

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/30/2026 7:45:41 AM

First name: Kathy

Last name: Kernan

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My concern is straightforward: I want everyone to have clean water, I want this land managed responsibly, and I care how my tax money gets spent. The Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision affects all three, and two choices in the current draft demand a direct response before any record of decision is signed.

The DEIS builds its proposed action, alternative 2, on an assumption that the Roadless Rule has already been rescinded at the national level. That decision has not been made. As the document states in Substantive Issue 5: Inventoried Roadless Areas, "Alternative 2 analyzes the Blue Mountains planning area as if a national-level decision rescinds the Roadless Rule." Tables 14, 15, and 16 show zero acres of inventoried roadless area prohibition under alternative 2, while alternatives 1 and 3 retain roughly 722,000 acres in the roadless management area. The proposed action treats a contingent future decision as settled fact, which inflates the acreage classified as suitable for timber production by 17 percent relative to alternative 1. I do not want the Roadless Rule rescinded, and I do not want a plan built around its disappearance finalized before the public knows whether or when that national-level change will occur. The agency must either analyze alternative 2 with the Roadless Rule intact or fully disclose the probability and timing of any rescission. A supplemental analysis is needed before this plan moves forward, and the agency must address this point directly.

The draft also sidelines a serious ecological risk in its grazing analysis. The agency dismisses a detailed economic comparison of grazing across alternatives in Substantive Issue 1 because the contribution to local economies would not vary between alternatives, yet alternative 2 introduces 5,000 acres per year of targeted grazing that does not appear in alternatives 1 or 3. The document itself warns, under Rangelands, Forage, Livestock Grazing, that "Targeted grazing may be at levels greater than the allowable forage use in the plan components; therefore, there is a risk that targeted grazing for fine fuels reduction could lead to an increase of non-native forage and invasive species." Clean water depends on healthy riparian areas and stable plant communities. Authorizing grazing at levels that may exceed allotment permits, with a documented risk of spreading invasive species, is not a minor variation that can be waved past with an economy-stays-the-same rationale. The agency should conduct a full quantitative ecological analysis of this targeted grazing objective, including risks to native vegetation and compliance with existing permits, before selecting any alternative.