

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/7/2026 4:19:00 PM

First name: Anne

Last name: March

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I spend a great deal of time in our national forests. Mainly, I hike and backpack through these lands (and pick up a lot of trash). I appreciate being able to go to places where people cannot drive.

Please consider my thoughts regarding the latest version of the Blue Mountains Forest Plan:

I am opposed to the plan's removal of protections for over 700,000 acres of roadless areas. These places are the lifeblood of our mountains. Elk, bear, wolves, badgers, deer, etc... deserve to have connected areas of safety, away from motors and other human disruptions, so that they might thrive. We should be creating more wilderness areas instead of removing that possibility forever by building roads.

84% to 90% of wildfires are started by humans. Creating more roads and more ways for people to get into the woods is complete insanity.

I am opposed to the removal of standards protecting riparian areas. We must preserve, not remove, protections for these riparian areas in order to offer refuge for salmon and steelhead and give them some chance of survival.

The 21-inch rule needs to stay in place. Unrestricted commercial logging of old growth and mature forests will lead to the same cycle that we've seen in the past: tree removal, followed by dry, open ground, followed by the dense growth of lodgepole pines and other flammable plants, followed by a need for more thinning to remove these trees, followed by more dry, open ground.... Mistakes from decades ago have shown us what not to do.

I do not want our public lands to look like the Manulife lands in northeast Oregon that have been managed by a for-profit industry. They have created thousands of acres of hot, dry, weedy wasteland in NE Oregon. To me they are a disturbing symbol of what greed and industry pressure can bring.

The USFS is severely understaffed and underfunded. Who will provide effective oversight for new logging, grazing, and mining operations?

It's obvious that industry would love to get their hands on as many big trees as they can, but at what cost? Taxpayers should not have to foot the bill in 20 years because big trees are gone and little trees need thinning.

Finally, I oppose the destruction of our forests in the name of "fire mitigation." Wildfires will always burn if conditions are right, and drying out our forests even more than they are now will create a self-fulfilling prophecy. Instead, focus on prescribed burns on lands that are adjacent to communities. We need buffer zones, not millions of acres of compromised forest lands.

The current administration will go away, but industry pressure will always be there. Don't let these people inflict long-term damage by reversing the decent USFS management of the past two decades (saving big trees, thinning out lodgepole, for example). Please follow the science of your own biologists' research from past years as you move forward with the draft of the forest plan. Research shows that management of forests must focus on their long-term ecological health in order to make them resilient.

I know that you are under tremendous pressure right now to favor industry. Please be strong, do what your own scientists know to be right, and don't cave in to the fickle pressure of political whims.