

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/15/2025 7:00:00 AM

First name: June

Last name: Peterson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Forest Supervisor Wallowa-Whitman N.F.U.S. Forest Service Whitman Unit 1550 Dewey Ave Suite A Baker City, OR 97814 U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA Forest Service 2025 Preliminary Draft Proposed Land Management Plan for Malheur, Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests Forest Supervisors Office, 236 pp

Re: Comments on the Preliminary Draft Proposed Land Management Plan for Malheur, Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests pertaining to readability, mining and East Eagle Creek

Dear Sir: Enclosed are my comments on the Preliminary Draft Proposed Land Management Plan for Malheur, Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests (Draft Plan). I simply could not read this Draft Plan and understand what it was saying. I wanted to know about mining, but could not understand the desired condition "provide for ecological integrity and diversity of surface resources including endangered species, species of conservation concern". Maybe someone can tell me what this means and how it pertains to the Forest Service encouraging the development of the mineral resources. Mining must take place where the minerals are located, adverse effects must be mitigated, but mining operations are ground disturbing. The writers of this Draft Plan do not appear to understand how important the mineral resources are. In addition, 02 under Standards should be moved to the section on Special Uses. It has nothing to do with locatable, leasable, or saleable minerals. In addition, Standard 01 is not legal, as the Forest Service has no authority to approve a Notice of Intent. All the rest of the Standards and Guidelines for mineral activities are [middle dot] located in other sections of the Draft Plan. The reader must try to find out about these restrictions in other parts of the Draft Plan. Forest Service employees trying to manage the minerals program will have the same problem. The Draft Plan, which is meant to be a guiding document for the forests, also had to comply with the Plain Writing Act of 2010. The Draft Plan does not comply. The Draft Plan is very confusing and hard to follow. The Plain Writing Act of 2010 requires all government documents to be clear and readable by the general public. This means writing in a clear, concise, and well-organized manner, making information easily understandable and usable by the public. The Draft Plan fails to meet the intent of this law. I am very interested in what the Forest Service is planning for mining, but also for recreation, local communities, and scenic waterways. I kept seeing hundreds of abbreviations, like FWERC DIS-DC and MA2B-ffNA-DC and it goes on and on. I did try to read the part on page 64, under desired future conditions for Local Communities, but all I could see was things like I should refer to FW-WTR-DC, FW-AQ-DC, FW-TRI-DC, FW-REC, and MAIA-DWA DCS. These Plan Component Codes, or abbreviations, which continue throughout the document, may mean something to the Bureaucrat that wrote that section, but the general public, and even the on-the-ground Forest Service administrators, are looking for clear, concise directions. If there is something important to the subject being discussed, that information should be presented and be written in plain English. I looked at page 94-96 about wild and scenic waterways, because I live on East Eagle Creek during the spring, summer and fall. I see that East Eagle Creek is being studied again for a Forest Service recommendation to Congress to designate East Eagle Creek as a recreation waterway. I am opposed to the designation by the Forest Service of East Eagle Creek under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. But if I hadn't then looked at Appendix G on page 200, I would never have understood what the Forest Service was saying about East Eagle Creek. I do not understand why all the information couldn't be in one place in the Draft Plan. I did read that there is a total of 269 miles of waterways already designated, including Eagle Creek. I believe 269 miles of river are enough. East Eagle Creek does not meet the definition of a free-flowing, fish bearing waterway. The last time East Eagle Creek was studied, the Forest Service decided they would not recommend it for inclusion in the Act. There is good reason for this. I am very familiar with East Eagle Creek. I agree with the findings of the Eagle Creek Watershed Analysis, that East Eagle Creek goes subsurface in the summer before it reaches Eagle Creek, forming a fish barrier to fish movement during the summer and fall months. Hudson Creek, which is tributary to East Eagle Creek, also flows subsurface and does not support fish. Thus, neither waterway demonstrate "free-flowing character". The Draft Plan states that the study area may extend outside administrative boundaries. This is not true. Federal designated wild and scenic waterways do not affect private lands, and there are many patented mining claims (private land parcels) along East Eagle Creek. There are also many mining claims along East Eagle Creek, where the [frac{14}

mile buffer being proposed would prohibit any new claims<sup>1</sup> and wild and scenic waterway rules will affect current operations. On page 213 of the Draft Plan, it states East Eagle Creek is suitable because of fish. This is not true, as stated above. The Forest Service has plenty of regulations in place to manage the mining claims and the recreation activities that take place along East Eagle Creek. The East Eagle Creek Road and bridge are managed by Baker County. One of the landowners along East Eagle Creek regularly diverts the stream and makes swimming areas in the creek. East Eagle Creek should not be considered for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. In conclusion, please rewrite this Draft Plan so it is dear~ concise and understandable by the general public. Put everything about each topic in one section. Write out all abbreviations, so I can understand what the Draft Plan is saying. And finally, do not recommend East Eagle Creek to be included as a wild and scenic river. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Laura Perrigan, June Peterson Mineral and Land Owner on East Eagle Creek