

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/14/2025 1:46:28 AM

First name: Pam

Last name: Youngquist

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hello,

I am writing to provide comment on The Lost River Integrated Resource Project proposed logging plan in the White Mountain National Forest. As a yearly hiker and camper in this majestic forest and gorge I am especially concerned with how this project is being hastily pushed through. It is deeply troubling to see yet another logging plan being jammed through in our national forest. The Peabody West, Tarleton, and Sandwich logging is beyond enough already.

The draft environmental analysis of the Lost River project is brief and unsubstantiated. In numerous sections, the Forest Service leans on incomplete reasoning - often with no citations to support their claims - that Lost River logging is necessary and would not have significant environmental impacts. For example, in the hydrology section the Forest Service concludes that the project would have no impacts on water "quality or quantity" because it does not exceed blanket thresholds for the proportion of an entire watershed that is logged. They fail to include any discussion of the slope of the logged lands or the increase in extreme precipitation due to climate change, both of which certainly impact the chance of negative effects to streams.

The Forest Service considers no alternatives to their proposal beside a "no-action" alternative, which they cursorily discuss in half a page. This discussion mostly amounts to an ominous claim that, without the proposed logging, "the landscape would trend toward a homogeneous even-aged structure and species mix," without providing any evidence to support this claim.

Additionally the Lost River IRP fails to account for negative impacts on carbon and the climate, but claims that logging will benefit both climate mitigation and climate resilience. The Forest Service should revise its assessment to do an accurate analysis of climate and carbon impacts as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

Lastly the proposed project is in two Inventoried Roadless Areas that are fully documented. Logging in roadless areas threatens water quality and floodwater retention, as well as habitat for interior forest species. No logging should ever occur in Inventoried Roadless Areas, period.

Since the only option provided is "no action" I am urging the Forest Service and all decision makers to make this choice, the only sound and considered one.

Sincerely,

Pam Youngquist