Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/13/2026 12:57:42 AM
First name: Angeline
Last name: Zalben
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I want the Wallowa-Whitman managed responsibly, and I do not think the Whitman Post-Fire Recovery decision, covering 7,402 acres between the Anthony, Olive Butte, and McCully fires, meets that standard as written. My request is simple: either quantify the socioeconomic effects at a meaningful geographic scale or prepare an Environmental Impact Statement that forces that rigor.

The document concludes there are no adverse socioeconomic impacts, yet it concedes throughout Section 2.3.6 that its analysis is largely qualitative. In Section 2.2 it states: "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." Difficulty is not a substitute for analysis. The document offers no site-specific or even regional estimate of jobs created, board feet harvested, acres treated, or dollars of timber value recovered under the proposed action. A conclusion of no significant impact that rests on no project-level numbers is an unreasoned leap, and NEPA calls for a reasonably complete disclosure of effects. I ask the agency to show its work: where are the figures that support the no-adverse-impacts finding?

The cultural resources section raises a second problem. In Section 4.3 the agency acknowledges: "On average, about 15 percent of National Forest System lands have been inventoried through surveys and other methods to identify historic properties and other cultural resources." The same section reports that only 26 percent of the 456,839 recorded resources have been evaluated for National Register eligibility. Yet the proposed action authorizes ground-disturbing work across burned areas and pushes all site-specific identification and assessment off to later project-level decisions under a phased Section 106 process. The document never asks whether that gap is itself a significant impact. Will the agency conduct or fund accelerated surveys in high-probability areas before ground disturbance begins, or explain in an EIS why deferral is adequate given what it already knows about its own inventory? I expect a direct answer to that question.

Managing this forest responsibly means knowing what is at stake, economically and culturally, before the work starts rather than after.