

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/28/2026 3:58:54 AM

First name: Kimberley

Last name: Schmoe

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing because I am deeply concerned about motorized access, household and rural community use of the forest, the management of old growth and large trees, wildfire risks, and the need for dependable access for mining, materials, and fire response. I have direct experience with Forest Service Road 66 and hunting unit 62, and I know how important it is for people like me to be able to reach the forest for hunting, camping, gathering firewood and forest products, and supporting family and small business needs. For my family, motorized access is not just about recreation-it is how we heat our home, put food on the table, and maintain long-standing family traditions. Right now, the access situation is open, but I see real threats of future restrictions or closures. If the Forest Service limits access, narrows it, or moves to designated routes only, it would cut off my family's ability to hunt and gather as we always have. These activities are more than tradition-they are a necessary part of how we live. Access is also essential for older or disabled family members and for working people who depend on the forest for income. The Forest Service must not reduce household and rural community use to recreation statistics or county-wide averages. The analysis and final plan need to reflect how people actually depend on access and forest resources in their daily lives. I rely on firewood to heat my home, hunting for meat, and gathering for food. The Forest Service must keep access open, remove unnecessary restrictions, avoid creating new roadless areas, allow for more logging and mining, and not restrict travel, hunting, or gathering. These uses are essential, not just optional recreation. I am also concerned about usable access to mining claims and operations, as well as to local sources of gravel, rock, sand, and other materials. The Forest Service must protect real, on-the-ground access for these purposes. When the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) uses the term "reasonable access" for mining, it must clearly define how that will be determined and show how overlapping plan direction affects actual access. There's no reason to have "administrative routes" that are closed to the public. Community pits and material sources must be shown with the plan layers that could affect them. The Forest Service cannot just assume away valid existing rights or other access authorities-they must be identified and addressed. Wildfire risk is another major concern. Communities, homes, and infrastructure are at stake. Hazardous-fuels treatment must happen at the needed pace and scale, with thinning, prescribed fire, and active management. Roads and motorized access are critical for fire response. Closing, storing, or decommissioning roads makes it harder for fire crews and emergency responders to do their jobs. The final plan must maintain roads, water access, material sources, safety areas, and coordination with local fire departments, counties, and responders. Wildfire and fuels direction must result in real work on the ground, and the Forest Service must publicly report whether promised treatments and response capabilities are actually delivered. The DEIS does not provide enough route-level information for the public to understand how plan direction will affect real roads, routes, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, management areas, and future Travel Management decisions. People need to see what the plan means on the ground in order to give meaningful input. I am also concerned about old-growth and large-tree management. The 21-inch rule needs to be removed. The final plan must clearly define the standards and decision criteria that replace it, explain how these connect with timber and vegetation management, and keep the ability to complete needed forest health, safety, and active management work. As a generational local, a wife, and a homeschooling mom. I do not want to see my family's traditions lost. I am asking the Forest Service to protect existing public motorized access and current open-area or cross-country opportunities, and not use the plan to set up future reductions. The final plan must protect existing access, restore any that has been reduced, and keep public access available for the life of the plan.