

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/4/2026 8:39:28 PM

First name: Dr. E.

Last name: O&#39;Halloran

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Unfortunately, since the Trump administration fired scientists and gave our government over to corporate interests, I do not know whether or not we can trust the environmental impact statements regarding this project. The fact that USDA concludes streams will be contaminated with sediment and recovery of streams may take as long as one year AFTER five year project means these streams will definitely be adversely affected despite the claim that they will not be. Indeed, your own draft environmental impact statement says: "the effects determination for UCR steelhead and its critical habitat is May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect (see BA)." That is NOT acceptable and it is unconscionable that you are not even considering other options. What is the so-called "emergency" here requiring consideration of only one plan and not following the regular process and procedures for review and public input into such projects? Is it that Donald Trump wants to give some timber industry donor a freebie on the public expense with disregard to environmental impact and the public's right for future generations to have an intact environment? The goals of improving habitat for wildlife, both of land and water, are good goals, as is the goal to improve water quality. The fact that the entire project area, all 5,130 acres, will be subject to either pile or prescribed burning appears both excessive and damaging. Based on USDA documents stating that trees under 25 inches in diameter, trees under 11 inches in diameter and trees under 7 inches in diameter will all be sacrificed, one can conclude that this will essentially be clear cutting with only trees larger than 25 inches in diameter mostly being spared (but not entirely!). The government's memo states: "The United States has an abundance of timber resources that are more than adequate to meet our domestic timber production needs, but heavy-handed federal policies have prevented full utilization of these resources and made us reliant on foreign producers," the memo reads. "It is vital that we reverse these policies and increase domestic timber production to protect our national and economic security." This is absurd and gives away the game here. It shows the dishonesty by the administration to all of us. There is no timber shortage, there have been no "heavy-handed" federal policies preventing timber harvest on public lands, and, indeed, for generations we have been selling our timber at bottom prices across the sea in Asia while decimating our forests and mismanaging them so they are stock full of young saplings crowded in fire-promoting stands while wildlife habitat and watersheds have been destroyed. STOP this project now and consider HONESTLY the requirements of healthy land and watersheds and fire prevention and consider a series of alternatives so that we, Americans, can have a healthy Okanogan Forest for generations to come.