



## **Alert Toolkit**

### **Proposed changes to the public comment and objections processes on National Forests.**

Comments on the NOI **must be received in writing by March 9th, 2026 at 11:59 PM EDT** on [the Public Comment Portal](#), or mailed to:  
Director, Ecosystem Management Coordination,  
201 14th Street SW, Mailstop 1108,  
Washington, DC 20250-1124.

To view the NOI, [see the federal register notice here.](#)

## **SAMPLE ACTION ALERT**

### ***Sample Email to Members (for organizations):***

**Tell the Trump Administration — The public deserves a say in how our national forests are managed.**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Our National Forest System holds some of America's most iconic public lands. But the Trump administration is once again hard at work to limit the public's ability to track and comment on logging projects on public lands. The new rule would limit the public comment and objection periods for Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements to 10 days and 20 days, respectively. These projects can be massive, spanning thousands of acres and impacting drinking watersheds, special recreation areas, and vulnerable wildlife habitat.

Here in Oregon, national forests offer campgrounds at the base of Mt. Hood, mountain biking trails near Bend, and mushroom gathering and berry picking in the Coast Range. Our intact forests also offer unique and critical habitat for at risk fish and wildlife, including iconic Pacific Northwest salmon. Forests also filter water to keep our streams, rivers and lakes clean and cold, and these same forests protect watersheds and communities from flooding and landslides. The public deserves a say in how logging projects are developed in these forests, and the Trump administration is trying to cut out your voice from these decisions.

The proposed rule would impose strict limits on the public comment and objection process — which will cut the public out of these processes, especially people and organizations with limited time and capacity. Please join us in demanding the Trump administration withdraw the proposed rule.

Sincerely,

---

***Sample Email to Members (for individuals or organizations doing alerts):***

Dear Acting Director of Ecosystem Management Coordination,

I am writing to respectfully request that you withdraw the proposed rule — it ignores the critical role the public and outside experts play in providing information for public lands decisions.

The organizations and individuals who submit public comments for national forest logging projects provide essential expert insights and real-world observations. They often have local, ecological knowledge and deep ties to the forests covered by the proposed projects. Providing this knowledge can be time consuming. Cutting the comment and objection periods short on these projects will leave our forests, communities, and wildlife worse off.

The projects impacted by the proposed rule can cover tens of thousands of acres and can span decades. The new rule would limit the public comment and objection periods for Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements to 10 days and 20 days, respectively. This is simply not enough time for individuals and small volunteer based organizations to draft comments.

Commenters often must review an environmental document, determine which areas of the project site to visit, coordinate with the appropriate specialists to evaluate site conditions, visit the site to verify the information in the environmental document and survey for additional

information, analyze findings, and describe those findings in written comments. It can take several hours to reach project sites from nearby population centers, or even to travel from one end of a project footprint to another, and site visits can occur over multiple days or weeks.

The new time constraints and page limits will lead to ill-informed management decisions on public lands, and will result in less transparency and accountability of logging in national forests. Communities, wildlife, drinking watersheds, and beloved recreation areas will be impacted by the proposed rule, and none of those impacts are properly accounted for. The rule must be withdrawn.

Sincerely,

XX

## *How to personalize your comments (for individuals):*

The Forest Service's proposed changes to the public comment and objections processes for projects would burden organizations and individuals who care about public lands and who wish to submit meaningful comments on logging and other project proposals. Your personal experience with participating in the public comment process can lend important examples of why the proposed rule is bad. In submitting your comments on these proposed changes, consider sharing your experience with the following:

- When have you commented on a Forest Service project in the past?
- How did you find out about the comment period? (Forest Service email, FS website, from an organization, for the local newspaper?)
- Once you found out about it, how long did it take you before you felt ready to submit your comment? Did you seek out additional information outside of the Forest Service documentation? Did you visit the project area during the comment period?
- In your comments, did you offer any specific ecological or other local knowledge based on your personal or professional experience?
- Has the timeline for project comments been an impediment to you? For example, would you have been able to submit more thorough comments with more time or would you have been able to visit the project area with more time?
- Has the information you submitted in comments ever led to the Forest Service making changes to the project? For example, were any areas dropped from the project because of your field survey or personal knowledge about the presence of sensitive areas or species?

Highlighting your personal experience in your comments is important — thank you for taking this extra step!