

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/3/2025 7:00:00 AM

First name: D.M

Last name: Ballard

Organization:

Title:

Comments: October 1, 2025 Umatilla National Forest C/O Blue Mountain Forest Plan Revision Team 72510

Coyote Road, Pendleton, Oregon 97801 RE: Blue Mt Forest Plan Draft I begin my comment with a question, "why is the forest plan being revised?". Depending on your perspective, the answers vary. The opinion most often voiced by the USFS; mainly the forest plan is old, 1990 instated, and has since been burdened with over 40 amendments to suit different projects. Our forest management is dictated by a ten year document, when in our Pacific Northwest we can figure an 80 yr turn around. This is so fundamentally flawed and obvious, and yet this organization (BIC) created by the USFS plugs along 15 years over date, to implement once again a document that doesn't fit. Everyone involved from the beginning of the forest overhaul, knows the plan was and continues to be targeted by ACCESS. Resistance and pushback will continue until an honest approach with language that secures our historical "open forest" designation. I find many, way too many instances in the draft circumventing and eroding our access. "Ecological integrity", "additional mitigation", (page 66), "recreation opportunity", "reasonable access"; all of which depend upon the definition of reasonable ... The USFS began working on the forest plan revision and presented the public with a document widely and unanimously rejected by the public. A few quotes from a "news release" dated Aug. 5, 2022. "In 2018 when the Final Environmental Impact Statement and draft Records of Decision were released, the forest service received widespread feedback that the Revised Plans were difficult to understand and potentially confusing to implement." Guess what, this proposed draft is so full of abbreviation, such as on page 64, under desired conditions, it's next to impossible to read. The Plain Writing Act of 2010 requires clear and readable by the general public. This draft plan falls short of meeting this requirement. Nothing in this draft gives me hope our forests will be better managed. The choke hold enjoyed by dozens of non-profit environmental groups, masterfully using every "act" (NEPA, etc) to stymie every project the USFS proposes. The threat of litigation; litigation usually with a pot of gold known as Equal Access to Justice, filling their coffers. Public domain provides the resources our economies need to thrive. Timber, grazing, and minerals are the economic engines of rural America. These industries require natural resources to grow and prosper. Presently, less than 70% of the Wallowa-Whitman is accessible to pursue minerals, timber, or grazing. We need to quit tying up areas for closure. Denying this draft doesn't contain "travel management" can only be considered an attempt to persuade us the USFS is being truthful. "Reasonable access", yours or mine; I can assure you the USFS along with ODFW have no interest in the public's desires .. and they seem to share the same gloves .. No need to continue, as it stands I do not support this draft. Language assuring our remaining forest, the Wallowa-Whitman and Malheur retain the "open forest" designation. Additionally hiding behind "set asides", will not be welcomed. Sincerely, D.M Ballard