

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/21/2026 2:24:17 PM

First name: Anne

Last name: Meier

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The forest/urban interface is a resource I care deeply about, and what happens at the Akawa Butte Fire in the Sisters Ranger District touches that concern directly. I hike in this beautiful region, I take pictures out there, and I want my kids to have something worth inheriting. I also care how my tax money gets spent, and this project gives me serious reason to question whether it has been thought through.

The project document states, "It is estimated the project will authorize about 12 million board feet (MMBF) of timber or other wood product removal," yet no site-specific environmental analysis of this landscape supports that authorization. The Treatment Acres Table shows 10,080 total acres affected and 28,655 overlapping activity acres, with commercial salvage covering 3,587 of those acres, but the agency relies entirely on a national programmatic Post-Fire Recovery EA rather than any project-level NEPA review of actual local conditions, fire severity, soils, hydrology, or species populations. There is no effects analysis, no alternatives analysis, and no mitigation rationale tied to what is actually on the ground at Akawa Butte. I want the agency to address this gap directly and explain why a project of this scale does not require a project-specific EA or EIS analyzing the real environmental consequences on this specific landscape.

The temporary road construction raises a related concern. The project authorizes 3.05 miles of new temporary road in a post-fire watershed, and the activity card shows that checkboxes for installing drainage features such as culverts and for restoring natural drainage patterns by removing culverts or drainage structures are both unchecked. The Activity Card: Temporary Roads, Construction and Removal does state that "Temporary road removal shall establish vegetative cover to reduce erosion and restore soil productivity and watershed function," but leaving drainage installation and drainage restoration entirely out of the picture while operating in a hydrologically sensitive burned landscape is internally inconsistent with that stated goal. I want the agency to explain why drainage features are excluded here and to analyze what the erosion and sedimentation risk of that choice actually is.

My concern about sustainable practices extends to soil productivity. PDC H-10a states, "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," and the document also requires that 80 percent of each activity area retain acceptable productivity potential. The project authorizes landings at a rate of one per 10 to 15 acres averaging one-half acre each across 4,928 harvest acres, yet no pre-activity soil condition baseline and no cumulative soil impact calculation appears anywhere in the document. I want a site-specific soils analysis showing that the 80 percent productivity threshold will actually be met given the combined footprint of landings, skid trails, and temporary roads.

Beyond these specific technical failures, I strongly urge open and public processes for decisions that affect American resources like this one. Stronger moves toward sustainable resource management practices belong at the center of any post-fire recovery effort, not as afterthoughts appended to a programmatic template. This project, in its current form, does not meet that standard.