

COMMENTS ON BLUE MT. FOREST REVISION PLAN

1. We have been told in meetings that the Forest will remain open, but your plan doesn't address this. We need enforceable plan language that protects roads and use of our forest.
The vast majority of this plan is identical to the 2018 version that was withdrawn by the agency itself in 2019. We need to start a new planning process w/ public input and direction from the 2019 withdrawal decision.
2. I read in the plan there are semiprimitive zones to many areas w/out analyzing the affect on current motorized use. I request the forest Service revise the draft plan to protect motorized access, doing so recognizes my family and friends use of these ~~open~~ public lands.
3. I believe the forest Service violates -FACA- to participate in the blue Mountain Intergovernmental Council. W/out complying w/ the rules to be transparent.
I believe any content by improper advisory groups be deleted and restart a public planning process under the federal advisory committee act.
4. I believe the primitive zones that are not wilderness cuts off access, these should be rezoned as Semi-primitive motorized or roaded natural.
5. I believe the forest Service should coordinate with the Counties.

6. The plan needs to include Rural non tribal communities that rely on the forest for Subsistence. They need to include a Standard recognizing Subsistence motorized Access as a valid cultural and economic use of the forest.
7. The public needs binding language that there is a guideline that requires all future project-level decisions have a commitment to motorized access.
8. The Forest Service has verbally said that the Forest will remain open, I believe there should be enforceable plan language that protects roads and forest use

I believe the plan should reflect the needs of the people who live and rely on these forests. I request the forest Service revise the draft plan to protect the long time users of these public lands.

Marty Stroy

