

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Analysis of Comments

7/13/2007

Comments were received from the OR/WA State Office and three field offices.

1. ACEC_PLAN_DATE – concern expressed about potential confusion with the PLANID attribute. Name was changed to ACTIVITY_PLAN_DATE.
2. PLANID – new wording to describe this attribute was proposed and those changes were made.
3. ACEC_TYPE – suggested that this attribute have standard codes established. This was done. Another comment asked for some specific additions. All of those are in the domain that was established with the exception of the SEC (see next comment) code. One code was requested that is part of the ACEC_VALUE attribute so it is accommodated there instead of as part of this attribute.
4. ACEC_SEC – a couple of comments raised questions about the “secondary” ACEC code. After doing some research we found that this is not used (except possibly by one district) so it was dropped from the standard.
5. Proposed ACEC’s – concern expressed about storing ACEC proposals in the corporate database. It was never intended to store ACEC proposals in the corporate database. The “proposed” design is just presented to aid field offices when working with proposals.
6. ALTERNATIVE – concern expressed about the need a way to keep proposals under different alternative separate. This is the purpose of the ALTERNATIVE attribute.
7. ACEC_DSGN_PROCESS – new attribute requested to show how an ACEC got its designation. This is handled in the attribute PLANID (name and date of the RMP or RMPA that established the ACEC) and ACTIVITY_PLAN_DATE (the date of the activity plan for the specific ACEC).
8. ACEC_DSGN_DATE – see #7 above.
9. ACEC_LINE_TYPE – request made to add this for cartographic reasons. This need can be accommodated with views or publication datasets and does not need to be added to the edit database.
10. BLM_ORG_CODE – request to add this field. This field is part of the standard.
11. ACEC_TYPE/ACEC_LINE_TYPE (PROPOSED) – same comments as for the designated ACEC’s; same response.
12. ACEC_VALUE/ALTERNATIVE (PROPOSED ACECs) – request to add _P to the names to make them unique. After consultation with contract staff it was decided that this is not necessary. However, since the PROPOSED version of this dataset is not stored as corporate datasets, field offices may add this to their local dataset if they feel it is needed.