

Phoonswadi-Brewer, Sean

From: Lander RMP
Subject: FW: Lander RMP

From: Diamond 4 Ranch [mailto:diamond4@wyoming.com]
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2012 3:51 PM
To: BLM_WY_LRMP_WYMail
Subject: Lander RMP

To: Lander RMP Comments

From: Jim Allen
 Allen's Diamond 4 Ranch
 PO Box 243
 Lander, WY 82520
 307-332-2995 hm
 307-349-6784 cell
 Website – www.diamond4ranch.com
 Email – diamond4@wyoming.com

Dear BLM,

This letter intends to comment on the proposed draft Lander RMP with a comment deadline of January 20, 2012. Thank you for taking into account my comments.

I prefer Alternative A or C. I urge adoption of either one of these alternative management options or some combination of the two.

1)The draft plan is not user friendly and shows a bias against resource use and a bias against human presence. More proposed ACEC's is proof.

2)The RMP seems contrary to FLPMA and NEPA. FLPMA instructs BLM by federal statute to coordinate planning and management activities with local government and local land use plans. I don't see that in this draft RMP. In fact, the RMP seems to ignore the local LUP. The Fremont County LUP clearly states the resource policy of the citizens of the county.

3) The draft RMP also seems to ignore NEPA, another federal statute, that says "man shall live in productive harmony with the environment." The RMP so severely restricts man's activities that BLM is acting more like the national park Service than the multiple use resource agency Congress created in BLM. Man is out and so is production in this RMP.

4) I find it offensive that the RMP reduction of grazing AUM's is justified by stating that ranchers are getting old anyway. BLM should instead encourage investment in resource production for the future of our county and America. America needs young ranchers unafraid to invest their life in producing healthy beef and lamb for national food security.

5) BLM lands in Fremont County are and always have been a working landscape. As a result of past management, citizens have enjoyed a sustainable economy, healthy wildlife herds, recreation opportunities, lower property taxes resulting from energy production, good water and profitable ranching maintaining open spaces. Since past management created these desirable living conditions, why would BLM change to a more restrictive alternative?

In summary, I urge final adoption of Alternative A or C.

Sincerely,
Jim Allen