

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/23/2026 1:55:29 AM

First name: Gaylene

Last name: Bruce

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am raising concerns about motorized access, recommended wilderness and roadless direction affecting roaded and historically used areas, working land needs like grazing and timber, missing maps and clear information, and wildfire risk, especially in the Summit Creek area and the Northside hunting unit on the Malheur National Forest. Motorized access is essential for me as a hunter and camper. My experience with Summit Creek is that it is currently open, but I am worried ongoing work will be used as a reason to close the road along the creek "for the health of the fish." Access is already too limited. The Forest Service has closed many roads and stopped maintaining others, making it harder for people like me to get to the places we have always hunted and camped. Grazing, timber supply, and active forest management are also critical. Working uses on the forest need more than just words in a plan—they require real, usable access and conditions on the ground so local people can do the work. Roads are needed for these uses, for maintenance, and for fire response. Wildfire risk to communities, homes, and infrastructure is a major concern. We need hazardous-fuels treatment at the right pace and scale, thinning, prescribed fire, and active management. Roads and motorized access are necessary for fire response. Closing, storing, or decommissioning roads can block emergency access. The Forest Service must maintain roads, allow logging in burned areas to clean up the forest floor, and make sure environmental lawsuits do not stop needed cleanup work. Wildfire and fuels direction must result in real work on the ground. The final plan must maintain the roads, water access, material sources, safety areas, and coordination needed for timely fire response, and must measure and publicly report whether promised treatments and response capabilities are actually delivered. I am concerned that recommended wilderness, roadless area direction, or similar restrictions could move roaded or historically motorized areas out of public reach. The Forest Service must not be planning more wilderness. The agency must listen to the people who use the forest. We need to be able to use the forest for grazing, timber, and other local needs, not just see it become a cost. Roaded and historically motorized areas, working forest landscapes, and places people rely on must not be moved into more restrictive direction. The Forest Service must provide clear maps, disclosure, and analysis of access effects before making these decisions. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not give the public enough route-level information to understand how the plan connects to real roads, routes, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, management areas, and future Travel Management decisions. Without this detail, the public cannot give meaningful input because we cannot see what the plan means on the ground. As an avid hunter and hiker, I want to keep accessing the places that allow me to camp and enjoy the outdoors. As a U. S. citizen, I consider it a right to access my public land. The Forest Service must not use plan components to set up future motorized access reductions. The final plan must protect existing motorized access, restore access where it has already been reduced, and keep public access available for the life of the plan.