Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/11/2024 12:34:08 AM
First name: Richard
Last name: Artley
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Dear Ranger Champa and selected IDT members,

"The nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired, in value."

Theodore Roosevelt

"God has cared for these trees, saved them from drought, disease, avalanches, and a thousand tempests and floods. But He cannot save them from fools."

John Muir

Ranger Champa, your proposed North Sand timber sale proves you are pathologically obsessed by the need to accumulate volume regardless of how it destroys the integrity of a forested ecosystem owned by 324 million Americans. Your swarm of so-called specialists on the IDT know their jobs depend on 1) writing a cut & paste, ridiculous, laughable P&N that always requires tree removal, and 2) populating their Chapter 3 effects analysis with unsubstantiated statements intended to convince the public that the Proposed Action is wonderful and choosing No Action would be a tragic mistake.

After reading the North Sand Forest Management Project Proposal and Opportunity to Comment document it became clear to me the IDT members are either clueless nit-wits or people whose primary goal is to screw the public.
Who do you think you are?

The North Sand Forest Management Project Proposal and Opportunity to Comment document at page 13 says:

"The Forest Service does not anticipate providing an additional opportunity to submit written comments other than this scoping period."

If you don't modify your The North Sand Forest Management Project Proposal and Opportunity to Comment document immediately to remove the scoping comments only idiocy you will have broken:

40 CFR 1500.2 (d) because you did not encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment.

40 CFR 1506.6 (a) because you did not make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures.

By not allowing the public to comment on the DEIS or pre-decisional EA you are robbing the public of their right to object to this proposed timber sale. Why? An objection must never mention an issue that was not discussed in comments to the NEPA document.

You people sicken me.

The public should not be forced to pay for the salaries of corporate lap-dogs. You and the IDT members either reject or don't know about best science that your agency assures the public will drive new projects. Is there a

reason the Black Hills National Forest rejects science?

The IDT members are all spending the best years
of your lives backhanding the public while
simultaneously deluding yourselves to believe that
you serve the public.

You all know the North Sand timber sale will decimate the proper functioning of many resources in and downstream from the sale area but you don't care. Why? You need the volume to "make your cut" and to justify your NFTM funding. You have no qualms about destroying the splendid symbiotic relationship between the countless forest resources to assure you spend every dime of your NFTM funding this FY do you?

After reading the North Sand Forest Management Project Proposal and Opportunity to Comment document it became clear your IDT members knew they must make you happy by agreeing to lie for you to justify your selection of the Proposed Action for implementation. Competent, professional resource specialists would refuse to serve on an IDT knowing the Proposed Action will destroy the resources the public pays them to protect.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Ranger Champa, below I present you with a tiny sample of the science you either ignore or don't know about … and should. There are many, many more in Opposing Views Science Attachments #1 which clearly describes how a tragic commercial timber sale like this destroys the proper functioning of many natural resources in and downstream from the sale area. Why does the USFS claim commercial logging and roading "restores" the forest? Do you or any of your IDT members hold Ph.D.s? Are any of you experts on your fields? Well, the scientists who authored the quotes below are experts. What gives you and your IDT members the authority to ignore best science? Your agency assures the public its projects are all grounded in best science. Is volume really that important to you?

"We concluded that commercial timber sales do not meet the criteria for forest restoration." (pgs. 1 and 2)

Western Region Audit Report: Forest Service National Fire Plan Implementation
Long, Richard D., U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Inspector General
Report No. 08601-26-SF, November 2001.
http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/08601-26-SF.pdf

"Biodiversity in managed ecosystems is poor. Less biodiverse communities and ecosystems are more susceptible to adverse weather (such as drought) and exotic invaders, and have greatly reduced rates of biomass production and nutrient cycling." (pg 2)

Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning: Maintaining Natural Life Support Processes
Naeem, Shahid Ph.D., F.S. Chapin III Ph.D., Robert Costanza Ph.D.,
Paul R. Ehrlich Ph.D., Frank B. Golley Ph.D., David U. Hooper Ph.D.
J.H. Lawton Ph.D., Robert V. O'Neill Ph.D., Harold A. Mooney Ph.D.
Osvaldo E. Sala Ph.D., Amy J. Symstad Ph.D., and David Tilman Ph.D.
Published in Issues in Ecology No. 4. Fall 1999.
http://cfpub.epa.gov/watertrain/pdf/issue4.pdf

"For much of the past century the Forest Service, entrusted as the institutional steward of our National Forests, focused its management on an industrial-scale logging program. The result of the massive logging and road construction program was to damage watersheds, destroy wildlife habitat and imperiled plant and animal

species." (pgs 6 and 7)

Scientists Seek Logging Ban on U.S.-Owned Land
By Anne Ehrlich Ph.D., David Foster Ph.D. and Peter Raven Ph.D.
Published in the New York Times, April 16, 2002
http://www.nytimes.com/2002/04/16/us/scientists-seek-logging-ban-on-us-owned-land.html

I ask the IDT members to be real professionals and remove yourselves from the USFS box. Allow yourselves to think without being constrained by your agency. Most of you will agree the quotes above authored by experts make sense. Now comes the big questions you are all afraid to approach:

*Why isn't the USFS guided by this science?
*Why are the management actions used by the USFS they claim will restore the forest back to health is contradicted by what the experts say?
*Why are you afraid to acknowledge to your line-officer that you agree with the independent science the USFS ignores?
*How will you feel working on a project not supported by "best Science?"
*Are you aware that people who have been subject to sophisticated brainwashing techniques don't know their mind has been manipulated?

You already know the selected alternative that will be described in the ROD or DN. When was the last time your Preferred Alternative was different from the Proposed Action on your scoping package?

Champa, most IDT members know you have already chosen this Proposed Action for implementation. You have no intention of using public scoping comments to modify the Proposed Action that will be the ONLY Action Alternative in the DEIS or pre-decisional EA. The USFS has rigged the process to make it possible to serve its corporate masters. Your IDT members are frightened of you so they keep quiet and continue to play the game.

An Explanation of the Opposing Views Science Attachments

I am giving you and your IDT members the opportunity to become familiar with the natural resource research conclusions of independent scientists not associated with the USFS in the Opposing Views Science Attachments. Each Opposing Views Attachment is clearly labeled.

These attachments will make you all uncomfortable because they contain a wealth of independent science conclusions that are inconsistent (many times in total conflict) with the so-called USFS science your IDT members used to craft your Proposed Action. An intelligent person would not reject the quotes by Ph.D. experts in their fields contained in the Opposing Views Science Attachments out of hand as your IDT members will do here. An intelligent, unbiased natural resource specialist would be cautious and try to understand why USFS science conclusions and independent science conclusions are so different. The USFS claims commercial logging and roading "restores" the forest. If this is so, then why do independent scientists reperedly describe why logging is a tragic assault on the forest's natural resources in Attachment #1?

All USFS employees have been programmed to embrace the corporate friendly timber agenda.

A few of your IDT members know the USFS claims about what should and should not occur in a forested ecosystem is the antithesis of what hundreds of science papers and books written by independent scientists say. The agency has a sophisticated process for mind manipulation. They subject new employees to the

brainwashing process from their first day on the job. You have all been manipulated to believe the following untrue USFS claims without question. These 3 claims would have been laughable if you had heard them in college.

1) most forests are sick and will become healthy again after they are commercially logging and roaded.

2) Opposing Views Science Attachments #1 and #4 describe how commercial logging and roading inflict tragic, long-term damage to the forest resources in and downstream from the sale area yet you people agree with the notion that . commercial logging and roading "restores" the forest. Even kids that have taken a high school science course know logging damages and sometimes renders some important natural resources incapable of functioning properly.

3) you have been programmed to believe the health of the commercially valuable trees is the measure of "forest health. You were conditioned to never question USFS claims. Any lay member of the public knows the forest contains countless natural resources other than trees that are symbiotically dependent on one another to create a fully functional forest. So why does the agency place such a high value on merchantable conifer tree species? You have been taught that an "unmanaged" forest is an "unlogged" forest. For over 100 years the USFS has done what the natural resource extraction corporations wanted … regardless of the other resource damage that the USFS conveniently fails to acknowledge.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Gifford Pinchot made the following statement on February 5, 1905:

"Where conflicting interests must be reconciled, the question shall always be answered from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run."

He intended these words to provide guidance to agency employees.

The results of the 16 statistically significant public surveys taken from coast to coast reveal there are major "conflicting interests" with the way the USFS administers the land owned by 323 million Americans. Opposing Views Science Attachment #10 contains these survey results showing the recreating public does not want their public land logged. You are all aware of this, yet you mindlessly forge ahead with your timber sale planning knowing that 75% to 85% (depending on the survey) of the people you supposedly serve want their precious national forest lands to remain undeveloped. Your actions clearly indicate you care more about your climb up the USFS promotion ladder by providing volume than you do for future generations of kids.

Without a Doubt, your Scoping Package Describes
a Project that has Major Problems.

Ranger Champa, if your pending draft NEPA document analyzes a Proposed Action that even remotely resembles the one described in this scoping package you will give the Objection Deciding Officer no choice but to agree with my objection and direct you to make major changes. If the Objection Deciding Officer is one of those who rejects all objection points before they read the objection, legal or Congressional action will be necessary. Also understand the court of public opinion is often more effective at stopping tragic USFS projects than a court of law. You can be sure the people on your area who read the Spearfish newspaper will become aware of what you are about to do.

A reasonable person intent on serving the recreating public would never have chosen to use their tax dollars taking this timber sale through the NEPA process. The public trusts you. They think your first priority is to take action to reduce or eliminate conditions (natural or manmade) that might harm the amenity resources in their

national forests. Even a layperson would realize this proposed sale will inflict long-term damage to aquatic resources, wildlife habitat and scenery. You owe it to the public to end this FY with unspent NFTM dollars by withdrawing this needless sale. A few of your IDT members will respect you for that.

Encountering Unprofessional USFS
Resource Specialists is not Uncommon.

I have worked with a few USFS IDT members who refused to become knowledgeable about science that disagreed with what the USFS programmed them to believe. They were terribly frightened. Intelligent people whose mind has not been manipulated (a.k.a. brainwashed) would consider all available science regardless of its source before acting.

Sadly, you know volume is incredibly important to you so you all deny reality. After all, why would you allow your ethics and values to guide you when such behavior will jeopardize your job?

Each IDT member has no problem denying and rejecting real science. Why? You all want to climb the agency promotion ladder.

I know it's difficult for seasoned USFS employees to question agency "truths" that have been pounded into them for decades, but please seriously consider applying the wisdom of the 9 people quoted below. An intelligent, competent public lands administrator would understand what these people are saying.

Please don't laugh as you read these quotes. Indeed, they reflect the feelings and wishes of the vast majority of the people who visit their national forests. In spite of what the USFS teaches you, most national forest users prefer to pursue their recreational activities in forests that are natural, wild and undeveloped (emphasis added).

"Every other civilized nation in the world has been compelled to care for its forests, and so must we if waste and destruction are not to go to the bitter end, leaving America as barren as Palestine or Spain."
John Muir
August 1897

"Because we don't think about future generations, they will never forget us."
Henrik Tikkanen

"I believe in God, only I spell it Nature."
Frank Lloyd Wright

"Let us a little permit Nature to take her own way; she better understands her own affairs than we."
Michel de Montaigne

"We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."

Aldo Leopold, from A Sand County Almanac

"The tree which moves some to tears of joy is in the eyes of others, only a green thing which stands in their way."
William Blake

"We must protect the forests for our children, grandchildren and children yet to be born. We must protect the forests for those who can't speak for themselves such as the birds, animals, fish and trees."
Chief Edward Moody

"In America today you can murder land for private profit. You can leave the corpse for all to see, and nobody calls the cops."
Paul Brooks, from The Pursuit of Wilderness, 1971

Ansel Adams must have had the US Forest Service in mind when he said this:

"It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environment." (May 1983)

You (with your IDT assistance) abuse and violate the public you are paid to serve for personal gain and the IDT members assist you. Who are you people?

Your Timber Sale will Remove
Trees Older than 80 Years

On April 22 2022, President Biden directed the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to conserve old-growth and mature forests as a climate change solution. It was an historic step toward meaningful protections for forested federal lands.

Ending the logging of mature forests and trees on federal public lands is a key strategy for curbing climate change - while also protecting biodiversity and healthy watersheds. Mature forests hold enormous amounts of carbon, safely stored in trunks, branches and soil. Left to grow, they will store even more. Yet federal agencies routinely target these carbon-storing heroes for logging.

But there's a solution. President Biden defined "mature" forests and trees as those 80 years of age and older." His executive order requires the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to protect these old trees which would spare our most climate and carbon-critical forests.

Request for changes to be made to the final NEPA document: Don't hide your planned logging of trees older than 80 years-old. Include these acres and allow public comment again.

If this is not done I'll send a letter to one of President Biden's aides.

Failure to do so will violate:

President Biden's Executive Order 14072 to expand his Administration's efforts to tackle the climate crisis, make our nation more resilient to extreme weather, and strengthen local economies by prohibiting Federal Agencies from logging mature trees.

Your Purpose & Need is a Cornucopia of
Exaggerations,
Half Truths and Outright Lies that are Designed to
make Logging and Roading Appear to be the Obvious
Path to Forest Health. Tricking and Fooling the Public doesn't Serve them does it?

As I said before the P&N statements were copied from previous timber sale EAs and EISs and pasted into this scoping package. NEPA requires site specific analysis. All (emphasis added) USFS Purpose & Need statements contain several trumped up, untrue statements that the timber sale will benefit the other resources in and downstream from the sale area.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA

document: Of course the real reason for this timber sale is to further your career by providing profit opportunities for resource extraction corporations. The USFS hides this real reason for the sale by telling the public the timber is needed to enhance the economics of the local communities. You know this is the USFS approved P&N statement used to reject public suggestions for alternatives that don't include logging and roading. If you really wanted to enhance the economics of the local communities, this sale would be a small business (SBA) sale to keep the large timber companies from buying it.

The "get-out-the-cut" copy & paste P&N statement for this timber sale includes the cooked-up need that appears in 90% of USFS P&N statements.

After reading this nonsense, one size fits all P&N, I am certain the public is dealing with either 1) a clueless IDT, or 2) IDT members who will say anything to assure you get your volume. You know your real purpose for this timber sale is to help you spend all your NFTM funding this FY and meet you supervisor's volume expectations. An honorable person would tell the truth and say it.

Preparing an adequate NEPA document requires knowledgeable, honest, caring interdisciplinary IDT members whose goal to assure their resource won't be harmed.

For those who don't know what independent scientists' logging-related research conclusions are I suggest you all read Opposing Views Science Attachments #1 and #4. These 2 attachments describe the tragic natural resource damage caused by logging and road construction. Ask yourselves why the USFS teaches you that logging and roading "restore" the forest back to health. Ask yourselves if you want to be part of this scheme to deceive the public.

Now read the P&Ns for past timber sales on your forest. Most are identical aren't they? Copy & paste NEPA documents don't comply with NEPA unless you are dealing with identical conditions. NEPA requires site specificity.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: You have created an untrue Purpose & Need for your scoping package that deceives the public into believing commercial logging will benefit what you claim is a sick forested ecosystem needing "treatment" (a.k.a. logging). Do you really think the public agrees that every biological problem in the forest (real or imagined) will be solved by logging? Of course not. The reality is your proposed "treatments" (aka logging) will inflict more damage than if you left it alone by selecting the No Action alternative.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments sectio in the draft NEPA document n: Over a decade ago Associate Chief Sally Collins told the public the forest service was changing. She said logging to produce volume in order to provide corporate profit opportunities no longer occurs in the USFS. You provide excellent reasons to believe her statements were wishful thinking.

"our focus today in the Forest Service is no longer on logging and road-building. In the last 5 years, for example, we decommissioned 14 miles of road for every mile of road added to our forest road system. And where we do cut timber, it is usually a byproduct of forest health projects-like cutting 14-inch white fir to protect giant sequoia groves."

from a speech by Forest Service Associate Chief Sally Collins
"Changing Public Land Uses: A Tale of Two Debates"
Outdoor Writers Association of America, 76th Annual Conference
Columbia, MO-June 17, 2003
http://www.fs.fed.us/news/2003/speeches/06/collins.shtml

"Post-World War II, we entered a new period characterized by timber production. From the 1960s to the 1980s, every administration, with strong congressional support, called for more timber harvest from the national forests, with the goal of replacing the depleted stocks of private and state timber as a result of the war effort. We measured success largely in terms of producing timber and providing multiple uses, including outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife.

In the early 1990s, that changed again. Today, we're in a new period focused primarily on ecological restoration and recreation. Maybe more than ever before, we are focusing on delivering values and services like clean air and water, scenic beauty, habitat for wildlife, and opportunities for outdoor recreation. Not only do Americans want these things from their national forests, but this shift is also essential to cope with some huge threats to the sustainability of these forests." (pp 8-9)

Forest Service Associate Chief Sally Collins
"The Future of Partnering with the Forest Service"
A speech presented at the Annual Meeting of the
National Association of Conservation Districts
Atlanta, GA-February 8, 2005
http://www.fs.fed.us/spf/coop/library/NACDspeech.pdf

Read this from the Portland Oregonian:

"Increased logging on federal lands will not fix these problems. Instead, it will diminish jobs in one of Oregon's fastest growing industries, outdoor recreation. The outdoor recreation industry employs about 140,000 workers in Oregon (logging and wood-products manufacturing employ fewer than 30,000). Nationally, jobs in outdoor recreation are growing 5 percent annually. High-quality recreation attracts middle- and high-income families to settle in rural counties, too, boosting local economic activity. There is abundant research and data showing that our federal forests would do far more for workers, families and local businesses if managed for ecosystem and human health rather than as tree farms."

From: Logging expansion won't help rural communities
Portland Oregonian online, June 29, 2014
http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2014/06/logging_expansion_wont_help_ru.html

****
Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Why do you reject the findings and conclusions of Undersecretary of Agriculture Jim Lyons who states "recreation revenues from national forests significantly exceed timber revenues." Elsewhere in these comments are the results of public survey information indicating the public is less likely to recreate near areas that have been logged, thus logging diminishes recreation revenue. Since recreationists avoid areas that have been logged the many "ma and pa" businesses that depend on recreation are harmed. How do you justify harming the revenues of motels, gas stations, restaurants etc. to increase the profits of a large corporate lumber mill?

Please describe why Undersecretary Lyons' conclusions about community stability do not apply to the Black Hills National Forest.

You are abusing and ignoring the small business owners in the area? A well placed letter to the editor in the Black Hills Pioneer newspaper will educate the public about what you plan to do. My letter will suggest they contact the Regional Forester with questions. This isn't what you want is it?

Please don't allow this "get out the cut" P&N statement to appear in your pending draft NEPA document.

Show the public you serve them and not the natural resource extraction corporations.

Understand most line-officers know what the public wants and do the opposite knowing only court action might force the agency to serve the public. They know 99% of the folks who recreate on the national forests and want them undeveloped don't have the money to sue the USFS.

Champa, when you all go home tonight please have the courage to contemplate what you are about to do. If your property were surrounded by forest and your drinking water originated in that forest and your family camped and hiked in that forest would you want it logged and roaded like you propose here? Please be honest with yourself.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: You rely on the advice of your IDT silviculturist(s) who really believes logging and roading will restore the resources that are already functioning properly. They are dependent on offering timber sales for their jobs. How could they not be biased towards logging? They spent 4 years in college learning industrial forestry. Unfortunately, they think this "obtain maximum volume at the lowest cost" forestry they learned applies to national forest land. Only a few biologists on the IDT know these corporate tree-farm treatments create conditions that aren't real, fully functioning, biodiverse forests … but they are frightened to voice their opinions.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Opposing Views Science Attachment #1 contains the statements of 221 Ph.D. scientists who discuss the tragic natural resource damage caused by logging. A thinking, responsible USFS line-officer would not rely on the recommendations of a few biased silviculturists knowing 221 experts all conclude logging negatively impacts the amenity resources in and downstream from the cutting units. The IDT specialists know what they are and are afraid to voice their opposition.

After reading these comments this far you are all either feeling uneasy and sheepish or angry that a member of the public would have the audacity to suggest you are wrong. Understand my comments reflect the views of most reasonable adults in America.

Commercial Logging Merchantable Trees to Reduce Fire Intensity and Rate of Spread is rarely Effective and successful. You must know it's not Uncommon for Wildfires to Burn through Thinned/Logged Stands without Slowing (see Opposing Views Attachment #25). Competent, Caring Public Servants would Analyze other ways to Save Human Lives and Homes in the WUI.

Your North Sand Forest Management Project Proposal and Opportunity to Comment document at page 7 states:

"The project area borders almost 10 miles of privately owned land, 2.5 miles of land held by the State of Wyoming, and one-half mile of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (Figure 1). Thirty- seven percent of the project area is within one-half mile of non-National Forest land."

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Opposing Views Science Attachment #3 contains the statements of 24 Ph.D. scientists, a GAO employee, a USFS employee and an Oregon State University professor that clearly conclude fuels logging does

not reduce fire intensity and rate of spread. Thinking, responsible USFS employees would not rely on the recommendations of their fire IDT member knowing the experts all conclude commercially logging hazardous fuels is the USFS's latest excuse to log and accumulate volume. As part of this comment, I present you with 2 statements authored by a retired USFS employee.

Dr. Cohen (a retired USFS employee) states: "Effective landscape fuel reduction does not necessarily prevent W-UI home fire destruction." (Pg. 10)

"Treating fuels to reduce fire occurrence, fire size, or amount of burned area is ultimately both futile and counter-productive." (Pg.1999)

"Some viable fuel treatments may actually result in an increased rate of spread under many conditions (Lertzman et al., 1998; Agee et al., 2000). For example, thinning to reduce crown fire potential can result in surface litter becoming drier and more exposed to wind. It can also result in increased growth of grasses and understory shrubs which can foster a rapidly moving surface fire." (Pg.2000)

Source for quotes above: Objectives and considerations for wildland fuel treatment in forested ecosystems of the interior western United States
Published in Forest Ecology and Management 256, 2008
http://www.firewise.org/Information/Research-and-Guidance/WUI-Home-Ignition-Research/~/media/Firewise/Files/Pdfs/Research/CohenFuelTreatment.pdf

"Timber harvest, through its effects on forest structure, local microclimate, and fuels accumulation, has increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity."(pg.62)

"Logged areas generally showed a strong association with increased rate of spread and flame length, thereby suggesting that tree harvesting could affect the potential fire behavior within landscapes. In general, rate of spread and flame length were positively correlated with the proportion of area logged in the sample watersheds."

Source for quote above: University of California; SNEP Science Team and Special Consultants
"Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project: Final Report to Congress
Volume 1, Chapter 4 - Fire and Fuels.
https://pubs.usgs.gov/dds/dds-43/

Dr. Cohen has written much more showing why fine fuels removal is far superior to merchantable tree removal to reduce the risk of WUI wildfire damage. Please ask yourself these questions:

Should I value timber volume and career advancement more than human lives?

If I lived in the WUI would I want the USFS to ignore and reject Dr. Cohen's methods?

Isn't it my job to reduce the chances homes in the WUI will burn?

Would a reasonable person use all realistic options to accomplish this goal?

You know exactly what to do.

You Propose to Log 9.3 Square Miles of Forest
Knowing the Vast Majority of the People who Visit
their National Forests do so Seeking Naturally

Appearing Undeveloped (emphasis added)
Recreation Opportunities.

Your North Sand Forest Management Project Proposal and Opportunity to Comment document fails miserably to convince me the natural resources in and downstream from the sale area will benefit from logging and roading. Trying to convince the public the forest is sick and will be healed by logging & roading is a pathetic, absurd venture. How do people like you get promoted to line-officer?

Once again, I'm tired of reading USFS NEPA documents that claim a properly functioning forest is sick and logging is the only way to bring it back to heath. You know this is what USFS line-officers are supposed to say to comply with the agency's overriding timber agenda. You also know if you remove your timber beast hat and concentrate on taking action to maintain amenity resource health your promotion possibilities in the agency will suffer.

If you were a normal, caring, intelligent human being you would be overcome by guilt each time you see the harmful after-effects of what your logging will cause. I have worked with USFS line-officers like you who mentally genuflect and squeal with glee each time they see a loaded logging truck. The public is no longer clueless about what motivates USFS employees. Opposing Views Science Attachment #1 and #4 shows why the pubic feels the way they do about logging.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Statistically significant nationwide surveys clearly indicate the vast majority of the American public do not want their national forests logged anywhere for any reason.

In 2002, 7,069 Americans were randomly selected in the lower 48 states to respond to the Objectives and Beliefs survey sanctioned by Chief Thomas. Chief Thomas spent the American public's tax dollars on the survey because he believed it would guide future agency management decisions. Chief Thomas didn't anticipate USFS line-officers would ignore the survey results like you are doing.

Here are a few excerpts from Chief Thomas' survey findings:

"The items in the survey have been extensively pre-tested and applied in various other studies. The values scale was designed to focus on values that people hold for public lands (called the Public Lands Values). It was tested using both students and adults around the United States. The objectives scale items were developed using input from 80 focus groups around the country. The beliefs and attitudes scales tier down from the objectives items." (page 1)

"People see the provision of less consumptive services as more important than those that are more consumptive." (page 2)

"Overall, the protection of ecosystems and wildlife habitat is seen as an important objective for public land management." (page 9)

"It is interesting to note that the public feels that the conservation and protection of watersheds is an important objective, consistent with the USDA Forest Service Organic Act. Also, important objectives for the public are the preservation of natural resources through policies that restrict commodity uses, protection of ecosystems and wildlife habitat, and preservation of the ability to enjoy a "wilderness" experience. A somewhat important objective is the preservation of local cultural uses." (page 27)

"The public sees the restriction of mineral development and of timber harvest and grazing as being more important than the provision of natural resources to dependent communities (although this is still seen as

somewhat important)." (page 28)

This survey was done to generate information needed to support the 2000 USDA Forest Service RPA Assessment. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-95.

Link to survey: http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr095.pdf

You ignore the wishes of the public for personal gratification. What does this make you? You are paid to serve the public, not yourself and natural resource extraction corporations. Who supplies the money for your salary?

You seem to think the USFS owns the
Black Hills National Forest. Anyone who believes this
has no business making decisions that affect national forest land.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Why am I not surprised that the map at page 2 shows Black Hills National Forest land as "Forest Service Land." The Black Hills National Forest is public land owned by 323 million Americans. Obviously, you obviously feel its OK to have your way with the Black Hills National Forest to generate corporate profit opportunities.

Please alert me when the draft NEPA document
that addresses these comments is posted online
and you are accepting comments.

I ask you to seriously consider my comments and modify your timber sale proposal. My Opposing Views Science Attachments show your timber sale will eliminate the proper functioning of some important non-timber natural resources in and downstream from the timber sale area … especially aquatic related resources. Please modify the sale to eliminate these actions. Future generations of kids will appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Dick Artley (retired USFS forester)
Grangeville, Idaho 83530
da99333@gmail.com

PS: Champa, please remove your timber beast hat. Do what the American people pay you to do. Stop being a corporate puppet. Your non-timber resource specialist will admire you. Opposing Views Science Attachment #10 will tell you something about the American public you claim to serve that you should already know …. or perhaps you do know and believe supporting the USFS's need to serve-up volume to their corporate masters is more important.