

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/29/2025 7:00:00 AM

First name: Johnny

Last name: West

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Umatilla National Forest Supervisor's Office Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision 72510 Coyote Road Pendleton, Oregon 9780127 September 2025 Dear Forest Supervisors Office, I would like to submit my comments regarding the Preliminary Draft Proposed Land Management Plan. I live in Boise, Idaho, but have mined in North East Oregon (full and part time) for the past 30+ years. It is a tough business, but I enjoy the challenge, and I enjoy being in the mountains, for many reasons, not just mining.

Comment #1: The proposed plan is confusing. I have considerable experience in placer mining and being in the Blue Mountains of Oregon, but the plan is hard for me to fully understand. I would refer to the Plain Writing Act of 2010. It should be written in a way that the general public actually understands it.

Comment #2: This comment refers to page #25 under Guidelines (FW-SOIL-GDL), 03. In this paragraph it suggests that "existing or past disturbed areas should be utilized before creating new soil disturbances". In the mining business it is almost always necessary to utilize new or virgin ground to have any success. So yes, miners will need to open up "new" ground routinely.

Comment #3: This comment refers to page #52 under Desired Conditions (FW-VEGNF-DC), 07. "Sagebrush and bunchgrass habitat is protected from loss caused by unplanned wildfires or damage resulting from management related activities". Mining by its very nature is going to cause disturbance to surface plants. Mining activities can be minimized, but it is a legal activity, and should be supported.

Comment #4: This comment refers to page #57 under Management Approach (FW-SPDIV-MAPR) 06. "To preserve species diversity buffer areas with high concentrations of metal ores". That is not a good idea. Because high concentrations of metal ores sounds like an ideal location to prospect, and develop if it is a viable deposit.

Comment #5: This comment refers to page #65 under Transportation Infrastructure (TRANSPT). Mining is not listed when it comes to providing safe and efficient access. We miners need good roads too.

Comment #6: This comment refers to page #66, under Desired Conditions (FW-TRANSPT-DC) 02. This paragraph mentions the transportation system for many activities and locations, but needs to include mining.

Comment #7: This comment refers to page #112, Under Desired Conditions (MA3ARMA-DC), 04. "The transportation system has minimal impacts on Riparian Management Area". Miners need safe access to minerals, wherever they are. It seems like mining activities are not well represented in this plan. I would like to see more encouragement for mining in the USA. As a country we need to develop our abundant and valuable mineral resources. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Johnny West