

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/4/2025 8:41:43 PM

First name: Jonathan

Last name: Hartman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Logging of large and old trees: the plan removes protections, creates loopholes, for logging large trees-essential for wildlife habitat and carbon storage. large, old trees are fire-resistant and store disproportionately high amounts of carbon.

Increased logging and fire risk: logging, even for "hazardous fuel mitigation," increases fire risk by drying out forests and removing fire-resistant older trees.

Encouraging salvage logging: Environmentalists oppose the plan's support for salvage logging after wildfires, arguing that this practice harms delicate post-fire habitats and removes valuable wildlife habitat from standing dead trees (snags).

Reduced environmental protections: the plan replaces clear, enforceable standards for water quality, large trees, and wildlife with weaker, voluntary guidelines.

Protection for wolves and other wildlife: the plan fails to protect native wildlife, including large carnivores like wolves, instead favoring livestock grazing interests.

Lack of public and tribal input: Criticism has focused on the insufficient opportunity for public, and particularly tribal, input in earlier stages of the planning process.

Circumvention of the planning process: The Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project successfully challenged the Forest Service over a previous plan that relied on an illegal process that circumvented public participation.

Lengthy, ineffective process: The Forest Service has repeatedly failed to finalize a revised plan, withdrawing drafts in 2014 and 2019 after receiving widespread objections from all sides. This history has led some to believe the process is fundamentally flawed.