

From: [McKay, Doug- FS, HEPPNER, OR](#)
To: [Taylor, Leslie -FS](#)
Subject: FW: [External Email]Ellis timber sale
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 4:25:06 PM

Another Ellis comment.

From: Brenna Sahatjian [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 8:37 PM
To: McKay, Doug- FS, HEPPNER, OR <Douglas.Mckay@usda.gov>
Subject: [External Email]Ellis timber sale

[External Email]

If this message comes from an **unexpected sender** or references a **vague/unexpected topic**;
Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.
Please send any concerns or suspicious messages to: Spam.Abuse@usda.gov

I am writing to oppose the Ellis timber sale. I have spent time in the Umatilla National Forest and my major concerns include:

- * **The huge scale of the sale and the intensity of logging planned** for the excessively expansive fuel breaks up to one and a half miles out to either side of roads, forming huge contiguous blocks of what would become barren open stands;
- * **Commercial logging within old growth forest and cool moist mixed conifer forest** under alternatives 2, 4, and 5;
- * **Logging of an unlimited number of large (and inevitably mostly old) Douglas and Grand firs up to 30" dbh** under alternative 5, which should not be legal since it was not discussed in the scoping stage of the public comment process;
- * **Extensive logging of undeveloped lands that have never been logged or roaded**—from 16,785 acres under alternative 3 and 17,103 acres under alternative 4 to 27,515 acres under alternatives 2 and 5;
- * **Damaging commercial logging within Riparian Habitat Conservation Area buffers** along streams and wet meadows and aspen under alternatives 4, 2, and 5 in violation of Forest Plan requirements;
- * **Drastic logging loss of suitable marten habitat:** 56% reduction of suitable habitat (loss of 14,021 acres) under alternatives 2 and 5, with less loss from alternative 4 and

much less loss under alternative 3;* **Significant long-term impacts to soils on a landscape scale** that would be the worst under alternatives 2 and 5, less under alternative 4, and least for the action alternatives under alternative 3;

* **Extreme loss of suitable Pileated woodpecker habitat to logging:** losing 41,402 acres of 43,578 total acres of Pileated woodpecker source habitat, with 41,109 acres lost under alternative 4 and 35,285 acres lost under alternative 3;

* **Construction of “temporary” roads** that are rarely decommissioned under all action alternatives except alt. 3, and **insufficient mileage of road closures and especially of road decommissioning under** alternatives 3 and 4;

* **Grossly inadequate analysis in the Environmental Impact Statement** of effects analysis to forest values, with significant omissions of standard information that would inform public comments and decision-making, and failure to disclose scientific controversy and to use the full range of best available science.

I ask the Forest Service either to rewrite the EIS with more detailed, in-depth analysis and release a new EIS for another 45 day comment period, or scrap this timber sale

Sincerely,

-Brenna Sahatjian

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]