

APPENDIX D
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS

The following issues and concerns associated with the Proposed Action have been identified by attendees at the Public Scoping Meeting and by comments received from the BLM IDT:

Water Resources

1. Groundwater availability and quality could be affected by development of the Proposed Action.

Wildlife Resources

1. Greater sage-grouse leks and nesting sites may be affected by surface disturbance, vehicle traffic, and human presence.
2. Crucial winter range for pronghorn antelope and elk may be affected by project activities.

Rangeland and Vegetation

1. Invasive and noxious weeds are a concern in the project area.
2. Noxious weed infestations on disturbed sites shall be eradicated.
3. All disturbed areas will be reclaimed and reseeded with the BLM recommended seed mixture.

Soil Resources

1. Soils could be affected within the project area.

Cultural Resources

1. Impacts to cultural resources are a concern in the project area.

Other Issues

1. Cumulative impacts to natural resources are a concern in the project area.

The following table summarizes the written comments received by the BLM at the August 16, 2007 Public Scoping Meeting or via mail during the public comment period, which ended on September 17, 2007

**Public Meeting Comments Received
Saratoga Well field and Transmission Line Project**

Name	Date	Comments
Mary Read/Gary Soles	9/4/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about depletion in water table because of proposed action. • Concern that there are no other alternatives west of North Platte River.
Gary Millhouse	9/10/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about sage grouse, antelope, elk, meadowlark, and Indian Paintbrush. • The road, pipeline, power poles and added traffic will be a great disturbance.

Name	Date	Comments
Tom and Sandy Smith	9/10/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that personal water supply will be greatly reduced or eliminated if plan moves forward. • Many species of wildlife use study area as their habitat. • Much of the water pumped from the proposed location would be used for irrigation, but it could be used for drinking. Water in other areas west would be more suitable for irrigation. • BLM land should be preserved and not used for well drilling.
Cindy Thompson	9/11/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lives in watershed and concerned about drawdown on own well. • Would like to see more alternatives discussed in the analysis.
Susan Foley	9/13/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see funding go into river plant improvements instead. • Against wells going in and jeopardizing homeowners that rely on wells. • Important aspect of study is altering public access to Pennock Mountain area with new road; people will use improved access road. • Bury power lines. • Would like to see feasibility of existing water supply and other sites studied to show why this site is best. • Many homeowners stand to have their wells affected by this project as others already do further north in this same aquifer when water use is high in summer. • Cumulative water drawdown and effects needs to be evaluated. • Will project affect wintering sage grouse? • Weed control needs to be addressed.
Patricia Forbes	9/17/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about drawdown of Buck Springs and the aquifer by Pennock-Code Mountain. • Wildlife depends on Buck Springs. • Overland Trail Ranch, Kelly Land and Cattle, Mountain View Estates, and Fish Hatchery use huge amounts of water from the aquifer. • Recreation is hunting – no animals means no hunting.
Neal Forbes	9/18/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pump test of 400 gal/min. for 14 days insufficient to determine effects of proposed pump that would pump 1,200 gal/min for 30 years. • Aquifer in Browns Park Formation being considered is a perched aquifer and only recharged from run-off. • Heard no talk of water usage by people living in project area, which is growing rapidly. • Project would adversely affect Buck Springs Draw, a source of water for wildlife.
John B. Lund	8/18/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project seems well thought out; there should be a big savings in maintenance costs to the city. • Likes the fact that a long-term water supply is available.

Other Agency Contact and Comments

PMPC began coordinating with several federal agencies in spring 2007. Letters were provided to the WDEQ-AQD, NRCS, USACE, USFWS, and the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) informing them of the proposed project and requesting concurrence or guidance.

The WDEQ-AQD determined there were no foreseeable air quality issues associated with the project, but requested that dust control measures be taken.

The NRCS stated that no prime farmlands or lands of state importance were located within the project area. However, they were concerned with potential erosion on slopes and requested that an erosion control plan be developed. They were also concerned with potential wetland impacts and requested that a revegetation plan be prepared.

Based on the NWI and color infrared aerial imagery, the USACE was fairly certain that there were wetlands adjacent to the North Platte River; however, a formal wetland delineation was required. The USACE cited for future guidance potential authorization under Nationwide Permit 12 and applicable regulations.

The USFWS provided a list of special status species that may occur in the project area and habitat descriptions were provided. They provided guidance on compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as well as Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Because the proposed project involves construction of an overhead power line, the USFWS was concerned with the potential increase in raptor mortality. Information on raptor-proofing the power line was provided.

The Wyoming SHPO provided a list of approved consultants.