

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/28/2026 3:31:53 AM

First name: Zach

Last name: Zsiga

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The Forest Service must ensure that the final Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision protects motorized access for hunting, camping, and for taking older or disabled family members into the forest. Access must remain usable on the ground, not just in policy language. If the plan limits, narrows, or restricts access to designated routes only, this would mean a real loss of hunting grounds and firewood-gathering opportunities for people who rely on these areas, including Road 16 Logan Valley Blue Bucket. The plan must also address the needs of working lands-timber supply, local mill capacity, and active vegetation management all depend on reliable road access. Roads are critical for working uses, routine maintenance, and especially for fire response. It is not enough to mention working lands in the plan; the final plan must provide for the actual ground conditions and access needed to sustain these uses. Wildfire risk to communities, homes, and infrastructure is a real concern, and the final plan must commit to hazardous-fuels treatments at the right pace and scale, using thinning, prescribed fire, and active management. Fire response depends on maintained roads, access to water, material sites, and safe areas for crews. The plan must not allow road closure, storage, or decommissioning that would hinder emergency response. The Forest Service must measure and publicly report whether promised fuels treatments and fire-response capabilities are being delivered, and ensure that wildfire and fuels direction results in completed work on the ground. Wildlife, elk security, wolf, habitat, riparian, or disturbance language must not be used as a pretext to reduce motorized access. The final plan must protect existing motorized access, and the Forest Service must clearly show where these wildlife or habitat components apply, what standards are being used, and how they will affect local users and communities. Direction related to wildlife and habitat must be transparent and must not result in hidden reductions to motorized access. The Forest Service must separately analyze and explain the effects on local users and communities. It is also important that the Forest Service provide accurate comparisons to the 1990 baseline when describing increases, improvements, or restoration under Alternative 2 or any other alternative. Comparing only with current or recent conditions does not show the public how the alternatives relate to the 1990 plans being replaced. The record must include clear, forest-by-forest comparisons so that the public understands what is actually changing. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not give enough route-level information for the public to see how plan direction will affect real roads, routes, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, management areas, and future Travel Management decisions. Without this information, meaningful public input is impossible. The Forest Service must provide a current route baseline, preserve existing public motorized access and any current open-area or cross-country opportunities, and adopt a preferred alternative that protects and maintains existing motorized access. Plan components must not be used to set up future reductions. The final plan must include clear direction to maintain existing motorized access, restore access where it has already been reduced, and prevent further losses.