Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/11/2026 6:34:10 PM
First name: Suzie
Last name: Savoie
Organization:
Title:
Comments: The things I look for in the Wallowa-Whitman are rare plants, wildlife, birds, and mature and old-growth forests, along with the old-growth dependent species that need them. I value the botanical diversity of this region and its intact, native plant habitat. When I hike, camp, paddle or take pictures out there, that is what I am trying to see, and it is why the Whitman Post-Fire Recovery proposal troubles me.

Salvage logging is not good ecologically and does nothing but provide increased profits for the timber industry at the expense of the public and ecological good.

Don't salvage log these forests!

Section 3.4.2 says that post-fire harvest "results in openings where nearly all trees are removed from the unit, especially when mortality is high," and then states: "The effect is like that of a clear-cut or other treatment that creates an opening." That is a frank description of what is planned. Yet the same section tells the public these landscapes will look "unaltered" over the long term, without saying how long "long-term" is for each forest type, and without disclosing which scenic integrity objectives are assigned to the affected units. Clear-cut-equivalent openings do not recover to a mature forest on any short horizon, and that matters to someone who values old-growth and the plants and birds that depend on it. The agency should publish the distribution of scenic integrity objectives across the burned areas and show whether such openings can meet them within a defined time. I ask the agency to answer that directly.

The scenery conclusion also leans on design criteria that are not reproduced in the text. The document says the scenery "would appear slightly to moderately altered when viewed from high concern level travel corridors or use areas in the short-term and appear unaltered in the long-term as remaining trees increase in height." But in units where nearly all trees are removed, there are no remaining trees to grow taller, and the document itself says stumps can persist into the long term. So how can those units appear unaltered, and by what date? Define short term and long term, publish the scenery criteria, and show the reasoning for the units where nearly everything is cut.

The burned ground between these fires still holds native plant habitat and rare species that I care about, and I want this land managed responsibly. I ask that the agency not treat scenery impacts as settled by assertion, and that it answer these questions in the final analysis.

Stop this project and only implement real hazard tree mitigation along roads and near human infrastructure, and don't log the biologically diverse post-fire forests.