

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/4/2024 8:00:00 AM

First name: Richard

Last name: Hiatt

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Please accept this public comment on the subject of Draft Preliminary Need to Change, concerning the Blue Mountain forest plans.

While I agree with much of the expressed concern that recent management has been inadequate and resulted in catastrophic destruction by fire, I strongly disagree with three flawed premises in the draft, first, that Climate change or warming is a substantial cause that requires action and secondly, that substantial additional restrictions on access and use by people is the answer to that flawed premise. Third, I disagree that financial stakeholders, as identified by the Forest Service and Department of Agriculture should predominate in management plans, and I would remind you that it is the people who should have the primary voice.

I attended the public meeting held in Portland on March 31, 2014 when Travel Management plans were being updated. During that meeting, I commented that I thought the scope of the meetings and comments being limited to the local area of the Wallowa Whitman, Malheur and Umatilla National Forests was flawed in that these public resources were established for use by all Americans, and many people who are effected by the travel plan are temporarily out of the area by reason of military service, schooling, or many other personal but temporary reasons. A substantial number of people can be expected to return to the local areas in question, without having been included in this process and should be considered to have standing despite being unable to comment during a very short 90 day period. Despite assurances that this travel management plan doesn't close off roads, people will be faced with very limited access to the Forests because each of the six alternatives presented, all assume that unelected managers have the right and obligation to limit access and allowed uses with little oversight. I'm disappointed that nearly a decade later, the supervisors of the three major US National Forests in Oregon have largely eliminated the public by creating alliances with local leaders in towns near those forests in the Eastern half of the state and those leaders get special treatment for playing ball with the Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, the Forest Service is again pandering to a small but, vocal group of environmental radicals with your new and improved plans to restrict human access and "re-wild" land that belongs to all Americans to enjoy and utilize.

It is my opinion that the best way to manage our forest is to welcome additional use and help from the general public rather than to restrict and exclude them. The science is not settled on Global Warming cause or effects on the environment, and opposing points of view are too often being ignored.

Richard Hiatt