

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/13/2025 8:10:00 PM

First name: Erin

Last name: Healy

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As someone who loves the White Mountains, I am deeply concerned about the Lost River Integrated Resource Project.

The significant increase in logging that would result from the Lost River IRP would be disastrous for numerous reasons. First, nearly 20% of the proposed logging would take the form of clear cuts, which are environmentally catastrophic (completely decimate the forest ecosystem, lead to significant runoff in nearby waterways, facilitate increased wind speeds and therefore heightened forest fire risks, etc.) and make it impossible for a forest to regenerate within our lifetime. Second, over 91% of the proposed logging in the Lost River IRP is within two Inventoried Roadless Areas. One of these areas is on the slopes of beautiful Mt. Moosilauke and the other surrounds stunning Elbow Pond. Logging in roadless areas is particularly damaging as it causes significant harm to sensitive interior forest species and all but guarantees diminished water quality and floodwater retention. This is especially dangerous in light of the steep slopes in these mountains and increased precipitation from climate change. Inventoried Roadless Areas should NEVER be logged as they are among the last vestiges of true wilderness in New England. As icons of our country's natural heritage, these areas are worthy of permanent protection.

The Lost River IRP both fails to account for negative impacts on carbon sequestration and our climate and erroneously claims that logging will benefit both climate mitigation and climate resilience. This is nonsense. Logging that would result from the Lost River IRP would undermine our region's climate resilience, biodiversity, heritage and outdoor recreation industry in addition to critical habitat for hundreds of species, including one of our endangered species, the Northern Long-eared Bat.

I urge the Forest Service to do the following:

- Revise its assessment and do an accurate analysis of climate and carbon impacts as required by the National Environmental Policy Act; and
- Give significantly more consideration to the so-called "no-action" alternative, which is currently limited to a half-page discussion reliant on the unsubstantiated claim that logging is necessary to prevent the landscape from trending "toward a homogeneous even-aged structure and species mix."

From where I'm standing, no action seems considerably less damaging than the actions proposed by the Lost River IRP.