

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/14/2025 3:51:58 PM

First name: Alice

Last name: Roberge

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to logging proposed by the Lost River Integrated Resource Project #63401. The environmental analysis proposed by the Forest Service lacks evidence in areas of key importance. For example, it is stated that the Lost River logging is necessary and would not have significant environmental impacts. What evidence is used to support this claim? This is clearly false as it would further endanger the already endangered Northern Long-eared Bat, not to mention other species that depend on this area. Another example is that the Forest Service's conclusion 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 - while including no 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. Further, the Forest Service considers no alternatives to their proposal beside a "no-action" alternative, which they cursorily discuss in half a page (p. 16). 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," while providing no evidence to support this claim. As a science teacher for many years, I drummed into my students that in science, one must support claims with evidence. It is time the Forest Service does the same.