

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/25/2026 12:24:55 AM

First name: Martin

Last name: Stroy

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision must protect continued motorized access to the places people use and depend on, including all of Bald Angel, Puzzle, Shanghai, Taylor Green, Pollard Flats, Red Mountain, and Bennett Peak. The plan must address how recommended wilderness or roadless directions will affect historically roaded and motorized areas, and provide clear, understandable maps, route baselines, and plain explanations of how these directions will shape real access and management on the ground. Without this transparency, the public cannot fully understand or participate in the process, and the plan risks disconnecting from the reality of how people use and rely on the forest. As someone who is 88 years old and unable to walk more than 100 feet at a time, I rely on all existing roads for hunting, camping, firewood and fuelwood gathering, berry picking, grazing and ranch work, mining or material access, emergency response, and bringing older or disabled family members into the forest. If access is limited, narrowed, or reduced to designated routes only, I would be cut off from these activities. The final plan must keep an open forest and protect the motorized access that households, rural communities, businesses, and individuals actually use-not just as recreation, but as a foundation for daily life, food gathering, household income, and family traditions. These uses must not be dismissed or reduced to county-wide statistics or recreation numbers. The analysis and final plan must show how real people rely on these roads and forest resources. The plan must also address working-land concerns: usable grazing opportunity, access for ranch work, timber supply and mill capacity, active vegetation and forest management, roads needed for maintenance and fire response, and access to mining claims, material sources, and community pits. Uses described on paper are not protected unless they remain usable on the ground. If the Forest Service does not retain Alternative 1, grazing will decrease and roads needed for fire control will remain closed. My continued travel and ability to work, gather resources, and maintain traditions in the forest require that roads remain open and accessible. Usable access to mining claims, county roads, historic routes, private property, inholdings, and easements must be identified and protected. The plan must distinguish between public, administrative, permitted, private, county, and mining access, and clearly show the status of routes and rights before treating any road as discretionary. The Forest Service must identify mining claims inside proposed roadless areas and define how "reasonable access" for mining will be determined, disclosing how overlapping plan directions would affect actual access. Possible valid existing rights and other access authorities must be addressed directly, not assumed away or ignored in the planning process. Wildfire risk, hazardous fuels, and fire response must be addressed with active management, including thinning and prescribed fire, and by maintaining the roads, water access, material sources, safety areas, and coordination needed for effective fire response. Road closures, storage, or decommissioning that could hinder emergency response are unacceptable. The Forest Service must ensure that closed roads can be opened for firefighting and other emergency needs without delay, and must publicly report whether promised fuels 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 places-including Bennett Peak-away from public access. The Forest Service has not taken a hard look at travel management and seems more focused on closing roads than on opening those needed for fire control and public use. No additional wilderness or roadless areas should be considered. Roaded and working landscapes must not be shifted into more restrictive management, and the Forest Service must provide clear maps and analysis of access effects for all overlapping plan layers. Direction for Wild and Scenic River corridors must be clear and must not close access to waterways, roads, or crossings, or affect grazing, minerals, timber, fuels work, or forest products. The public needs segment-by-segment maps and tables showing corridor boundaries, classifications, values, protections, affected roads and crossings, and the cumulative effect of all overlapping plan layers. River-corridor direction must protect and maintain existing access and working uses, with full disclosure and analysis of effects. The Forest Service must provide a clear, forest-by-forest comparison with the 1990 plan direction and outputs, not just with current conditions. The baseline for all three alternatives must be made available before the plan is finalized, so the public can see how proposed changes compare with what the 1990 plans provided. Data, assumptions, and outcomes must be

transparent and understandable, and descriptions such as "increase," "improvement," or "restoration" must reference a clear and meaningful baseline. Finally, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not provide enough route-level information to show how plan directions will affect real roads, routes, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, management areas, and future travel decisions. The Forest Service must provide the full information, maps, and explanations needed for the public to see and understand these effects before finalizing the plan. All of these issues must be addressed so that the final plan protects existing access, working uses, forest health, and rural livelihoods as they exist on the ground.