

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/14/2026 11:31:05 PM

First name: Elise

Last name: Mazur

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to comment on the proposed Anvil Vegetation Management Project that published a preliminary environmental assessment in May 2026. I am a resident of Oregon, who often uses the forest for recreation and benefits from the clean air and water that the Mount Hood National Forest creates. I have spent time in this Project area, and have visited multiple of the proposed units.

I generally support the goals of improving forest health and diversity, and reducing excessive fuel loading primarily along roads, however I reject the use of the Emergency Action Determination (EAD) for Increasing Timber Production and Designating an Emergency Situation on this land. The two reasons for using the EAD are stated as "uncharacteristically severe wildfires and insect and disease outbreaks." Research has shown that the 2020 Riverside fire in the Clackamas Ranger District was not necessarily historically unprecedented as there were likely fires of this scale in the 20th century (Reilly et al., 2022 <https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ecs2.4070>). More importantly, fires of that scale are typically wind-driven and would not be influenced by forest management.

The project is a combination of commercial and non-commercial thinning, and commercial thinning of plantations is not one of the authorized emergency actions to respond to emergency situations. Wouldn't that make applying this EAD to the entire project illegal?

I also believe that applying this EAD creates unnecessary rushing of this project and minimizes public engagement. Applying the EAD to this project feels like manipulation of the NEPA process for the sole benefit of the timber industry, and I would like to see more explanation from the Forest Service on what you see as the hazards and how this EAD will help reduce those.

In the preliminary EA it says that this project may affect the spotted owl, and my concern in my scoping comment stands about unit 78 potentially requiring re-opening a previously closed road that could affect spotted owl habitat.

The preliminary EA also states that the project will not address the perched culvert on road 46, and I believe that should be added into the project since it is part of the forest plan.

I also believe the Forest Service should be conducting the botanical surveys for the roadside fuels reduction work instead of leaving that to a contract who would have a conflict of interest in that assessment, especially in stands over 80 years old.

I appreciate the focus on stands less than 80 years old and the use of prescribed fire in multiple units in the project. Thank you for this opportunity to engage on this project, and I hope that there are more opportunities throughout the NEPA process.

Sincerely,
Elise Mazur