

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/25/2026 10:37:23 AM

First name: atom

Last name: wrbb

Organization:

Title:

Comments: From top to bottom, this entire revision is peculiar. You are proposing something that is proven almost entirely unfavorable to the Oregon population. You propose weakening of foundational protections in the midst of a statewide landgrab. We have already heard and seen clear cuts with marked Old Growth trees being cut down as well. To save time.

I think the ways the USDA operates leaves a distinct impression. The core element being flying by wire, and throwing your own procedures out the window. "Draft EIS mistakenly refers to supplemental information on pages 16, 33, 38, 63, and 69. The Forest Service did not publish supplemental information documents with the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS presents the substantive analysis for public comment."

How did we even get to the public comment period when you're not supplying the necessary supplemental information? How can we know you will genuinely "maintain a desired condition or conditions, to avoid or mitigate undesirable effects, or to meet applicable legal requirements. (36 CFR 219.7(e)(1)(iv))." To keep things on the rails when there isn't even a fully baked draft. Well, you will say there is but it's missing critical cited references. Plus the obvious truth that if you assess these changes with species of concern in mind you realize that you cannot go forward. The entire thing needs to be redone. This is gross incompetence at best and malicious obfuscation at best.

Our children inheriting a dead earth.. is too high a price to pay for timber.