

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/30/2026 3:00:32 PM

First name: ERVING

Last name: LOGAN

Organization:

Title:

Comments: What happens in the Blue Mountains forests matters to me because my family and I depend on being able to reach the places we use for hunting, camping, gathering firewood, and taking older or disabled family members into the forest. I am worried about losing access to these areas, especially with the new Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Forest Plan proposing changes that could impact roads, motorized access, and the ability to use these forests for work and recreation. I am especially concerned about how overlapping plan layers-like the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), scenic integrity, wildlife, riparian areas, recommended wilderness or roadless area direction, Wild and Scenic River (WSR) corridors, and various management areas-could combine to limit public access. In the areas I know, including roadless areas 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, the 2023 area, 2010, 2025, 2031, and places like ODF&W green dots and road 7225 020, there is a lack of clear detail on access. The public needs to see route-level maps, access baselines, clear crosswalks, and plain explanations showing how these layers affect actual roads, routes, and uses on the ground. Without this information, it is impossible for people like me to understand or comment meaningfully on how the plan will affect our ability to get to the places we use. Access is not just about recreation for me. It is also about working lands-grazing, ranch work, timber supply, roads needed for hauling and maintenance, and fire response. Local contractors, jobs, and household income depend on being able to get into the forest and do the work. Working uses cannot just be listed in the plan as "protected" without real, usable access and the conditions that allow those jobs to happen. Wildfire risk is a real threat to our communities, homes, and infrastructure. The plan must support active management, thinning, prescribed fire, and fuels work at the pace and scale needed to reduce these risks. Roads and motorized access are critical for fire response, getting to water sources, material sites, and safety areas, and for coordinating with local fire departments and counties. Closing or decommissioning roads that are needed for emergency response puts lives and property at risk. The Forest Service must maintain the roads, water access, and coordination needed for timely and effective fire response, and must publicly report on whether promised treatments and capabilities are actually delivered. I am also concerned about language in the plan related to wildlife, elk security, wolf, habitat, riparian areas, and disturbance-these could be used as excuses to cut off motorized access. The final plan must protect existing motorized access. Wildlife-related direction must not be used to reduce access, and the Forest Service must clearly show where these standards apply and how they will affect local users and communities, with clear analysis and explanation. Recommended wilderness, roadless area direction, and other restrictive designations threaten to move historically motorized and worked areas away from public access. Roadless areas, places with historic use, and working forest landscapes must not be shifted into more restrictive direction. The Forest Service must provide clear maps and full disclosure of how these changes will affect access. For Wild and Scenic River corridors and similar designations. I am concerned about the effects on grazing, minerals, timber, fuels work, and forest products, and how these rules overlap with other restrictions. The public needs segment-by-segment maps and tables showing corridor boundaries, classifications, interim protections, affected roads and crossings, access for inholdings and private land, existing uses, and the cumulative effect of overlapping plan layers. River-corridor direction must protect and maintain existing access and working uses, and the Forest Service must provide the full analysis needed to understand these effects. The DEIS does not provide enough route-level information for the public to see how plan direction connects to real roads, routes, ROS settings, management areas, or future Travel Management decisions. We cannot give meaningful input without being able to see what the plan means on the ground. For old growth and large trees. I want to see clear standards and decision criteria that replace the 21-inch rule, with explanations of how these connect to timber and vegetation management. The plan must maintain the ability for needed forest-health, safety, and active management work to continue. The loss of large-tree protection should not be assumed unless the record fully supports that conclusion. The Forest Service must preserve existing public motorized access and current open-area or cross-country opportunities where they exist. The final plan must protect and maintain the access that people like me rely on, and restore access where it has already been reduced.

