

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/4/2026 4:16:00 PM

First name: Wayne

Last name: Hall

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My concerns with the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision focus on protecting motorized access, keeping public lands open for the uses and activities that local people and families depend on, and ensuring that plan changes do not further restrict access or reduce working uses. I have lived here for 67 years and have spent my life accessing these lands for recreation, family time, hunting, fishing, food and wood gathering, and making a living. The areas surrounding the 77 Road, West Eagle, Main Eagle, East Eagle, Baum Creek, Bald Mountain, Mount Harris, Starkey, Sumpter, the Elkhorn Mountains, and the Minam River drainage are all places where these concerns are urgent and directly affect my family and community. The final plan must protect all existing motorized access used for hunting, camping, firewood and fuelwood gathering, grazing and ranch work, emergency and fire response, and for taking older or disabled family members into the forest. This access is essential for rural livelihoods, household income, and the continuation of family traditions and multigenerational forest use. I have seen access that was once open for hunting, fishing, wood gathering, camping, off-road riding, mushroom, and huckleberry gathering systematically restricted, cutting off opportunities my family and I have relied on since childhood. The plan must keep full, on-the-ground motorized access to lands and roads not already designated as wilderness, with no new travel restrictions or route-designation limitations. The plan must also recognize and address household dependence on firewood, hunting, food gathering, and other forest products, along with the impacts of increased travel distance, higher fuel costs, and lost access for older, disabled, or less-mobile people. Local small businesses, contractors, and rural families are directly affected in ways that are not captured by county-wide statistics or recreation averages. The analysis and final plan must account for these real, daily needs, not reduce them to general statistics. Working lands and uses require real, usable access-not just mention in plan language. The final plan must protect access needed for grazing and ranch work, timber supply, local mill capacity, forest management, and local jobs. Grazing and timber harvesting must be kept open and available, with active management to reduce fuels and wildfire risks. These uses benefit local communities and have been systematically reduced, harming rural families and economies. The plan must ensure that roads needed for these activities, for ongoing maintenance, and for fire response remain open and usable. Wildfire risk and forest health demand active management, access, and accountability. Decades of mismanagement and limited access have led to increasingly severe wildfires. The final plan must require fuel reduction, thinning, prescribed fire, and open access for fire response. No road closures or restrictions should be allowed that would hinder emergency access or forest management. Forests must be maintained as a working resource, and the plan must measure and publicly report whether promised fuels treatments and fire-response capabilities are delivered on the ground. Wildlife, elk security, wolf, habitat, riparian, or disturbance direction must not be used to reduce motorized access. The Forest Service must clearly show where these components apply, what standards are used, and how they affect local users. Access for hunting, fishing, camping, off-road and motorized travel, and gathering must be protected in writing, with no new restrictions for wildlife or habitat reasons unless fully justified and separately analyzed for impacts on local people and communities.

Recommended wilderness, roadless area, or similar restrictive direction must not move roaded or historically motorized areas away from public access. Past closures and restrictions have already gone too far. The Forest Service must roll back these restrictions to pre-1990 levels and ensure that historically accessible areas remain open for the public, logging, and grazing communities. Clear maps, disclosure, and analysis of access effects are required, not just blanket reclassification or restriction. The Forest Service must provide a clear comparison with 1990 plan direction and outputs, not just with recent conditions. The public needs to see full, forest-by-forest comparisons for access, timber, grazing, and local use, with transparent data, assumptions, and methods. The Purpose and Need must reflect motorized access and rural dependence. The record must state in writing: no more road closures for any reason, and full, unfettered access to all roads before the plan is finalized. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not provide enough route-level detail for the public to understand how plan decisions connect to real roads, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, management areas, or future Travel Management decisions. This prevents meaningful public input and must be corrected. The final

plan must also define clear standards and decision criteria for old growth, large trees, and forest management to ensure that active, on-the-ground work can continue. Changes to standards must be transparent and must not be described as the loss of every large-tree protection unless the record supports that claim. After a lifetime of using and relying on these forests, I expect the Forest Service to provide a current route baseline, preserve all existing public motorized access, and ensure that access, working uses, and rural livelihoods remain protected for current and future generations.