

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
1	12/20/18	Lee Dusa & Rich Jakino Uncompahgre Valley Trail Riders	Montrose, CO		x		The members of our organization strongly object to the proposals you are considering relating to fee increases and recreational use controls. You have introduced these proposals with little advance announcements and a short decision time frame. Your actions are contrary to good relationships between your organization and users.
2	12/31/18	Jack E Miller MD			x		The process by which this plan is being reviewed is ill considered. A surprise announcement followed by a brief comment period regarding fair weather sites in winter is a transparent attempt to dodge true comment and establish conditions and procedures that are undesired by the citizens you are charged to serve. Are you guys too afraid of the public that you can't conduct a fair analysis ?
3	12/17/18	Stephen Hawn			x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted. The process is stealthy because comments are only being accepted in the middle of winter and over the busy year-end holidays although the areas affected receive little winter visitation and most visitors are completely unaware this is happening. The process is rigged because BLM has already decided to go ahead with the proposals regardless of public input. For example, the cover letter of the Monticello proposal refers to the public comment period in the past tense and has an approval date of January 15, 2019 already filled in - even though the comment period is currently open. For another example, both proposals will be submitted on January 11, 2019 to the statewide Resource Advisory Council for their approval. That's only five days (or four or one depending on which deadline you believe - there are three different dates specified in the documents) after the comment period closes. Clearly no honest analysis can be accomplished in such a short time. I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
4	12/17/18	Warren Woodward	Sedona, AZ		x		Both the Cedar Mesa Business Plan & Richfield Campground Business Plan are terrible. What are you thinking? Fee increases as much as 300%? Forgetaboutit! And approving new fee sites before they are even built? Forgetaboutit! Reducing free dispersed camping? Forgetaboutit! Also, you should be ashamed at your lame attempt to ram this through with a short public comment period at a time of year where few will be paying attention. From the little info you have put out, this has every appearance of being a done deal. Shame on you!
5	12/19/18	Josh Bruening	Sandy, UT		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
6	12/17/18	Pat Marquet	Hurricane, UT		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
7	12/17/18	Guy Gipson	Livingston, TX		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
8	12/17/18	Dave Foley	Ophir, CO		x		I am writing to oppose the plan for increasing fees and reducing dispersed camping in the Cedar Mesa area. I oppose raising the day use and overnight permit fees. I oppose fees for dispersed camping in Butler Wash. I oppose user fees for the roadside attractions at Mule Canyon and Butler Wash. This is outrageous, we pay enough in taxes to cover the use of our public lands for free.
9	12/17/18	Rick Antolovich (incoming land use officer, Western Slope 4 Wheelers)	Montrose, CO			x	Just a quick note on the chance to comment on the various proposed fee increases in and around Butler Wash & Cedar Mesa. Is there any way you can extend this period through Spring 2019? It's kind of tough for us at this time of year to provide the kind of input you need. I think I get the difficulty of providing access to all with responsible land management. I only would want to see a few more interested people be able to respond. As always, thanks a big bunch for everything you do,
10	12/17/18	Brandt Mannchin	Humble, TX		x		You have publicized these two important proposals, that will charge people to pay for access to their public lands, on a webpage that few people know about and in the heart of the Christmas and New Year's holiday season when few people will learn about these two proposals.. Shame on you for doing as little as you can to let the public know that these proposals exist.
11	12/17/18	Annette Keller	Aspen, CO		x		Some light needs to shine on the internal processes at BLM! - Are you mandated to serve the interests of the public & public lands? - Is this best accomplished by sending notice for public feedback in the off-season, right before Christmas? - Is the public served when proposals presuppose public approval? - Are you doing your due diligence by analyzing the public response in only 5 days? - Are you being honest by approving fees for sites that do not exist yet?
12	12/17/18	Allan Morgan	Eagle Mountain, UT		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
13	12/30/18	Bradford Townsend	Winterhaven, CA		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
14	12/17/18	Jim Stacy	Westminster, CO		x		I am against the proposed increase in user fees and the proposal to formalize dispersed camping in the area. I am also requesting the the BLM provide a meaningful opportunity for public input on these proposed fees and other changes.
15	12/17/18	David Pikren			x		No, I do not agree with your plan to increase fees. The area doesn't need so called human improvements. Just leave it as is with dirt roads and dirt parking areas and stop increasing fees. When government agencies first started charging the public to park and walk into the woods was one of the most absurd ideas ever. Since the government sees fit to charge us to walk on trails, I sure as hell won't volunteer my time anymore on trail crews.
16	12/17/18	Chris Freeland			x		I am concerned with the process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
17	12/18/18	Dawn Serra			x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
18	12/17/18	W.H. Wolverton	Escalante, UT		x		NO fee increases for Cedar Mesa overnight hiking or day use NO new fees for Butler Wash dispersed camping NO new fees for Mule Canyon and Butler Wash ruins interpretive sites on highway 95
19	12/17/18	Dave Christiansen	Warrenville, IL		x		My wife and I are retired and live on a fixed income. We come out to Utah and enjoy our public BLM lands for several months each year, exploring new areas and responsibly camping in our RV. We are in our 70s and cannot do this much longer. We've been visiting your area for almost 35 years now, once or twice each year. More and more, our public lands have been either been placed off-limits or fees imposed. This is a major issue for us.
20	12/17/18	James Wright	Bothell, WA		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
21	12/17/18	Trent Sanders	La Canada, CA		x		We should NOT have to pay a fee to visit our land. We the people own the land, NOT the BLM! The BLM needs to put their funding into the land, NOT into increasing the BLM's bureaucracy!
22	12/17/18	H.C. Juengst	Topock, AZ		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
23	12/17/18	Loren Bruns	Lake Havasu City, AZ		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
24	12/17/18	James MacFarlane				x	Please extend the time for public comment to a span of time that will allow for the this plan to be received by and responded to by the maximum number of interested public. Allow for comments at least through one high-use season and post notices conspicuously in all rec areas the plan effects.
25	12/18/18	Susan Smith	Delta, CO		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
26	12/18/18	Robert Morris	Montrose, CO		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
27	12/17/18	Mark Gall	Placitas, NM		x		I am a retired NPS law enforcement ranger, was also a BLM law enforcement ranger in the Burley District in Idaho, and have decades of experience camping on public lands in many States. I also lived and camped in Utah at Dugway Proving Ground during my 3 years military time. I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
28	12/17/19	Jon Klingel	Santa Fe, NM		x		As a former BLM employee and US citizen I am amazed and appalled that you would propose such atrocious and I believe illegal plans. It is quite obvious that the decision has already been made without public input, which I believe is illegal, and that you appear to be making a great effort to avoid public input by such a short comment period during the winter holiday season. This strikes me as highly unethical, unprofessional and probably illegal behavior. I was fortunate that the BLM employees I worked with and knew, all seemed to be highly ethical and acted in a professional manner. I have to conclude you are apparently under significant pressures or threats in the Utah offices. I regularly hike and camp in the areas of your plans, sometimes several times a year. I prefer the dispersed camping. Living mostly on social security, additional and unreasonable costs matter to me. I strongly object to your plans.
29	12/19/18	Jaran Higley	Utah		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
30	12/18/18	Bob & Sharon Scott	Montrose, CO		x		This e-mail is to let you know we oppose the raising of fees in these areas.
31	12/18/18	Ron & Carol Stoner	Durango, CO		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted. We have visited many of the areas at risk of these new fees many times over the course of 35 years of living in the southwest.
32	12/18/18	Mark Cooke	Elizabethtown, KY		x		If these changes are slammed into action without the proper input my backpacking friends and I will find other areas to do our outdoor recreation activities. You are a long way from central Kentucky and when we have visited these areas in the past we spend considerable monies that help the local communities. It is expensive to travel and we will have no part of what appears to be a blatant disregard for a fair and equitable process to do an honest analysis.
33	12/18/18	Bob Boyd	Prescott Valley, AZ		x		I'm concerned that the comment period has been set in the middle of winter, over the holiday season. Since the proposal may actually limit public access by raising fees and limiting dispersed camping in some areas, I would encourage a longer comment period at a time when you might actually receive more comments, as well as the time to evaluate comments, before making a final decision.
34	12/18/18	Travis Bennett			x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted. We have visited many of the areas at risk of these new fees many times over the course of 35 years of living in the southwest.
35	12/18/18	Willa Renken, President Owyhee Gem & Mineral Society	Kuna, ID		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted. We have visited many of the areas at risk of these new fees many times over the course of 35 years of living in the southwest.
36	12/19/18	Chris Ramias			x		The process is minimizing opportunities for public input because BLM has already decided to go ahead with the proposals regardless of public input.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
37	12/19/18	Bruce & Judith Lehman	Enterprise, UT		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
38	12/19/18	Zac Poulson	Toole, UT		x		The process is minimizing opportunities for public input because BLM has already decided to go ahead with the proposals regardless of public input.
39	12/19/18	Brad Mower	Bluffdale, UT		x		I'm voicing my concern. You folks need to do more to work with those of us using public lands. Your attempt to pull one over on us only serves to distance trusted, working relationships between the Government and Public.
40	12/20/18	Mike Flannigan	Houston, TX		x		I oppose your plans to increase camping fees at Cedar Mesa and institute a fee at Butler Wash and the roadside interpretive sites. Please reconsider your plans.
41	12/19/18	Todd Butikofer	Menan, ID		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
42	12/19/18	Michael Herbert			x		I strongly oppose these exhorbant fee hikes by the BLM, you charge excessive fees and give NOTHING IN RETURN. These parks and camping areas belong to the Citizens of the United States and are not for you too pad you pocket books with, If you made improvments on the properties that the fee's are paid for that would be different but WE all know that does not happen. Mad as Hell
43	12/22/18	Chris Christiansen	Mesa, AZ		x		My family and many others need to be able to enjoy our nation's natural wonders without being shut out by these fees. We need more undeveloped, no-fee recreation sites, not more developed sites and increased fees for developed sites. The federal general budget funds should be used to cover the minimal costs it takes to keep undeveloped sites open for no-fee access. The BLM should also give credit to the many volunteer hours people spend supporting the BLM in taking care of our natural resources.
44	12/22/18	Suzanne Clarke				x	Blank message
45	12/21/18	Connie Parker	Box Elder, SD		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
46	12/21/19	John Parker	Box Elder, SD		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
47	12/21/18	Marilyn Ghere	Laguna Beach, CA		x		I am writing to say that I strongly oppose the process being used by BLM regarding the proposal to increase fees and to develop public land that is currently open for free, undeveloped camping. We who greatly enjoy getting out and spending time in our undeveloped open spaces don't want to see them developed. Undeveloped public land is what we desire. Keep currently free areas free, and please don't increase fees as high as proposed. I urge the Bureau to give people a lot more notice about their intentions. I urge you to give more time for comments from the public, and then take these comments seriously before making decisions.
48	12/20/18	Bill & Karen Murrow			x		We are on a fixed income and cannot afford to lose or pay for dispersed camping. Many thousands are the same. Utah will lose a lot of tourist money if the proposed plans are implemented

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
49	12/28/18	Amanda Podmore (Friends of Cedar Mesa)	Bluff, UT	x			Friends of Cedar Mesa writes to provide comment in support of the Cedar Mesa Business Plan, specifically the proposed fee changes for day and backpacking use the Cedar Mesa Special Recreation Management Area and the Butler Wash area of the Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone. It is critical to on-the-ground protection and enforcement that fees be collected and retained locally to support law enforcement, ranger staffing, education, and public safety. We support the proposed fee changes and proposed management changes at Moon House. As the BLM points out in the Business Plan, fees have not changed since 1999 to reflect visitation trends and visitor management needs. FCM believe it's very important for BLM to be taking these proactive measures at this time, as the Comb Ridge Area in particular has been seeing significantly increased visitation, due to its accessibility and proximity to Bluff. The fee structure provides a funding stream to help address increased visitor pressures and provided amenities to decrease issues on the ground, such as human waste and trail erosion issues. We appreciate the mention of Friends of Cedar Mesa and the Visit with Respect Ambassador Program as an important tool for responding to visitor education needs. Additionally, any use of collected fees in support of "trailhead kiosks with directional, etiquette, and interpretive information" as mentioned would be a positive win for front country and middle country sites in the SRMA and RMZ. We offer our continued assistance to the Monticello Field Office in developing and helping install educational signs like kiosks.
50	12/17/18	Jesse Smith	Utah		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
51	12/24/18	Stephen Fleming BLM Special Agent (retired)	Alto, NM		x		This timing and scheduling, along with seeing in a very quick reading that the outcome already is forecast before the comment period ends (with projected implementation dates), in no way meets even a minimum agency obligation to allow for adequate notice to the public. The obvious implication that the outcome is predetermined regardless of public comment is, in a word: UNACCEPTABLE.
52	12/24/18	Peter Wiechers	Kernville, CA		x		I'm writing to you to not only object to the massive changes in recreation fees that are being proposed, but also to object to the process by which this is being done.
53	12/23/18	Brett LeCompte			x		I strongly object to the major changes being proposed for the Cedar Mesa/ Butler Wash area of the Monticello Field Office. Fee hikes of 188% to 300% for overnight hiking and day use permits seem extreme. In Butler Wash, I've always cherished my ability to enjoy free dispersed camping and hiking and do not wish to see this ending. I particularly object to the stealthy and seemingly rigged process which the BLM is undertaking with a short comment period during the holiday season and assuming the changes proposed are a foregone conclusion.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
54	01/01/19	Chris Schiller	Ft Collins, CO		x		I object to the clandestine process and the forgone conclusions of the proposed new business plan. BLM seems to be going through the motions of soliciting public comment with no real intention of receiving public comment on the proposal. I am a frequent visitor to the Cedar Mesa area, and I usually camp outside campgrounds (dispersed camping). Charging feeds for dispersed camping is a blatant attempt to increase revenues without providing any services. It is nothing more than a self-justifying process: areas must be patrolled to ensure compliance, so fees must be charged to fund the patrols. It is contrary to recreation ethics and represents a further commodification and degradation of public land values. I oppose the imposition of fees for dispersed camping.
55	12/31/18	Paula Zerzan	Sonoma, CA		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
56	12/31/18	Bob Brister	Salt Lake City, UT		x		I oppose the proposed fee increases for camping at Cedar Mesa. Increased fees reduce the opportunities for low and middle income families. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed camping. Increase the public comment time so this is not a rigged deal.
57	01/06/19	Heidi Nadiak	Ridgway, CO		x		The process by which these changes are being made is sneaky. The public comment window has fallen during the busy holiday season, and the proposed changes to the fee structure were not publicized during the high use time of the area (spring, summer, fall). Most visitors to the Cedar Mesa area are completely unaware of the proposed changes and are therefore unable to make public comment concerning the proposed fee increases and reduced dispersed camping. I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fees for roadside interpretive sites. I oppose the BLM choosing to act on these very important decisions without much opportunity for the public to comment.
58	01/05/19	Janet Walworth	Palo Alto, CA		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
59	01/04/19	Eric Gerhardt	Knoxville, TN		x		<p>This is no way for a government agency, supposedly acting in consideration of the American public, to conduct "business." Your process for collecting feedback on new and increased recreation fees on both the Monticello and Richfield districts is highly suspicious, to say the least. A short comment period over the Holidays looks much like the Trump Administration's release of the recent climate report. What percentage of visitors to these areas of theirs do you suppose will know anything of these proposed (predetermined?) changes prior to showing up in the spring or summer of 2019? The fact that an approval date has already been filled in on the cover letter of the Monticello proposal and that the review period for the comments generated by these "proposed" changes is less than a week points to a predetermined outcome and no real way for the public to be informed on -- or to inform -- the future course of their lands. Though our opinions appear to be worthless to our so-called public servants/stewards in the BLM, I want to be on the record as ardently opposed to these fee increases (300% in at least one instance!) and any reduction to the opportunity for free dispersed camping. And, in case it isn't clear already, I'm opposed to the self-serving, stealthy tactics employed by BLM, an obvious attempt to deny Americans information and a voice in the substantial changes BLM intends to implement. This is just another example of why so many in our country have so little trust in "their" government agencies.</p>
60	01/01/19	Stephen Brown	Berkeley, CA		x		<p>Unfortunately, it appears that BLM wants to absolutely minimize public input here, inferring from the time of publication (winter, holidays) and the very short comment deadline. I vigorously object to this schedule, and suggest that the deadline be extended by some more usual time period (maybe 40 to 60 days?). This would allow the message to be conveyed through organizations of interested land users who would be impacted by the proposed changes. It further appears that BLM is not sincerely, or even officially, interested in outside comment, as the process documentation (for the Monticello proposal) includes evidence that a decision has already been made, and that BLM simply awaits the date set for signing an approval (an approval that cannot yet officially be decided). I have worked with BLM on a number of plans for group outings on Cedar Mesa, and I do believe in the professional ethic of these managers. This curtailed process, however, makes me question the kind of considerations that have gone into setting it up. The public deserves a fair opportunity to review this kind of proposals, and a reasonable time period for making input.</p>

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
61	01/07/19	John T. Unger	Montrose, CO		x		I am objecting to the hidden, deceptive process that you are using right now, to change recreation fees in Monticello District and in Richfield District. Scheduling this narrow window of comments, at this ending of the holiday cycle, resembles a back-door effort to minimize comments, as opposed to what your job description says you should be doing with gathering/maximizing comments. It's wrong to do it this way, and reflects poorly on the find BLM staff and employees and managers. It looks like a foregone conclusion when you act in this way, by submitting the fee-change proposals to the Resource Advisory Council on 1-11-2019, thus without allowing proper time for real analysis of comments. I have visited these sites in recent years, and have experience with the area. I am in strong opposition to these fee increases, being in the range of apparently two hundred and three hundred percent. I am in opposition also to your proposal to reduce opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. And I am in opposition to approving new fee sites before they have been constructed.
62	01/06/19	Mike Nadiak	Ridgway, CO		x		I have recently become aware of the BLM's stealthy attempt to dramatically increase user fees on Cedar Mesa. The addition of new fees to visit Mule Canyon and Butler Wash ruins is concerning. The biggest issue I have is the PROCESS whereby many users of the area are totally unaware and/or inconvenienced by the comment period falling over the Holidays. Perhaps this whole process should be "shut down", just like much of the Federal Government?? I encourage you to suspend the comment period and reopen it for Public comment in the Spring.
63	12/17/18	Suzi Smith	Idaho Falls, ID & St George, UT		x		We object of your new plans to charge fees and limit dispersed camping as per the Cedar Mesa Business Plan. We are retired seniors and being able to get out and camp and recreate and being able to afford to do so is one of our great joys of senior citizens. We already pay enough taxes to run government.
64	12/17/18	Brad & Mishelle Cary	Utah		x		We strongly object to the sneaky and rigged process by which your office is attempting to make sweeping changes to recreation use fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts.
65	12/17/18	Larry Ribnick	Crawford, CO		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
66	12/17/18	Corey Bloom	Montrose, CO		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
67	12/17/19	David Archibald	Cave Creek, AZ		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
68	12/19/18	Kim Kobylarz	West Haven, UT		x		I oppose the following: Huge fee increases. Reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. Approving new fee sites before they are even constructed. Please review the process and ensure that their is a reasonable amount of time for public input so that decisions that are made are for the good of all of us.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
69	12/30/18	Kelly Moore	Piedmont, SD		x		I object to changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being considered by the BLM. I am concerned that the narrow window for comment on these changes will limit the amount of input from the public. The dramatic increase in fees some as high as 300% will prevent many from using these public lands. Also, by reading the verbiage in the proposals, it sounds like the decision has already been made. . Clearly no honest analysis can be accomplished in such a short time. Even though my home address is in South Dakota I spend much of my retired life in these areas and would hate to see the change and go away. I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
70	12/17/18	Greg DeFabio			x		You should be a shamed for these shady style deals!
71	12/19/18	Paul Stumpf	Andover, VT		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
72	12/19/18	Margaret Lucas			x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
73	12/17/18	Donald Scott Former National Park Service Ranger, Former NASA State Educational Representative for Nevada and Montana			x		The fact that a document for PUBLIC lands is called a "business plan" gives away the intention here – to join the corporate state, represented at the moment by Trump, in privatizing public assets. Since the citizens, not the Trumpeters, pay your salary, I hope you understand that your duty is to us, not those scoundrels. This is reminiscent of the Yosemite Master Plan controversy of 1986. The plan was drawn up to benefit the concessionaire, but discovered by members of the Yosemite Natural History Association and distributed, so that all of us who love Yosemite were able to comment and defeat the plan – which included a tram to Glacier Point. . . . I use BLM lands, here in Nevada and elsewhere in the west, and will do all I can to defeat this sneak attack on the concept of "public lands," and the idea that such plans must be available for public comment.
74	01/01/19	Harvey Halpern	Cambridge, MA		x		While I object to your proposed raising of use fees on Cedar mesa, I even more vociferously object to your stealthy, underhanded way of announcing these changes. Doing it in the dead of winter during the holiday season insures that you'll get few comments. Which is what you want because you know most people will oppose these plans. Try to remember we live in a democracy not a dictatorship.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
75	12/21/18	Jack Benter Adventure Coordinator, Tahoe Expedition Academy			x		I work for a school who has brought our students to Cedar Mesa area in order to experience a real world classroom for Native American history. More recently we have been studying the political affects of the presidential administration use of the Antiquities act and the protection or exclusion of public land. The Monticello Field Office has been very difficult to work with throughout these educational experiences. Though I absolutely support more interpretation and educational representation in the new monuments and throughout the greater Cedar Mesa area, I opposed greater fees for groups and especially school groups. If your proposed fees would continue to put schools in a class of commercial user and then charge potentially \$100-\$150 for a day hike and then \$300-\$450 to accomplish an overnight trip, in addition to other vehicle fees and weekly fees, I OPPOSE the fee increase. To me the greater concern is the lack of the field office to differentiate a school visit from commercial users. This lack of differentiation has clear repercussions on the ability of United States youth to witness and experience a living classroom within our public lands. These public lands were supposedly set aside for future generations. Now the Monticello Field Office and the BLM employees interpretation of commercial users and placing schools within these limits does not allow the future generations to actually see these lands, unless of course, you come from affluence and have more \$.
76	01/05/19	Douglas Tooley	Mountain Village, CO			x	I am a disabled individual living on a fixed income residing in SW Colorado and a frequent visitor to the area, including extensive volunteer work through Friends of Cedar Mesa. I've done this for three years, most recently working on the 'House on Fire' restoration project, the cover photograph for this plan. I have become aware of this plan via other channels than Friends, folks who have process/notification concerns I'd like to second those concerns. I am however in support of these fee increases and the expansion of the regulated area to include Butler Wash - with one caveat. I hold a disabled public lands pass and although it is clear this area is not eligible for a fee waiver the 50% fee discount is not documented on the remote site envelopes. . . The patterns of informal use in this area are largely responsible, let's hope that continues.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
77	1/2	Charles Woodward	Victor, ID		x		As a life-long public lands user, taxpayer, and outdoors person, your process offends me. I strongly oppose all attempts to commercialize and privatize the public lands, especially so when it comes to public recreation. While I am mostly a back-country, off-grid camper, I occasionally use developed campgrounds, at access points. Typically they are ghettos with little screening between sites, crowding, noise, and have become very expensive, so I avoid them and go boondocking. I like Butler Wash and Cedar Mesa, and have visited on and off for more than 40 years. . While I do not oppose having ONE developed campground there, it should be a good one, but simple—minimize the built environment, allow for good spaces between units, and keep the price VERY reasonable. LOTS of undeveloped camping should be allowed, to keep the crowds dispersed and the environment quiet. Worried about sanitation? Put in a couple of extra pit toilets. I have long objected to ANY day-use fees and almost all so-called "wilderness fees" for permits for the use of public lands. The ONLY meaningful use for permits should be so rangers can contact and educate users prior to letting them enter the rec area. (This rarely happens). They should not be used to try to make a profit from land which belongs to the public. They should be VERY reasonable if existing at all. Day-use should always be free. Interpretive sites should be free, you NEED to educate people about how to treat the public lands, and you need for the public to APPRECIATE the public lands or they won't tell their senators and representatives to support your budget for public recreation. Fees just piss people off.
78	12/19/18	cap503fd@aol.com			x		To whom this may concern I do not like the idea of setting up fees for camping on BLM land. I do not like the way it is underhandedly announced to very few people. My vote is no.
79	12/22/18	M.A. Pentis	San Diego County, CA		x		The BLM lands are for all American's use, not just a way to make money for another entity's interest. As a limited income senior, camping fee increases will drastically impact my ability to enjoy our PUBLIC LANDS. I am retired and now hope to be able to utilize free camping on BLM lands. As fees now stand, it is one of the few ways I can afford to see MY country while I am still able to camp.. With your apparently planned limited public input, you cannot reach an objective and impartial reasonable opinion.
80	01/01/19	Gary Dorgan Local Business Owner	Mexican Hat, UT			x	I am writing to express my concern pertaining to proposed fees/increases for recreational activities on and around Cedar Mesa. I would request that the public participation comment period be extended. The period is very short for meaningful consideration and is squeezed into a time slot containing the Holidays when many people are unavailable. I also was not aware of this process until this writing. Did I miss the public notifications or could I be notified directly concerning these types of actions? If my understanding is correct, there would be significant fee increases for day use. With more time to evaluate and discuss, perhaps an alternative area wide pass/permit system that would be equitable can be considered. As a local business owner I know that the visitors to this region are supportive of Public Lands and I feel we need to consider how these actions will affect them as well. I consider myself to be active in the Public Lands process, but this action was completely unknown to me. Please give the public more time to work on this issue.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
81	12/17/18	Paul Williams	New Harmony, UT		x		The timing of this proposal looks like an NED RUN AROUND THE PEOPLE affected by this proposal. In light of the gutting of Bears Ears, your priorities SHOULD BE TO INCREASE VISITATION. The fee structure will reduce camping sites and shut out less monies people who need these lands the most lacking money to go to Africa. PLEASE DO NOT IMPOSE NEW FEES at least until a proper public comment period is done later.
82	12/19/18	Henry Whiteside				x	Message consists of only one word
83	12/17/18	Mark Statham	West Valley City, UT		x		I object to the proposed fee increases. Let's leave the area in its present state .
84	12/18/18	Stephen Toombs	Hurricane, UT		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
85	01/04/19	Beatrice Tocher			x		As a hiker and someone who enjoys the outdoor, I find that your proposed fee increase of between 188% and 300% depending on the season unacceptable. Most hikers and campers are not millionaires, yet still need to have reasonably priced vacations.
86	12/29/18	Deborah Austin			x		I have copied and pasted this suggested response but I totally agree with it. I'm an avid outdoors person and BIG fan of public lands, monuments and parks, who has not only spent much vacation time in these areas, but has also volunteered with orgs that have assisted the BLM in various projects in Utah. I am also a nurse with current CA and UT licenses. Your approach is like the recent auctioning off of public lands in Utah in Dec. to the oil industry without public comment and am hoping illegal. Short sighted, selfish, just to make a few rich at the expense of the public and those who live close by (pollution). I realize this admin has defunded much of the services to public lands. Please find other ways than to pass more onto the taxpayer. You are on front lines to take care of these precious resources that so many enjoy at a time when most Americans find their incomes insufficient.
87	12/20/18	Bill & Karen Murrow			x		We are retired, fixed income and live in our rv. We could not do this had it not been for BLM dispersed camping. Be aware many thousands are like us and cannot afford to pay for camping. Utah will lose a ton of tourist dollars if the proposed changes go into affect.
88	12/19/18	Jeremy Laws			x		This is a joke its not right to charge people to enjoy our land land of the free home of the brave. Not pay. Step foot on the land and pay. I do not agree to this what so ever. There are people that can barely afford to go out for a weekend. Let alone trying to charge them to enjoy public land. I do not agree.
89	12/17/18	Michael T. Moon, R.N., A.S., B.S., M.P.A.,M.S.			x		This is not the way it is to be done.
90	12/18/18	Mike Coronella	Moab, UT		x		I will not pay to recreate on land that is concurrently grazed...that is literally asking me to subsidize that destruction.
91	12/19/18	Roxanne Franklin & Family	Boise, ID		x		I oppose (we oppose) these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I (We) oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
92	12/18/18	rcollis79@gmail.com			x		As a frequent visitor to the area, I'm disappointed with the proposal to raise the fees to access our public land. Please reconsider raising the price to enjoy public lands. Most Americans have not had increases to our income, but have had increases to our cost of living. The proposed changes will make accessing public land impossible for many people.
93	112/16/18	gnbaldwin@aol.com			x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
94	12/17/18	Michael Chartrand	Wausau, WI		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
95	12/19/18	Travis Sevy Outreach Director, Turning Point Centers	Sandy, UT		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
96	12/17/18	Lester M. Sendeki	Montrose, CO		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
97	12/17/18	Luce Cruz			x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
98	12/17/18	Gaye Adams	Tucson, AZ		x		My husband and I are OPPOSED to this attempt to subvert public opinion by ramming these ideas through without public comment. We don't yet know what to do about it, and we hope the BLM will reconsider. The Public is NOT your enemy, we continually advocate for better funding for public lands by taxation, and believe most citizens would support it.
99	12/19/18	David Gillette			x		I have read the proposal for the increase in fees and feel it's not a good idea to do that. The area is not that highly used and it's accessible to those that want to get out for the day or weekend. Increase in fees would limit the number of people that can afford to see our pristine lands. Please don't do that.
100	12/17/18	Paul Williams	New Harmony, UT			x	Duplicate of comment #81
101	01/01/19	Lynn Buckner	San Francisco, CA		x		I'm a frequent visitor to Cedar Mesa. I just heard about the secretive process by which huge changes are being made to recreation fees at Cedar Mesa, Butler Wash, and Mule Canyon. I am writing to you to let you know I oppose the new fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing the opportunities for free dispersed camping. And I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed. It's not fair to try to sneak this through during the winter and the holiday season. This sweeping change needs public input and that takes more time than you are allowing. Please amend your time table for a fair discussion of this matter.
102	12/19/18	Don Trotter	Washington, UT		x		I oppose these fee increases of as much as 300%. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.
103	12/17/18	Ron Roundtree	Montrose, CO		x		We are opposed to any new fees for the use of BLM lands of any kind. We pay our fair share of taxes, stay the trails and gather any trash we may find on public lands. If you want people to respect BLM assets, then respect the people who use them.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
104	12/17/18	Aaron Johnson	Denver, CO		x		The addition of fees and the proposed plan for the Cedar Ridge area is not acceptable, and the timing for the review process seems suspect to "running under the radar" with cover of the holiday season. I suggest you change the public review and input period to a later date in 2019. If fees go up, visitation will go down. I'm one of those visitors from Colorado.
105	01/07/19	John Quillen	Knoxville, TN		x		In what world do you think you have the right to charge taxpayers, yet again, these exorbitant fees? No, No, No, No.
106	12/17/18	Bill Quapp	Heber City, UT			x	In general, I appreciate the need for fee increases that are used for improvements in BLM recreational properties. However, I am opposed to the large bump in fees all in one year. I propose that you limit the fee increases to a maximum of 25%. You can generate additional fees by increasing again in a couple of years. Alternatively, a 10% fee increase each year for several years is an alternate strategy. Just as the large fee increases at National Parks failed due to the opposition, I believe public opposition will also cause this fee increase to fail.
107	12/17/18	Wayne LaGrone	Littleton, CO		x		We really don't feel the process is aimed at getting feed back from the public re: raising park fees, but to appear to be interested only. Public land means just that and the governing bodies should be sincerely interested in the public's opinion, not it sliding something in place to the best interests of the bureau and employees and very minimal value to the public. We have No interest in new fees on public lands.
108	12/17/18	Gaye Adams	Tucson, AZ			x	Duplicate of comment #98
109	12/17/18	Corey Bloom	Montrose, CO			x	Duplicate of comment #66
110	01/02/19	Ginger Harmon	Portola Valley, CA		x		I have been hiking and backpacking in Southern Utah yearly for the last fifty years--often several times a year. I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
111	12/19/18	John Moeller	Duluth, MN		x		I am now 75 and don't hike SE canyons like I used to but I want any younger hiker to have the experience I was able to have. We hikers do not abuse the land or the environment and I deeply resent your under-handed attempts to financially gouge and limit people's access to THEIR canyons. The fact that this statement period is taking place in the dead of winter is a thinly veiled attempt to limit replies and indicate little hiker interest. It is really time for the BLM to start acting like they represent the the citizens of this great country - not the wealthy and corporations which would exclude me from MY lands.
112	12/17/18	Larry L. Whiting	Hurricane, UT		x		The proposed fee increases in Utah are a sham for two reasons. The increases are highly inordinate and you are obviously leaving to little time during the busiest time of the year for public comment. I respectfully request additional time for public comment rather than rush something as important as this to be pushed through with such little notice and published notification. Leaves all kinds of unpleasant feelings about how THE PUBLIC IS BEING TREATED on this BY OUR PUBLIC SERVANTS.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
113	12/16/18	Dr. Andrew Eatchel	Salt Lake City, UT		x		<p>I have read your proposal and as a member of the public who uses public lands, I object to any attempt to charge new, or increase existing, fees that have the effect of restricting access to the economically disadvantaged which your plan will do. I find it interesting that the document justifies overuse of the resources and a desire to increase the size (number of personnel) of the field office as reasons for implementing new and increasing existing fees while at the same time, public lands agencies are constantly advertising (TV, radio, etc.) for new visitors as if use of "public" land is endangered. The larger the field office gets, the more money it will need to sustain itself in the future and the greater will be future fee increases. The BLM is not a business and should not be operated as such. The purpose of any land management agency is, or at least used to be, to keep the lands open and available to everyone. Dispersed camping, which is preferred by many, is becoming harder to find all the time. One of the main reasons is that more and more of the dispersed (undeveloped) camping areas are being taken over and used as fee sites with lots of amenities that are unaffordable to many and undesirable to many more. I believe that the BLM is biased or prejudiced toward this type of camping which is not necessary in order to preserve the resources. I also see that there is a drive these days to begin charging for hiking and similar activities. I suspect it will become an expensive proposition to take a walk in the woods in the future. Your increased fee for back-country hiking/camping will of course eliminate a segment of the population from using the resource as any other price increase does in basic economics.</p>

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Monticello Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Cedar Mesa FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
114		Kitty Benzar Western Slope No Fee Coalition	Durango, CO		x		<p>[Conclusion of email exchange with Matt Blocker in state office] Benzar: Re: your responses to my concerns: The link to the proposals is not provided at the RAC website where the meeting dates are announced: https://www.blm.gov/get-involved/resource-advisory-council/near-you/utah/RAC Nor is the link included in this news article which appears to be a verbatim copy of what went out to the media: https://www.lakepowelllife.com/blm-utah-resource-advisory-council-to-meet-in-salt-lake-city/ It seems like BLM crafted two different press releases: one for the media that frames the meeting as just routine boring government business, and another buried on an obscure website purporting to be a notice to the public to read and comment on the proposals. The distribution of this second "public notice press release" is not clear. I have also to question how widely either press release was distributed given that no major newspaper in Utah, and no regional newspaper in SE Utah, has picked up the story to date. As you know, it's a requirement of FLREA that "The Secretary shall publish notice of a new recreation fee or a change to an existing recreation fee established under this chapter in local newspapers and publications located near the site at which the recreation fee would be established or changed." Sending out a press release that obscures the content of the meeting and that never gets published does not fulfill this legal obligation. If a media outlet declines to pick it up as a news story, you should publish it as an advertisement. [Blocker: The RAC agenda will be posted here once it is finalized.] Benzar: When will that be? Very very few members of the public can carve out two days in the middle of the work week to attend a meeting that may require them to travel a considerable distance. But for those who can, they deserve to know when the issue they are interested in will be discussed and decided so that they can plan ahead and use their limited time as productively as possible.[Blocker: It is the responsibility of the public to educate themselves on the process to provide meaningful public comment.] Benzar: So the public, instead of pursuing their holiday activities should instead be monitoring obscure government websites to find out about changes coming to recreation areas that they never use in the winter months? Really? [Blocker:. . . they will incorporate any substantial comments received during the comment period into the business plans before the RAC meeting. The offices will also summarize the public comments received and present the summary to the RAC meeting.] Benzar: We have previously documented BLM Utah offices (and other federal land agencies) presenting skewed and misleading "summaries" to the RAC in order to get their approval. The only way anyone can ground-truth their summary is by obtaining the raw comments under FOIA. The time frame here does not allow that. Sorry, this is a transparent effort to slide these proposals in under the public's radar, not to engage in meaningful public participation. I stand by my earlier comments.</p>
TOTALS				1	103	10	