
KEMMERER
PROPOSED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Appendix R

Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental
Impact Statement Final Comment Analysis

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	R-1
2.0	Content Analysis Process	R-1
3.0	Summary of Public Responses to the Draft RMP/EIS	R-4
	Geographic Representation	R-4
	Organizational Affiliation	R-5
	Public Response Document Format and Method of Delivery	R-6
4.0	Analysis of Comments	R-6
5.0	Conclusion	R-13

Appendix A – Public Response User’s Guide

Appendix B – Public Response Documents

Appendix C – Individual Comments and Responses

(Appendices B and C can be accessed on the Kemmerer RMP Revision website at www.blm.gov/rmp/kemmerer/docs.htm.)

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Comment Topics	R-3
Table 3-1.	Geographic Representation of Respondents.....	R-4
Table 3-2.	Number of Responses per Affiliation.....	R-5
Table 3-3.	Number of Public Response Documents by Format	R-6

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
RMP	Resource Management Plan
ROD	Record of Decision
WGFD	Wyoming Game and Fish Department

This page intentionally left blank.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On July 13, 2007, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register announcing publication of the Kemmerer Field Office Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMP/EIS). This NOA initiated the beginning of a 90-day public comment period. The BLM accepted comments on the Draft RMP/EIS between July 13, 2007 and October 11, 2007. During the 90-day public comment period, the BLM hosted two open houses and three public meetings within the Kemmerer planning area to gather comments on the Draft RMP/EIS and to answer questions from the public. This report provides a summary of public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS during the 90-day comment period. During this period, the Kemmerer Field Office received 61 public responses, including letters, comment forms, and public meeting testimony. Three public response documents (from the Uinta County Citizens Coalition, Gary-Williams Production Company, and the Office of the Governor) were received after the close of the comment period and are not considered in this report. The individual comments in these public response documents were similar to other comments received within the public comment period and therefore, may have already been addressed.

Although this report attempts to capture the full range of public issues and concerns, it should be used with caution. Respondents are self-selected; therefore, their comments do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the public as a whole. However, this summary does attempt to provide fair representation of the wide range of views submitted. In consideration of these views, it is important for the public and decision makers to understand that this process does not attempt to treat input as if it were a vote. Instead, the comment analysis process ensures that every comment is considered at some point in the decision process.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

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

2.0 CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCESS

Comment content analysis for this document is defined as a systematic method of compiling, categorizing, and evaluating written comments made by individuals, federal and state agencies, Tribal

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

governments, elected representatives, and other organizations on the Draft RMP/EIS in order to identify substantive issues for review and response by the BLM decision makers. Additionally, through the content analysis process, BLM supplemented the project mailing list of respondents and compiled demographic information on the geographic distribution of respondents (see Section 3 of this report).

Public responses include oral testimony given at the public meetings and written responses postmarked or received via the project website within the 90-day public comment period. Methods of receiving responses included U.S. mail, e-mail, website submittals, and public meetings. All individuals attending public meetings were encouraged to submit responses in writing. Note that a public response document refers to the written submission or oral testimony from a respondent (e.g., letter, e-mail, etc.), whereas a comment refers to an identifiable expression of interest or issue statement included within a public response document. For example, a letter (i.e., public response document) received within the public comment period may contain one or more identifiable comments.

Analysis Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 2-1. Comment Topics

Description	Description	Description
Implementation	Short-Term vs. Long-Term Productivity/Risks	Other Management Areas
Mitigation Measures	Multiple Physical Resources Management	National Historic Trails
Definition of Terms	Soils and Geology	Heritage and Visual Resource Management
Cumulative Impacts	Water Resources	Historic Resources
Appendices	Air Quality	Paleontological Resources
Out of Scope	Noise	Multiple Natural Resource/Management Activities
Mailing List/Copy DEIS	Visual Resources Management	Multiple Use Management
Editorial Corrections	Climate, Weather, and Atmospheric Processes	Ecosystem Management
Purpose and Need for Proposed Action	Biological Elements Management, General	Monitoring and Evaluation
Industry/Business Groups	Ecosystem/Habitat Composition and Function	Forested Vegetation Management
Public Involvement	Grassland/Shrubland	Late Successional/Old Growth
Outreach/Agency Communication Efforts	Riparian	Forest Health Management
Use of Public Involvement/Comment	Wildlife Management General	Noxious Weeds
Extension Needed	Wildlife Population Management	Insects and Disease
Collaboration with Other Government Entities	Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat	Use of Pesticides and Herbicides
Other Federal Agencies	Fisheries and Aquatic Wildlife	Fire Management
State or Local Governments/Officials	Special Status Species (wildlife)	Role of Fire in Ecosystems
Relation to or Consistency with Other Plans, Directives, Etc.	Wildlife Structures	Prescribed Fire
Agency Rules and Regulations	Special Status Species (vegetation)	Domestic Livestock Management
Rules of Other Agencies	Transportation System Management (Infrastructure)	Livestock Grazing
Use of Science In Decision Making General	Roads Analysis	Fences, Water Troughs, Facilities
Best Available Science	Roads Infrastructure Management General	Mineral Resources Management
Funding, General	Motorized Routes	Leasable (Oil, Gas)
Funding for Implementation of Proposed Action	User-Created Roads and Trails	Directional Drilling
Alternatives General	General/Multiple Access	Leasable (Coal)
Alternative Development/Range	Recreation Management General	Locatable (Hardrock)
Alternative A	Motorized Recreation and Access General	Salable (Gravel, Rock, Etc.)
Alternative B	Mechanized Recreation	Communication Sites And Facilities
Alternative C	Non-Motorized, Non-Mechanized Recreation	Utility Corridors
Alternative D	Landownership	Utility Access and Rights-Of-Way

Table 2-1. Comment Topics (Continued)

Description	Description	Description
Relation to Laws, Act, Policies General	Land Exchanges and Disposal	Renewable/Wind Energy
Federal Laws, Acts, and Policies	Rights-Of-Way	Social Values Management (Includes Socio-Economic General)
NEPA	Special Land Designations General	Public Health And Safety
FLPMA	Other Special Designations	Economic Values Management
State Laws, Acts, and Policies	Wild and Scenic Rivers	Economic Contribution/Role of Agency-Administered Lands
Environmental Management General	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Local/Regional
Managing Ecosystem Integrity	Wilderness Study Areas	Tax Base and Payments to States

3.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

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

The demographics presented below are based on public response documents received during the 90-day comment period. Note that separate comments are not treated as votes, and the outcome is not determined by a majority opinion. Every comment is considered individually. While demographic information can provide insight into public concerns, the comments are not a random representative sample of public opinion; therefore, the demographics presented in this report do not necessarily represent the opinions of society as a whole.

Geographic Representation

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

Table 3-1. Geographic Representation of Respondents

City	State	Number of Respondents
Oakland	California	1
San Diego	California	1
Boulder	Colorado	1
Denver	Colorado	8
Longmont	Colorado	1
Wilmington	Delaware	1
Idaho Falls	Idaho	1
Independence	Missouri	1

**Table 3-1. Geographic Representation of
Respondents (Continued)**

City	State	Number of Respondents
Portland	Oregon	1
Logan	Utah	1
Provo	Utah	1
Salt Lake City	Utah	2
Washington D.C.	Washington D.C.	1
Casper	Wyoming	3
Cheyenne	Wyoming	5
Cokeville	Wyoming	2
Diamondville	Wyoming	1
Evanston	Wyoming	5
Jackson	Wyoming	1
Kemmerer	Wyoming	6
Laramie	Wyoming	3
Lonetree	Wyoming	1
Lyman	Wyoming	7
Unknown	Unknown	6

Organizational Affiliation

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

Table 3-2. Number of Responses per Affiliation

Affiliation	Number of Public Response Documents
Federal Agency	4
State Agency	6
Local Government	6
Non Governmental Organization	9
Private Industry	15
Unaffiliated Individual	21

Public Response Document Format and Method of Delivery

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

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

Response Document Format	Number
E-mail	3
Website	7
E-mail with a letter attached	5
Letter	36
Postcard	0
Comment Form	5
Public Hearing Testimony	5
Total	61

4.0 ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS

The BLM received 61 public responses to the NOA for the Kemmerer Draft RMP/EIS during the 90-day comment period. This section describes the categories of comments, summarizes like comments, and provides responses to comments. The 61 public responses received contained substantive and non-substantive comments. Representative non-substantive comments include requests to be added to the project mailing list, requests for a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS, personal preference or opinion, and comments which are outside the scope of the Draft RMP/EIS. Representative substantive comments generally relate to accuracy or adequacy of the analysis.

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

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

- **Comments on Inaccuracies and Discrepancies.** Factual corrections should be made in the EIS in response to comments that identify inaccuracies or discrepancies in factual information, data, or analysis.
- **Comments on the Adequacy of the Analysis.** Comments that express a professional disagreement with the conclusions of the analysis or assert that the analysis is inadequate may or may not lead to changes in the EIS. Interpretations of analyses should be based on professional

expertise. Where there is disagreement within a professional discipline, a careful review of the various interpretations is warranted. In some cases, public comments may necessitate a reevaluation of analytical conclusions. If, after reevaluation, the manager responsible for preparing the EIS does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.

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

A total of 1,522 individual comments were identified in the 61 response documents. Of these 1,522 comments, 934 comments were identified as substantive. Individual comments and agency responses are provided in Appendix C of this document. However, in an effort to provide a user-friendly method of understanding the broad themes or topics of concern expressed in the comments, the analysis team grouped individual comments with similar concerns and developed 24 summary comments and responses. The 24 summary comments and responses are presented below, and generally are organized by BLM resource program and other applicable categories (e.g., purpose and need). A summary comment that addresses several resource programs is listed under the heading Multiple Resource Programs.

PURPOSE AND NEED

Summary Comment #17: Respondents raised questions or requested clarification on the purpose and need as written for the Draft RMP/EIS as it relates to mineral resources.

Summary Response: As stated on Page 1-5, new data have become available, new policies have been established, and old policies have been revised. This, along with emerging issues and changing circumstances, resulted in the need to revise the existing plan. This section is not arguing that energy minerals

development has become the priority use on public land. Rather, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act Reauthorization of 2000 coupled with the Nation's growing demand for domestic energy is simply listed as an example of the many emerging issues and changing circumstances resulting in the need to revise the existing plan. See Page 1-5, New Data; Page 1-6 New and Revised Policy, and Page 1-7 Emerging Issues and Changing Circumstances.

AIR QUALITY

Summary Comment #1: A number of respondents submitted comments requesting a change, alteration or clarification of air quality (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure) or requested additional information.

Summary Response: The inter-agency air quality team (including air quality staff from Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality [Air Quality Division], U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, and BLM) collaborated on the “emissions-based” method used for the KFO RMP/EIS. Quantitative air quality analysis will be performed at the project level as necessary. BLM recognizes the primacy of the State of Wyoming in regulating air quality. Emission factors and parameters will be revised as necessary.

Summary Comment #24: A few of respondents submitted comments requesting a change, alteration or clarification concerning climate change/global warming (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure) or requested additional information.

Summary Response: Text regarding climate change/global warming has been added to the document where appropriate. The BLM Washington Office is currently in the process of preparing guidance to address the issue of climate change/global warming. However, this guidance has not been finalized, and thus does not appear in the Draft RMP/EIS. Once finalized, the Kemmerer Field will adhere to all applicable guidance.

SOIL and GEOLOGY

Summary Comment #19: Numerous respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of soil or geology (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information regarding geologic hazards.

Summary Response: Mitigation measures protecting soil and geology resources were based on the best available information as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance. If needed, project level analysis will provide additional information. In most cases, the site-specific impacts will be identified during onsite reviews and will be analyzed in environmental documents pertaining to the specific action. Additional information or clarification will be provided in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS where appropriate.

WATER

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

Summary Response: Mitigation measures protecting water resources were based on the best available information as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance. The BLM coordinates with the

appropriate regulatory authority responsible for water quality in Wyoming (i.e., Wyoming DEQ).

MINERAL RESOURCES

Summary Comment #3: Respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of salable and leasable minerals (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information regarding salable and (or) leasable minerals.

Summary Response: The Reasonable Foreseeable Development was the base document used for analysis of salable and leasable minerals in the Draft RMP/EIS. The document can be found at <http://www.blm.gov/rmp/kemmerer/>. Additional information or clarification will be provided in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS where necessary.

VEGETATION

Summary Comment #4: Respondents submitted requests to set standards, verify effectiveness of management activities, or clarify information regarding vegetation in the planning area.

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

FISH AND WILDLIFE – WILDLIFE

Summary Comment #5: Some respondents commented on the need for additional information on big game, or clarification of potential discrepancies in alternatives or the analysis on big game.

Summary Response: The WGFD, a cooperator who participated in the preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS, is responsible for establishing herd objectives through a public process. Many of the management challenges to meeting herd objectives are outside BLM's authority to manage (i.e., intermingled land ownership, agricultural conversion, drought conditions, etc.). The BLM decided to produce mapping of all big game species combined because constraints are aligned with crucial winter range regardless of species. Moose, elk, pronghorn, and deer crucial winter range restrictions are in place from November 15 through April 30. The BLM will continue to consider your comment throughout the planning process.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

Summary Comment #6: Numerous respondents requested a change, alteration, or clarification of special status species (analysis, management action, or mitigation measure), or they requested additional information regarding special status species.

Summary Response: This analysis considers numerous management actions to reduce indirect impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, including special status species. Mitigation measures protecting special status species were based on the best available information as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws,

regulations, policies, and guidance. BLM maintains compliance with all federal laws and guidance.

HERITAGE RESOURCES

Summary Comment #21: Respondents expressed concern or requested additional information regarding cultural resources including National Historic Trails and (or) other historic resources.

Summary Response: Section 106 requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of undertakings on historic properties and to accommodate historic preservation concerns through consultation among the agency and other parties with interests in historic properties potentially affected by undertakings. BLM completed a Class I Regional Overview prior to completion of the Draft RMP/EIS. Mitigation measures and management actions protecting heritage resources were based on the best available information as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance. BLM maintains compliance with all federal laws and guidance. The Proposed RMP and EIS will include additional clarification of National Historic Trails, including buffers and management levels.

LAND RESOURCES

Summary Comment #20: Respondents expressed concern or requested additional information regarding retention, disposal, exchange, or acquisition of land within the planning area.

Summary Response: The Kemmerer RMP revision undertakes to incorporate a land tenure adjustment strategy, in accordance with the Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), by specifically identifying all of the individual parcels potentially affected. Once identified in the RMP and as opportunities arise, these identified parcels can then be considered for adjustment using the available tools including sale, exchange, Recreation and Public Purposes, acquisition, withdrawal, etc. Prior to any action, site-specific analysis will be conducted and will consider public access and the natural and cultural resources on the land.

Summary Comment #9: Expression of interest in length of time it takes for completion of coordination processes of projects impacting BLM-administered lands (surface and mineral estate).

Summary Response: Any proposals for development on BLM-administered lands are subject to coordination and environmental review as appropriate and the review time varies with the project.

Summary Comment #10: Numerous respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of livestock grazing management (utilization, management actions, mitigation measures) or requested additional information regarding livestock grazing. Some respondents expressed concern about an anti-livestock bias in the Draft RMP/EIS. Conversely, other commenters felt the prominence of grazing on public lands was too high.

Summary Response: The analysis considers numerous management actions to reduce impacts to livestock grazing. Mitigation measures for livestock grazing were based on the best available information as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance. BLM maintains compliance with all federal laws and guidance. Appropriate text in the

Proposed RMP and Final EIS will include information addressing the importance of appropriate grazing management practices as related to rangeland health.

Summary Comment #8: Respondents requested clarification of the use or management of motorized and mechanized recreation or travel management in the planning area, including snowmobiles. Respondents also included requests to change, alter, or clarify motorized recreation and general access.

Summary Response: Travel management areas and travel planning criteria will be defined in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. Travel management areas are identified for development of travel management plans within 5-10 years of signing the Record of Decision for the revised RMP. Your comments will be considered at that time. A number of referenced documents as well as updated BLM policy will be considered during this process so the most up-to-date scientific data are used.

Summary Comment #7: Respondents expressed concern or requested additional information regarding Visual Resource Management (VRM) classifications in the planning area.

Summary Response: The purpose of visual resource management is to manage the quality of the visual environment and to reduce the visual impact of development activities while maintaining the viability of all resource programs. The inventory included visual quality, distance zones, and sensitivity of the landscape. See BLM Manual Handbook 8410-1 and Washington Office Information Bulletin No. 98-135 for further guidance.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Summary Comment #22: Numerous respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of special designations in the planning area (analysis, management action, mitigation measure) or requested additional information. Special designations include Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), Research Natural Areas (RNAs), Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and Back Country Byways (BCBs).

Summary Response: A full range of alternatives were developed and considered. Special designations may constrain or encourage select resource uses in order to conserve resource values. Mitigation measures and management actions intended to protect resource values within special designation area boundaries were based on input from the public and the best available information as referenced in Chapter 5 and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance. The BLM will continue to consider you comment throughout the decision making process.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Summary Comment #23: Respondents request a change, alteration, clarification, or broadening of the socio-economic impact analysis.

Summary Response: BLM recognizes the importance of quantifying non-market values when appropriate; however, this type of analysis is beyond the scope of this effort. BLM also recognizes the socio-economic impact/value of resources such as oil and gas is a function of where those resources are found. Estimates for social and economic impacts for the Draft RMP/EIS

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

were analyzed using the best available data and applicable modeling methods.

MULTIPLE RESOURCE PROGRAMS

Summary Comment #11: Respondents submitted comments beyond the scope of the current document or expressed personal preference or opinion regarding alternatives, resources, or mitigation measures.

Summary Response: After review and careful consideration, the BLM has determined that your comment represents personal preference or opinion, or is outside the RMP's scope. Changes to the Kemmerer Draft RMP/EIS related to your comment will not be made at this time. The BLM will continue to consider your comment throughout the decision making process.

Summary Comment #12: Commenter requests a clarification of terminology, a correction in language or grammar, or a reevaluation of a section of text for accuracy.

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

Summary Comment #13: Some respondents requested verification that the recommendations set out in the document are in compliance with applicable laws, acts, regulations, policies, plans, directives, standards, or guidelines.

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

Summary Comment #14: Respondents requested the inclusion or adoption of additional baseline information (such as more data or a map); provisions or data from reports, guidelines, or recommendations; expressed concern over effectiveness of mitigation measures; or requested to implement specific mitigation measures.

Summary Response: BLM considered and incorporated baseline information including peer-reviewed, relevant scientific literature where applicable. Mitigation measures were based on the best available information and federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidance. A wide range of reasonable mitigation measures are included in each alternative as management actions, including measures suggested by individuals and organizations in their scoping comments. Upon completion of the Kemmerer RMP revision, an implementation strategy will be developed. This process occurs after the Record of Decision and is not a part of the Draft RMP/EIS. However, the BLM will continue to consider your comment throughout the decision making process.

Summary Comment #15: Respondents requested to broaden or alter the scope of the cumulative impacts analysis, range of alternatives, or requests to widen the overall scope of the EIS.

Summary Response: The Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires that BLM manage public lands and resources in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, including recognizing the Nation's need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber. With that in mind, a

full range of alternatives were developed and analyzed. BLM took extensive measures to ensure the scope, content, and analysis of cumulative impacts was thorough and appropriate for resources and resource uses potentially affected by the actions proposed in the document. However, the BLM will continue to consider your comment throughout the decision making process.

Summary Comment #16: Respondents requested change, alteration, or clarification of surface-disturbing activities (analysis, management action, mitigation measure), or requested additional information regarding surface-disturbing activities.

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

Summary Comment #18: Some respondents raised questions or requested clarification on the public participation/coordination process.

Summary Response: The BLM published the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on June 16, 2003, and issued a scoping notice to initiate a 30 day scoping period for the purpose of informing potentially affected parties of the intent to revise the Kemmerer Field Office RMP/EIS and to solicit input regarding identification of potential issues and alternatives; however, the revision scoping period remained open for 5 months. The BLM appreciates your comments and will consider them during preparation of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

5.0 CONCLUSION

In summary, respondents voiced a range of concerns relative to the revision process and land management issues. The most frequently discussed topics in the public comments were special status species, mineral resources, and livestock grazing.

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FINAL COMMENT ANALYSIS

APPENDIX A

Public Response User's Guide

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A – Public Response User’s Guide

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

Table A-1 provides a list of respondents, the response document number, and the comment numbers associated with each public response document. Table A-2 (page A-4) identifies summary comments by comment number. To use these tables:

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

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

Table A-1. Public Response Index

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Alleman	Farrell	Individual	24	302-315
Azeka	Michael	AES Sea West	42	585-598
Barrett	Bruce	Bureau of Reclamation	31	348-352
Bates	Jennifer	Questar	57	1298-1302
Bennion	Sam	Individual	4	6-7
Binder	Joan	Wyoming State Geological Survey	18	209-212
Bown	Edward	Various Cattle Permittees	19	213-222
Broadbent	Joe	Individual	10	27
Brown	David	BP American Production Company	52	982-1062
Burg	Diane	Individual	7	15-18
Cattelan	Jeanie	Individual	1	1-3
Clark	Blake	Wyoming State Snowmobile Association	12	33-43
Clayson	Tom	Anadarko	32	353-381
Connelly	Kent	Coalition of Local Governments	50	754-976
Cooper	Stan	Wyoming State Senate	6	9-14
Corbett	Mary Lynn	Individual	2	4
Corbett	Mary Lynn	Individual	8	19-23
Corra	John	Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality	34	383-395
Coyle	Stewart	Individual	13	44

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

Table A-1. Public Response Index (Continued)

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Emmerich	John	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	14	45-106
Etchepare	John	Wyoming Department of Agriculture	30	335-347
France	Annette	Individual	43	599-604
Freudenthal	Dave	Office of the Governor (Wyoming)	40	570-576
Fujimoto	Shirley	Union Telephone Company	17	178-208
Hickey	Joe	Individual	23	295-301
Hickey	Joe	Uinta County Citizens Coalition for Sound Resource Use	22	270-294
Howard	Tim	Gary-Williams Production Company	41	577-584
Hubbard	Carla	Wyoming Pipeline Authority	48	722
Jaggi	Allen	Individual	3	5
Jenkins	Michael	Pacificorp	56	1271-1297
Johnson	Van	Individual	46	646-648
Kelly	Brian	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	35	396-407
Larson	Carl	Larson Livestock, Inc.	51	977-981
Mahr	Aaron	National Park Service	45	638-645
Moseley	Claire	Public Lands Advocacy	54	1067-1137
Nordstrom	Jenifer	Western Watersheds Project	60	1305-1507
Anonymous	NA	Individual	58	1303
Anonymous	NA	Individual	59	1304
Pendery	Bruce	Wyoming Outdoor Council	55	1138-1270
Powers	Mick	Uinta County Commissioners	27	322
Putnam	Lynn	Individual	37	564-567
Redden	Jud	Western Wyoming Range Limited Partnership	25	316-320
Robinson	Peter	Individual	11	28-32
Robinson	Gail & Bill	Individual	53	1063-1066
Schaefer	James	EOG Resources, Inc.	36	408-563
Sgamma	Kathleen	Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States	21	248-269
Sims	Shaun	Uinta County Conservation District	39	569
Sobie	Scott	Fortuna (US) L.P.	15	107-169
Stoddard	Robert	Uinta County Commissioners	28	323
Svoboda	Larry	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	61	1508-1522
Tanner	Russ	Individual	16	170-177
Tanner	Russ	Individual	33	382

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

Table A-1. Public Response Index (Continued)

Respondent Last Name	Respondent First Name	Respondent Affiliation	Response Document Number	Comment Number(s)
Teichert	Tim	Individual	5	8
Timbel	Margot	Anschutz Exploration Corporation	47	649-721
Turley	Paul	Individual	38	568
Vanderhoef	Tyler	Yates Petroleum Corporation	49	723-753
Welch	David	Oregon-California Trails Association	29	324-334
Welling	Craig	Uinta County Commissioners	26	321
Williams	Kent	Uinta County Planning Commission	9	24-26
Wischmann	Lesley	Alliance for Historic Wyoming	20	223-247
Zimmerman Winland	Kathleen Mark	National Wildlife Federation & Wyoming Wildlife Federation	44	605-637

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
1	00011	51	00006	101	00012	151	00003
2	00011	52	00006	102	00012	152	00004
3	00008	53	00012	103	00012	153	00003
4	00011	54	00015	104	00012	154	00015
5	00011	55	00011	105	00012	155	00012
6	00011	56	00016	106	00014	156	00012
7	00011	57	00013	107	00011	157	00011
8	00011	58	00004	108	00011	158	00003
9	00008	59	00011	109	00003	159	00023
10	00011	60	00011	110	00007	160	00011
11	00011	61	00011	111	00007	161	00011
12	00011	62	00011	112	00022	162	00003
13	00011	63	00011	113	00006	163	00011
14	00011	64	00011	114	00016	164	00011
15	00011	65	00011	115	00015	165	00003
16	00011	66	00014	116	00014	166	00013
17	00011	67	00011	117	00007	167	00013
18	00011	68	00011	118	00013	168	00011
19	00011	69	00011	119	00016	169	00003
20	00006	70	00011	120	00011	170	00011
21	00011	71	00013	121	00007	171	00011
22	00011	72	00011	122	00003	172	00011
23	00011	73	00011	123	00007	173	00011
24	00012	74	00011	124	00013	174	00011
25	00012	75	00011	125	00007	175	00011
26	00011	76	00011	126	00011	176	00011
27	00011	77	00011	127	00011	177	00011
28	00011	78	00011	128	00011	178	00015
29	00012	79	00011	129	00022	179	00011
30	00011	80	00012	130	00007	180	00011
31	00011	81	00016	131	00011	181	00011
32	00011	82	00011	132	00011	182	00011
33	00011	83	00015	133	00016	183	00011
34	00018	84	00012	134	00007	184	00013
35	00018	85	00011	135	00013	185	00013
36	00012	86	00012	136	00007	186	00015
37	00012	87	00010	137	00011	187	00015
38	00012	88	00010	138	00011	188	00015
39	00012	89	00010	139	00007	189	00015
40	00008	90	00011	140	00011	190	00011
41	00011	91	00012	141	00014	191	00015
42	00011	92	00012	142	00003	192	00015
43	00015	93	00011	143	00013	193	00011
44	00007	94	00011	144	00015	194	00011
45	00012	95	00013	145	00015	195	00015
46	00012	96	00003	146	00004	196	00011
47	00006	97	00011	147	00015	197	00015
48	00011	98	00014	148	00014	198	00011
49	00015	99	00011	149	00003	199	00015

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
50	00006	100	00012	150	00003	200	00011
201	00011	251	00012	301	00011	351	00012
202	00011	252	00003	302	00011	352	00012
203	00018	253	00023	303	00011	353	00003
204	00015	254	00023	304	00012	354	00013
205	00015	255	00011	305	00011	355	00013
206	00015	256	00011	306	00018	356	00011
207	00011	257	00003	307	00012	357	00003
208	00011	258	00007	308	00011	358	00014
209	00003	259	00011	309	00011	359	00011
210	00003	260	00011	310	00011	360	00011
211	00011	261	00007	311	00011	361	00002
212	00019	262	00011	312	00022	362	00011
213	00011	263	00003	313	00013	363	00011
214	00013	264	00012	314	00011	364	00016
215	00015	265	00015	315	00011	365	00011
216	00005	266	00003	316	00018	366	00004
217	00004	267	00004	317	00018	367	00016
218	00011	268	00013	318	00010	368	00003
219	00004	269	00011	319	00018	369	00014
220	00010	270	00011	320	00011	370	00012
221	00011	271	00006	321	00012	371	00011
222	00011	272	00004	322	00012	372	00006
223	00011	273	00004	323	00012	373	00011
224	00011	274	00006	324	00011	374	00011
225	00011	275	00012	325	00011	375	00011
226	00011	276	00012	326	00011	376	00021
227	00011	277	00013	327	00021	377	00021
228	00011	278	00011	328	00021	378	00021
229	00011	279	00011	329	00012	379	00021
230	00012	280	00011	330	00012	380	00003
231	00012	281	00010	331	00021	381	00003
232	00012	282	00011	332	00011	382	00021
233	00021	283	00004	333	00011	383	00001
234	00011	284	00010	334	00011	384	00011
235	00021	285	00011	335	00011	385	00013
236	00021	286	00011	336	00014	386	00012
237	00011	287	00022	337	00011	387	00013
238	00011	288	00011	338	00012	388	00013
239	00011	289	00011	339	00012	389	00002
240	00011	290	00011	340	00012	390	00013
241	00011	291	00011	341	00012	391	00002
242	00011	292	00003	342	00010	392	00013
243	00011	293	00003	343	00010	393	00002
244	00011	294	00011	344	00012	394	00002
245	00011	295	00011	345	00011	395	00002
246	00011	296	00011	346	00012	396	00011
247	00011	297	00011	347	00011	397	00006
248	00003	298	00011	348	00011	398	00012

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
249	00003	299	00011	349	00012	399	00006
250	00012	300	00012	350	00012	400	00011
401	00006	451	00014	501	00012	551	00003
402	00006	452	00003	502	00011	552	00016
403	00006	453	00004	503	00011	553	00012
404	00006	454	00012	504	00011	554	00016
405	00012	455	00014	505	00011	555	00014
406	00011	456	00012	506	00011	556	00021
407	00011	457	00011	507	00014	557	00021
408	00011	458	00014	508	00011	558	00021
409	00011	459	00019	509	00007	559	00014
410	00003	460	00004	510	00011	560	00014
411	00003	461	00011	511	00011	561	00003
412	00013	462	00011	512	00011	562	00003
413	00011	463	00012	513	00011	563	00013
414	00011	464	00011	514	00011	564	00011
415	00013	465	00006	515	00003	565	00011
416	00013	466	00006	516	00011	566	00011
417	00003	467	00011	517	00001	567	00011
418	00011	468	00006	518	00003	568	00011
419	00003	469	00011	519	00003	569	00008
420	00014	470	00006	520	00014	570	00011
421	00003	471	00006	521	00014	571	00011
422	00014	472	00011	522	00011	572	00011
423	00014	473	00011	523	00011	573	00011
424	00014	474	00011	524	00012	574	00013
425	00014	475	00006	525	00001	575	00014
426	00013	476	00011	526	00011	576	00014
427	00013	477	00011	527	00001	577	00011
428	00003	478	00014	528	00012	578	00011
429	00011	479	00011	529	00011	579	00011
430	00011	480	00006	530	00011	580	00007
431	00001	481	00011	531	00002	581	00011
432	00001	482	00006	532	00002	582	00011
433	00001	483	00011	533	00002	583	00011
434	00014	484	00011	534	00011	584	00017
435	00016	485	00006	535	00011	585	00011
436	00012	486	00006	536	00002	586	00011
437	00014	487	00006	537	00012	587	00011
438	00015	488	00011	538	00015	588	00015
439	00015	489	00011	539	00003	589	00011
440	00015	490	00011	540	00014	590	00011
441	00014	491	00014	541	00003	591	00011
442	00002	492	00006	542	00003	592	00021
443	00012	493	00006	543	00011	593	00012
444	00011	494	00006	544	00011	594	00011
445	00011	495	00021	545	00013	595	00011
446	00011	496	00011	546	00003	596	00022
447	00003	497	00012	547	00011	597	00011

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
448	00013	498	00012	548	00003	598	00024
449	00011	499	00014	549	00011	599	00011
450	00011	500	00008	550	00012	600	00011
601	00011	651	00014	701	00012	751	00006
602	00011	652	00011	702	00021	752	00006
603	00011	653	00013	703	00011	753	00006
604	00011	654	00011	704	00011	754	00013
605	00011	655	00003	705	00011	755	00011
606	00011	656	00003	706	00021	756	00012
607	00011	657	00003	707	00011	757	00013
608	00011	658	00003	708	00011	758	00013
609	00014	659	00011	709	00003	759	00014
610	00011	660	00004	710	00011	760	00013
611	00011	661	00014	711	00022	761	00013
612	00015	662	00014	712	00011	762	00006
613	00014	663	00011	713	00011	763	00013
614	00011	664	00012	714	00011	764	00022
615	00011	665	00003	715	00011	765	00012
616	00011	666	00003	716	00011	766	00012
617	00011	667	00012	717	00001	767	00015
618	00011	668	00003	718	00001	768	00012
619	00014	669	00014	719	00001	769	00014
620	00012	670	00014	720	00001	770	00007
621	00005	671	00006	721	00001	771	00003
622	00006	672	00006	722	00011	772	00003
623	00006	673	00011	723	00011	773	00011
624	00006	674	00006	724	00003	774	00013
625	00006	675	00011	725	00003	775	00013
626	00006	676	00003	726	00003	776	00013
627	00006	677	00011	727	00003	777	00007
628	00006	678	00014	728	00012	778	00012
629	00006	679	00011	729	00013	779	00012
630	00011	680	00011	730	00011	780	00020
631	00003	681	00006	731	00011	781	00020
632	00016	682	00011	732	00001	782	00020
633	00014	683	00011	733	00011	783	00018
634	00014	684	00006	734	00013	784	00011
635	00011	685	00011	735	00012	785	00012
636	00011	686	00011	736	00012	786	00012
637	00011	687	00015	737	00006	787	00011
638	00011	688	00004	738	00006	788	00012
639	00011	689	00006	739	00003	789	00011
640	00011	690	00011	740	00011	790	00022
641	00011	691	00007	741	00006	791	00007
642	00011	692	00016	742	00011	792	00008
643	00012	693	00011	743	00011	793	00015
644	00012	694	00007	744	00014	794	00011
645	00011	695	00011	745	00003	795	00006
646	00011	696	00011	746	00014	796	00013

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
647	00011	697	00003	747	00004	797	00006
648	00011	698	00011	748	00003	798	00011
649	00003	699	00007	749	00014	799	00012
650	00003	700	00007	750	00003	800	00012
801	00014	851	00010	901	00010	951	00012
802	00008	852	00012	902	00011	952	00011
803	00012	853	00014	903	00011	953	00012
804	00012	854	00015	904	00013	954	00012
805	00008	855	00004	905	00014	955	00012
806	00008	856	00012	906	00013	956	00012
807	00008	857	00011	907	00012	957	00012
808	00011	858	00012	908	00011	958	00012
809	00011	859	00012	909	00011	959	00012
810	00011	860	00015	910	00012	960	00012
811	00011	861	00011	911	00011	961	00012
812	00022	862	00022	912	00010	962	00012
813	00008	863	00007	913	00010	963	00012
814	00022	864	00021	914	00010	964	00012
815	00022	865	00021	915	00011	965	00012
816	00012	866	00022	916	00010	966	00012
817	00008	867	00012	917	00010	967	00012
818	00008	868	00022	918	00011	968	00012
819	00007	869	00011	919	00012	969	00012
820	00013	870	00022	920	00012	970	00012
821	00013	871	00011	921	00011	971	00012
822	00007	872	00011	922	00004	972	00012
823	00007	873	00022	923	00004	973	00012
824	00007	874	00022	924	00004	974	00013
825	00007	875	00022	925	00004	975	00003
826	00007	876	00022	926	00007	976	00013
827	00012	877	00022	927	00011	977	00011
828	00007	878	00022	928	00004	978	00011
829	00007	879	00022	929	00011	979	00006
830	00007	880	00022	930	00011	980	00006
831	00021	881	00022	931	00011	981	00011
832	00013	882	00022	932	00011	982	00011
833	00013	883	00022	933	00011	983	00001
834	00010	884	00022	934	00013	984	00011
835	00010	885	00022	935	00013	985	00013
836	00010	886	00022	936	00022	986	00011
837	00004	887	00022	937	00011	987	00011
838	00012	888	00022	938	00013	988	00003
839	00013	889	00022	939	00013	989	00003
840	00013	890	00004	940	00003	990	00015
841	00013	891	00013	941	00003	991	00011
842	00012	892	00021	942	00003	992	00011
843	00010	893	00012	943	00015	993	00012
844	00012	894	00012	944	00003	994	00012
845	00012	895	00015	945	00023	995	00006

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
846	00012	896	00011	946	00023	996	00006
847	00004	897	00010	947	00013	997	00011
848	00012	898	00015	948	00023	998	00006
849	00012	899	00001	949	00023	999	00011
850	00012	900	00010	950	00012	1000	00011
1001	00011	1051	00001	1101	00012	1151	00015
1002	00006	1052	00001	1102	00011	1152	00015
1003	00011	1053	00001	1103	00011	1153	00011
1004	00014	1054	00001	1104	00013	1154	00001
1005	00014	1055	00011	1105	00022	1155	00014
1006	00006	1056	00011	1106	00021	1156	00011
1007	00015	1057	00014	1107	00011	1157	00011
1008	00011	1058	00001	1108	00021	1158	00011
1009	00011	1059	00001	1109	00011	1159	00011
1010	00011	1060	00011	1110	00011	1160	00011
1011	00011	1061	00011	1111	00011	1161	00011
1012	00011	1062	00011	1112	00011	1162	00011
1013	00011	1063	00011	1113	00004	1163	00011
1014	00008	1064	00011	1114	00011	1164	00011
1015	00001	1065	00011	1115	00011	1165	00011
1016	00001	1066	00011	1116	00014	1166	00004
1017	00001	1067	00003	1117	00006	1167	00011
1018	00001	1068	00003	1118	00006	1168	00022
1019	00001	1069	00013	1119	00011	1169	00004
1020	00001	1070	00013	1120	00006	1170	00012
1021	00014	1071	00003	1121	00006	1171	00014
1022	00012	1072	00014	1122	00006	1172	00011
1023	00001	1073	00003	1123	00011	1173	00011
1024	00001	1074	00014	1124	00012	1174	00011
1025	00001	1075	00013	1125	00011	1175	00006
1026	00001	1076	00015	1126	00014	1176	00011
1027	00001	1077	00011	1127	00012	1177	00006
1028	00011	1078	00011	1128	00004	1178	00011
1029	00001	1079	00013	1129	00003	1179	00011
1030	00001	1080	00011	1130	00003	1180	00006
1031	00001	1081	00013	1131	00008	1181	00012
1032	00001	1082	00001	1132	00003	1182	00011
1033	00001	1082	00011	1133	00006	1183	00011
1034	00001	1083	00001	1134	00011	1184	00006
1035	00001	1084	00001	1135	00003	1185	00011
1036	00014	1086	00001	1136	00011	1186	00002
1037	00001	1087	00001	1137	00007	1187	00013
1038	00001	1088	00001	1138	00011	1188	00021
1039	00001	1089	00011	1139	00011	1189	00011
1040	00001	1090	00012	1140	00011	1190	00011
1041	00001	1091	00012	1141	00011	1191	00020
1042	00001	1092	00011	1142	00011	1192	00011
1043	00001	1093	00011	1143	00011	1193	00011
1044	00001	1094	00014	1144	00011	1194	00011

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
1045	00001	1095	00002	1145	00003	1195	00011
1046	00011	1096	00014	1146	00011	1196	00011
1047	00001	1097	00011	1147	00011	1197	00011
1048	00001	1098	00011	1148	00011	1198	00013
1049	00011	1099	00014	1149	00011	1199	00013
1050	00014	1100	00002	1150	00015	1200	00022
1201	00011	1251	00014	1301	00013	1351	00002
1202	00011	1252	00014	1302	00011	1352	00002
1203	00011	1253	00014	1303	00011	1353	00011
1204	00011	1254	00011	1304	00011	1354	00014
1205	00014	1255	00011	1305	00011	1355	00013
1206	00011	1256	00008	1306	00011	1356	00016
1207	00008	1257	00011	1307	00013	1357	00002
1208	00012	1258	00014	1308	00011	1358	00004
1209	00011	1259	00014	1309	00010	1359	00016
1210	00011	1260	00013	1310	00011	1360	00010
1211	00011	1261	00022	1311	00010	1361	00002
1212	00011	1262	00013	1312	00010	1362	00010
1213	00011	1263	00011	1313	00010	1363	00002
1214	00011	1264	00014	1314	00010	1364	00002
1215	00011	1265	00011	1315	00010	1365	00013
1216	00011	1266	00011	1316	00010	1366	00002
1217	00011	1267	00011	1317	00010	1367	00002
1218	00011	1268	00006	1318	00010	1368	00011
1219	00011	1269	00006	1319	00010	1369	00002
1220	00011	1270	00014	1320	00010	1370	00002
1221	00003	1271	00011	1321	00010	1371	00002
1222	00013	1272	00011	1322	00010	1372	00013
1223	00001	1273	00011	1323	00010	1373	00013
1224	00011	1274	00011	1324	00011	1374	00011
1225	00022	1275	00015	1325	00011	1375	00004
1226	00007	1276	00011	1326	00011	1376	00004
1227	00011	1277	00011	1327	00010	1377	00004
1228	00024	1278	00011	1328	00011	1378	00012
1229	00011	1279	00011	1329	00010	1379	00004
1230	00011	1280	00014	1330	00010	1380	00004
1231	00015	1281	00011	1331	00010	1381	00006
1232	00014	1282	00011	1332	00010	1382	00011
1233	00003	1283	00011	1333	00010	1383	00012
1234	00011	1284	00011	1334	00010	1384	00004
1235	00011	1285	00015	1335	00011	1385	00011
1236	00013	1286	00012	1336	00019	1386	00004
1237	00015	1287	00013	1337	00019	1387	00004
1238	00003	1288	00011	1338	00019	1388	00004
1239	00014	1289	00012	1339	00012	1389	00004
1240	00011	1290	00011	1340	00019	1390	00011
1241	00011	1291	00011	1341	00014	1391	00014
1242	00011	1292	00015	1342	00011	1392	00004
1243	00013	1293	00006	1343	00019	1393	00011

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

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

Comment Number	Summary Comment Number						
1244	00015	1294	00011	1344	00019	1394	00006
1245	00011	1295	00006	1345	00019	1395	00004
1246	00015	1296	00021	1346	00014	1396	00011
1247	00011	1297	00011	1347	00004	1397	00004
1248	00011	1298	00011	1348	00019	1398	00011
1249	00011	1299	00011	1349	00014	1399	00011
1250	00004	1300	00013	1350	00002	1400	00011
1401	00010	1432	00006	1463	00003	1494	00011
1402	00004	1433	00006	1464	00003	1495	00011
1403	00010	1434	00014	1465	00011	1496	00011
1404	00010	1435	00006	1466	00011	1497	00011
1405	00004	1436	00006	1467	00011	1498	00011
1406	00011	1437	00011	1468	00011	1499	00011
1407	00011	1438	00011	1469	00013	1500	00011
1408	00006	1439	00006	1470	00003	1501	00011
1409	00006	1440	00011	1471	00003	1502	00011
1410	00006	1441	00006	1472	00003	1503	00018
1411	00006	1442	00006	1473	00003	1504	00014
1412	00011	1443	00006	1474	00003	1505	00008
1413	00006	1444	00011	1475	00003	1506	00011
1414	00011	1445	00015	1476	00011	1507	00011
1415	00004	1446	00015	1477	00011	1508	00011
1416	00011	1447	00014	1478	00011	1509	00011
1417	00012	1448	00011	1479	00013	1510	00011
1418	00006	1449	00003	1480	00011	1511	00011
1419	00011	1450	00011	1481	00011	1512	00001
1420	00002	1451	00011	1482	00015	1513	00001
1421	00010	1452	00015	1483	00011	1514	00001
1422	00002	1453	00015	1484	00011	1515	00001
1423	00014	1454	00011	1485	00024	1516	00001
1424	00004	1455	00003	1486	00010	1517	00001
1425	00006	1456	00015	1487	00010	1518	00001
1426	00012	1457	00015	1488	00010	1519	00011
1427	00011	1458	00015	1489	00010	1520	00011
1428	00011	1459	00014	1490	00010	1521	00011
1429	00006	1460	00011	1491	00011	1522	00011
1430	00006	1461	00015	1492	00011		
1431	00006	1462	00011	1493	00011		

This page intentionally left blank.