

Comment Summary

Summary of public comments on the October 2001 Analysis of the Management Situation for the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan

Background

In the fall of 2000, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Prineville District, reinitiated the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan (RMP) Environmental Impact Statement (formerly the Urban Interface EIS) in an effort to respond to growing concerns over the expanding and changing needs of the urban interface areas. The RMP will amend (update) needed sections of the Brothers/La Pine RMP and the Two Rivers RMP in response to changing issues as identified by both internal and external scoping efforts.

On October 21, 2000, members of the BLM Planning Team gathered to identify the agency's goals and objectives for reopening the plan, and to identify the public's expectations for the plan. Through this internal scoping process, the agency identified project timelines, plan objectives and methods to involve the public in the planning process.

In October 2001, the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) for the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan was released. The AMS compiled important information regarding existing resource conditions, uses, and demands. It summarized the current management direction and describes the planning criteria. The AMS is the first step in revising the 1989 Brothers/La Pine RMP. Nine issue categories were identified in the RMP/EIS. This report is a synopsis of the comments received regarding these issues as well as additional comments outside these categories.

Scoping Process

The BLM requested public comments on the AMS through announcements in local newspapers, and in the cover letter on the AMS (mailed to about 1,200 people in October 2001).

There were three ways to share comments: (1) by mail, email or fax to the Prineville BLM office; (2) by providing them verbally or in writing at one of three public meetings held in Redmond on October 16, 2001, Prineville October 17, 2001, and in La Pine on October 18, 2001; or (3) by participating in field trips to various sites of interest within the planning area. These field trips took place on October 20, 2001 in the area west of the Powell Butte Highway, on October 21, 2001 in the La Pine area and on October 27, 2001 in the area east of the Powell Butte Highway. The official deadline to submit comments was November 30, 2001. This report also includes relevant comments received before the release of the AMS, as well as some comments received after the deadline.

Methodology

This report summarizes 134 public comment letters received during the scoping period for the Upper Deschutes RMP. "Letters" consisted of letters, emails, faxes, documented conversation

records, and comments from public meetings. "Comments" refer to a discrete portion of a letter referring to a specific issue. Each letter contained between 1 and 31 separate comments. Approximately 500 comments were considered.

Each comment was coded to a specific issue category. Occasionally, a comment addressed more than one issue category, in which case it was coded to each category it directly addressed. People often listed various reasons (or rationale) why their comments were valid. For example, a comment requesting that the BLM acquire access to an isolated parcel of public land might list rationale including hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding. This comment would be coded to the transportation and access issue category, but not to the recreation issue category. The table on Page 4 summarizes the frequency that various subjects were used as rationale behind more specific comments.

People who wrote more than one letter (2) in which the content was the same (i.e., duplicates) were counted as only one letter. Group letters such as petitions (one was received with 24 signatures) and letters from married couples were counted once for each different person signing the letter. Comments received at public meetings, usually with no names of individuals, were separated and each comment was entered as a separate letter. However, these people were recorded as residents of the city or town in which the meeting took place. There was one meeting between city, county and federal officials: the meeting notes were entered as one letter.

Our intent with this report is to provide a review of the range of comments received. We have also listed the number of letters received on each topic to give the reader an idea of the amount of public interest by topic. These numbers were not used to weigh the value of various comments. The BLM assigns the same importance to comments made only once as it does to comments made 100 times, provided the comment is relevant (substantive and within the scope of the plan). Comments that were clearly not relevant were not included in this analysis, but some that were marginal (may or may not be relevant) still appear in this report.

Who Provided Input

Most letters came from Central Oregon residents (90%), living in Powell Butte (38%), Redmond (16%), Bend (16%), La Pine (8%), Prineville (8%), Terrebonne (2%) and Sisters (1%). Eight responses (6%) came from cities within Oregon, but outside the planning area. Two letters (1%) were received from out of state, one from Boise, Idaho and one from Pacific, Washington.

The majority of letters received were from individuals (81%). Governmental agencies represented were state (5%), federal (1%), county (1%), and city (1%). Of comments received from non-governmental organizations (2%), most were made on behalf of local chapters of national organizations such as the Juniper Group of the Sierra Club and the National Speleological Society. Other local non-governmental organizations (7%) commenting included Oregon Natural Desert Association, Native Plant Society of Oregon, Native Range Restoration Project, Oregon Natural Resources Council, and the Central Oregon Motorcycle and ATV Club. One letter was received from the Burns Paiute Tribe.

Specific Geographic Areas Addressed

Twenty-seven letters (20%) did not contain comments addressing a specific geographic area. The remaining 107 (80%) letters contained one or more comments addressing a specific area. These letters are detailed in the table below.

Table 1. Number of letters (and percentage of total) addressing specific areas.

Geographic Area	Letters
No specific area addressed	27 (20%)
Powell Butte	57 (43%)
Cline Butte	11 (8%)
Badlands WSA	10 (7%)
Bend/Redmond/Powell Butte	8 (6%)
Prineville Reservoir	6 (4%)
Young Avenue Quarry	4 (3%)
Mayfield Pond	3 (2%)
Redmond Caves	3 (2%)

Other areas mentioned only once or twice include “Cain Fields,” Barnes Butte, Bear Creek County road, Boonesborough, Dry Canyon, Horse Ridge, Howard Lane, La Pine area, Maston allotment, Middle Deschutes River, Millican Valley, Moffett Butte, Smith Rock area, Steamboat Rock, Steelhead Falls, and Stout Cave.

Issues Addressed

Nine issue categories were identified in the AMS. The issue categories are as follows: Land Ownership, Transportation and Access (regional transportation systems, local transportation systems, rights-of-way and easements, utility corridors and communications sites, Land Uses (livestock grazing, commercial forest use, minerals, use authorizations, and unauthorized occupancy and use), Ecosystem Health and Diversity (vegetation, wildlife, water quality and quantity, air quality, and fire ecology/fire hazard), Recreation (developed recreation, motorized use, non-motorized dispersed use, and special recreation permits), Special Management Areas (ACECs, caves, and wilderness study areas), Archaeological Resources, Public Health and Safety, and Social, Economic and Visual Values. Additional comments outside these nine issue categories included planning area boundary, law enforcement and plan implementation, public education and public input into the planning process.

The following table summarizes the issues addressed by letters. As mentioned above under methodology, some comments addressed issues specifically, while others did so indirectly as rationale. The example we used before was a comment asking BLM to retain a parcel in federal ownership because of the opportunities for hiking. This is a request for a land ownership action, so the comment will be counted in the “Direct” column for Land Ownership, but it will also be counted in the “Indirect” column for Recreation. Forty-eight letters contained comments addressing recreation specifically, while another 53 letters contained comments addressing

another issue but listing recreation as the rationale. In all, 101 letters addressed recreation either directly or indirectly.

Table 2. Number of letters (and percentage of total) addressing each issue.

Issue Category	Direct	Indirect	TOTAL
Land Ownership	73 (54%)	0 (0%)	73 (54%)
Transportation and Access	48 (36%)	0 (0%)	48 (36%)
Land Uses	38 (28%)	4 (3%)	42 (31%)
Ecosystem Health and Diversity	22 (16%)	48 (36%)	70 (52%)
Recreation	48 (36%)	53 (40%)	101 (75%)
Special Management Areas	13 (10%)	40 (30%)	53 (40%)
Archaeological Resources	4 (3%)	35 (26%)	39 (29%)
Public Health and Safety	22 (16%)	7 (5%)	29 (22%)
Social/Economic/Visual Values	2 (1%)	41 (31%)	43 (32%)

Land Ownership

Seventy-three letters (54%) addressed land ownership. Most of the comments were directed at allowing changes in land ownership through exchange or sale. Most of the comments were concerning the Powell Butte area. Twelve comments requested that BLM acquire more land on Powell Butte including a 1,600 acre parcel. One person felt that a private piece of land north of Mayfield Pond should be acquired. Four people felt that BLM should try to block up public lands and dispose of scattered "unmanageable" tracts. Eight people were in favor of retaining (i.e. don't sell or trade off) public lands as an important tool in preventing growth and because of the significant recreational, visual, ecosystem and watershed values associated with these lands. Fifty-six people, including 24 who signed a petition letter, asked that BLM retain all public lands on Powell Butte and place these lands in the Z-1 zone. Most people felt that this is an historical and beautiful area, which should be preserved for future generations. Six people felt the land between Bend, Redmond and Powell Butte should be retained. Four people commented that BLM should retain scattered tracts to serve as buffers to limit sprawl and provide important habitat as well as protecting special sites or ecosystems. One person felt if BLM was going to acquire land it should buy it not acquire by exchange and one person felt that, no matter what the benefit to BLM, criteria for acquiring land should be on a landscape level.

There were five general comments regarding land ownership ranging from keeping community needs in mind when considering land ownership changes to one person saying the land should all be sold to a conservation society to protect it from development.

Transportation and Access

Forty-eight letters (36%) were received in this issue category and the majority expressed concern with access. Lesser numbers addressed road classifications, road closures, road realignments, right-of-way, road maintenance and airstrips.

Four comments addressed the issue of road classifications. Two people felt BLM should abolish the "Open" space designation due to abuse and vandalism and to control off-highway vehicle (OHV) use on public lands, and one person felt there should be 15 mph speed limits.

Seven people commented on road closures and limited access. Four people felt BLM should close roads and improve enforcement around sensitive areas such as the Badlands WSA and the Bombing Range pictograph site. Four more people suggested BLM limit access to curtail dumping, OHV use, repeated vandalism and abuse in some areas. One person felt there are too many roads and many should be obliterated while another person felt that closing or limiting access to roads has impacts on people with physical limitations. One person expressed concern that there should be access for wildfire suppression.

In the area of acquiring legal public access, 30 comments were recorded. The majority (25) asked that the BLM work toward gaining public access to the lands on the Powell Buttes. One each discussed gaining some sort of access to the east side of Cline Butte, Middle Deschutes River, easements to Wild & Scenic Rivers and the land between Redmond, Bend and Powell Butte.

One person addressed the need for agencies to work together around Prineville Reservoir where proposed access roads cross boundaries between agencies.

Seven people commented on Right-of-Way (ROW) issues. One writer felt the type of right-of-way grants issued needs to be examined on the widening of Bear Creek Road. Three people expressed that ROW access should be completely denied for any future proposals for communications towers on Barnes Butte (1), for a secondary access road into Huntington Ranch Resort (1), and for all developers (1). Three more people addressed ROW, expressing the need to carefully consider scenic values, fish and wildlife habitat, and the natural character of these lands when considering easements for communication towers, utility companies and mineral sites.

One comment dealt with the need for an eastern parallel route through Redmond, due to the increased growth and use of Yew Avenue. They felt the route should be east of the railroad and west of the airport. Two people supported a route across the east side of Bend via Millican Road and making it Highway 27. Another felt BLM should establish criteria for type of road maintenance levels. One person expressed concern that Big Prairie airstrip between Bend and Redmond should not be shut down.

Land Uses

A total of thirty-eight letters (28%) were received commenting on land uses. In addition to these letters which specifically addressed land use issues, four letters listed land uses as rationale for comments that fell into another issue category.

Commercial Forest Use: Six letters addressed this issue. One person commented that logging was extremely destructive and should have fees assessed for environmental damage and cost of repair. Three people addressed wood cutting recommending no wood cutting areas due to resource damage or limited to use for ecosystem restoration. One other person commented on the removal of dead snags and limbs from old growth woodlands for furniture, landscaping etc. as damaging the character and scenic value of the woodlands.

Minerals: Eighteen letters expressed concerns for this issue. The comments ranged from "keep out any mining or industry" to "there is a demonstrated need to identify and reserve areas on public land" for aggregate extraction. Six letters made more general comments with three in favor of aggregate sites on public land and three commenting on the negative impacts on fish and wildlife, lack of need and destructive aspect of mining. More specifically, five letters were totally opposed to mining (i.e., gravel pits) on public lands while two people felt old growth woodlands and recreational areas should be exempt from mining operations. Four other letters were opposed to mining operations in specific areas most notably Cline Butte (3) and Horse Ridge (adjacent to the Badlands WSA) due to infringement on recreation areas and the noise and air pollution associated with these activities.

Livestock Grazing: Nineteen letters made comments regarding grazing and grazing allotments. Comments ranged from "no grazing on any public lands" to "continue this important economic resource." Eight letters made general comments from reviewing the permits to determine appropriateness given the ecological decline of species and habitat (4), while 3 were interested in determining the effects of grazing on riparian areas, wildlife forage and cover habitat needs, and big game. One person felt fees should be assessed for environmental damage and costs of repair.

One letter expressed concerns about the negative tone of the AMS about livestock grazing. One person felt the cost vs. benefits of grazing should be weighed. Four comments expressed concerns regarding "overgrazing." One person felt the Mayfield Pond area is overgrazed and almost irreversibly damaged, while the other three letters hoped the review process would fully disclose the costs to the public of allowing overgrazing on public lands.

Twelve of the nineteen letters made reference to restricting or closing areas to livestock grazing. Some of the reasons for these concerns are as follows: Sensitive areas and critical habitats (5), old growth juniper woodlands (1), conflicts with other user groups and adjacent land-owners (2), big game winter range (2), and sediment delivery to Bear Creek, Prineville Reservoir and the lower Crooked River (2).

As for grazing allotments, one letter strongly urged BLM to permanently close 21 (inactive) allotments. Two letters recommended that BLM permanently retire permits if the permittees are willing.

Three comments were made regarding various types of conflicts caused by grazing. These included the ecological conflicts and elevation of fire risk in the urban interface. Two other letters expressed the need to inventory fences to determine if fence improvements would enhance the movement of mule deer and elk.

Use Authorizations: One letter was a general comment on the effects of long-term leases and Temporary Land Use Permits. Another letter commented on Special Recreation Permits and where, under what conditions, and how these permits will be managed. Four letters were received with suggestions for lands to be used under Recreation and Public Purposes act leases. One person expressed that BLM needs to look at the Oregon National Guard's long-term use of public lands.

Unauthorized Use and Occupancy: Four people commented. Three were concerned with the unauthorized use by "transients" and "hobos" and the stealing of gravel from the Young Avenue Quarry and called for it to be fenced and controlled. The other was a general comment on the need for BLM to join with county decision-makers and law enforcement to resolve this issue.

Commercial Use: Three letters commented on non-specific commercial use on public lands. Two dealt with Cline Butte saying there should be no extractive uses in the area. The other felt that BLM should ensure that commercial use does not dominate public lands especially around Smith Rocks.

Ecosystem Health and Diversity

Twenty-two letters (16%) were received with comments in this issue category. Five comments were very general just commenting on current conditions versus historical norms. Three people felt the AMS did not do a good job of analyzing the current ecological conditions and failed to emphasize ecological issues under consideration in the AMS. Three commented on how BLM management decisions may have contributed to the ecological decline of the area and wanted to know what steps are underway to improve that condition.

Nine people commented on fire, both natural and prescribed. Three people were in favor of allowing natural fires to help sustain a natural vegetative state (on Powell Butte) and five people were in favor of prescribed burns as a tool to maintain a natural state and incorporate fire back into the landscape. Two people felt fire should only be used as a management tool and be tightly controlled and two others felt the use of fire could have adverse impacts to Bear Creek, Prineville Reservoir and the lower Crooked River due to sediment delivery. One person commented that fire management activities could damage historic and archaeological sites.

One person felt human resource needs should be added in to health and diversity concerns. Two letters addressed the need for more and closer evaluation to monitor rangeland health. Another two people mentioned vegetation enhancement and management efforts.

Five comments were considered dealing with juniper with three people concerned with thinning to improve water quality and quantity as well as juniper removal to consider the needs of deer and elk cover and the management of old growth. Three people commented on the need to control noxious weeds and one was concerned about the type of poisons used that could also damage cultural plants used by tribal members depending on the site and treatment chosen.

Seven people voiced wildlife concerns about how much land is managed for wildlife habitat, specific species such as the sage grouse, as well as big game and fish. One person expressed that a plan for managing wildlife is needed especially in the Mayfield Pond area.

Four comments addressed the protection of rivers and enhancement of water quality. One person wanted BLM to address water laws, revamp irrigation systems, or revoke water rights in the Draft RMP/EIS. Three more letters addressed concerns over determining how healthy the soils are.

In addition to the above letters specifically addressing ecosystem health and diversity, another 48 letters listed ecosystem health and diversity as rationale for a comment that fell into another issue category.

Recreation

Forty-eight letters (36%) were received in this issue category. Most of them were directed toward motorized vehicle use. Eight people made general comments such as “develop more recreational opportunities within the planning area” to “recreation needs to be monitored more closely to prevent damage to the resources.” Two people felt a well-diversified recreational environment was desirable both socially and economically and enhanced the quality of life.

In addition to the above letters which specifically addressed recreation, another 53 letters listed recreation as rationale for a comment that fell into another issue category.

Motorized Vehicle Use: Ten people made general comments about this use. Four felt that the range of alternatives did not adequately address impacts of motorized use, conflicts, or desired future conditions. Two people commented on the Cline Butte Area, one wanting all motorized vehicles out and the other wanting better control of use in that area due to tearing up of the land. Another person commented that fees should be assessed, due to the extremely destructive nature of off road use, to cover the cost of repairs.

Twenty-five people who wrote letters commented on restricting off-highway vehicle (OHV) use on public land. Specific areas mentioned include Powell Butte (6), the Young Avenue Quarry (4), and Cline Butte (2). Two addressed Wilderness Study Areas (WSA), Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), and/or Wild and Scenic (W&S) rivers (2). The rest did not address a specific area. Most felt that certain sensitive and fragile areas should be restricted to non-motorized use or closed completely. Two people felt that OHV use should be limited to designated areas and only on existing trails and roads. Five letters addressed the concern for protecting certain habitats and species of fish and wildlife from OHV damage. Sage grouse use areas, mule deer winter range and Peck's Milkvetch ACEC were suggested as areas where prohibiting OHV use would be appropriate. Two people felt that resource damage in OHV use areas should be re-assessed, closed and rehabilitated if necessary. These concerns were with erosion, water quality, and wildlife harassment.

There were two comments received in support of OHV use. One suggested a day use park north of Highway 26 and the other felt the use in the Millican Valley drew people from all over thus eliminating damage to other areas.

Regarding trail density for motorized vehicles, four people commented. Two felt that further evaluation of roads, trails and OHV use was necessary to determine future use and the impact of

OHV use on water quality. One person felt that the density of trail systems should be based on the available resource i.e., topography, vegetation and geology relating to trail placement. One comment was that motorized trail and roads are not equal and allowable densities should be calculated separately.

Two letters commented on the need to restrict or limit motorized vehicle use to prevent overuse and to protect certain areas. Three people felt it was necessary to ban all motorized use in any WSA i.e. Badlands.

Non-Motorized/Dispersed Use: General comments in this issue category were made in five letters. Four people felt the Upper Deschutes RMP needs to better address urban day use, both existing and potential and consider passive recreational activities in the urban interface. One person commented that the BLM provide for all types of non-motorized dispersed recreation in the Cline Butte area.

More specifically, one commenter wanted BLM to enhance some hiking trails around Powell Butte, and another propose BLM close all roads in the Badlands WSA except Route 8, which would be acceptable for non-motorized vehicle (mountain bike) use only. Two letters addressed equestrian use. One person supported horseback riding on Powell Butte, and another wanted the BLM to more clearly mark equestrian (endurance) trails, close the Burma Road trail closed due to conflicts with mountain bikes, and establish new trails not shared with OHV vehicles.

One person recommended that the BLM enhance opportunities for primitive recreation and solitude whenever possible.

Two comments were made about recreational developments: one proposed there be none on Cline Butte, the other proposed a park at the County Landing at Prineville Reservoir.

The issue of trails was addressed in four letters. One person suggested that this would be an excellent opportunity to examine the possibility of a recognized public trail system (for bikes and pedestrians) connecting Bend, Redmond, and Smith Rock State Park along canals on BLM land. One comment was made regarding erosion caused by horses on Gray Butte Trail suggesting BLM coordinate with the Forest Service to maintain and improve trail systems. Another person felt that for the safety of hikers and equestrians, there was a need for designated OHV trails and "no vehicles allowed" trails. One person wanted trails to better access Steelhead Falls.

Hunting and Shooting: Hunting and target shooting are also valid recreational activities, and they will be addressed as such in the Recreation section of the EIS. However, for this report they are addressed in the Public Health and Safety section, since most of the comments regarding these activities voiced safety concerns.

Special Management Areas

Thirteen people (10%) commented on Special Management areas. Nine of these letters dealt with "wilderness" areas. Three comments were of a general nature on how much land under management is designated as wilderness. One person felt the BLM should re-evaluate non-WSA

lands and possibly designate new WSAs during this process. Five people commented on management of the Badlands WSA, one on designation of Steelhead Falls and one in favor of designation of the proposed Crooked River Wilderness.

Seven letters commented on ACECs. Four comments were general stating how much land under management is managed for this purpose and how BLM should designate more of these areas. One letter supported BLM's four ACEC proposals in the planning area. One person felt Powell Butte should qualify for ACEC designation and another felt old growth juniper woodlands meet the criteria.

Two letters were received expressing tribal and cultural concerns for the protection of certain caves (Stout and Redmond) as well as pictograph sites in the Badlands/Bombing Range area.

In addition to the above letters which specifically addressed special management areas, another 40 letters listed special management areas as rationale for a comment that fell into another issue category.

Archaeological Resources

A letter from the Burns Piaute Tribe as well as three others expressed comments in this category (4%). In general, one person felt that due to increasing eastside populations and the spread of suburbia, there will be increased threats to cultural resources as well as traditional plant gathering areas for tribes. Two others felt that perhaps BLM should form partnerships with other agencies as well as the High Desert Museum to identify, protect, preserve and showcase archaeological sites. One letter said that areas of traditional significance are not confined to areas that have “vegetative conditions...,” so traditional religious practices should be considered separately. Another person expressed the fact that a number of tribal families still use the area for hunting, gathering and fishing and this information has not been incorporated into the planning document.

In addition to the above letters which specifically addressed archaeological resources, another 35 letters listed archaeological resources as rationale for a comment that fell into another issue category.

Public Health and Safety

Twenty-two letters (16%) were received in this issue category. Two people made general statements regarding the need for BLM to address the dumping on BLM land and the need for some sort of program addressing garbage. Four people were concerned specifically with the Young Avenue Quarry saying that it is a public nuisance, it is unattended, there is dumping (among other things) taking place there and it needs to be fenced and controlled. One person was concerned with the "trashing up" of Moffett Butte and suggested a trash patrol or containers be provided. Two people suggested a need for some sort of citizen involvement program. Two other people suggested that BLM needed to work with other agencies and officials to provide affordable places for the people to take their trash, enforce stiff penalties for violators, and pursue financial support from the county to deal with illegal dumping. One person felt there was a need to safeguard archaeological sites from vandalism. Excessive noise from OHVs and parties was mentioned in two letters.

Four comments were made about hunting on BLM land. Two people felt there needed to be one-mile noise and safety setbacks around private lands to separate homes from hunting areas. One other person commented on shooting versus hunting next to urban interface areas and one made a very general comment about being concerned about hunting use on BLM lands.

Fourteen (14) letters mentioned problems with shooting. Specifically, four people were concerned with shooting so close to neighborhoods around the Young Avenue Quarry. They felt that this property needed more controls. Five people were in favor of designated shooting areas or ranges with other areas being strictly off limits to shooting to facilitate public safety. One person complained that target shooters leave their targets and shell casings all over the ground. Two people proposed one-mile noise and safety setbacks from shooting areas and residential neighborhoods. One person commented, "BLM needs to acknowledge that shooting is likely to occur...at mineral sites."

In addition to the above letters which specifically addressed public health and safety, another seven letters listed public health and safety as rationale for a comment that fell into another issue category.

Social/Economic/Visual Values

Social, economic and visual values were rarely mentioned as a primary issue, but they were listed in numerous comments (41) as rationale for why the BLM should or should not take specific actions. For example, many of the comments requesting land retention suggested visual resources were important.

In two instances (1%), letters specifically addressed this category. One expressed concern over the cost of the AMS while the other felt that public lands in the La Pine area were critical to the future development of that region.

Planning Area Boundaries

Three letters (2%) were received recommending planning area boundary changes. All three concerned areas around Prineville Reservoir as well as one suggestion that Wild and Scenic Rivers within the area be included.

Law Enforcement and Plan Implementation

Seven letters (5%) were received addressing law enforcement and plan implementation. Six people commented on the need for better law enforcement. Of these, four felt increased and improved enforcement is needed to control off road use, resource damage and illegal dumping. Two suggested that BLM provide staff to monitor and to enforce motorized access restrictions. One person was concerned with BLM's ability to implement activities as outlined in the plan.

Public Education

Three letters (2%) felt that better education of the public was necessary to facilitate and encourage non-abusive use of the public lands. One comment said BLM should encourage education, interpretation and scientific study.

Public Input to Planning Process

One letter (1%) commented on a concern with the issue teams not seeing the big picture because they were too segregated. Another requested that the BLM staff find more time for workshops soon.