Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/8/2025 12:27:02 AM
First name: David
Last name: Lukas
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I have many concerns about this planned project, starting with the fact that significant amounts of new information was released after the public had a chance to comment on the draft EA. Not only that, but there's more information that hasn't even been released yet, so I don't feel that the public has had a chance to meaningfully comment on this project. I ask that this new information be added and the public given a chance to comment of a new draft EA or EIS.

This is especially important because the current FEA is so illegible and disorganized that I can't evaluate the impacts of this project. It might have helped if the FEA had been developed with public input in the first place, rather than behind closed doors with special interest groups having privileged, early access to the information in these documents.

I'm especially dismayed that the Forest Service is providing only one action alternative and that your cumulative effects analysis misses so many critical impacts. In particular, impacts on recreational use of the forest are not disclosed and this matters to me and many other people in the community whose economic livelihoods depend on forest recreation. I am a certified guide who leads educational outings on the National Forest under a special use permit so this is personal to me.

In terms of the long-term sustainable health and well being of our national forest, it's a glaring omission that the FEA does not analazye the impacts of reconstructed and new roads in the project area. Roads are harmful to forest health, stream and river health, and they diminish the recreational potential of a wild landscape that people pay to experience.

Given the obvious impacts to landscape I am concerned that no response from the National Marine Fisheries Service and Fish & Wildlife Service was included prior to the final EA. What are the impacts to the 14 listed species impacted by this project? I don't know, and there's no information in the FEA that can help me evaluate the status of these impacts.

On a more technical note, I notice that the FEA deviates without justification from directives of the Northwest Forest Plan. This includes logging of older forests, protections for listed species, and riparian safeguards. Trying to remedy this with Forest Plan amendments goes against the bipartisan and democractic spirit of the Northwest Forest Plan.

In conclusion, I'd like to see the Midnight and Twisp Restoration Projects combined, with an EIS and project that is consistent with Forest Plans. This process must include a wide-ranging, good faith effort to include the public who lives and livelihoods are most impacted by this project. Thank you.