

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/5/2026 5:40:32 PM

First name: Larry

Last name: Pennington

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Delintment Lake is where I go to see birds, old trees, and wildlife, hiking and camping there with friends. The Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision will govern how that place is managed for decades, and the draft environmental impact statement contains contradictions serious enough that I cannot support the proposed action. I ask the agency to answer the specific points raised below.

The plan's own analysis undermines its promise on water. I watch birds and wildlife that depend on healthy streams, and the condition of those streams matters directly to what I am able to find at Delintment Lake and across the forest. Yet as shown in Table 9 of the DEIS, the projected effects to water quality, water quantity, and riparian conditions under the proposed action are described as "Potential effects to water quality, water quantity, and riparian structural complexity and function from implementation of MA3A-RMA-OBJ-02 (stream miles enhanced or restored) - Less than alternative 1." In plain terms, the alternative the agency appears to favor would restore fewer stream miles per decade than simply continuing 1990s-era management. The DEIS offers no explanation for this reversal, and it does not reconcile the outcome with the stated goal of improving aquatic and riparian conditions. The agency must explain on the record how alternative 2 produces less stream restoration than the no-action alternative, and why that result is acceptable given the fish species present in these waters.

The fire resilience rationale for alternative 2 is similarly undercut by the agency's own numbers. The DEIS presents faster active management as the path to the highest reduction in high-severity fire risk, and that argument is a central justification for preferring alternative 2. But Table 6 of the DEIS shows, for dry upland forest on the Malheur, "Structural stage departure by PVG at 20 years Dry Upland Forest 45.3 46.3 45.3," meaning alternative 2 produces a higher structural stage departure at 20 years than alternative 1 for the dominant forest type on the largest forest in the planning area. The core claim and the vegetation departure figures point in opposite directions. The agency must explain in the final EIS how alternative 2 can be preferred on fire resilience grounds when its own 20-year departure index for dry upland forest is worse than the no-action alternative, or it must revise the analysis accordingly.

Clean water and the integrity of the landscape I photograph and watch wildlife in are reasons I care about this plan getting it right. The contradictions identified above are not minor: they go to the two central promises the agency makes for its preferred alternative. I ask that the Forest Service address both points with specific, substantive responses before the final plan is adopted.