

[Submit a comment](#)

Make it your own. Agencies bundle identical form letters and count them as a single comment, so even a few sentences in your own words carry more weight than a copied one. The most powerful comments are specific, point to the agency's own analysis, and ask for something concrete. *I have provided two separate comments depending on how much time you have and what you feel like sending.* The comment period closes **September 30, 2026**.

Short Version

I am writing about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision. I oppose Alternative 2 and urge the Forest Service to select Alternative 3. By the agency's own analysis, opening 722,000 roadless acres is not necessary to meet the timber objectives, yet Alternative 2 commits the public to new road construction and permanent maintenance costs on top of an \$8.6 billion deferred maintenance backlog the agency already cannot fund. I ask that the roadless protections and the large tree diameter limit be retained, and that the final EIS fully analyze the long term cost of new roads, the net fiscal return to the public, and the increased human caused wildfire ignition risk that expanded road access brings. Please keep these acres protected.

Thank you.

Long Version

If you want to get a little more into it, send this one. Please change **the red text** to something personal, and remove any bullet points you'd like. This is what I submitted.

My name is [Name] and I live in [City/State]. **I've spent years roaming the forest that this Forest Plan is targeting. Through Ponderosa Pines, Douglas-firs, and Whitebark Pines. Hanging out with the Blue Grouse, various songbirds, spotting martens slinking their way through the trees, and paddleboarding on the John Day. The Wallowa Whitman was the first place I heard a wolf pack howl in the wild, a core memory that I will carry with me for the rest of my life. This plan would fundamentally change everything I remember about these forests.**

I am writing to oppose Alternative 2 and ask the following concerns be addressed in the final environmental impact statement.

1. The roadless reclassification is not necessary to meet the plan's timber objectives. The DEIS states that adequate feasible acres exist under every alternative to meet that alternative's objectives, and that the difference in roadless protections has only a minimal influence on the overall timber program. Removing protection from all 722,200 inventoried roadless acres, and moving 494,000 of them into a category suitable for

commercial harvest, is therefore not justified by the stated purpose and need. I ask that these protections be retained.

2. The long term cost of new road construction is not adequately analyzed. The Forest Service already carries a deferred maintenance backlog of more than \$8.6 billion and is funded to maintain only a fraction of the roughly 370,000 miles of road it manages. This plan commits the three forests to maintaining hundreds of miles of road every year simply to hold the existing system together. The final EIS should fully analyze the lifetime construction and maintenance cost of any new roads, and weigh it against the public's ability to fund that obligation.

3. The economic analysis relies on gross jobs and labor income without disclosing the net return to the public. The DEIS presents job and labor income figures but does not clearly analyze the net fiscal return to the Treasury, including the risk of below cost timber sales once road and sale preparation costs are counted. I ask that the final EIS disclose the net public cost or return of the timber program under each alternative.

4. The wildfire analysis does not appear to account for the increased human caused ignition risk that new roads bring. The fire analysis centers on natural lightning ignitions, but expanding road access into previously roadless country predictably increases human caused ignitions, which are the leading source of wildfire starts nationally and are strongly associated with proximity to roads. The final EIS should analyze how new road construction under Alternative 2 changes human ignition risk across the planning area.

5. Removing the large tree diameter limit sacrifices old forest values that took a century to grow. The diameter limit has protected the largest and oldest trees across these forests for decades. I ask that the large tree protections in Alternative 3 be retained rather than eliminated.

6. The expansion of targeted grazing should be bounded and analyzed. The DEIS notes that targeted grazing under Alternative 2 may run at levels higher than the forage limits the rest of the plan allows, and flags a resulting risk to sensitive plants and soils. I ask that targeted grazing be subject to the same forage limits as the rest of the plan and that its effects on sensitive resources be fully analyzed.

7. The mineral and commercial access effects of roadless removal should be disclosed as a purpose, not treated as incidental. The DEIS acknowledges that dropping the roadless designation may open certain areas to additional mineral exploration and development. If expanded access is an intended result, it should be stated plainly and its effects analyzed, so the public can weigh it.

For these reasons I ask that the Forest Service select Alternative 3, or at minimum retain the roadless protections and the large tree diameter limit and complete the additional analyses above before issuing a final decision. Please keep these acres protected for the people who own them.

Thank you.