

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/16/2026 2:23:34 PM

First name: Cheryl

Last name: Marceau

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My tax dollars must not be used to rubber stamp a private enterprise's unfettered use of my public land. I am horrified and furious that my government would treat my lands that casually, and I am filing this comment to demand that the Forest Service do its job under NEPA before this project moves one step further.

The notice states that the plan amendment will except the project from certain desired conditions related to tribal, cultural, and water resources, but it defers identifying which specific plan components will be amended until after this comment period closes. The agency's own document states, at the section titled Substantive Provisions of Forest Service 2012 Planning Rule Directly Related to Potential Plan Amendment, that "The specific plan components included in the project-specific amendment will be determined based on the final proposal and analysis." That is not a meaningful disclosure. The public cannot comment on the scope of an amendment when the scope of that amendment is admittedly unknown. If my tax dollars are funding this process, I expect the process to be real. The agency must identify the specific plan components subject to amendment before this comment period closes, or extend the comment period until those components are disclosed and available for public review.

The agency also acknowledges prior history with this project while simultaneously treating it as if it never happened. In the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section, the notice states that "A draft EIS was published in 2013; however, due to the submission of a new proposal and updates to applicable regulations, the project is being reinitiated as a new project." That sentence raises more questions than it answers. What changed in the proposal? What environmental conditions have shifted since 2013? Which prior data and analyses are being carried forward, and which are being discarded? Responsible management of my public land requires answering those questions openly, not burying them in procedural language. The agency should publish a clear summary of how the new plan of operations differs from the 2013 proposal and explain which prior data and analysis will or will not be used in the new EIS.

The water discharge element of this proposal is particularly alarming given how little the notice actually discloses. The notice states, under Proposed Activities, that "Treated water would be discharged into the Rio San Jose in the Village of Milan." That single sentence is the extent of what the public is told about what goes into that waterway, at what volume, carrying what contaminants, and treated to what standard. Milan is a community whose residents live near that corridor. Listing an NPDES permit as a required authorization is not a substitute for baseline water quality data. The EIS must include baseline water quality data for the Rio San Jose and must quantify the anticipated discharge volume and contaminant load before any draft EIS is released for public comment. I want a direct response to this point in the agency's record of decision.

The Forest Service has responsibilities under NEPA that cannot be satisfied by deferring critical details until after the public has already been asked to comment. Extremely dirty operations with virtually no accountability are not an acceptable outcome for my public land. I expect the agency to step up and enforce these requirements.