



# United States Department of the Interior

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Pinedale Field Office  
PO Box 768  
1625 West Pine St.  
Pinedale, WY 82941



In Reply Refer To:  
1610 (LLWYD01) P  
Adaptive Management Proposal #1

### **Deliberation to Public Comment for Proposed Matrix Threshold Changes**

The public comments received by the adaptive management review team were categorized into four primary categories. The management team's response to each comment is listed below.

#### **Comment #1**

##### **Comments outside of the proposed matrix change scope:**

##### **Response:**

During the deliberation process of the public comments received, the adaptive management team determined many comments to be outside the scope of proposed matrix changes. Comments such as mitigation responses, other matrix modification recommendations, changes to the adaptive management process, and additional requests for third party reviews were not included in the final decision process.

#### **Comment #2**

##### **Implementation of additional coop review team recommendations:**

##### **Response:**

Several comments requested full implementation of the third party Coop review comments. The BLM and WGF D have reviewed the Coop comments and responded. At this time the BLM has adopted many of the Coop review comments. The agency response to the Coop review can be found at the following link <http://www.wy.blm.gov/jio-papo/papo/wildlife.htm>.

#### **Comment #3**

##### **Comment pertaining to continued data collection:**

##### **Response:**

A number of comments addressed concern over whether monitoring data associated with the proposed removed matrix thresholds for pronghorn, mule deer and sage-grouse would still be collected. The adaptive management team concurs with the third party Coop review and public comments that this data would be important in mitigation efforts and understanding habitat use for mule deer and pronghorn. Given this, we recommend continued monitoring of mule deer distribution across the PAPA from a sample of GPS collared adult females and modeling annually using Resource Selection Function analyses. In addition, we support the continued collection and analysis of habitat use data for pronghorn.

The review team concurs with the agency response to the Coop review regarding the removal of the sage-grouse nest success matrix criteria from the matrix. Based on findings of recent research projects conducted on the PAPA, nesting success did not differ significantly between disturbed and undisturbed nest sites. Therefore continued monitoring of nest success is not justified.

**Comment #4**

**NEPA Conformance:**

**Response:**

Comment that the proposed changes in the mule deer matrix are not in conformance with current NEPA. Because the proposed change to the matrix regarding mule deer does not change the management strategy of the BLM no further NEPA analysis is required. Changes in avoidance do not trigger any mitigation action by itself, only when changes in population have been documented to exceed 15%. Mule deer distribution and habitat use data will continue to be collected and will be utilized in management and mitigation efforts.