Rio Puerco Field Office RMP/EIS November 15, 2021

### Preliminary Proposed RMP/Final EIS version 1

Preliminary Proposed RMP/Final EIS version 1 is intended for internal review by the BLM Rio Puerco Field Office and New Mexico State Office. Please provide comments to EMPSi by **Monday, December 13, 2021**.

Documents for review can be accessed at the following link:

<https://backup.filesanywhere.com/fs/v.aspx?v=8e6c66895c5f717ba1a5>

Password: November2021

**Comment Matrix** (provided at the end of these instructions). This is the comment matrix you should use to capture your comments. Please save the file with a new file name including your last name, and then fill out your comments on the document. Please coordinate within your office to compile your comments and submit them to the following people no later than December 13, 2021.

* E-mail to [holly.prohaska@empsi.com](mailto:holly.prohaska@empsi.com); cc [alujan@blm.gov](mailto:alujan@blm.gov)

### How to Provide Valuable Feedback

**Commenting:**

For each comment, please fill in the following information under the appropriate column heading in the comment matrix:

* Page and line number on which you are commenting. Use the complete page number (e.g. “4-48”) so that it indicated the chapter on which you are commenting.
* **Please make your comments specific and provide exact changes to the text.** Comments should be unambiguous, clear, and directive, with exact wording changes stated. Ambiguous comments, such as “What?,” “Poor,” or “Is this right?,” are not helpful and cannot be addressed.
* If you have the same comment more than once, please do not refer back to a previous comment number. Instead, copy and paste your comment to a new row in the matrix and provide the specific measure number, etc.
* Feel free to insert more rows if needed.
* An example has been provided in row one of the table.

| **Cmt #** | **Page #** | **Line #** | **Commenter** | **Comment** | **Response *(To be completed by EMPSi)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Example | 2-23 | 70 | J. Doe – NMSO Soil Specialist | Change “topsoil” to “soil” | SAMPLE |
|  | Dear Reader Letter | NA | Catherine Brewster – NMSO NRS (Planning and NEPA) | “…protests submitted electronically by any means other than the e-Planning project website protest section will be invalid unless a protest is also submitted in hard copy. Protests submitted by fax will also be invalid unless also submitted either through the e-Planning project website protest section or in hard copy.” This is not as readable as it could be. Perhaps revise to “…protests submitted electronically by any means other than by the e-Planning project website protest section will not be considered. Additionally, protests submitted by fax will also not be considered.” |  |
|  | Dear Reader Letter | NA | Cbrewster | Signature on Dear Reader Letter and elsewhere throughout the documents will need to be updated to “Melanie G. Barnes, Acting BLM New Mexico State Director” |  |
|  | ES-1 | 37 | Cbrewster | “Since the Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in January 1986 for the existing plan, new data have become available, new policies have been established, and old policies have been revised.” Suggest rephrasing to “…old policies have been revised or rescinded” |  |
|  | 2-4 | 129 | Cbrewster | Curious as to why Fort Stanton-Snowy River National Conservation Area RMP, Prehistoric Trackways National Monument RMP and the Taos RMP are listed here? Do any of these plans and their decisions impact the planning area of this RMP? |  |
|  | 1-13 | 496 | Cbrewster | There is now a 2020 version of the Water Support Document at can be found here: <https://www.blm.gov/programs/energy-and-minerals/oil-and-gas/about/new-mexico>. Please also confirm the soils section was updated as a part of incorporating this reference. |  |
|  | 1-13 | NA | Cbrewster | Please ensure the new 2020 Air Resources Technical Report is included in this document: https://www.blm.gov/programs/energy-and-minerals/oil-and-gas/about/new-mexico |  |
|  | 3-4 | Table 3-3 | Cbrewster | This table should be updated to show the three most recent years. At a minimum, please add 2018-2020 EPA data. The reference will need to be updated as well. |  |
|  | 3-7 | 242-245 | Cbrewster | The Cumulative BLM GHG Emissions Supplemental White Paper is no longer used. The newer version of the ARTR should now include anything that was previously cited within that whitepaper. MMT of OC2e will likely need to be updated. |  |
|  | 3-48 | 1648 | Cbrewster | WIND AND SOLAR - We will likely need a map to show which areas may be most economical to produce renewables. We should show which areas have the highest potential and the associated type of development it could see. We may be asked to have “priority” areas identified on a map. In addition, in the realty section it would be in our best interest to have a map overlaying ROW/utility corridor availability in these priority areas. |  |
|  | 3-48 | 1688 | Cbrewster | Suggest creating a map to show which areas are Class I, II, and III for wind. |  |
|  | 3-48 | 1680 | Cbrewster | Which areas are open and most suitable? |  |
|  | Table 3-41 | Third Column | Cbrewster | Please clarify what we mean by “Current Designation” is this how it is currently managed under the existing RMP (changed through one of the amendments) or as proposed under this PRMP. |  |
|  | 4-11 | 401 | Cbrewster | To be able to calculate the SC GHGs, table 4-5, the CO2e are likely also going to need to be broken down to CO2, CH4, and N2O. |  |
|  | 4-14 | 477 | Cbrewster | Please consider using 2017 NEI data. |  |
|  | 3-29 | 882 | David Jevons-Hazmat Coord. | Please add to the hazardous material section (3.8.10) that any spilled hazardous material will be cleaned up, reported and properly disposed according to Local, state and federal regulation requirements. |  |
|  | 4-68 | 2228 | Cbrewster | Suggest clarifying – so a CSU would be available under some alternatives, as would the LN? Under which alts would the CSU be used? |  |
|  | H-29 | 909 | Cbrewster | Suggest adding in SO stipulations/LNs for Paleo (NM-13-CSU and NM-14-LN), and NM1\_LN\_SS Plant Species. I can provide the word documents for these stip descriptions if provided place to upload them. |  |
|  | H-30 | 942 | Cbrewster | Please add the short name for this one, “WO-NHPA” in parenthesis. |  |
|  | 4-77 |  | Cbrewster | Are there any prime locations for renewables development? If so, can you determine what size that the solar or wind farm it could see? If so, suggest disclosing this information. |  |
|  | 4-95 | 3058 | Cbrewster | Table 4-54 – They may ask us where renewables jobs would fall within this table and the previous table, suggest altering the titles to disclose this. |  |
|  | 3-72 | Table 3-29 and 3-30 | Cbrewster | Suggest updating data in this table and throughout this section to include more recent census data. |  |
|  | 3-73 | Table 3-30 | Cbrewster | This table is not as reader friendly as I think it could be. Suggest breaking it down into separate tables or better highlighting the spaces where the percentages fall within the criterion that identifies them as EJ populations. Perhaps bolding the State of NM Row would be a simple solution to making it easier to read. As presented, it’s difficult to interpret where the threshold has been met. |  |
|  | 3-73 | Table 3-30 | Cbrewster | Suggest adding a row for Total Minority Population. |  |
|  | 3-72 | Table 3-29 | Cbrewster | Suggest adding rows for Poverty Prevalence – 1. All individuals below the poverty line 2. Families below poverty line |  |
|  | 3-73 | Table 3-30 | Cbrewster | Suggest adding a foot note to the Hispanic or Latino Column that states: “Hispanic refers to ethnicity and is derived from the total population, not as a separate race, i.e., it is calculated differently than the other columns in this table. Therefore, it is considered separately in this analysis.”  Once you add in the “All individuals below the poverty line” row, suggest including a footnote that says, “includes those below the poverty line, regardless of whether they are included as such due to being below the individual income or family income poverty line.” |  |
|  | 4-103 | 3337 | Cbrewster | Call out should be Table 3-30. I assume this will be done at a later time but suggest double checking all table call outs throughout document. |  |
|  | 4-103 | 3335-3340 | Cbrewster | Suggest adding a summary to explain what criterions these minority populations met. Something like this “*After examination of the most recently available data on minority and low-income populations for the area of analysis (U.S. Census Bureau XXXX), the BLM has determined that there are communities of concern present in the analysis area. The communities of concern present include people of XX origin for XX and XX Counties, which comprises more than 50% of the county population and would therefore be considered a community of concern (U.S. Census Bureau 2020) (see Table 3-30). In addition, the population in poverty for XX County is greater than that of the State of New Mexico and therefore is also considered a community of concern.”* |  |
|  | 4- |  | Cbrewster |  |  |
|  | 4- |  | Cbrewster |  |  |
|  | 5-4 | 104 | Cbrewster | If we are going to speak to meetings held at the draft stage in the sections to follow, suggest adding in the dates of the CA meetings from the DEIS stage here too. |  |
|  | 5-5 | 139 | Cbrewster | Need to update to include those in office now. |  |
|  | 1-2 | 50 | Kim Ryan, NMSO Archaeologist | Global check and correct for consistency in use of terms: revise “American Indian” to “Native American”. Noted use of various terms throughout document. “American Indian” should only be used when directly citing legal text and titles, or when quoting a referenced statement. |  |
|  | 1-5 and 1-6 | 167-205 | KRyan | Add a section/statement that Native American Pueblo and Tribal Interests are addressed throughout the analysis and within specific sections relevant to comments and concerns brought forth by Pueblos and Tribes during the course of G2G consultations and DRMP/DEIS review. Particular sections where Tribal Interests have been expressed and analyzed include Cultural Resources (as related to historic properties- including Traditional Cultural Properties –and Sacred Sites), Land Tenure/Access, Mineral/Energy Development, and Social and Economic Conditions (as related to Environmental Justice). |  |
|  | 2-7 | 280-282 | KRyan | BMPs (and potentially Standard Procedures) should be detailed and provided as an appendix. Appendix G only includes Fluid Mineral Lease/Development BMPs; BMPs for other activities, authorizations, and programs should also be provided. |  |
|  | 2-7 | 289 | KRyan | Revise bullet to specify that: Fluid Mineral Lease stipulations would be applied as detailed in Appendix H. |  |
|  | 2-42 | 958 | KRyan | Insert bullet stating that split-estate leasing/development involving tribal allotments would be processed under the authority of the Federal Indian Minerals Office (FIMO) in accordance with the Onshore Energy and Mineral Lease Management Interagency Standard Operating Procedures (2013) and FIMO’s August 17, 2017, interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change Title to “Major Rock Units found within the Planning Area and their Geologic Age” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change column title from “Epoch (Million years ago)” to Geologic Age (Mya\*) with footnote explaining Mya is Million years ago. This saves space in the header to accommodate change |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change “Quaternary (present–2.5)” to “Quaternary (2.58–Present)” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change “Tertiary (2–65)” to “Tertiary (66–2.58)” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change “Cretaceous (66–145)” to “Cretaceous (145–66)” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change “Jurassic (145–200)” to “Jurassic (201–145)” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | After “Triassic” add “(252–201)” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | After “Permian” add “(299–252)” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add two new rows under “Permian”. The first will be “Pennsylvanian (323–299)” and the second “Precambrian (4600–541)” in the Geologic Age column. See comment 46 |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | See comment 45. In Rock Unit Column, add “Madera Group” to Pennsylvanian row and “Granitic plutonic rocks, shist, gneiss, and other metamorphic rocks” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | To Rock Units, add to Permian row: “Abo Formation”, “San Andrea Formation”, “Bursum Formation” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | To Rock Units, add to Cretaceous row: “Crevasse Canyon Formation”, “Dakota Sandstone” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 697 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | To Rock Units, add to Tertiary row: “Nacimiento Formation”, “San Jose Formation”, “Ogallala Formation” |  |
|  | 3-24 | 694 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change this sentence to “Major rock units in the Planning Area consist of Quaternary alluvium and the Santa Fe Group of the ancestral Rio Grande, Tertiary volcanic rocks, Lower Tertiary basin-fill sediments, Cretaceous mudstones and sandstones, Jurassic gypsum and terrestrial sediments, Triassic terrestrial sediments, Permian terrestrial and marine sediments, Pennsylvanian marine sediments, and Precambrian granites and metamorphic rocks.” |  |
|  | 3-42 | 1413 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “The fossils found on public lands are considered part of our national heritage and are therefore afforded protection under the Paleontological Resources Preservation Act of 2009.”  with:  “Besides PRPA of 2009, paleontological resources are protected on public lands by the NEPA which requires that that “…important… natural aspects of our national heritage…” be protected, as well as FLPMA which requires that the public lands be managed in a manner that protects the “…quality of scientific…” and other values.” |  |
|  | 3-42 | 1425 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “The PFYC system has been developed to predict the potential for discovering scientifically important fossils during any surface-disturbing activity in specific geologic units.  With:  “The BLM has developed the PFYC system [CITE IM 2016-124 here] as a baseline tool to make initial assessments of paleontological resources and determine if any potential action may affect paleontological resources on public lands |  |
|  | 3-42 | 1426 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Change to …uses a ranking of 1 through 5, and U, I, and W;…” |  |
|  | 3-42 | 1428 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “significant” with important” |  |
|  | 3-42 | 1432 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add” These include intrusive volcanic or metamorphic rocks, and rocks of Precambrian Age.” |  |
|  | 3-42 | 1433 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add” These include units that are younger than 10,000 years, have been physically or chemically altered, or are recent aeolian deposits. |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1442 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add “…assignment due to lack of scientific literature on paleontological resources, or geologic mapping is insufficient. These units are treated as a PFYC 5 until more information is available to re-rank them.” |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1442 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add two more entries under PFYC U   * PFYC W—Water. Includes any surface area that is mapped as water. * PFYC I—Ice. Includes any area that is mapped as ice or snow. (Note, this is not present in the Planning Area) |  |
|  | S-85 | Map 3-11 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Standard colors for the symbology are: 1 Yucca Yellow; 2 Mango; 3 Electron Gold; 4 Flame Red; 5 Tuscan Red; I Snowfield/ice; W lake; U Gray 40%. No outlines on the PFYC classes, but outline water and ice polygons. |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1446 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “The PFYC map (Appendix S, Map 3-11) was developed by the BLM.”  With  “The 1:500,000 scale PFYC base map (Appendix S, Map3-11) under development by the BLM is based on the New Mexico State Geologic Map (NMBGMR, 2003) |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1446 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Remove “Since the scale of the base map is 1:500,000, the RPFO would refine the data as part of plan implementation.” |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1448 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add “The NM PFYC map is currently under review and being updated to bring it into compliance with BLM IM-2016-124. Ideally, geologic map coverage would be at the 1:24,000 scale, and these and other scale maps will be added to the 1:500,000 base map as they are published and digitized.” |  |
|  | 6-4 | 12 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add this Citation:  \_\_\_\_\_. 2016a. Instruction Memorandum No. 2016-124: Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) System for Paleontological Resources on Public Lands. July.  Make sure to make the other existing citation 2016b |  |
|  | 6-10 | 3 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add this Citation:  New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources (NMBGMR), 2003, Geologic Map of New Mexico, Scale 1:500,000. |  |
|  | 2-44 | 984-986 | KRyan | Revise text to read: Cultural Resources and Tribal Consultation Stipulation - (WO-NHPA): The BLM may require modification to exploration or development proposals to protect significant cultural resources and historic properties or, disapprove of any activity that is likely to result in adverse effects that cannot be successfully avoided, minimized, or mitigated. |  |
|  | 3-9 | 346 | KRyan | Insert legal reference for Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act (GBASPA; Public Law 108-208) |  |
|  | 3-10 | 392 | KRyan | Strike “of the NHPA” |  |
|  | 3-12 | 429 | KRyan | Table 3-5: Add a footnote to El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro NHT stating that the BLM is an NHT co-administrator with the NPS but does not have jurisdictional responsibilities for the trail within the RPFO Planning Area. |  |
|  | 3-13 | 441 | KRyan | Table 3-6: Remove bullet listing Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks Nat’l Monument. It is managed under its own plan and previously noted as being excluded from the Planning Area. |  |
|  | 3-14 | 441-442 | KRyan | Table 3-6: Chacoan Outliers (3)- Casamero, Andrews Ranch, and Kin Nizhoni (all footnoted as being located w/in the FFO but managed by RPFO under inter-area agreement NM-010-071). If these 3 sites are located outside the RPFO Planning Area and are not subject to this RMP (i.e., managed under the FFO RMP), these should not be included in this RMP/EIS. If they will be managed under this RMP, please provide cultural resources-related details of the NM-010-071 agreement that confers that status and any specifications, along w/appending a copy of the agreement for public reference. Global check and correct as warranted. |  |
|  | Dear Reader | Signature line | SOL Vaccaro | Tim Spisak is listed as the State Director |  |
|  | 3-16 | 445-448 | KRyan | Strike sentence regarding Tent Rocks NM and El Malpais NCA- these are excluded from the Planning Area. |  |
|  | 3-16 | 466 & 467 | KRyan | Strike two occurrences of “Indian” |  |
|  | 1-9 | 333 | Vaccaro SOL | I may have missed it, but has the acryonym VRM been defined yet? |  |
|  | S-78 | Map 3-4 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Standard colors for geologic units and ages need to be used (and can be provided). In legend, replace “&” with “IP” (Which is capital I and P), and Replace “@” with TR. These are placeholders for when special Geologic Age Symbol Font ("FGDCGeoAge") are in use. Ideally, Legend would be in geologic time order, youngest to oldest (Water, Playa, Q, QT, T, K, J, TR, P, IP, M, D, S, O, C, Y, X). Is there a place for rock unit descriptions for at least the names of the units? What about Faults on the map? |  |
|  | 3-16 | 478-479 | KRyan | Revise sentence to: This underscores the need for early and continual consultation during project planning and to best inform management decisions. |  |
|  | 3-19 | 566 | KRyan | Global check and correct: after the initial explanation that Kasha Katuwe-Tent Rocks NM has its own management plan and is excluded from the Planning Area and this analysis, do not mention it again unless there is a specific- and explicit- analysis-related reason to reference it. Remove text. |  |
|  | 3-33 | 1056-1061 | KRyan | Are the grazing allotments w/in FFO that are administered by RPFO done so by agreement under NM-010-071? What does that document say? Are the FFO-mgmt area allotments subject to administration under the FFO RMP or this RMP? This section confuses the definition of the RPFO Planning Area and warrants explanation. Also, does the current draft analysis in various resource sections account for these allotments (i.e., cultural, wildlife, etc.)? If the FFO-area allotments are managed in accordance w/the FFO RMP, global search and remove. |  |
|  | 3-34 | 1094-1098 | KRyan | Global check and correct: after initial explanation that El Malpais NM has its own management plan and is excluded from the Planning Area and this analysis, do not mention it again unless there is a specific- and explicit –analysis-related reason to reference it. Remove paragraph. |  |
|  | 3-46 | 1578-1580 | KRyan | Strike last two sentences in paragraph and revise text to read: Both areas now have their own RMPs and are excluded from the RFPO RMP Planning Area. |  |
|  | 3-52 | 1825-1827 | KRyan | Revise sentence to read: Archaeological data demonstrate that, prior to Euro-American contact, local indigenous groups practiced sophisticated forms of sedentary agriculture and were engaged in far-reaching trade networks. |  |
|  | 3-52 | 1822 et seq. | KRyan | General comment re context: Recommend back-checking with and aligning the Historical and Social Setting in Section 3.17.3 with the Cultural History section (Section 3.4.1) for consistency (in particular, all parts discussing history prior to the Spanish Entrada). |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1460 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Remove “Although the Planning Area contains rocks as old as 2 billion years,” |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1458 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Update numbers in table and add percent. Source: BLM GIS 2021   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **PFYC** | **Acres** | **Percent** | | PFYC 1 | 1205599 | 12.68% | | PFYC 2 | 783745 | 8.24% | | PFYC 3 | 2803859 | 29.49% | | PFYC 4 | 2156042 | 22.68% | | PFYC 5 | 258068 | 2.71% | | PFYC U | 2295805 | 24.15% | | PFYC W | 3966 | 0.04% | |  | 9507084 | 100% | |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1456 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “About 32 percent of public land in the Planning Area is underlain by Class 2 rock units, and Class 1 makes up 37 percent of the Planning Area (Table 3-16).”  With  “Units with PFYC 3 account for approximately 29% of the Planning Area, while PFYC 1 and 2 only about 21%. PFYC W is a negligible amount.” |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1455 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “Within the Planning Area, PYFC Class 5, 4, and 3 geologic formations account for approximately 31 percent of the total acreage, including all ownerships.”  With  “Within the Planning Area, geologic units with PFYC ranks U, 5, and 4 account for almost 50% of total acreage.” |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1448 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “The geologic units range from almost two billion years old to the present.”  With  “The oldest units are 2.5–1 billion years old in the Precambrian. Rocks from the later Precambrian and early Paleozoic are absent in the Planning Area. However, geologic time from about 323 million years ago to the present is represented, and is where the paleontological resources would be located.” |  |
|  | 3-43 | 1453 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “The PFYC of both volcanic and limestone areas may be 1, 2, or 3, but cave and karst conditions should enter into decisions.”  With  “Caves like these are the reason there is not a PFYC 0 (zero potential).” |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1476 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “There are five active research paleontology permits in the Planning Area, representing five different researchers. Three of these active permits are issued statewide to the NMMNHS.”  With  Researchers at NMMNHS have several statewide science research permits, and…” |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1495 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “Significant” with “scientifically important” |  |
|  | 4-62 | 2051 | Ross Klein | The text states CSU and NSO for steep slopes of a given percentage. Maybe it is elsewhere in the document, but a length needs to be given. The reason is because at a micro scale, slope may generally exceed those percentages, but at some length, the erosion potential issue arises. For example, a suggested text revision could state “a NSO will be applied for steep slopes that exceed 30 percent over **a run of 300 feet**”. Note: This lack of run length matter is presented elsewhere in the analysis. |  |
|  | 3-52 | 1827-1830 | KRyan | Strike last sentence and revise remaining text to read: Around 200 CE, regional inhabitants became more sedentary and began to practice subsistence agriculture. In the late eleventh 11th century, Ancestral Puebloans started constructing multistoried pueblos. Evidence of Athabascan-speaking peoples in the area—i.e., Apache and Navajo— appears as early as the late 1400s to 1500s. |  |
|  | 3-53 | 1832 | KRyan | Strike “Ute” and “Indians” |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1499 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Should this be “Southwest”? Otherwise this is the same as 3.13.6 |  |
|  | 3-45 | 1523 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Replace “…type locality for the Torrejonian Land Mammal age in North America.”  With  “…is the Type Locality that defines the Torrejonian North American Land Mammal age.” |  |
|  | 3-45 | 1528 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add “This includes Stearn’s Quarry, an important location for Brontotheres in the Paleogene Galisteo Formation.” |  |
|  | 3-45 | 1527 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Update to “…given PYFC U, 4, and 3 ranks of…” |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1512 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Retitle “Western Sandoval County” to differentiate from 3.13.5 Eastern Sandoval County |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1509 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Update “…given to this area is PFYC 1509 1 because of map scale…” with Dec 2021 PFYC data |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1502 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Update “…ranked PFYC 4 and 3 for…” with Dec 2021 PFYC data |  |
|  | 3-44 | 1505 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Update “…ranked PFYC 3 and 2 for…” with Dec 2021 PFYC data |  |
|  | 3-45 | 1524 | Colin Dunn, Paleontologist | Add “Located between the Chamisa and Cabezon WSAs, Shark-tooth Ridge in the Cretaceous Mancos Shale is a popular area for casual fossil collection, as well as for the unauthorized collection of shark teeth. |  |
|  | 3-53 | 1844-1847 | KRyan | Strike last sentence in paragraph (it is contradictory to subsequent discussion re Dawes Act & allotments); revise remaining text to read: In the late 1800s, the US government also created reservation areas for the Navajo and Apache. |  |
|  | 3-53 | 1848 | KRyan | Revise sentence start to: Much of the non-Pueblo tribal land... |  |
|  | 3-53 | 1851-1852 | KRyan | Replace “Indian” with “Native American”; revise “non-Indians” to “non-natives” |  |
|  | 3-53 | GENERAL | KRyan | Noted switching among use of both “United States” and “US” - pick one and global check/correct for consistency in use of terms and acronyms. |  |
|  | 3-54 | 1885-1886 | KRyan | Revise sentence start to: Land grant heirs, tribes, and Pueblos continue... |  |
|  | 3-55 | 1923 | KRyan | Replace “jurisdiction” with “Planning Area” |  |
| 109. | 3-56 | 1949 | KRyan | Replace “reservation” with “Nation” (i.e., it’s the Navajo Nation) |  |
| 110. | 3-56 | 1959 | KRyan | Replace “Indian” with “Native” |  |
| 111. | 3-57 | 2011-2017 | KRyan | Zuni often refers to itself as the “Zuni Tribe,” but also alternatively as Pueblo of Zuni or Zuni Pueblo. Zuni is a Pueblo (i.e., has shared ancestry, relations, and notable cultural similarities with other Puebloan groups). Revise paragraph to count/list Zuni as a Pueblo and continue to reference accordingly. Global check and correct. |  |
| 112. | 3-57 | 2014 | KRyan | Replace “Numerous” with “Twelve” (and include Zuni in that list). |  |
| 113. | 3-60 | 2102 | KRyan | Table 3-19: Zuni is a Pueblo. Revise table to list Zuni w/the other Pueblos and not as a “Tribal Nation/Reservation” |  |
| 114. | 3-61 | 2121 | KRyan | Table 3-20: Zuni is a Pueblo. Revise table to list Zuni w/the other Pueblos and not as a “Tribal Nation/Reservation” |  |
| 115. | 3-63 | 2152 | KRyan | Table 3-22: Zuni is a Pueblo. Revise table to list Zuni w/the other Pueblos and not as a “Tribal Nation/Reservation” |  |
| 116. | 3-69 | 2324 | KRyan | Strike “…, particularly for the Navajo” |  |
| 117. | 3-69 | 2324-2327 | KRyan | Revise two sentences to read: In addition, the Planning Area one documented—Mount Taylor—and likely other traditional cultural properties (TCPs) of importance to local and/or tribal communities that have potential to be affected by management decisions or land-use activities. TCPs, which are a particular type of historic property subject to consideration under the NHPA, are addressed more specifically as Cultural Resources in Section 3.4. |  |
| 118. | 3-72 | 2402 | KRyan | Table 3-29: Zuni is a Pueblo. Revise table to list Zuni w/the other Pueblos and not as a “Tribal Nation/Reservation” |  |
| 119. | 3-73 | 2406 | KRyan | Table 3-30: Zuni is a Pueblo. Revise table to list Zuni w/the other Pueblos and not as a “Tribal Nation/Reservation” |  |
| 120. | 4-23 | 771-772 | KRyan | Revise text to read: “…are considered long-term and likely permanent…” |  |
| 121. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 122. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 123. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 124. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 125. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 126. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 127. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 128. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 129. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 130. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 131. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 132. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 133. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 134. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 135. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 136. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 137. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 138. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 139. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 140. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 141. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 142. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 144. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 145. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 146. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 147. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 148. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 149. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 150. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 151. |  |  |  |  |  |