

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/19/2026 10:36:36 PM

First name: Dustin

Last name: James

Organization:

Title:

Comments: What happens in the Blue Mountains forests is personal to me. I am a lifelong Wallowa County resident and small business owner, and my family has farmed here for generations. I care deeply about access in the Chesnimus area, Hells Canyon corridor, Imnaha River watershed, and Sled Springs-these are the places I call home. My customers, neighbors, and family all depend on the forest for work, hunting, camping, gathering firewood, grazing livestock, and recreation. I see every day how poor forest management and endless red tape have hurt our local economy and limited what people can do. We need a forest plan that actually supports active management, not more hoops to jump through. Right now, the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest is what I would call an "open forest." With the few routes we have left, farmers, ranchers, firefighters, berry pickers, and all kinds of recreationists rely on these roads to get in and do what needs to be done. If the plan reduces road density or moves toward a "closed forest" or designated-route-only system, access will be severely limited. I understand better than anyone how this would impact the social and economic fabric of Wallowa County. When access is cut, locals lose out on firewood for heat, grazing and ranch work, timber harvest, and the ability to spread out for recreation and camping. Instead, people get pushed into smaller areas, which just puts more pressure on fewer places and hurts the forest even more. Less access also means less ability to prevent and fight wildfires, which is a risk we cannot afford. I am also concerned about working lands, especially grazing and timber. The plan does not do enough to expand grazing opportunities or timber harvests, both of which are needed for local jobs and for keeping the forest healthy. More grazing allotments, better rotation, and increased timber sales would help reduce fire risk and improve wildlife habitat. Roads needed for grazing, logging, and fire response must be maintained, not closed or decommissioned. Working uses like ranching and timber production can't just be mentioned in plan language-they require real, usable access and conditions on the ground that let us get the work done. Wildfire risk is another major concern. The current approach seems to be "let it burn" and respond after the fact, instead of preventing fires in the first place. The final plan must support proactive management: more thinning, logging, grazing, mechanical fuels reduction, and keeping roads open for monitoring and early fire suppression. Fires need to be put out fast, not allowed to grow into major disasters. The Forest Service must work with local resources and responders, and there must be real accountability. The public needs to see what fuels reduction, timber harvest, grazing, and fire suppression work is getting done each year. The plan's wildfire and fuels direction must actually result in work on the ground, not just promises on paper. Roads, water access, material sites, and coordination with local fire departments must be maintained for effective fire response, and the Forest Service must publicly report whether these commitments are met. I strongly oppose any new recommended wilderness or roadless area direction that would take roaded or historically used areas away from public access. The Wallowa-Whitman already has the largest wilderness in Oregon-there is no reason for more. Locking up more land under restrictive management will only hurt the forest and the people who depend on it. We need a working forest that supports timber harvest, grazing, wildfire fuels reduction, and recreation like hunting and berry picking. Overgrown, unhealthy forests with limited grass and feed are bad for wildlife and eventually burn. The Forest Service must make active, sustainable management the top priority, not more closures. Roaded and working landscapes people rely on must not be moved into more restrictive direction. Before adopting any recommended wilderness, roadless area, or similar direction, the Forest Service must provide clear maps, full disclosure, and real analysis of how access and use would be affected. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not give the public enough information about real roads, routes, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, management areas, or how future Travel Management decisions will play out. People need to see how plan direction connects to the ground in order to give meaningful input. I want the Forest Service to provide a clear, current route baseline, an ROS-to-Travel-Management crosswalk, and a full analysis of usable access by alternative. The final plan must protect and maintain existing public motorized access and restore access where it has already been reduced. A preferred alternative must not set up future reductions through plan language. People here depend on the forest for their livelihoods, families, and way of life, and the plan must reflect that reality.