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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Sites</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake &amp; Harney Counties, Oregon</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine &amp; Eastern Elko Counties, Nevada</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard &amp; Beaver Counties, Utah</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Response Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings of Natural Conditions in the Great Basin, 2006 & 2010

- **Very Unhealthy**: 3% (2006), 4% (2010)
- **Somewhat Unhealthy**: 27% (2006), 31% (2010)
- **Somewhat Healthy**: 60% (2006), 57% (2010)
- **Very Healthy**: 11% (2006), 9% (2010)
Threats to Healthy Rangelands, 2006 & 2010

- Invasive Plants: 85% (2006), 91% (2010)
- Damage to Streams: 66% (2006), 70% (2010)
- OHV: 64% (2006), 67% (2010)
- Wildfire: 61% (2006), 63% (2010)
- Over-grazing: 64% (2006), 61% (2010)
- Wild Horse Overpopulation*: 44% (2006), 56% (2010)
- Juniper Encroachment: 54% (2006), 61% (2010)

- **Livestock Grazing**: 89% (2006) & 89% (2010)
- **Prescribed Fire**: 88% (2006) & 86% (2010)
- **Felling Trees**: 78% (2006) & 79% (2010)
- **Mowing Shrubs/Grasses**: 78% (2006) & 77% (2010)
- **Chaining Trees**: 61% (2006) & 63% (2010)
- **Spraying Herbicides**: 60% (2006) & 59% (2010)
Trust in BLM & Forest Service Managers to Use Specific Practices, 2006 & 2010

- Prescribed Fire: 61% (2006), 63% (2010)
- Felling Trees: 64% (2006), 66% (2010)
- Chaining Trees: 51% (2006), 55% (2010)
- Spraying Herbicides: 45% (2006), 46% (2010)
Public Acceptance vs. Trust in Managers 2010

- Livestock Grazing: 89% Acceptability, 64% Trust
- Prescribed Fire: 86% Acceptability, 63% Trust
- Felling Trees: 79% Acceptability, 66% Trust
- Mowing Shrubs/Grasses: 77% Acceptability, 66% Trust
- Chaining Trees: 63% Acceptability, 55% Trust
- Spraying Herbicides: 59% Acceptability, 46% Trust
## Citizen Interactions with BLM and Forest Service, 2006 & 2010

### Statements About Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Percent Agree (don’t know)</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency information about projects usually provides a good explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of options and consequences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal managers use public input to help make decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal managers effectively build trust and cooperation with local</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are few opportunities for citizens to participate in the agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am skeptical of information from federal management agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Level of Trust in BLM and Forest Service over last 5 Years

- Decreased: 19%
- Not Changed: 75%
- Increased: 6%

Legend:
- Urban
- Rural*
Reasons for Decreasing Trust in Agencies

- Perceived influence of outside groups on management policies—largely environmental groups
- Managers not in touch with local communities
- Anger with current administration in Washington, DC
- Too much federal control of local decisions
Management Objectives: Immediate or High Priority, 2010

- Protect Wildlife Habitat*: 76% Urban, 60% Rural
- Reduce Invasive Plants*: 56% Urban, 47% Rural
- Reduce OHV Impacts*: 48% Urban, 29% Rural
- Reduce Wildfire Threat: 48% Urban, 41% Rural
- Forage for Grazing*: 46% Urban, 23% Rural
- Enhance Recreation: 23% Urban, 19% Rural
- Stop PP/J Encroachment*: 28% Urban, 17% Rural
- Reduce Sagebrush*: 20% Urban, 10% Rural

Legend:
- Orange: Urban
- Yellow: Rural
Major Urban/Rural Differences

• Urban residents
  ➢ See more threats: overgrazing, mining, OHV’s, development
  ➢ Fewer interactions with managers (don’t know responses)

• Rural residents
  ➢ Tend to view rangelands as healthier
  ➢ Decreased trust of managers in last 5 years
  ➢ Greater emphasis on forage for grazing
Management Implications

- High level of awareness of potential threats

- Support for treatments remain consistent over time particularly p-fire, grazing, thinning, mowing

- Overall, high level of acceptance for use of management practices to restore conditions

- Much less trust in managers’ ability to implement practices
Management Implications

• Substantially less understanding and/or agency contact among urbanites … may be an opportunity

• Findings are largely consistent with research in other Western States… except in communities where collaborative efforts among stakeholders are becoming successful.

• Much less evidence of citizen-agency collaboration in Great Basin