

ATTACHMENT B

Areas of Special Designation, Including Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

During the NWCOS meeting, participants noted the following comments for changes in the new RMP:

- BLM land consolidation needs to be addressed
- Need to incorporate science and monitoring
- Need to be more outcome oriented and deliberately manage for wild lands
- Need to work together
- Need to use technology to lessen impacts
- Need to designation specific trails

After the discussion, participants posted the following stickies on the flipcharts at the back of the room.

Goals

- Goals [all from one sticky note]
 - Long term protection of unique natural resources / significant places
 - Rare plant occurrences
 - Scarce or concentrated breeding habitat for sensitive species
 - Grouse
 - Ferrets
 - Prairie dogs
 - Fish
- We urge the Colorado BLM to adopt guidance on lands with wilderness character as did the Arizona BLM
- **Areas of Desire**
 - RMP needs to look at all 7 proposed wilderness areas within the LSRA (not just Vermillion Basin)
 - Special Designations – What great mechanisms to protect particular natural resources in the most critical places while still allowing for multiple use across the landscape/entire resource area
- **Areas of Concern**
 - Get Rid of Special Designations they fragment management actions or protect all uses with special Designations
 - There is a real lack of balance. To say special designations are not multiple use is as incomplete a statement as O/G development is single use. Multiple use does not imply multiple on every acre. I urge the committee to move past rhetoric and look at the full scope of what balance really means.
 - Wilderness[:] Protecting our Natural Heritage with local considerations of history at all levels[:] protecting that land for the rest of nation

ATTACHMENT B

- The amount and overwhelming pressure that the LSRMP “needs” wilderness expansion could adversely effect the NCOS process
- Is wilderness a part of BLM’s multiple use mandate? Yes. Comment. Local ranchers have preserved wilderness values in designated areas keeping resource and character [renewable?] and sustainable. It is only right to respect this and include them in all decisions including the use of approximate numbers of cattle permitted with consideration for annual ecosystem changes and BLM range [con’s?] assessments. Please remember how everything interrelates and wild life issues need to be a table, including rancher’s contribution to the same. Out side agendas for need to preserve also need to understand the local history.
- **Comments on Alternatives** [no stickies]
- **Instructions for Workgroup**
 - Respond ASAP to wilderness opponents’ warning that wilderness advocates will never satisfied and will want more and more. Explain relation between CWP’s in LSRA and their mutual or cumulative long-term value
 - Work to explain why wilderness quality (by definition) isn’t possible with anything beyond already permitted other uses on wilderness
 - No more WSA or management areas that attempt to be wilderness – only Congress can
 - Decisions for stewardship will be better for land health is local values and mgmt is inclusive to national goals; [maybe separate note, maybe continuation] intersecting private land stewardship has contributed to local wilderness character [;] must be at table
 - Please remember ag’s contribution to the wide open space in Moffat County