

Barbara Carol Champer-Cook
1945-2026

Barbara "Bobbie" Carol Champer-Cook, 80, born November 3, 1945, in Ironton, Ohio, passed away on Saturday, September 19, 2026.



Bobbie graduated from Ironton High School in 1963, where she was a member of the high school band. Her love of music stayed with her throughout her life and continued to bring her joy over the years. Bobbie worked for Whayne Supply Company in Ashland, Kentucky, and was a member of St. Lawrence Catholic Church in Ironton, Ohio.

Those who knew Bobbie knew just how much personality she had. She was incredibly funny, had a heart of gold, and had a way of bringing laughter to those around her. Bobbie had a special place in her heart for animals, but nothing meant more to her than the people she loved.

Bobbie is survived by her husband, Carl E. Cook; longtime friend, Carolyn Sheridan; niece, Allison Champer-Swim; children, Jerry Cook and Terry Cook (Elaine); grandchildren, Cortney Holbrook (Nick), Kimberly Cook, Carrina Cook, and Jacob Cook (Brittany); and great-grandchildren, Brantley Shelton, Paisley Shelton, Roman Davis, Isaac Cook, Raelyn O'Neal, Adaraha O'Neal, and Edward Cook.

She was preceded in death by her parents, Paul Henry Champer and Carol Genevieve Morris Champer, and her brother, Stanley Paul Champer.

Vitiation will be held on Friday, September 25, 2026, at 11:00 a.m. at O'Keefe-Baker Funeral Home in Ironton, Ohio. The funeral service will begin at 12:00 p.m., with graveside burial to follow.

Donna Mae Prince
1991-2026

Donna Mae Prince, 35, of Ironton, Ohio passed away on September 15, 2026, in Ohio State University Hospital ICU. She was born January 8, 1991, in Ironton, Ohio, the daughter of Donald Prince of Ironton and the late Margaret Delawder Prince.



Donna was a 2012 graduate of Rock Hill High School. She loved coloring and drawing, participating in family drag racing, shopping, and getting her hair and nails done especially.

In addition to her mother, she was preceded in death by her paternal grandparents, Stairl (Beulah) Prince, maternal grandparents, Walt (Donna) Delawder, uncles, Dave, Danny (Sherry) Prince, Rick, Steven Prince and Bill Delawder.

Survivors include, in addition to her father, are her aunts, Debbie Young of Grayson, Kentucky, Dreama (Curt) Fannin of Ironton, Janice (Matthew) White of Ironton, her uncles,

Dale (Beth) Prince of Ironton, Dean (Sherry) Prince of Kitts Hill, aunts Eileen Green of Rush, Kentucky, and Jody Delawder, uncle Doug (Ashley) Delawder, her special friends, Heather Colley, Skylar Higgins, Tiffany Mandeville,

RayRay and Daniel Bridges, her cousins, Ashlee (Josh), Kim (Brian), Kelly Prince, Nick (Kelly) Prince, Charley (Destiny) Young, Becky Young, Matt, Kaylon, Mark, Luke (Lisa Perkins) and Rachel.

Funeral service will be at 11:00 am, Monday, September 21, 2026, with Brother Larry Royster officiating. There will be a public visitation from 5:00 pm - 7:00 pm on Sunday September 20, 2026, at Phillips Funeral Home, 1004 S. 7th St. Ironton. Burial will follow the funeral service in Haverhill Cemetery. Please visit www.phillipsfuneralhome.net to offer condolences to the family.

Mom's passing triggers reevaluation of friendships

Dear Abby: My mom died of extreme old age recently. She was a sweet woman everyone loved. I sent invitations to her memorial, and I'm getting a lot of excuses for why my friends can't attend. I am upset.

In my circle of friends (all similar ages), I was the last to graduate, get a career job, start a relationship, buy a house, be married and so forth. I've attended my friends' graduations, weddings, baby showers, milestone birthdays, and family funerals, yet there hasn't been much reciprocation.

Excuses for not attending Mom's memorial included going to a grandkid's soccer game and attending a 2-year-old's birthday party. Really? I know I'm dealing with unusually strong emotions due to Mom's death, but I want to scream, "This is MY MOM," not some distant friend or relative.

My spouse says I shouldn't stress and that all we need is each other (said by someone who has a huge, loving family whereas my family is just me and my dad). How do I deal with my feelings of resentment, abandonment and being a low priority? - Last one in California

Dear Last One: Your spouse is right. In the final analysis, all you need is each other - though a few supportive friends would certainly be welcome. I have always said that funerals are for the living, not the deceased. Be grateful for the support you are receiving from the people who accepted the invitation to your mother's funeral. They are your core support group; the others are mere acquaintances, so start thinking of them in those terms.

Dear Abby: I rent a two-bedroom apartment, which I shared with my best friend. When he moved away last month due to a work relocation, I advertised the room, and a couple moved in. They are friendly and pay their rent on time, but their cooking produces extremely strong smells that I cannot tolerate. My medication causes hypersensitivity to odors, and I can no longer stand to be in the kitchen because the smells linger. They also live on a very different schedule from me. As a result, my diet and sleep are both suffering. They remain unaware of how the adjustment has affected me because I don't feel they are doing anything wrong.

I would like to move out into a studio of my own. The lease on this apartment is currently a month-to-month, so the only thing keeping me here is the guilt I feel about burdening my roommates with this. They will have to move out, find a replacement for me or take on the full rent themselves. I want to do right by them, but I know it would be best for me to leave. What is the proper course of action here? - Doomed in Australia

Dear Doomed: There is no reason why you should feel guilty for leveling with this couple; your health must come first. Explain the problem to them and tell them that while you like them personally, your health is being affected by the cooking odors. Tell them that because you are now on a month-to-month lease, you plan to move to a smaller place of your own and give them the option of staying or moving. Consider this a first step in learning to stand up for yourself.

Dear Abby is written by Abigail Van Buren. For nearly four decades, Jeanne Phillips penned this column, which was founded in 1956 by her mother, Pauline Phillips. Contact Dear Abby at www.DearAbby.com or P.O. Box 270135, Kansas City, MO 64127.

Paid obituaries are published as submitted to The Daily Independent

Trump administration says developers, loggers can kill endangered species

BY ALEX BROWN
STATE NEWSROOM

The Trump administration's top wildlife official issued a directive last week that expands a recent rollback of endangered species protections much further than the feds had told the public.

Individuals and industries may kill endangered animals in the course of logging projects, developments and other activities, it said — so long as the activity's purpose isn't killing species.

The memo issued by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director Brian Nesvik is the most drastic move yet in the Trump administration's campaign to limit the scope of the Endangered Species Act.

Wildlife advocates and experts said the nation's bedrock wildlife conservation law would offer few safeguards under the new federal guidelines.

"Unless you're wearing a T-shirt that says, 'I'm here to draw the blood of endangered species,' you're basically off the hook," said Brett Hartl, government affairs director with the Center for Biological Diversity, a conservation nonprofit. "Wink, wink, nudge, nudge, go crazy, we're not gonna prosecute you."

Chris Servheen, who served as grizzly bear recovery coordinator for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for 35 years, said the agency's current approach to the endangered species law is "ridiculously extreme."

"It's essentially going to be a meaningless law, and it will have no protection whatsoever for species," he said. "It's like taking the four wheels off your car and saying it's still your car."

Earlier this year, the Fish and Wildlife Service and other federal agencies finalized a rule excluding the destruction of habitat from the definition of "harm" covered by the law. As long as chopping trees or draining a wetland didn't directly kill animals, the feds said, those actions were legal even if they led to a species' demise.

Now, Nesvik is instructing wildlife officials that even the direct killing of endangered animals does not constitute an illegal "take" as long the action was not "intentionally directed at a particular animal or animals." Its instructions to staff on how to implement the new rule take effect immediately.

"A vessel that inadvertently strikes a whale has not taken it, because the vessel's course was not set against the whale," he wrote. "Felling a tree is not a take of the bats roosting in it unless the tree is felled for the purpose of killing or capturing them."

The memo could unravel a longstanding framework in which developers and other industries undergo an environmental analysis for their projects' impacts to endangered species, and obtain permits accounting for that harm. Wildlife advocates warned that industries using the agency's new directive to forgo permits may still face citizen lawsuits, and a new administration could reinstate the previous interpretation of the law.

The Fish and Wildlife Service forwarded a Stateline request for comment to the Department of the Interior, which did not grant an interview request.

The memo, sent last Monday to agency staff across the country, quickly raised alarms after it was leaked to the public.

A coalition of attorneys general, tribes and environmental groups have filed lawsuits challenging the Trump administration's rollbacks to the Endangered Species Act. Advocates said the Nesvik memo will open up a new battle ground in the ongoing legal fight, but it's too early to say if that will come in the form of separate lawsuits.

Jane Davenport, senior attorney at Defenders of Wildlife, a conservation nonprofit, noted that the "harm" rule and Nesvik's memo draw heavily from the late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia's dissent in a landmark 1995 case. In a 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that habitat destruction constitutes harm to wildlife under the Endangered Species Act. But Scalia disagreed, saying that the "take" of wildlife describes actions "done directly and intentionally (not indirectly and by accident) to particular animals (not populations of animals)."

"(Nesvik's) decision in every aspect of it entirely relies on Scalia's dissent," she said. "It's reducing the scope of (endangered species protections) to an absurdly narrow interpretation that is inconsistent with what Congress intended."

While some industry groups sup-

ported the "harm" rule in public comments, few of the organizations or lawmakers who backed that change have made public statements on Nesvik's memo about how it will be applied. But some conservatives praised the decision.

"It will shield innocent people from litigation by the country's largest law firm, the Department of Justice," William Perry Pendley, who served as acting director of the Bureau of Land Management during Trump's first term, told *Cowboy State Daily*.

Wildlife advocates said the memo could allow developers or logging companies to knowingly chop down a forest filled with endangered owls or bats, so long as the purpose of their action was timber harvest.

Kate Groetzing, communications director with the Center for Western Priorities, a conservation group. said "This basically is a blank check to companies, landowners, developers, loggers — anyone operating in endangered species habitat — to both destroy that habitat and kill the animals and literally face no consequences."

Servheen, the former grizzly bear recovery coordinator, said the memo will allow hunters to gun down endangered species, as long as they later claim they mistook a grizzly bear for a black bear or a similar failure of species identification.

"This tells law enforcement that they have no ability to prosecute somebody who kills a grizzly bear," he said. "(Hunters) are basically relieved of any responsibility of what they're shooting, you can do whatever you want and say 'I didn't mean to.' It makes the outdoors a pretty dangerous place now."

The memo could also limit environmental reviews of potentially harmful projects, some advocates warned. For instance, a new road through Florida panther territory may no longer need an environmental analysis if increased vehicle collisions with panthers are no longer considered "take" by federal wildlife officials, Davenport said.

During the rulemaking process for the "harm" definition, federal officials argued that the change would empower states to protect wildlife under their own laws. But experts say state wildlife agencies lack the authority, resources and expertise to replace federal oversight.

FOR ALL YOUR
OBITUARY
NEEDS AND
QUESTIONS
Please Phone Us Directly At
THE DAILY
Independent
606.326.2663