

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#351

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Chris Cameron

Address, City, Zip: 63221 Bedrock Ct.

Signed: Chris Cameron Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

352

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Jeff Moe

Address, City, Zip: 4791 29th Ct. Redmond OR 97756

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-6-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#353

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M..'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Cody Lindqvist
Address, City, Zip: 4623 NE Butler Ave, Redmond, OR 97756
Signed: Cody Lindqvist Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#354

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B.L.M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: TODD LINDQUIST

Address, City, Zip: 4623 NE BUTLER AVE REDMOND, OR 97756

Signed: Todd W. Lindquist Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#355

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Richard E Reznick

Address, City, Zip:

2601 Rimrock West Redmond

Signed:

Richard E Reznick

Date:

12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#356

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Josh Reznicek
Address, City, Zip: 2601 Rimrock Ln 3
Signed: Josh Reznicek Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#357

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Barb Saucedo
Address, City, Zip: P.O. Box 1696 Redmond Or. 97756
Signed: Barb Saucedo Date: 12/26/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#358

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Kim Lonien

Address, City, Zip: 12856 SW Wheatgrass Loop

Signed: Kim Lonien Date: 12/23/03

RECEIVED

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#359

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: PAUL Godfrey

Address, City, Zip: 12213 NW Sumpter

Signed: P. Godfrey Date: Dec 23/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#360

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Richard Belanger

Address, City, Zip:

PO box 567 The Dalles, OR 97058

Signed:

Richard Belanger

Date:

12/16/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#361

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: KEVIN WILLIAMS
Address, City, Zip: P.O. BOX 454 MOSIER OR, 97040
Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-16-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#362

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M..'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: TERRY LANDON

Address, City, Zip: 2815 WOODBRIDGE CT BEND OR

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12/11/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

363

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M..'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

SAGIE WILKINSON

Address, City, Zip:

2733 NO HOPE DR BEND 97701

Signed:



Date:

12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

364

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Kathy Crager

Address, City, Zip:

22989, Vintage, Bend, OR 97701

Signed:



Date:

12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#365

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Bill Needham
Address, City, Zip: 1687 NE Meerkat
Signed: Billy Needham Date: 12-11-03

RECEIVED

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#366

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.

- a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
- b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
- c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
- d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
- e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
- f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
- g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.

- a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
- b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
- c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
- d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
- e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Shane Munoz

Address, City, Zip: 1918 NE WITCHITA Bend 97701

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#367

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Jon Burt

Address, City, Zip: P.O. Box 2246 Redmond Or 97756

Signed: Jon Burt Date: 12-9-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#368

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Mike Jones
Address, City, Zip: 2126 NW 8th St. Prineville, OR 97756
Signed: Mike Jones Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

369

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Pat Burris
Address, City, Zip: P.O. Box 49 Tennebaine Ore. 97766
Signed: Pat Burris Date: 12-9-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#370

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Joey Kelly
Address, City, Zip: 2988 SW Glacirr Ave Redmond, OR
Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#371

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Phillip Wilson

Address, City, Zip: 321 E sage Ln Pulver OR 97734

Signed: Phillip Wilson Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#372

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: JASON A. RATLEDGE

Address, City, Zip: 5049 Green Valley Ave Prineville

Signed: JASON A. RATLEDGE Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#313

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Mickey Moore

Address, City, Zip: 852 NW Quince pl Redmond 97756

Signed: Mickey Moore

Date: 12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#374

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M..'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'

Print name: Gale Haskin

Address, City, Zip: 3234 SW Newberry Ave

Signed: Gale Haskin Date: 12-17-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#315

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M..'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Jeremy Blair

Address, City, Zip: 67294 Hwy 20 Bend 97701

Signed: Jeremy Blair Date: 12-17-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

1376

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Gerald (Budley) Blair

Address, City, Zip: 67294 Hwy 20 Bend, OR 97701

Signed: Gerald A Blair Date: 12-17-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#377

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M..'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Kathy Blair

Address, City, Zip: PO Box 1865 Sisters OR 97759

Signed: Kathy Blair Date: 12/17/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#318

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

DANIEL ADAM FUNDERBURG

Address, City, Zip:

61365 SW ELKHORN ST BEND, OR 97702

Signed:

Daniel Adam Funderburg

Date: 12-17-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#379

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Troy Bethe
Address, City, Zip: 59934 minnetonka mn.
Signed: Troy Bethe Date: 1/10/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

380

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Bill Martney

Address, City, Zip:

Po Box 178 Turboponne OR 97760

Signed:

Bill Martney

Date:

12-26-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St,
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#381

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: JAPON MCKERNAN

Address, City, Zip: 1513 NW JACKPINE

Signed: [Signature] Date: _____

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#382

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'

Print name:


Terry McKenney

Address, City, Zip:

5499 S.W. Yow Rd

Prineville, OR

Signed:



Date:

12-12-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#383

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Mindy McTiernan

Address, City, Zip: 1513 NW Jackson Ave, Redmond 97756

Signed: Mindy McTiernan Date: 12-12-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#384

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Curt Newman

Address, City, Zip: 399 NW Antler Loop Redmond 97756

Signed: C Newman Date: 12-13-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#385

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Dustin Aldous

Address, City, Zip: 1885 N.W. Lower Bridge Terrebonne OR 97768

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12/12/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#386

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'

Print name: Rick Roberts

Address, City, Zip: 809 SW Canyon Drive Prineville OR 97756

Signed: R. Roberts Date: 12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#387

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'

Print name: Kenneth Amburn

Address, City, Zip: 13352 S.W. Shawnee Rd

Signed: Kenneth Amburn Date: 12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#388

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'

Print name: Darletta Amburn

Address, City, Zip: 13352 SE Shawnee Rd Prineville

Signed: Darletta Amburn Date: 12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#389

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: GARY M TAYLOR

Address, City, Zip: 620 SW 35 ST Redmond 97754

Signed: GM TAY Date: 12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#390

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'

Print name: C. Zach Senkinst

Address, City, Zip: 59636 Osage Rd.

Signed: C. Zach Senkinst

Date: 12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#391

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Ricky Bats

Address, City, Zip:

538 NW Revere Bend OR 97701

Signed:

[Signature]

Date:

12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#393

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Chuck Rystedt

Address, City, Zip: 1700 NW 4th St Prineville OR 97756

Signed: Chris Rystedt Date: 12/11/03

RECEIVED

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#393

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Cody Hollis

Address, City, Zip: 3342 SW Reservoir Redmond OR 97756

Signed: Cody Hollis

Date: 12-11-03

RECEIVED

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#394

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Bob Milichichi

Address, City, Zip: 1825 SW KALAMA AVE Redmond OR 97756

Signed: Bob Milichichi Date: 12-11-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#395

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: MARIO MILICHICHI
Address, City, Zip: 3423 QUARTZ AVE 97756
Signed: Mario Milichich Date: 12-11-103

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#396

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Josh Marks
Address, City, Zip: 615 N.W. 103rd St. Redmond, OR. 97756
Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-9-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#397

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of its built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: HAROLD BLAN

Address, City, Zip: 137 N.W. McDONALD RD PRINEVILLE OR 97754

Signed: Harold M. Blan Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#398

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.

2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;
'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: DONNA L. BLAN

Address, City, Zip: 137 N.W. McDONALD RD. PRINEVILLE OR 97754

Signed: Donna L. Blan Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#399

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft

As a concerned citizen and recreationist I would like to be on record as supportive of motorized recreation on BLM lands in Central Oregon.

The preferred alternative BLM is proposing does not adequately reflect how an interim policy will be implemented. This interim policy greatly affects our sport and the users as there are no assurances BLM will ever have the resources to put together a designated trail system in the areas proposed.

The aggressive vegetation management in Alt. 7 of the Juniper woodlands will negatively impact a proposed trail system.

We do not support the closure of the Badlands and feel that providing no motorized opportunities at Prineville Reservoir and the Lapine area is a mistake. There is use occurring in those areas currently, where will that use go? Especially for the Lapine and Prineville residents.

Our use is increasing approximately 20% annually with sales of OHV equipment listed at \$18 billion annually – the increasing use is not reflected in the severe limitations to OHV use on BLM land.

Please adopt a more flexible road trail density to allow for the best use of the land and for a designated trail system that will succeed. By micromanaging your areas and attempting to put trails out for several different uses in the same areas we feel the management will fail and ultimately our use will suffer further restrictions.

Print Name NICK Wydra

Address _____

Signed Nick Wydra

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#400

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft

As a concerned citizen and recreationist I would like to be on record as supportive of motorized recreation on BLM lands in Central Oregon.

The preferred alternative BLM is proposing does not adequately reflect how an interim policy will be implemented. This interim policy greatly affects our sport and the users as there are no assurances BLM will ever have the resources to put together a designated trail system in the areas proposed.

The aggressive vegetation management in Alt. 7 of the Juniper woodlands will negatively impact a proposed trail system.

We do not support the closure of the Badlands and feel that providing no motorized opportunities at Prineville Reservoir and the Lapine area is a mistake. There is use occurring in those areas currently, where will that use go? Especially for the Lapine and Prineville residents.

Our use is increasing approximately 20% annually with sales of OHV equipment listed at \$18 billion annually – the increasing use is not reflected in the severe limitations to OHV use on BLM land.

Please adopt a more flexible road trail density to allow for the best use of the land and for a designated trail system that will succeed. By micromanaging your areas and attempting to put trails out for several different uses in the same areas we feel the management will fail and ultimately our use will suffer further restrictions.

Print Name Dan Freauff

Address _____

Signed [Signature]