

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/21/2026 2:26:48 PM

First name: Kira

Last name: Muller

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Clean water and protected public land are what brought me to this comment. I want everyone and everything to have access to clean water, and I want my kids, and their kids, to have access to a pristine and protected landscape at Akawa Butte. Stop destroying beautiful and essential wildlife and natural lands. That is the frame through which I oppose this project.

The scale of commercial extraction proposed here demands a full site-specific environmental analysis, and none exists. The Treatment Acres Table shows 10,080 total acres affected and 28,655 overlapping activity acres, yet the agency relies on a national programmatic framework rather than examining actual site conditions, fire severity, soils, hydrology, or species populations at Akawa Butte itself. In that same document, the agency states that "It is estimated the project will authorize about 12 million board feet (MMBF) of timber or other wood product removal." That volume of extraction, authorized without a project-level effects analysis, without an alternatives analysis, and without mitigation rationale tied to local conditions, does not meet the standard the public deserves. Who benefits from this, and how much money are they making while public land absorbs the cost? The agency must answer that question and must explain on the record why no project-specific EA or EIS was prepared for this specific landscape.

The soil productivity standard embedded in this project's own design criteria is also unmet by the document as written. 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 detrimental soil condition baseline and no cumulative soil impact calculation appears anywhere in the document. The agency's own criterion at 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." Asserting that standard while providing no site-specific soils analysis to demonstrate it will be met is not a finding, it is a placeholder. The agency must provide the analysis showing the 80 percent productivity threshold will be satisfied across the combined footprint of landings, skid trails, and temporary roads.

The temporary road portion of the project raises a separate and serious concern about watershed protection. The project authorizes 3.05 miles of new temporary road construction in a post-fire watershed, yet the activity card for temporary road construction and removal leaves unchecked both the installation of drainage features such as culverts and the restoration of natural drainage patterns by removing them. A post-fire landscape is hydrologically sensitive. Operating new roads across it without addressing drainage design or removal is internally inconsistent with the erosion-minimization requirement the project itself cites. The agency should explain why drainage features are excluded from both the construction and removal phases of temporary road work here, and should analyze the erosion and sedimentation consequences of that choice for the Akawa Butte watershed.

My tax dollars fund this agency and this project. Responsible management of these public lands means answering these questions before a single tree is felled, not after. Protect our environment.