Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/8/2026 7:26:47 PM
First name: Anon
Last name: Anon
Organization:
Title:
Comments: The people's land belongs to the people, not to whoever profits from the next salvage contract. I am commenting to oppose the Whitman Post-Fire Recovery project because the agency has not demonstrated that it will manage this land responsibly, protect clean water, or spend public resources honestly.

The document's socioeconomic analysis is a conclusion without a foundation. The agency claims there are no adverse socioeconomic impacts under the proposed action, yet it acknowledges in Section 2.2 that "Given the nature of socioeconomic impacts and the broad scope of a national-level environmental assessment, quantifying the impacts on human communities is complex and challenging." A finding of no significant impact built entirely on qualitative reasoning, with no project-level estimate of jobs, harvest volumes, acres treated, or timber value recovered, is not analysis. It is an assertion. NEPA requires a reasonably complete disclosure of effects. If the agency cannot quantify what it proposes to do and what that will cost or return, it cannot honestly tell the public that the tradeoffs are acceptable. The agency must either supply meaningful numbers at a geographic scale relevant to this project or prepare an Environmental Impact Statement that compels that discipline. I want a direct response to this point in the record of this proceeding.

The document's internal timeline problem is just as serious. Section 2.3.6 states that "the available volume from fire-killed timber of similar species was shown to be about zero by year five following a fire," yet the same section describes an implementation window that runs five years and may extend beyond it. These two statements cannot both support the project's premise. If salvage value is effectively gone by year five, the economic rationale for harvest disappears exactly when implementation slips. The document never reconciles this. It never explains what recovery objective is served when timber is harvested after its value has gone to zero, or under what conditions the agency will stop calling an activity salvage and start calling it something else. The agency should directly address when and whether salvage harvest remains viable under its own timeline, and what it is actually recovering if the timber value is not there.

Clean water and functioning natural places are not abstract benefits. They are what I care about when I say this land should be managed responsibly. The agency has not shown me that it has thought carefully about either the economic or the ecological coherence of what it is proposing. I urge the agency to withdraw or substantially revise this project.