

Attention: RMP Project Manager

January 19, 2012  
LFO\_RMP\_10155

Comments for the Lander Area BLM RMP

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a fourth generation rancher on our family ranch along the Sweetwater River in Fremont County. Grazing on federal lands in an integral part of our operation and has been since the early 1900's. Raising beef cattle on this land is my heritage and culture given to me by my great grandparents. My grandfather was instrumental in providing water wells in our allotments, which not only provide water for cattle, but wild horses and wildlife. The BLM land where my grandfather worked is sacred to me, and being able to run our cattle where my grandfather did is priceless. The allotments where we hold permits are 1703, 1704, 1705, and 1706.

**Page 4** was concerning to me when you state that the aging/retirement of ranchers would be a good reason to cut AUM's in all permits. This is absolutely insane. The cutting of AUM's for this or any other reason that has NO scientific data behind it should NOT be considered. This needs to be removed from the RMP.

Something that is missing from the proposed RMP is permittee/range con monitoring. The data from this type of monitoring will provide scientific data for each allotment to be used as a tool for managing.

**Pages 40-45** states that you are going to cut grazing. I am going to assume that it is your opinion to cut grazing, when you clearly have no scientific data to do so. I believe that this is an extremely poor way to manage BLM lands, doing so on a whim or "because you think so". The ranching community cannot sustain a 1% or a 30% cut to AUM's.

Permittees are put in a no win situation when it comes to new and improved management ideas, i.e. more water and fencing. The wild horses and sage grouse benefit from the permittees water projects and management fences. Sage brush reduction in over infested areas would benefit the range. An over infestation of sagebrush will kill the grasses due to taking all of the water and there is so much sagebrush that grass cannot grow.

On **page 1448**, is a list of allotments and AUM numbers. There is NO state, private, and suspended AUMs listed. These need to be in the final plan, so the real grazing AUM numbers per allotment are stated. This is in the current RMP we now have. In your categories of maintain and improve you need to state why they changed, if they did.

Grazing is not a disruptive part of an allotment management plan, in fact grazing is necessary to maintain good range health.

Using "historic trails" as a tool to drastically reduce multiple in ANY corridor of EACH trail is very un-American. You are punishing us for all our fore-fathers coming here to live and improve the land. Using "historic trails" to control our private land is infringing on our private property rights.

Sincerely

Andrea L. Dockery

