

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
1	01/10/19	Piute County Commissioners	Richfield, UT		x		The draft plan will bring little to no economic value to Piute County and will bring more than its fair share of additional burden to law enforcement, Search and Rescue, Road Maintenance and Emergency Services. The Bureau of Land Management will be reaping economic benefits from this proposal while adding burden to the already strained resources of Piute County. It is our belief that the draft plan will have a negative effect on Otter Creek State Park, which already struggles to maintain its viability and solvency. The negatives associated with this development outweigh any possible benefit to Piute County and its residents.
2	01/07/19	John T. Unger	Montrose, CO		x		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.
3	01/07/19	John Quillen	Knoxville, TN		x		No to your outrageous fee schemes and increases. No No No No No! This is equal to economic rape. No. No No
4	01/06/19	Mike Nadiak	Ridgway, CO		x		I have recently become aware of the BLM's stealthy attempt to add fees to camping areas that are currently free. Some of these plans may very well have some merit. However, 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.
5	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 were not publicized during the high use time of the area (spring, summer, fall). Most visitors to the camping sites under consideration for changes and new fees are completely unaware of the proposed changes and are therefore unable to make public comment concerning the proposed fee increases and reduced dispersed camping. The fact that new fees may be approved before the proposed campsites are even built does not seem right.
6	01/05/19	Janet Walworth	Palo Alto, CA		x		I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which in the recreation fees by the Monticello and Richfield District are being conducted. The process is stealthy because comments are only being accepted in the middle of the winter and over the busy yearend holidays although the areas affected receive little visitation during this period and most visitors are completely unaware this is happening. The process is rigged because the BLM has already decided to go forward with the proposal. For example, the cover letter of the Monticello proposal refers to the comment period in the past tense and has an approved 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 Advisor Council for their approval. That's only five days (or four or one depending on which day 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 per cent. I oppose reducing opportunities for free dispersed (undeveloped) camping. I oppose approving new fee sites before they are even constructed.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
7	01/04/19	Beatrice Tocher			x		As a hiker and someone who really enjoy the outdoor, I disagree with a free campground becoming a fee payable campground, and doing so even before the new campgrounds are built. Most hikers are not millionaires, but still deserve un-expensive vacations.
8	01/04/19	Eric Gerhardt	Knoxville, TN		x		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.
9	01/02/19	Ginger Harmon	Portola Valley, CA		x		I have been a hiker and backpacker in Southern Utah on a regular yearly basis for fifty years. I object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
10	01/02/19	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 backcountry, 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 camping quietly in Utah. While I do not oppose having ONE developed campground in a rec area, 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. Use real rangers and BLM workers to run the campgrounds— no concessionaires, who triple or quadruple the price and shut down the campground as soon as the high season is over. 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 it 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.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
11	01/01/19	Stephen Brown	Berkeley, CA		x		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 must 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.
12	01/01/19	Gary Dorgan	Mexican Hat, UT			x	Comment pertains to Monticello FO only.
13	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 also object to building campgrounds and imposing fees in areas that previously allowed dispersed camping without real and substantive input from the public that might use those areas. Most of all, I object to banning dispersed camping near those new proposed sites. Crowding people into developed sites and banning dispersed camping nearby reduces the recreational values of public lands and chases away those like myself who prefer to camp outside developed sites.
14	01/01/19	Lynn Buckner	San Francisco, CA			x	Comment pertains to Monticello FO only.
15	12/31/18	Paula Zerzan	Sonoma, CA		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.
16	12/31/18	Bob Brister	Salt Lake City, UT		x		I oppose the proposed fee for camping. This fee reduces camping 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.
17	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 Sound 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.
18	12/30/18	Kelly Moore	Piedmont, SD			x	Duplicate of comment #17
19	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.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
20	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.
21	12/29/18	Dr. J. Mark Tillotson			x		I am opposed to this plan and the process of taking comments while the using public is home working the American Dream which includes fee free or modest camping fees in our public lands. Get the mining companies, ranchers, etc. to pay for the use of our land and not us working men and women of America.
22	12/28/18	Dick & Kay Frantz	Montrose, CO		x		While I am sure you have some far reaching and somewhat indefensible reason for raising fees for this area it appears that your attempt to do this during the holidays is an example of why the public does not trust government agencies. The short time period for receiving comment from the public and during the holiday period certainly does not bode well for you agency. To raise fees for these areas in the first place seems totally unnecessary and excessive with out some kind of well planned reasoning and need for such rate fees. Just saying it will benefit the public is not a reason. It appears to be just a way to enhance the income for the BLM. For these reasons I cannot support and fee hikes in this area.
23	12/27/18	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,
24	12/27/18	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.
25	12/26/18	gnbaldwin@aol.com			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.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
26	12/24/18	Stephen Fleming BLM Special Agent (retired)	Alto, NM		x		I am objecting to the process by which this plan proposal is opened for comment. The comment period, for the time of year and circumstances, is far too short. It must be extended and made available so the public has a reasonable opportunity to study the plan and make informed comments. Thus, I am not commenting upon the plan in particular (with exceptions noted below), but to the idea that having a comment period that encompasses not only the Christmas holidays, when a great majority of the affected public is otherwise occupied with family matters, but also a Government shutdown of indeterminate length. 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. ... That the NPS not only feels free to divert user numbers they refuse to accommodate, but also adopts a reservation system that only increases the tourist load they invite and rely upon, is beyond the pale. The NPS should be held accountable for this unwarranted pressure on public land. Obviously, the NPS feels it's okay to burden other agencies with their problem while they maintain the fantasyland experience inside the park. The idea the NPS won't do anything until their internal administrative needs are met also simply is incredible as well as unacceptable.
27	12/24/18	Peter Wiechers	Kernville, CA		x		Moreover, opportunities for free, dispersed, undeveloped camping are being further reduced (which many people, not just myself, oppose). These proposals should be tabled at this time. Visitors to these areas must be included, not purposely shut out of the process.
28	12/22/18	Nicholas Petrochko	Woodlawn, TN		x		I am adamantly opposed to the fee increases you are trying to implement. The short and stealthy way in which this has been carried out is disgraceful. These lands are owned by the American people. There should be free and unfettered access as it has always been.
29	12/22/18	M.A. Pentis	San Diego, CA		x		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.
30	12/22/18	Chris Christiansen	Mesa, AZ		x		I am strongly objecting to the proposed changes to turn existing no-fee, undeveloped sites into developed fee charging sites. We need more undeveloped sites for recreations, NOT MORE DEVELOPED SITES. My family and many others need to be able to enjoy our nation's natural wonders without being shut out by these fees. 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.
31	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.
32	12/20/18	D. E. & B.J. Rosner	Placitas, NM		x		The purpose of this email is to express our opposition to recreation fees and/or fee increases in the Monticello and Richfield Districts. We also ask that the period for public input be extended by several months so that the BLM can receive and consider a more statistically significant response from the public. I am now 85 years old and therefore have very limited opportunities to get needed exercise and to enjoy outdoor recreation. With very little fixed income, I feel that imposing or increasing fees is a terribly unfair tax on the elderly and is discrimination against the majority of us who have regularly used, helped maintain and respected our federal lands.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
33	12/20/18	Mike Flannigan	Houston, TX		x		I oppose your plans to decrease areas now open to free, dispersed camping. Please reconsider your plans. I think your people in charge of this change have done a poor job of informing the public of these changes, and allowing a reasonable comment period for these changes.
34	12/20/18	Rich Jakino, President 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. Our organization is made up of 130 families resident in the Montrose, Colorado area. As your neighbors, we frequently travel to the areas mentioned in your proposals. We either camp out or use local hotels. We spend money on groceries, restaurants, and other businesses in these areas. The reason for our travel to these areas is the natural beauty and availability of the public lands for our recreational use. We would be happy to enter into conversations with you as it relates to public use of these areas. In the meantime we adamantly oppose your imposition of these fees and controls you are proposing.
35	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.
36	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.
37	12/19/18	lerickson14@gmail.com			x		Please dont raise the cost or add extra cost's to use BLM and public lands. It already costs us so much just to take our families out to enjoy exploring nature and getting the kids outdoors, and if you make it so we cant afford it then we will stop camping or hiking and the kids will get bored and resort to vandalism and other mischief.
38	12/19/18	Travis Sevy, Outreach Director Turning Point Centers			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.
39	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.
40	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.
41	12/19/18	Chris Ramias			x		I am writing to comment on the sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts. The process being used for these changes lacks transparency and opportunities for public input.
42	12/19/18	Bruce & Judith Lehman	Enterprise, UT		x		We 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.
43	12/19/18	Sara Ransford	Loma, CO		x		This feels like manipulation, because BLM has already decided to go ahead with the proposals regardless of public input, such as, 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.
44	12/19/18	Sara Ransford	Aspen, CO			x	Duplicate of comment #43 using different address

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
45	12/19/18	John Moeller	Tucson, AZ		x		I'm 75 and don't hike like I used to in SE Utah - but I'll never forget the hiking and camping I did. I want any young hikers looking at the relatively empty canyon country to have the same opportunity I had to hike OUR lands. I resent the way and the time at which the BLM is pushing these fee increases. It is clear that the fee increases are being put into place at a time that meant to limit public reaction. Mid winter. I really think the BLM leadership should take a look at their next pay check and see that I am paying them monthly and have some "balls" and stand up to locals, politicians, and corporations and protect the lands they are charged with defending for "we the people."
46	12/19/18	Zac Poulson	Toole, UT		x		We 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.
47	12/19/18	Zac Poulson	Toole, UT			x	Duplicate of comment #46
48	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.
49	12/19/18	Roxanne Franklin & Family	Boise, ID		x		I (WE) object to the stealthy and rigged process by which sweeping changes to recreation fees in the Monticello and Richfield Districts is being conducted.
50	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.
51	12/18/18	Ron & Carol Stoner	Durango, CO		x		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. 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.
52	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.
53	12/18/18	Bob Boyd	Prescott Valley, AZ			x	I am writing as the comment and evaluation periods for the above are in the middle of winter, over the holidays, when many people may not notice. As these proposed fee increases and limits on dispersed camping may have the effect of limiting some public access, I would encourage you to schedule a longer comment period, at a time when people are more likely to actually make comments.
54	12/18/18	Travis Bennett			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.
55	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.
56	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.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
57	12/18/18	Judy Zumwalt	Leeds, UT	x			Kudos for planning these expanded campgrounds! We certainly have no problem paying for services rendered. The facilities are more than worth the fees proposed.
58	12/18/18	Richard G. Goacher	Montana & Arizona		x		Please find ways to keep your fees as low as possible for the folks to enjoy their public lands in Utah and elsewhere. Streamline. Make constant appeals for increased funding from Congress. Do NOT put the burden on the public pocketbook via this form of an additional direct tax.
59	12/18/18	Stephen Toombs	Hurricane, 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.
60	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.
61	12/18/18	Robert Morris	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.
62	12/18/18	Michael T. Moon, R.N., B.S.,M.P.A.,M.S.			x		I don't believe this is how it was ever to be done.
63	12/17/18	Adam Wright	Louisville, TN		x		Okay, you've been busted, red handed. Why are you allowing such a short comment period during Christmas on such a big change to the camping policy ? Well , here is my comment. Don't change it. Don't charge for it. Just leave these places alone and quit trying to get into everyone's pocket any chance you get. Leave these places as they are so everyone can enjoy them regardless of their financial situation. I hope I have made my point on your shady , underhanded plans. I'm going to get back to Christmas now if you don't mind. Thanks for your time.
64	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 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. I must also say that I will do everything that I am able to legally do to prevent your warping of time frames used for comment periods, including starting an information campaign at recreation groups, REI, and anywhere else that I'm able to notify the public concerning this travesty.
65	12/17/18	Lester M. Sendecki	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.
66	112/17/18	Guy Gipson	Livingston, TX		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.
67	12/17/18	Michael Chartrand	Wausau, WI		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 Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
68	12/17/18	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. Hopefully I can find others that feel the same way and perhaps join in legal action.
69	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.
70	12/17/18	Pat Marquet	Hurricane, 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.
71	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.
72	12/17/18	Greg DeFabio			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.
73	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.
74	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 Richfield Campground 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.
75	12/17/18	Annette Keller	Aspen, CO		x		Our country is moving down the road to being a banana republic. The disregard that BLM shows for public input is in sync with our new direction. I repeat: The solution is to fund operations on the budget but until then if the public allows agencies to increase fees they are just enabling this very non-conservative republican behavior!

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
76	12/17/18	Brandt Mannchen	Humble, TX		x		For the Richfield Campground Business Plan proposal: 1. I oppose the elimination of an existing, small, free, campground and its replacement with a expanded campground where a fee is charged. 2. I do not support the construction of four new group and individual campgrounds in locations that are now free, dispersed, undeveloped, allow camping, and have ATV and equestrian trailheads. I also do not support the ban on dispersed camping within 1/2 mile of these new campgrounds. 4. I certainly do not support the BLM approving fees at newly constructed campgrounds before they are built. The BLM owes citizens an opportunity for public review and comment on any proposals new or increased fees. You bias the process and violate the Administrative Procedures Act and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). 5. The BLM has lost its way. It treats public lands not as a national and natural heritage that needs to be protected but as a "business plan" and a way to make money. The BLM is a public servant and not a commercial enterprise.
77	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.
78	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.
79	12/17/18	Carl Woodruff	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.
80	12/17/18	Bob Moore	Lyman, WA		x		No increase in fees. We already pay for use on Public lands through taxes. This will limit or eliminate use of public lands for low and fixed income people.
81	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.
82	12/17/18	Russell Sly	Payson, UT		x		I have always thought that the BLM has been a thoughtful guardian of the public right to use and enjoy the wildlands of of Utah. What is happening? Why do we now face steamroller tactics on recreational use? Is it to protect the land or is it to generate more funds for the BLM? I find the process is pretty sneaky and not in line with the intent of public comment on issues like this. Please amend your dates to a more realistic framework and state the reasons behind these proposals.
83	12/17/18	Charles Hull	St George, 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.
84	12/17/18	Mark Statham	West Valley City, UT		x		I object to this fee and think the campground should stay at no cost
85	12/18/18	Stephen Sample	Cave Creek, AZ		x		I am strongly opposed to the sneaky stealthy and rigged process you are using to raise user fees and camping access. These increases are outrageous and are nothing but a discriminatory tax on the little guy and youths who can't afford them. We must allow open and FREE access to these areas. Have the courage to go to the Trump administration and the Republican Congress and resist. NO, NO, NO.
86	12/17/18	Jim Stacy				x	Blank message – missing attachment?

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
87	12/17/18	David Pickren			x		No, I do not agree with your proposed campground plan. Whenever the government starts charging for camping, I look for a free dispersed area. I don't need your tent pads, picnic tables, drinking water, shelters, trash receptacles or any other improvements. I'm fully capable of bringing what I need and packing everything out. There are existing places that provide for everyone's needs, they are called motel rooms.
88	12/17/18	Robert Ferry	Washington, UT			x	While I use and agree that daily/annual passes should cover the expenses of Federal and State parks, I don't agree that there should be anymore layers of government fees. Please figure out a way to include these BLM responsibilities and fees into state or federal parks. Way to many layers.
89	12/17/18	Donald Scott, former National Park Service Ranger, former NASA State Educational Representative for Nevada and Montana	Nevada		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.
90	12/17/18	Chris Freeland				x	Blank message – missing attachment?
91	12/17/18	Larry Ribnick			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.
92	12/17/18	Dawn Serra			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.
93	12/17/18	William Lazarus	Girdwood, AK		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.
94	12/17/18	Dave & Connie 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. We wish to protest your plan of using this time of year and such short notice to provide public comments in regards to your anti-public land proposed policies. We also wish to protest your policy of seemingly to go ahead with proposed policies regardless of public input. It seems to me you are trying to do an end run around the public on the lands that are owned by the public but managed by you. The timing of the comments and lack of time to comment are very suspicious. We expected more transparency from the BLM. It is shameful to reduce the number of public lands open to recreation and it's a gross misuse of the public trust to increase some fees by 300%. We are totally against the reduction of public lands open to camping and especially the addition or increase in fees.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
95	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.
96	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!
97	12/17/18	Mike Davis				x	I don't believe these changes should be made without a longer comment period. These changes should also be made known in more places so more people can find out about the changes and be able to comment. Putting this notice out for only 30 days just before Christmas is a shame and doesn't give the public time to find out what you want to do and respond to the changes.
98	12/17/18	John Ong			x		Is there anyway to defund the BLM? No more fee increases.
99	12/17/18	Ralph Guay	Helena, MT		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.
100	12/17/18	Gaye Adams				x	Blank message – missing attachment?
101	12/17/18	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.
102	12/17/18	Loren Bruns	Lake Havasu City, AZ		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	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!
104	112/16/18	Dr. Andrew Eatchel	Salt Lake City, UT		x		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. You state that "The socioeconomic data on BLM campers is unknown; however, those who vacation away from home are more likely to be above-average in income ... Impacts to low-income populations are also not expected to be high, as low-income populations are not heavily represented in the BLM camper population and there is ample opportunity for free dispersed camping within the Richfield FO. " May I suggest that the reason you do not have a lot of below average income visitors is that you have already priced them out of the market! There are ways people can cut the costs of transportation to/from a recreational area by cost sharing, etc. The main costs are now the fees you charge. It is a law of economics that when you put a price on something or raise its price, a segment of society will no longer be able to afford it. I think it is wrong to assume that low-income people don't want to participate in outdoor recreation away from home or that they would not find a way to get there and sustain themselves if it weren't for the fees.

**Summary of Public Comments Received by Richfield Utah BLM Field Office
Business Plan For Richfield Field Office Campgrounds FY2019**

Comment No.	Date	Name (if provided)	Location (if provided)	Support	Oppose	Ambiguous, Blank, Duplicate, Other	Excerpt
105	12/29/18	Vi Schweiker			x		I don't like the idea of replacing dispersed camping with new and enlarged campgrounds, with the accompanying restrictions on nearby dispersed camping. I don't like to be crammed in small areas with other potentially noisy and disruptive campers. Since I sleep in my vehicle and cook on bottled gas my camping impact is little more than just parking at a trailhead to hike. All I need is a fairly flat space the size of a small SUV. I don't like additional restrictions on locations for dispersed camping, which is all too common these days. I'm not even convinced that concentrating the use in one spot is even more environmentally sound than the spread-out use of dispersed camping. I also think that offering more campgrounds increases the impact.
TOTALS				1	91	13	