

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/21/2026 2:21:55 PM

First name: Stephanie

Last name: Cirillo

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The children of this country deserve to inherit public lands left better than we found them. This project, as proposed, is antithetical to that imperative, and my hikes in the adjacent area around Sisters put me directly in the landscape it would transform. I oppose the Akawa Butte Fire Recovery project and ask the agency to take these concerns seriously.

The project is built on a national programmatic framework rather than any analysis of what is actually happening on this specific ground. As the document states, "It is estimated the project will authorize about 12 million board feet (MMBF) of timber or other wood product removal," yet nowhere in the record does the agency analyze the actual site conditions, fire severity, soils, hydrology, or species populations that make the Akawa Butte Fire area what it is. The Treatment Acres Table shows thousands of acres affected, yet no effects analysis, no alternatives analysis, and no mitigation rationale tied to local conditions has been provided. Commercial salvage of this scale on this landscape requires a project-specific environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. The agency must explain on the record why it believes a programmatic framework substitutes for that obligation here.

There is also no economic gain for the American citizens in this project. The money will only benefit the logging company at the expense of the taxpayers. That is not hyperbole; it follows directly from a document that authorizes millions of board feet of commercial timber removal without demonstrating any public benefit tied to local environmental outcomes. The Forest Service is obligated to act in the interest of the American people, not the timber industry, and the framing of this project as "recovery" does not disguise what the balance sheet actually shows. The agency should explain what specific, measurable public benefit justifies the expenditure of public resources to facilitate this commercial harvest, and it should do so in terms that go beyond the industry's own gain.

The project also cannot demonstrate it will maintain the habitat conditions its own standards require. PDC TES-9 directs the agency to "Maintain mixed stand conditions in some portions of areas burned, including retaining a well-distributed diversity of patch sizes and burned conditions," yet the document contains no maps, no patch-retention targets, and no monitoring requirements that would show how any of that diversity survives across thousands of acres of mechanical harvest. The agency must provide a spatial analysis demonstrating how the proposed harvest pattern actually satisfies TES-9 rather than simply citing it.

Finally, the soil productivity question is unanswered. PDC H-10a states that "The cumulative detrimental effects from project implementation and restoration must, at a minimum, not exceed the conditions prior to the planned activity and should move toward a net improvement in soil quality." The project authorizes landings across the harvest area at a rate of one per 10 to 15 acres, yet the document contains no pre-activity detrimental soil condition baseline, no cumulative soil impact calculation, and no demonstration that 80 percent of each activity area will retain acceptable productivity potential once landings, skid trails, and temporary roads are accounted for together. The agency must supply a site-specific soils analysis tied to the actual footprint of this project before any ground-disturbing activity is authorized.