Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/11/2026 2:17:37 PM
First name: Lorie
Last name: Staffan
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Don't cut down these trees. Dead trees give wildlife a place to live, and as they break down they feed the soil. I watch wildlife and birds, clean water matters to me, and I want this land managed responsibly. I also care how my tax money is spent, and I don't want it spent cutting down burned trees. Let the forest heal itself over time.

The agency's own economics make that case better than I can. Section 2.3.6 says "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 document describes a window of activity that runs through the first 5 years after a fire and may extend later. If the timber is worth almost nothing by year five, what is the public paying for when work happens late? The document does not square a one-year window for value with an implementation period that can run well past it. I want the agency to say when salvage harvest still makes economic sense, and what recovery goal it serves when it does not.

The cost side is just as thin. The document concludes there are no adverse socioeconomic impacts, but admits at 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 conclusion of no impact built on qualitative judgment, with no project-level figures for jobs, harvest volume or timber value, is an assertion, not an analysis. As a taxpayer I am owed numbers before money moves. Either produce them at a meaningful local scale or prepare a full Environmental Impact Statement.

I ask the Forest Service to choose alternative 2, the no action alternative, in the final decision.