

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#551

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: Steve Heier

Address, City, Zip: Po Box 954, Prineville, OR 97754

Signed: Steve Heier

Date: 1-12-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#552

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: Justin Homan
Address, City, Zip: 7505 NW Eagle Dr Redmond OR 97756
Signed: [Signature] Date: 1/4/04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#553

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: Scott Fisher
Address, City, Zip: 1945 Highland Rd. Prineville 97754
Signed: Scott Fisher Date: 1, 2, 04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#554

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: Thomas L Shoof
Address, City, Zip: 12333 NE Echoe Hwy #15
Signed: Thomas L Shoof Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#555

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: NEA 1 Sheep

Address, City, Zip: 12333 NE Ochoco Hwy #14

Signed: Neal T. Sheep

Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#556

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: William Siers

Address, City, Zip: Prineville Or 97754

Signed: William Siers Date: 12-31-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#557

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:

Theresa K Siers

Address, City, Zip:

427 SW 5th place Prineville OR

Signed:

Theresa K Siers

Date:

12/31/03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#558

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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: Dennis Webster
Address, City, Zip: 486 SE Willowdale DR
Signed: Dennis Webster Date: 12-29-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

1559

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: Ryan Stout

Address, City, Zip: 724 SE Bailey RD Prineville OR 97754

Signed: Ryan Stout Date: 12-24-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#560

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: Steve Helet

Address, City, Zip: Po Box 954 Prineville, OR 97754

Signed: Steve Helet

Date: 12-19-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#561

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: Daryl Ivic

Address, City, Zip: 2318 NW, Ice Ave. Terrebonne, OR 97760

Signed: [Signature] Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#562

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 W Jocalyn

Address, City, Zip: _____

2980 NE Worthington Ct 97701 BEND

Signed: _____

Daniel W Jocalyn

Date: _____

1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#563

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: John Livingston
Address, City, Zip: 63493 Gentry loop Bend OR 97701
Signed: [Signature] Date: 1-4-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#564

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: _____

Address, City, Zip: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Cynthia Livingston
63493 Gentry Ln, Bend, OR 97701
[Signature] *01/03/03*

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#565

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: Kerry Snook
Address, City, Zip: 20856 Liberty Ln Bend, OR 97701
Signed: Kerry Snook Date: 1/3/04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#566

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: Ronald E Snook

Address, City, Zip: 20836 Liberty Lane

Signed: Ronald E Snook Date: 1/2/04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#569

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: Justin Clark
Address, City, Zip: 7140 SW Oleson Rd #3 Portland OR 97223
Signed: Justin Clark Date: 1/3/04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#568

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:

Stan Glover

Address, City, Zip:

3471 SW Glacier Redwood 97756

Signed:



Date:

1-7-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#569

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 Quinn
Address, City, Zip: PO Box 7 Culver OR 97734
Signed: Paul D. Quinn Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#570

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: Jennifer Quinn
Address, City, Zip: 211 3RD St. Culver, OR 97734
Signed: Jennifer Quinn Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#571

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: Sydney Kloepper
Address, City, Zip: 2910 SE 5th St. Apt. 23 Prineville, OR 97754
Signed: Sydney Kloepper Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#592

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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: Samantha Klopper
Address, City, Zip: 1605 Mason Dr Prineville OR 97754
Signed: Samantha Klopper Date: 1-2-04

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#513

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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: RON REISS

Address, City, Zip: 66834 Hwy 20 BEND OR 97701

Signed: Ron Reiss Date: 12-31-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#574

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: Alan Bradley

Address, City, Zip: P.O. Box 375 Sisters OR 97759

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-31-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#575

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: Randy Hubbs
Address, City, Zip: 246 NW J - PO Box Redmond, OR
Signed: [Signature] Date: 12/3/03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#576

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: WADE ISAACSON

Address, City, Zip: 10 Box 523 Donald OR 97020

Signed: Wade Isaacson Date: 1-6-04

RECEIVED

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#577

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:

Brent Maschetti

Address, City, Zip:

1738 NE Elm, Madras, OR 97241

Signed:

Brent Maschetti

Date:

12-31-03

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#578

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

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: Tyler DOWERS

Address, City, Zip: 1854 NE 3rd St Prineville OR

Signed: Tyler Dowers Date: 12/21/03

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

RECEIVED

#579

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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:

Kimi Forrester

Address, City, Zip:

2884 NW Ponderosa Ln Prineville

Signed:

[Signature]

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

#580

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: Russ Brown

Address, City, Zip: 3929 S.E. Umatilla

Signed: Russ Brown Date: 12-26-03

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#581

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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: Chance Bratt

Address, City, Zip: 1515 SE Kramer Ln Prineville OR 97754

Signed: Chance Bratt

Date: 1-06-2004

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 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: Prudence Dickenson
Address. City Zip: 6361 N.W. 59th St.
Signed: Prudence Dickenson Date: 12/26/03

RECEIVED

583

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Anne J Thomassen

Address 61310 Parrell Rd, Bend, OR 97702

Signed Anne J Thomassen

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

RECEIVED

584

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 BUY EDWARD BARNES

Address 65070 Gerking MKV. Rd.

Signed E. Edward Barnes

585

RECEIVED

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 TROY WRIGHT

Address 1940 SE COOPER PL BEND, ORE. 97702

Signed Troy Wright

RECEIVED

586

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Hayley Wright

Address 1947 SE COOPER PLACE BEND, OR 97702

Signed Hayley Wright

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

RECEIVED

587

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Rod Foshee
Address 534 NW Federal, Bend, OR 97701
Signed Rod Foshee

RECEIVED

588

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Sean Mesarich

Address 1749 NE Sonya Court

Signed Sean Mesarich

RECEIVED

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

589

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 Diane Young

Address 61061 Ropp Ln - Bend, OR 97702

Signed Diane Young

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

590

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

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 Lloyd Church

Address 13982 Smeadworth Ln, Powell Butte

Signed [Signature]

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

591

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 Dana Foshee

Address 534 N.W. Federal Bend, OR 97701

Signed Dana M. Foshee

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

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

592

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 Scott D. McKenzie

Address 6668 Woodriver Dr.

Signed Scott D. McKenzie

RECEIVED

593

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Gary D Young

Address 61061 Ropp Ln Bend

Signed Gary D Young

RECEIVED

594

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Jean McKenzie

Address 61668 Woodriver Dr Bend, Or 97702

Signed Jean McKenzie

595

RECEIVED

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Jennifer Schrimshaw

Address 18820 Tumalo Res. Rd. Bend, OR 97701

Signed 

RECEIVED

596

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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

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 TARA Hilliard

Address 515 SE 4th STREET

Signed Tara Hilliard

RECEIVED

597

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 BRYAN YOUNG

Address 515 SE 4th St Prineville, OR

Signed 

598

RECEIVED

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Jeremy Steward Ase II

Address 20659 Pine Vista DR Bend

Signed Jeremy Steward

RECEIVED

599

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Josh Lentz

Address 4321 SE 24th Gresham OR 97080

Signed Joshua E. Lentz

RECEIVED

600

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

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

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 Thomas Hurley

Address 65 SE TRACIE St Madras OR 97741

Signed Thomas Hurley