

Polls about whether the Public Accepts Logging on National Forests

Every Recent Survey Assessing the Public Acceptance of Commercial Timber Harvest on Public Land shows that the Majority Disapproves of it.

Recreationists Avoid Logged Areas. This eliminates the massive community revenue (motels, gas stations, restaurants etc.) that come from recreation-related pursuits.

The following 16 polls indicate that average Americans do not want the trees in their national forest harvested. They feel they are more valuable when left standing.

Each poll may be validated by accessing the poll itself using the electronic links provided.

If the Responsible Official believes that these polls do not represent the American public, then please cite polls (with links to the poll itself) showing that Americans approve of such timber harvest in their national forest.



Poll #1

Who was Polled: New England residents

Number of People Polled: 1,257 total

Maine - 300,
New Hampshire - 301,
Vermont - 301 and
Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island - 355

Date(s) of Poll: July 2002

Question: How important to you personally is it to ensure that there are areas where people can go for recreation where there are no motorized vehicles or logging?

Poll Findings:

	<u>Southern NE</u>	<u>Northern NE</u>
Very Important	74%	69%
Somewhat Important	20%	24%

Link to Poll: <http://www.brspoll.com/Reports/report-final.pdf>



Poll #2

Who was Polled: New England residents

Number of People Polled: 1,500

Date(s) of Poll: summer of 1998

Question: Do you oppose or support protection of all remaining undisturbed forest?

Poll Findings: 94%_supported protection of all remaining undisturbed forest.

Link to Poll: <http://www.forestwatch.org/content.php?id=53>



Poll #3

Who was Polled: Americans picked randomly nationwide from voter listings

Number of People Polled: 800 registered voters

Date(s) of Poll: June 22-25, 1998

Question: There has been a national debate about whether the U.S. Forest Service should continue to sell timber from our national forests. Do you favor or oppose continuing to allow timber companies to log in our national forests?

Poll Findings:

strongly favor logging in our national forests: 7%
somewhat favor logging in our national forests: 17%
neither: 2%
somewhat oppose logging in our national forests: 19%
strongly oppose logging in our national forests: 50%
don't know 5%

Link to Poll: <http://www.sdearthtimes.com/et0998/et0998s6.html>

Poll #4

Who was Polled: adult residents from across the province of Nova Scotia

Number of People Polled: 400

Date(s) of Poll: 2003

Question: "Some people say that protecting more wilderness areas in Nova Scotia is necessary to conserve native plants and animals and for outdoor recreation. Others say there are already enough protected areas, and that to create more would be too costly, particularly for resource-based industries such as forestry and mining. All things considered, do you personally believe there should be more, the same amount, or fewer protected wilderness areas on publicly owned Crown land in Nova Scotia?"

Poll Findings:

- More protected areas: 69%
- Same amount of protected areas: 28%
- Less protected areas: 3%

Link to Poll: <http://www.publicland.ca/news/040203.html>

Poll #5

Number of People Polled: 472 people living in Vermont

Date(s) of Poll: February, 2002

Question: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 not being important and 10 being extremely important, how important is it for the Green Mountain National Forest to provide opportunities for logging, grazing, or mining?

Poll Findings: 65% did not favor traditional development activities such as logging, grazing or mining.

Link to Poll: http://crs.uvm.edu/wildpoll/exec_summ.pdf

Poll #6

Who was Polled: North Carolina adults

Number of People Polled: 584

Date(s) of Poll: Oct. 19-30, 1998

Question: In general, do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose commercial logging in North Carolina's national forests?

Poll Findings: 62% of adult residents opposed commercial logging in North Carolina's national forests

Link to Poll: <http://www.unc.edu/news/archives/feb99/carpoll3.htm>

Poll #7

Who was Polled: Alabama registered voters

Number of People Polled: 400

Date(s) of Poll: 2000

Question: Do you favor logging on national forests?

Poll Findings:

74% opposed logging
13% favored logging

13% were not sure.

Link to Poll: <http://www.wildlaw.org/newsletters/July2000.htm>



Poll #8

Who was Polled: Residents of Oregon and Washington

Number of People Polled: 600

Date(s) of Poll: May 2001

Question: Should old-growth forests on national forest lands be protected from logging?

Poll Findings: Yes – 75%

Link to Poll: <http://www.conservationnw.org/library/newsletter/newsletter-pdfs/fall-ecosystemnews-2001.pdf>



Poll #9

Who was Polled: Randomly selected Georgia residents

Number of People Polled: 792

Date(s) of Poll: January 21 – February 1, 1998

Question: Recently there has been a national debate about whether the United States Forest Service should be allowed to sell timber from Federal public lands, such as the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests. In general, do you support or oppose commercial logging in Georgia's national forests?

Poll Findings:

Support Logging – 19.6%

Oppose Logging – 72.3%

Don't Know / No Answer – 8.1%

Link to Poll: <http://www.johnmuirproject.org/resources-summary-of-polling-data-1998.html>

Poll #10

Who was Polled: Randomly selected Ohio residents

Number of People Polled: 476

Date(s) of Poll: 1997

Question: Do you Support or Oppose Logging in Ohio's Wayne National Forest?

Poll Findings:

Support Logging – 26.5%

Oppose Logging – 73.5%

Link to Poll: <http://www.johnmuirproject.org/resources-summary-of-polling-data-1998.html>

Poll #11

Who was Polled: Randomly selected registered voters in the United States

Number of People Polled: 800

Date(s) of Poll: June 9-14, 1999

Question: Do you Support or Oppose Logging in Ohio's Wayne National Forest?

Poll Findings: 63% felt too little of the national forests are protected from commercial development and would favor a proposal that protects all roadless areas of 1,000 acres and larger.

Link to Poll: <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/archive/?date=19990806&slug=2975897>

Poll #12

Who was Polled: 344 district rangers and 124 forest supervisors randomly selected from a current organizational roster provided by the Washington Office of the Forest Service.

Number of People Polled: Of the 468 line officers selected, 246 (72 percent) of the district rangers and 70 (56 percent) of the forest supervisors returned usable questionnaires.

Date(s) of Poll: 1990

Poll Findings and Questions:

**Table 1 (Pg 455)
Mean scores on RPA questions for
District Rangers and Forest Supervisors
(Scale 1 to 5, 1 = Favorable, 5 = Unfavorable)**

RPA Question	District Rangers N=246	Forest Supervisors N=70
Increased production of wood from National forest System lands	3.91	3.99
Use of herbicides on brush in National Forest management	3.02	3.40
Use of pesticide to control insect losses in National Forest management	2.85	2.71
User payment for non-market services from National Forest lands	2.36	2.26
Development of National Forest lands for recreation purposes	1.77	1.60
Livestock forage development on National Forest lands	3.06	3.01
Development of energy-related and other minerals on National Forest lands	2.84	2.74

Link to Poll:

http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/bibarticles/brownharris_forest.pdf

Poll #13

Who was Polled: randomly selected voters in Washington state likely to vote in the November 2000 general election

Number of People Polled: 500

Date(s) of Poll: October 14-18, 1999

Poll Findings:

68% favor protecting existing natural areas for habitat and recreation by making them off limits to development and activities like logging and mining

Most (80%) likely voters say environmental issues are important to them when deciding how to vote, including a strong majority of Democrats (91%), Independents (80%), and Republicans (69%)

Link to Poll: http://www.lcvef.org/programs/polling-research/state-polling/LCVEF_Washington-Poll_Oct1999.pdf



Poll #14

Who was Polled: Americans randomly selected in the lower 48 states. A poll contracted by Chief Thomas.

Number of People Polled: 5,064

Date(s) of Poll: 2002

Questions and Poll Findings:

Public Beliefs about the roles of the Forest Service in their administration of the national forests.

The Forest Service should	Average Public Response	Page
Conserve and protect watersheds	4.61	32
Preserve natural resources through policies such as no timber, no mining	4.21	37
Protecting ecosystems and wildlife habitat	4.53	55

Restrict timber harvest and grazing	3.94	56
-------------------------------------	------	----

1 = public feels that the action is not important for the Forest Service to undertake
5 = public feels that the action should be something emphasized by the Forest Service

Link to Poll: http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr095.pdf
USDA Forest Service RMRS GTR-95

Poll #15

Who was Polled: Registered voters in the Western United States

Number of People Polled: 1000

Date(s) of Poll: between Dec. 28, 1999 to Jan. 2, 2000

Question: Do you support or oppose allowing logging, mining and other industrial activities on national forest lands?

Poll Findings: Oppose-60% Support-31%

Link to Poll: <http://www.gilawilderness.com/local/roadsurvey2.htm>

Poll #16

Who was Polled: Registered voters 5 Rocky Mountain states

Number of People Polled: 2,200

Date(s) of Poll: late January 2011

Question: Should a person have to choose between a strong economy and clean air and water?

Poll Findings: Seventy-six percent said we should ensure undeveloped public lands are kept in their natural state.

Link to Poll:

http://www.newwest.net/topic/article/poll_rockies_voters_want_stronger_economy_stricter_environmental_regs/C37/L37/



Here's the Economic Information Most USFS Line-Officers Ignore and Withhold from the Local Public they Claim to Serve. Instead, they Emphasize the Need to Supply Logs to Timber Dependent Communities

Idaho Outdoor Business Council's February 14, 2013 news release

Excerpt:

“BOISE -- Here's a valentine for Idaho's economy: Outdoor recreation creates more than 77,000 jobs, \$6.3 billion in consumer spending, \$1.8 billion in wages and \$461 million in state and local tax revenue, according to a new report from the **Outdoor Industry Association** released today.”

Total news release text at:

<http://www.idahooutdoorbusinesscouncil.org/news/2013/2/14/outdoor-recreation-in-idaho-supports-77000-jobs-63-billion-i.html>

Washington Dept. of Fish and Game February 10, 2014 news release

Excerpts:

“The study concluded that \$22.5 billion is spent annually in Washington on outdoor recreation, supporting 227,600 jobs and generating \$1.6 billion in state and local tax revenue. Outdoor advocates said the impact is actually greater, since the study did not include equestrian, sailing and diving activities, all of which generate significant economic activity in the state. Jobs in the outdoor recreation sector include outdoor gear and apparel design and sales; lodging and transportation; guiding and outfitting services; and many more.

"We are delighted that Governor Inslee is highlighting the broad business and social benefits of outdoor recreation. The sector is among the state's biggest contributors to economic, community and personal health," said Marc Berejka, who directs REI's government and community engagement. "We look forward to working with the Governor and others to find ways to better support the people, communities and entrepreneurs who help make Washington one of the best states in the country for outdoor recreation." "

Total news release text at:

<http://wdfw.wa.gov/news/feb1014a/>

The Timber Scam

by Keith Wright, 6/25/2000

Excerpts:

"In fiscal year 1997, over \$1.3 billion was appropriated from taxpayers pockets for expenditures associated with the timber sale program on national forests. In addition, the Forest Service spent another \$466 million from its off-budget logging accounts for additional expenses of the logging program. In the same year, the logging program generated only \$555 million in timber sales receipts, of which \$68 million was returned to the federal treasury. So, while the receipts were \$555 million, the costs to the taxpayer were \$1.7 billion. One forester estimates that the trees taken by the timber industry that year were worth over \$3 billion, or, \$2.5 billion more than they were sold for.

These dramatic losses are not unique to fiscal year 1997. For example, between 1992 and 1994, the General Accounting Office estimates that the Forest Service lost \$1 billion. Such expenditures have gone in the past towards, for example, building and maintaining 440,000 miles of roads; replanting, and other forest management expenses. The John Muir Project reckons that the US Forest timber program gives a great deal to the timber industry. If the Forest Service didnt spend the money on costs related to timber harvesting, then the timber industry would have to. The costs to biodiversity are immeasurable."

"Commercial logging on our national forests was originally illegal. It wasnt until six years after the creation of national forests that commercial interests opened them up to timber sales through an appropriations rider in Congress. The forests were originally created in response to intense destruction of land and the subsequent flooding brought on by an overzealous timber industry. The industry never learned its lesson. Today, the floods that have recently ravaged Oregon are being blamed on over zealous logging in our national forests."

Link to entire paper:

<http://www.jacksonprogressive.com/issues/misspolitics/timberscam.html>

National Forests Support Recreation Economy

By Frank Sturges 7/23/2014

Excerpts:

“Every year, over [160 million visitors](#) head to our National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation enthusiasts contribute more to the economy than anything else the U.S. Forest Service does—more even than timber, grazing, and mineral development combined.

Tapping our public lands for economic value should emphasize the benefits of the recreation economy rather than shortsighted timber harvest expansions that can harm our landscapes.

Visitors come to National Forests to hunt and fish, bike and hike, view wildlife, and paddle some of our most incredible rivers. Some head outdoors simply to de-stress and relax. While they're doing that, though, they are making jobs and providing an economic boost.

Seeing the Forest for the Jobs

According to a draft report by the U.S. Forest Service, recreation on National Forests contributes \$13.6 billion to the country's GDP each year and supports 205,000 jobs. Those numbers far outpace the forest products industry, which generate \$2.7 billion and support 42,000 jobs from the National Forest System, or energy and mineral production at \$8 billion and 56,000 jobs.”

Link: <http://blog.nwf.org/2014/07/national-forests-support-recreation-economy/>

Why Doesn't Uncle Sam Count Outdoor Recreation Jobs?

by Tom Kenworthy, Jan 21, 2015

Excerpts:

“Even though the outdoor recreation industry, by its own reckoning, employs far more Americans than the oil and gas, timber, and mining industries combined, the federal government does not measure or track the huge impacts of the outdoor economy.”

“Outdoor businesses provide billions of dollars in direct impact at the local, state and federal levels,” added Steve Barker, interim Executive Director of the Outdoor Industry Association, which is sponsoring the Outdoor Retailer Winter Market trade [show](#) which kicked off in Salt Lake City, Utah Wednesday. “Our industry has become a vital contributor to the U.S economy, and the government should recognize and record the economic benefits of outdoor recreation and of the protected land and water on which the outdoor industry relies.” “

“There is also research into the connection between the economic health of local communities and their proximity to protected lands, such as a 2012 study by Headwaters Economics that showed western communities near protected areas have better job growth and higher per capita income.”

Link: <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/01/21/3613721/uncle-sam-count-those-recreation-jobs/>

Logging on Public Land Must be Restricted

123HelpMe.com. 29 Nov 2015

“My argument stems out of this uneconomic use. The United States Forest Service should not allow the overuse of public lands for the purpose of logging because of environmental, as well as economic losses. The government should add new acts or inforce old ones to make the Forest Service adhere to the policies of multiple use and forest conservation. Also, several issues stem out of the policies of the Forest Service when dealing with environmental matters. Without a change in policy, the U.S. government is threatening the future of these public lands not only for economic gains but also as natural areas set aside for nature to run its natural course.”

“The environmental issue. There are several environmental issues which must be dealt with when considering the use of public lands. These include, but are not limited to deforestation due to roads, as well as the extraction of the lumber itself. The removal of habitat of native species of animals as well as erosion as losses in soil quality. After viewing all the problem it is very obvious that there is a need to reduce the use of the forests in the production of lumber.”

“The environmental benefits claimed by the government include things such as the creation of new habitat and feeding areas as well as the introduction of new and old plant species into the environment, thereby creating a more diverse ecosystem (Booth). These ideas are good ones, however, if we did not create these deserts of stumps we would not have to worry about a more diverse ecosystem. Perhaps we should allow nature to run it's own course. After all, the Earth did fine before humans were around to start influencing it.”

“We should allow future generations to enjoy what wilderness we have left, because if we do not we will be lost in a world of nothing but cities, unable to escape. Even the acting Forest Service Chief Jack Ward Thomas states, "above all, we have to remember that these lands have an economic and ecological value as intact ecosystems that is indefinitely greater than their value as timber producers." (Drabelle) I think perhaps he is right. It is up to us to realize, and then act upon the problem in our own, forested, backyard.”

Link: <http://www.123helpme.com/view.asp?id=10306>

If a tree falls in the watershed: Some question logging on land surrounding Northampton's reservoirs

Daily Hampshire Gazette, March 14, 2014

Excerpts:

"In a report Matera disseminated Tuesday, he argued that there is no need to log on the land. The reasons not to, he said, include the cost to taxpayers, the ecological impact and the potential public health risks. He pointed to studies such as one from Harvard University that say the best management approach is to do nothing because logging causes more harm to the ecosystem than it does good.

Large trucks compact soil and the creation of logging trails requires cutting down trees indiscriminately, he said.

Diesel trucks have the potential to leak near reservoirs and the plan suggests that herbicides are an option for dealing with invasive species.

"The fact that they're even considering using herbicides there doesn't make sense. This is our drinking water," he said."