was used solely for the purposes of analyzing the closure or designation of roads within the Sand Hills Management Area. Transportation network often extend beyond the boundaries of management areas and closure of routes within a given MA may have unforeseen impacts to larger transportation networks that extends beyond the boundaries. Therefore is it incumbent on the BLM to extend to scope of the analysis, however, road designations and maintenance levels for specific roads were limited to those routes that are inside the boundaries of the Sand Hills MA.

32. Unregulated vehicular use by the public also threatens existing sage grouse leks in the areas. Under Alternative A, OHV's will be allowed at a lek site where hundreds a sage grouse have been counted in the past year strutting. OHV use should be restricted to just during the hunting season at this location. We certainly are committed to protecting grouse on private land but have no recourse where legal access exists to federal land.

Response: The area where the lek is located is outside the boundaries Sand Hills MA and therefore cannot be addressed in this document. While it is outside the scope of this planning effort, the BLM is committed to protecting sage grouse and their habitats. Leks are considered to important areas for these birds and this issue will be addressed by the BLM. Decision 6016 4055 and 4054 of the Casper RMP allows the BLM to closed or reroute roads that are causing undue degradation natural resources, where there is a public health and safety issue or where use of motorized routes threaten wildlife habitats. Additionally, Appendix R of the Casper RMP – Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the Bureau of Land Management Land Use Planning recognizes that transportation planning is an ongoing process and provides the criteria for necessary road closures which include the following:

- OHV use is causing, or will cause, considerable adverse impacts.
- A road or vehicle route poses a threat to public safety
- Road and vehicle route density is adversely impacting resources.
- Closure is necessary for desired future conditions for access.
- Closure is necessary for visual resource protection.
- Closure is necessary for sensitive habitat management.

33. The scoping process was to be open to the public and transparent. However, on several occasions the Casper Field Office had closed door meetings with landowner/outfitters of which we were not invited. The same individuals were also provided with hard copy maps of the area as well as aerial photos not provided to the public or me. We feel that this is unethical for a scoping process open to the public, as it has no transparency and for that reason alone is void.

Response:

During the planning process, teams made up of the BLM, cooperating agencies, and members of the public will be used to ensure resource concerns and OHV user needs are properly addressed. Maps will be available to the teams that include all known roads to aid input for additional roads and vehicle routes to be considered for designation as open to OHV use. In addition to the sub-areas in general, these teams will address roads and vehicle routes in specific areas that have ongoing resource problems.

The BLM held a public scoping meeting on March 29, 2007. After which time the BLM met with several members of the public and received numerous phone calls from interested parties. Countless hours were spent with any individual wishing to provide input or inquiring about the process. Additionally, the BLM did meet with the grazing lessees. During the primary meeting with the lessees, a working group was formed in order to complete on the ground inventories for both public and large parcels of private lands in order gain a better understanding of the routes required for livestock operations and the current condition of rangeland improvement projects. Inventory maps were used to verify existing routes, field conditions and minimum routes necessary to maintain operations. The NEPA process does allow for working groups when preparing transportation plans, the RMP LR:4 seeks to manage OHVs use in partnerships with communities and interest groups in order to meet resources objectives and the scoping process was fully open to all members of the public. This further directed in Appendix R (Casper RMP) Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the Bureau of Land Management Land Use Planning which specifically states: During the planning process, teams made up of the BLM, cooperating agencies, and members of the public will be used to ensure resource concerns and OHV user needs are properly addressed. Maps will be available to the teams that include all known roads to aid input for additional roads and vehicle routes to be considered for designation as open to OHV use. In addition to the sub-areas in general, these teams will address roads and vehicle routes in specific areas that have ongoing resource problems.

34. It is my understanding that a NEPA review must thoroughly present the “No Action”. While Alternative C is a preservation option, it fails as a “no action” presentation. I am therefore requesting the BLM to formally produce a “no action” alternative and present it for public review prior to implementing the FONSI.

Response: The environmental assessment for the Sand Hills CTTMP is in full compliance with H-1790-1- National Environmental Policy Act Handbook, January 30, 2008.

8.3.4.2 Alternatives in an EA, page 79

Although the regulation at 40 CFR 1508.9(b) makes no specific mention of the No Action alternative with respect to EAs, the CEQ has interpreted the regulations generally to require some consideration of a No Action alternative in an EA. The CEQ has issued guidance stating: “you may contrast the impacts of the proposed action and alternatives

with the current condition and expected future condition in the absence of the project. This constitutes consideration of a no-action alternative as well as demonstrates the need for the project.” (CEQ Memorandum to Federal NEPA Contacts: Emergency Actions and NEPA (September 8, 2005), CEQ Memorandum to Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Interior: Guidance for Environmental Assessments of Forest Health Projects (December 9, 2002). Therefore, at a minimum, your EA must include documentation of the current and future state of the environment in the absence of the proposed action. This discussion does not need to be a separate section called “No Action Alternative,” but can be part of the environmental effects section of the EA to show the change in effects brought about by the proposed action or alternatives.

In the environmental assessment for the Sand Hills MA, the “No Action” Alternative was described on page 13 on the environmental assessment. This alternative was not analyzed in detail because it does not comply with the Decisions 6039 and 6075 of the 2007, Casper Field Office Resource Management Plan. However, Alternative A “The Development Alternative” would designate all existing road and trails for motorized use and would allow for the development of new access roads based on requests by private land owners bordering the Sand Hills MA. The “No Action” and the “Development Alternative” would have the same impacts as those impacts associated with the no action alternative and is used to contrast the impacts of the proposed action and alternatives with the current conditions and expected future condition in the absence of the project.

35. It is appropriate for the BLM to make recommendations to the Wyoming Office and State Land and Investments on possible restrictions on state land. There appears to be no evidence of state involvement or MOU in place. Grazing lessees need to be able to check on livestock and access improvements on state land. Valid and existing rights precede federal land laws.

Response: The BLM strives to work closely with a number of state and federal agencies, especially when decisions on federal lands has the potential to affect resource and resource uses adjacent lands managed by other agencies. Goals LR:4 States that the BLM will manage the use of OHVs in partnership with other land-managing agencies, local governments, communities and interest groups through a balanced approach, so as to protect public lands and resources while providing opportunities for the safe use and enjoyment of OHVs. Cooperation between managing agencies is especially important when dealing with transportation networks. Closing roads on public lands that connect to adjacent properties could in effectively close or otherwise impact the usefulness of the existing roads on those properties.

The Wyoming Office and State Land and Investments has been involved with this planning process since the beginning. This is may be an informal process with state or other federal agencies. During the scoping process the BLM specifically requested input from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department and the Wyoming Office and State Land and Investments Board. Additionally, the BLM requested permission from the adjacent

land management agencies to inventory existing roads and were granted verbal permission from agency personnel and private land owners.

36. The proposed closures on Wyoming State lands are not well thought out. These roads have been used since the early to 1900's. They transverse gentle slope and do not require a 4-wheel drive. Proposal B would close these routes while maintain the steeper fence lines roads. Routes depicted on map provide easiest year round access with minimal impact.

Response: Specific routes discussed in this comment will be reevaluated and final recommendations will appear in the Decision Record.

37. The Wyoming State Land Board of Investments requested a final copy of the Sand Hills CTTMP and a large sized detailed map. Any changes made to existing roads and trails on State lands will require board approval.

Response: The requested information will be sent.

End of Public Comments