

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/30/2026 9:09:09 AM

First name: Gary

Last name: Humphreys

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I writing in support of Alternative 1, No changes to the current Forest Plan.

The Blue Mountain Forest Plan Revision has been a very long process to address the many changes since the original 1990 plan. These plans are supposed to be revised every 10 years. I write this to acknowledge the basic facts.

My support of Alternative 1 is due to the fact that the Forest Service continues to NOT observe the real many changes and the real concerns of the public in any of the Forest Plan revision alternatives. Not the 8 or 9 from prior to 2018, to the current 3.

The most focused part of the public's concern over all of these years has been ACCESS. This was specifically acknowledged in the closed door Blue Mountain Interagency Council meeting minutes, break out sessions, public meetings, etc. Yet there is no focused area within this latest document. Even within these dark room discussions prior to coming into the light, Baker County Commissioners recognized the blindness of BIC to properly address Access in their own counter proposal. None of these concerns seem to be recognized in this document.

Another Real change is the Fact that the Department of Agriculture is reviewing the complete 2001 Roadless Area and this document specifically refers to this as "Outside the Scope". How can a long term managing document can completely ignore a very real potential massive change to management guidelines of Forest Access that will effect both Alternative 2 and 3 is a gross waste. If the Roadless Rule is reversed then Alternative 2 will have to radically edited. Alternative 3 will codify the ignoring of changes coming from the Department of Agriculture. Neither is an option that realistically listen's to the will of the people.

My support of Alternative 1 is my only option as it the only alternative that would delay this process entirely until the Roadless Rule and real response to Access is truly addressed.