

Bousfield, Lisa M -FS

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 9:37 AM
To: FS-comments-pacificsouthwest-klamath-happy-camp
Cc: Bousfield, Lisa M -FS
Subject: Scoping comments on Crawford

February 4, 2014

Dear Supervisor Grantham,

It saddens me that the USFS once again proposes a timber sale intended to please the natural resource extraction corporations while simultaneously attempting to justify it to the public with lies. You know and your IDT knows commercial logging never (emphasis added) improves forest health or biodiversity. Of course this is the case with the Crawford timber sale. ①

The only thing a commercial timber sale improves is the financial bottom line for the corporate purchaser.

I look forward to the day when truthful P&Ns for timber sales are written by the USFS. These P&Ns would describe the 2 real reasons all commercial timber sales are proposed in national forest land.

1) Help to spend all NFTM dollars allocated in the same FY so next year's budget will no be reduced.

2) Help to meet RO volume expectations.

Perhaps someday, the USFS will also truthfully describe how the logging and road construction will plunder numerous amenity resources in and downstream from the sale area in Chapter 3. Some truthful line-officers might actually admit that their mitigation measures are effective maybe 30% of the time. ②

Someday the USFS might actually delete units and roads to protect the proper functioning of the natural resources in the area. Intelligent people know that the USFS must never need to mitigate anything. Why? If a line-officer wants to protect and conserve the countless natural resources in the forest (which is what the public wants) they would never propose potentially harmful actions especially when their actions are intended to provide corporate profit opportunities.

if potentially harmful actions are from

Your January 21, 2014 scoping letter states:

“Although consultation and analysis are still ongoing, so far they indicate that in order to effectively meet the purpose and need of the project, proposed project treatments might result in a likely to

adversely affect determination for the Northern Spotted Owl and its habitat. As a result, I have decided to prepare an EIS instead of an EA.”

It's strange that a forest supervisor would believe completing an EIS rather than an EA will eliminate harm spotted owl habitat. Your witless quest for volume is affecting your ability to think rationally Grantham.

I suggest you practice your lie delivery to other people. In the not too distant future you will be receiving phone calls from reporters representing the Eureka *Times-Standard*, Redding *Searchlight*, Shasta Lake *Bulletin*, and the *Siskiyou Daily News*.

Sincerely,

Dick Artley (retired forest planner, forest NEPA document legal compliance reviewer, and forest appeals/litigation coordinator --- Nez Perce National Forest, Idaho)