

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/30/2026 3:03:21 PM

First name: Reagan

Last name: Reed

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My tax dollars fund these forests, and I want to know that the science guiding their management is sound and that the process allowing public input is genuine. The Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision raises serious questions on both counts, and I am asking the agency to answer them before any record of decision is signed.

The agency states, under the Wildland Fire section, "Under alternative 2, potential rescission of the Roadless Rule we would have the ability to treat more areas with uncharacteristic fuel loads, thereby reducing high-severity fire in those locations." That claim is never supported by a disaggregated analysis. The same document acknowledges that vegetation treatment objectives, not the total quantity of suitable lands, are the main drivers of harvest levels, and that adequate feasible acres exist across all alternatives. Nowhere does the agency isolate how many treatment acres or what reduction in high-severity fire depends specifically on dropping roadless protections, as opposed to what every alternative can already accomplish. The agency must show the treatment acres and fire effects that hinge on roadless rescission alone, separate from the capacity that already exists under alternatives 1 and 3.

The document's treatment of inventoried roadless areas compounds this problem. The agency explicitly states, under Substantive Issue 5: Inventoried Roadless Areas, that "Alternative 2 analyzes the Blue Mountains planning area as if a national-level decision rescinds the Roadless Rule." That national decision has not been made. 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. Building a preferred alternative around a rescission that has not occurred inflates the acreage classified as suitable for timber production and forecloses a meaningful comparison. Either analyze alternative 2 with the Roadless Rule intact, or fully disclose the probability and timing of any rescission before this plan moves forward. A supplemental analysis is required.

On rangelands, the agency dismisses a detailed economic comparison of livestock grazing because its anticipated contribution to local economies would not vary between alternatives. But alternative 2 introduces 5,000 acres per year of targeted grazing that does not appear in the other alternatives, and the agency's own rangeland section warns that this targeted grazing may be conducted at levels exceeding what the plan's own components allow, and that doing so risks increasing non-native forage and invasive species. That is not a trivial or equivalent outcome. It threatens the native plant communities and riparian areas that provide clean water, the wildlife habitat that sustains the birds and animals I care about seeing persist on this landscape, and the long-term productivity of the allotments themselves. The agency should conduct a quantitative ecological and economic analysis of that targeted grazing objective, including the risk to native vegetation and the question of compliance with existing allotment permits, before any alternative is selected.

This plan governs approximately 4.9 million acres of public land in Oregon and Washington. My children deserve forests that were managed on the best available science, not on assumptions about future federal decisions or on economic comparisons that ignore materially different ecological risks. I urge the agency to slow this process, answer each of these points, and give the public a genuine opportunity to engage with the results.

The proper process is not being done here, and as taxpayer, lover of public lands, and someone who will live to see the results of these actions in my lifetime, I cannot sit idly by while a National Forest is pillaged. The beauty of our land is what makes America so special. It's what has inspired generations of artists. It is home to some of the most diverse biomes and interesting species that exist nowhere else on the planet. It is home to these historical forests that have been time and again protected by the people and their government for a reason. I

plead with you not to change that now.