Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/26/2024 5:34:16 PM
First name: Deil
Last name: Auly
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Dear Acting Ranger McNeil and selected IDT members,

Incredibly, your July 1, 2024 Dear Friends and Neighbors of the Snoqualmie Ranger District letter at pages 21 and 24 says this proposed timber sale will restore:

Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics

Only a fool or someone clinically obsessed by the need to generate volume would believe commercial logging and roading would restore anything …other than the purchaser's financial bottom line. Telling the public this untruth indicates you and most of the IDT members are not professionals. You are all trying to trick us. Some of the IDT members already know your "restore" claim is rubbish yet they remain silent. This makes most of the IDT members world-class hypocrites.

After reading the independent science quotes in the attachments authored by experts below, even children in junior high school would agree with and understand the truth.

Opposing Views Attachments #1
Opposing Views Attachments #4

It's sad that you do not know the USFS has had a timber agenda and culture since the 1950s. They have spent millions hiring private firms to develop ways to convince every USFS employee that logging and roading is the way to "restore" unhealthy forests and to keep healthy forests healthy. Some would call this USFS scheme mind manipulation. USFS employees who don't buy these USFS claims know they must fake it in order to stay eligible for future promotions. If you do not make major changes in the design of the Carbon River timber sale or drop it, I'm confident you will be invited to Federal District Court.

I am compelled to assume some of the money for your salaries comes from the natural resource extraction corporations that purchase your timber sales. The Carbon River Landscape Analysis Project document does not read as if it's an unbiased description of the proposed timber sale. It's a collection of statements intended to convince the public the Carbon River timber sale is really needed and will create a healthy forest. The quotes in the 2 attachments below would convince a child commercial timber harvest must never be considered in national forest land.

Opposing Views Attachments #1
Opposing Views Attachments #4

Comment Requirements
Project NameCarbon River project
Responsible Official and TitleActing Ranger McNeil
District & Forest where it will be implementedSnoqualmie Ranger District, Mt. Baker National Forest
---
My Daughter and her Family do not Appreciate
your Unprofessional Behavior

You are probably wondering why a person from Montana is commenting on a project located in Washington.

You see my daughter and her family live in Darringtond. They enjoy the Mt. Baker National Forest National Forest very much.

They feel that developing this area will ruin their fishing, wildlife viewing, camping and hiking opportunities. They own the Mt. Baker National Forest. Since I am retired from the USFS my daughter called me and asked if there was anything she could do to convince you to leave the area undeveloped.

She wanted to know what she must do to gain standing to take court action. I told her she needs to comment on this project to gain standing to submit an objection and that when the Objection Deciding Officer's response to her objection is unacceptable she would have standing to take court action. I told her she must show the court she will be harmed by the decision. Acting Ranger McNeil, people like you must be held accountable. Clearly you are serving your corporate masters and backhanding the public. This is easy to change if you want to.

I hope the IDT members will make whatever changes to the sale design that are needed to maintain the proper functioning of the natural resources in and downstream from the sale area. Some IDT resource specialists understand the following facts that they do not talk about.

*Logging and roading slows the natural recovery of forests and of streams and creatures within them

*Logging and roading impacts result in increases in sediment, streamflow, and water temperature

*Sediment from logging and roading clogs the gills of fish, increases fines in spawning beds, impedes water flow and hampers oxygenation of incubating salmon eggs.

*Logging and roading causes a loss of bio-diversity

*Logging and roading causes T&E species in the forest to move closer to extinction.

*Logging and roading causes ecosystem fragmentation

*Logging and roading cause erosion

*Logging and roading obstructs streams and rivers

*Logging is changing the climate because live trees store carbon.

*Logging and roading causes increased habitat edge which causes increased wildlife vulnerability to predation, poaching, and invasion of non-native plants.

*Skidding can cause root damage, allowing entry of rot-causing microorganisms. Repeated passes of heavy equipment over certain types of soils, especially during wet conditions, can compact soil air spaces and impede root growth.

*Logging causes detrimental soil disturbance associated with ground-based extraction including compaction, rutting, lateral soil displacement, topsoil mixing and the formation of puddles.

*Logging causes noise and dust that destroys the experience for hikers and campers.

*Logged areas have little beneficial effect on wildfire spread and can actually aggravate fire growth in some cases.

*Some USFS commercial fuels logging treatments may actually result in an increased rate of spread under many conditions. See:
Opposing views Attachment #3

*Logging and roading destroys wildlife habitat.

Unfortunately, most USFS employees Suffer
from the Mental Illness called "confirmation bias."

There is no amount of science that would convince people with confirmation bias to examine logging and roading impacts with an open mind … if the science described errors in their beliefs. Here, become familiar with "confirmation bias."

"Confirmation bias is a psychological term for the human tendency to only seek out information that supports one position or idea. This causes you to have a bias towards your original position because if you only seek out information that supports one idea, you will only find information that supports that idea."

Read about The Psychology of Confirmation Bias here:
https://psychcentral.com/blog/the-psychology-of-confirmation-bias

https://www.tranceformpsychology.com/mental-health-psychology/confirmation-bias.html

https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/science-of-choice/201504/what-is-confirmation-bias

https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/confirmation-bias-mindshelp-gk2ze
---
Acting Ranger McNeil, please provide a meaningful response (per to each of my 24 comments below in the Response to Comments section in the pending final NEPA document. Garbage like "thank you for the comment" is unacceptable. The judge will know this. I will remind you again of 40 CFR § 1503.4.

After my daughter's objection is rejected by the Deputy Regional Forester, she will invite you to Federal District Court. I'll remind you of the law:

40 CFR §1503.4 Response to comments.

(a) An agency preparing a final environmental impact statement shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses are to:

(1) Modify alternatives including the proposed action.

(2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.

(3) Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.

(4) Make factual corrections.

(5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

(b) All substantive comments received on the draft statement (or summaries thereof where the response has been exceptionally voluminous), should be attached to the final statement whether or not the comment is thought to merit individual discussion by the agency in the text of the statement

(c) If changes in response to comments are minor and are confined to the responses described in paragraphs (a)(4) and (5) of this section, agencies may write them on errata sheets and attach them to the statement instead of rewriting the draft statement. In such cases only the comments, the responses, and the changes and not the final statement need be circulated (§1502.19). The entire document with a new cover sheet shall be filed as the final statement (§1506.9).

I hope the IDT members understand the experts quoted below are describing how commercial timber sales (like the Carbon River timber sale) will inflict massive damage to the resources in and downstream from the sale area. This will not be "short term" damage the USFS so often uses to justify such abuse. Indeed, logging and roading restore nothing!!!!

What do they do to get USFS professionals to really believe such nonsense? Please read:

Opposing Views Attachments #20 and #21

Quote below is from Getting it Right: Environmentalism for the 21st Century
By Patrick Moore Ph.D.
Published online by Berkely Rausser, College of Natural Resources, October 01, 1999
https://nature.berkeley.edu/events/2017/06/getting-it-right-environmentalism-21st-century

Quote:

"This gives rise to the obvious concern that if the trees are cut down the habitats or homes will be lost and the species that live in them will die. Indeed, in 1996 the World Wildlife Fund, at a media conference in Geneva, announced that 50,000 species are going extinct each year due to human activity. And the main cause of these 50,000 extinctions, they said, is commercial logging. The story was carried around the world by Associated Press and other media and hundreds of millions of people came to believe that forestry is the main cause of species extinction."

Comment #1: Acting Ranger McNeil, given what Dr. Moore says below are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "terrestrial and aquatic systems"?

"50,000 species are going extinct each year due to human activity. And the main cause of these 50,000 extinctions, they said, is commercial logging?"

Quote below is from A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000.
By Lyle Laverty USDA Forest Service and Tim Hartzell U.S. Department of the Interior, September 8, 2000
https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/migrated/pmb/owf/upload/2000-Report-to-the-President.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quote:

"Most of the trees that should be removed to reduce accumulated fuels are small in diameter and have little or no commercial value."

"Mechanically removing fuels (through commercial timber harvesting and other means) can also have adverse

effects on wildlife habitat and water quality in many areas. Officials told GAO that, because of these effects, a large-scale expansion of commercial timber harvesting alone for removing materials would not be feasible. However, because the Forest Service relies on the timber program for funding many of its activities (including reducing fuels) it has often used this program to address the wildfire problem. The difficulty with such an approach, however, is that the lands with commercially valuable timber are often not those with the greatest wildfire hazards."

Comment #2: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Mr. Laverty says this:

"Mechanically removing fuels (through commercial timber harvesting and other means) can also have adverse effects on wildlife habitat water quality in many areas"

Quote below is from Salvage Logging and its Ecological Consequences (246 pages)
By professor David B. Lindenmayer Ph.D., professor Phillip J. Burton Ph.D., and Professor Jerry Franklin Ph.D.
Published by Island Press, July 2012
https://islandpress.org/books/salvag%20Consequencese-logging-and-its-ecological-consequences

Quote:

"Salvage logging-removing trees from a forested area in the wake of a catastrophic event such as a wildfire or hurricane-is highly controversial. Policymakers and those with an economic interest in harvesting trees typically argue that damaged areas should be logged so as to avoid "wasting" resources, while many forest ecologists contend that removing trees following a disturbance is harmful to a variety of forest species and can interfere with the natural process of ecosystem recovery."

Comment #3: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Lindenmayer, Dr. Burton, and Dr. Franklin agree that

"removing trees following a disturbance is harmful to a variety of forest species and can interfere with the natural process of ecosystem recovery"

Quote below is from: Diversion Potential at Road-Stream Crossings
By professor Furniss, Michael J. Ph.D. Michael Love Ph.D. and Sam A. Flanagan Ph.D
USDA Forest Service. 9777 1814-SDTDC. December 1997
https://www.fs.usda.gov/t-d/pubs/html/wr_p/97771814/97771814.htm#:~:text=regardless%20of%20capacity.-

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quotes:

"Rarely can roads be designed and built that have no negative impacts on streams. Roads modify natural drainage patterns and can increase hillslope erosion and downstream sedimentation. Sediments from road failures at stream crossings are deposited directly into stream habitats and can have both on-site and off-site effects. These include alterations of the channel pattern or morphology, increased bank erosion and changes in channel width, substrate composition, and stability of slopes adjacent to the channels."

"All of these changes result in important biological consequences that can affect the entire stream ecosystem. One specific example involves anadromous salmonids, such as salmon and steelhead, that have complex life histories and require suitable stream habitat to support both juvenile and adult life stages."

"A healthy fishery requires access to suitable habitat that provides food, shelter, spawning gravel, suitable water quality, and access for upstream and downstream migration. Road-stream crossing failures have direct impacts on all of these components."

Comment #4: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Furniss, Dr. Love and Dr. Flanagan all agree that:

"Rarely can roads be designed and built that have no negative impacts on streams. Roads modify natural drainage patterns and can increase hillslope erosion and downstream sedimentation"

Quote below is from: Minimizing the impacts of the forest road system."
By Johnny M. Grace III Ph.D. 2003 Research Engineer Forest Operations Research, Southern Research Station USDA Forest Service
In: Proceedings of the conference 34 international erosion control association; ISSN 1092-2806 2003 International Erosion Control Association: 301-310.
http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/ja_grace011.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quote:

"Roads and skid trails have been identified as a major contributor to increased turbidity of water draining logging areas resulting in increases from 4 to 93 parts per million (Hoover, 1952). Forest roads have been found to have erosion rates from one to three orders of magnitude greater than similar undisturbed areas (Megahan, 1974) and perhaps account for as much as 90 percent of all forest erosion (Megahan, 1972). Forest roads can also cause soil erosion and stream sedimentation, which adversely impact on the nation's water quality (Authur et al., 1998).

Comment #5: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Grace III (a USFS employee) says

"Forest roads have been found to have erosion rates from one to three orders of magnitude greater than similar undisturbed areas"

Quote below is from: Hydrological processes and pathways affected by forest roads: what do we still need to learn?
By Luce, Charles H. Ph.D., USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station
Hydrologic Processes: 16, 2901-2904, September 27, 2002
http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/boise/teams/soils/Publications/Luce%202002%20HP.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quotes:

"Almost everywhere people live and work they build and use unimproved roads, and wherever the roads go, a range of environmental issues follows."

"Among the environmental effects of unimproved roads, those on water quality and aquatic ecology are some of the most critical. Increased chronic sedimentation, in particular, can dramatically change the food web in affected streams and lakes."

"The nearly impervious nature of road surfaces (or treads) makes them unique within forested environments and

causes runoff generation even in mild rainfall events, leading to chronic fine sediment contributions."

"If we look at the issue of what we need to learn or the research priorities for forest road hydrology, I would argue that the areas of cutslope hydrology and effectiveness of restoration efforts are perhaps most critical."

"At a few sites in the mountains of Idaho and Oregon a substantial portion of the road runoff (80-95%) came from subsurface flow intercepted by the cutslope (Burroughs et al., 1972; Megahan, 1972; Wemple, 1998)."

Comment #6: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Luce says

"Among the environmental effects of unimproved roads, those on water quality and aquatic ecology are some of the most critical. Increased chronic sedimentation, in particular, can dramatically change the food web in affected streams and lakes"

Quote below is from: Sediment Plume Development from Forest Roads: How are they related to Filter Strip Recommendations?
By J. McFero Grace III, Research Engineer, US Forest Service, G.W. Andrews Forestry Sciences Lab
An ASAE/CSAE Meeting Presentation, Paper Number: 045015, August 1-4, 2004.
http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/ja_grace017.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quote:

"Research has shown that roads can have adverse impacts on the water quality on the forest landscape (Authur et al. 1998; Binkley and Brown 1993; Megahan et al. 1991). The forest road system has been identified by previous research as the major source of soil erosion on forestlands (Anderson et. al 1976; Patric 1976; Swift 1984; Van Lear et al. 1997). Furthermore, roads are cited as the dominant source of sediment that reaches stream channels (Packer 1967; Trimble and Sartz 1957; Haupt 1959)."

Comment #7: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Mr. Grace and Mr. Andrews (both USFS employees) agree that

"roads are cited as the dominant source of sediment that reaches stream channels"

Quote below is from:Predicting Road Surface Erosion from Forest Roads in Washington State
By Walter F. Megahan, Ph.D.
from a presentation presented at the 2003 Geological Society of America meeting.
http://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2003AM/finalprogram/abstract_67686.htm

Quote:

"Erosion from forest roads can be a large source of sediment in watersheds managed for timber production."

Comment #8: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Megahan says this?

"Erosion from forest roads can be a large source of sediment in watersheds managed for timber production"

Quote below is from:Statements at a Press Conference with Senator Robert Torricelli, April 28, 1998
By David Montgomery Ph.D., about S. 977 and HR 1376), the Act to Save America's Forests
Dr. Montgomery is an Associate Professor for the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of Washington.
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/news/ScientistsStatement.htm

Quote:

"Today, addressing the adverse impacts of forest roads is consistently identified as one of the highest watershed restoration priorities in U.S. forests-in many forested watersheds in the western United States there is a greater road density than stream density. It is simply irrational to spend millions of dollars subsidizing further forest road construction when we are simultaneously spending millions of dollars to offset detrimental effects associated with similar actions in the past."

Comment #9: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. says this?

"It is simply irrational to spend millions of dollars subsidizing further forest road construction when we are simultaneously spending millions of dollars to offset detrimental effects associated with similar actions in the past"

Quote below is from: Statements at a Press Conference with Senator Robert Torricelli, April 28, 1998
By Seth Reice Ph.D., about S. 977 and HR 1376), the Act to Save America's Forests
Dr. Reice is Associate Professor of Biology in the Department of Biology and Curriculum in Ecology, University of North Carolina
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/news/ScientistsStatement.htm

quote:

"Clearcutting, along with the vast network of logging roads, result in sedimentation and soil erosion into our national forest's rivers and streams. Sedimentation degrades the water quality, impairs the habitat for fish and macroinvertebrates, and limits the ecosystem functions and services of streams.

The Act to Save America's forests bans clearcutting, restores damaged areas by allowing regeneration of native species, and reduces road building by prohibiting further road construction in core areas of biodiversity. These are necessary steps, to prevent further erosion and will help rehabilitate our forests our streams, and protect our wildlife.

Comment #10: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Reice says this?

"banning clearcutting will prevent further erosion and will help rehabilitate our forests our streams, and protect our wildlife"

Quote below is from: Review of Ecological Effects of Roads on Terrestrial and Aquatic Communities
By Christopher Frissell Frissell Ph.D and Stephen Trombulak Ph.D
Published by Conservation Biology, December 24, 2001
https://conbio.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2000.99084

Quote:

"We reviewed the scientific literature on the ecological effects of roads and found support for the general conclusion that they are associated with negative effects on biotic integrity in both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems."

"Not all species and ecosystems are equally affected by roads, but overall the presence of roads is highly correlated with changes in species composition, population sizes, and hydrologic and geomorphic processes that shape aquatic and riparian systems."

Comment #11: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Frissell and Dr. Trombulak agree with this statement?

"roads are associated with negative effects on biotic integrity in both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems"

Quote below is from: Sediment Production from Forest Road Surfaces
By Reid, L. M. Ph.D. and T. Dunne
Published by WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH, VOL. 20, NO. 11, PAGES 1753-1761, NOVEMBER 1984
https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/reid/psw_1984_reid001.pdf

Quote:

"Erosion on roads is an important source of fine-grained sediment in streams draining logged basins of the Pacific Northwest. Runoff rates and sediment concentrations from 10 road segments subject to a variety of traffic levels were monitored to produce sediment rating curves and unit hydrographs for different use levels and types of surfaces. These relationships are combined with a continuous rainfall record to calculate mean annual sediment yields from road segments of each use level. A heavily used road segment in the field area contributes 130 times as much sediment as an abandoned road. A paved road segment, along which cut slopes and ditches are the only sources of sediment, yields less than 1% as much sediment as a heavily used road with a gravel surface."

Comment #12: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Reid and T.Dunne say this?

"A heavily used road segment contributes 130 times as much sediment as an abandoned road"

Quote below is from: Sediment Plume Development from Forest Roads: How are they related to Filter Strip Recommendations?
By J. McFero Grace III, Research Engineer, US Forest Service, G.W. Andrews Forestry Sciences Lab
An ASAE/CSAE Meeting Presentation, Paper Number: 045015, August 1-4, 2004.
http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/ja_grace017.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quote:

"Research has shown that roads can have adverse impacts on the water quality on the forest landscape (Authur et al. 1998; Binkley and Brown 1993; Megahan et al. 1991). The forest road system has been identified by previous research as the major source of soil erosion on forestlands (Anderson et. al 1976; Patric 1976; Swift 1984; Van Lear et al. 1997). Furthermore, roads are cited as the dominant source of sediment that reaches stream channels (Packer 1967; Trimble and Sartz 1957; Haupt 1959)."

Comment #13: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores

"Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing J. McFero Grace III (a USFS employee) says this?

"roads are cited as the dominant source of sediment that reaches stream channels"

Quote below is from: Cumulative effects of roads and logging on landscape structure in the San Juan Mountains, Colorado (USA)
By Kevin McGarigal Ph.D., William H. Romme Ph.D., Michele Crist Ph.D.and Ed Roworth Ph.D.
Published in Landscape Ecology, Volume 16, Number 4 / May, 2001
https://www.umass.edu/landeco/pubs/mcgarigal.et.al.2001.pdf

Quote:

"Overall, roads had a greater impact on landscape structure than logging in our study area. Indeed, the 3-fold increase in road density between 1950-1993 accounted for most of the changes in landscape configuration associated with mean patch size, edge density, and core area."

Comment #14: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. McGarigal, Dr. Romme, Dr.Crist and Dr.Roworth all agree that?

"roads had a greater impact on landscape structure than logging"

Quote below is from: Forest Roads: A Synthesis of Scientific Information
By Gucinski, Hermann Ph.D., Michael J. Furniss, Robert R. Ziemer Ph.D.
and Martha H. Brookes, Editors. 2001
USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report PNW-GTR-509, 2001
http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/gtr509.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by USFS scientists.

Quotes:

"Roads have well-documented, short- and long-term effects on the environment that have become highly controversial, because of the value society now places on unroaded wildlands and because of wilderness conflicts with resource extraction."

"(Road) consequences include adverse effects on hydrology and geomorphic features (such as debris slides and sedimentation), habitat fragmentation, predation, road kill, invasion by exotic species, dispersal of pathogens, degraded water quality and chemical contamination, degraded aquatic habitat, use conflicts, destructive human actions (for example, trash dumping, illegal hunting, fires), lost solitude, depressed local economies, loss of soil productivity, and decline in biodiversity."

Comment #15: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Gucinski, Mr. Furniss, Dr. Ziemer and Ms. Brookes say?

"Road consequences include adverse effects on hydrology and geomorphic features (such as debris slides and sedimentation), habitat fragmentation, predation, road kill, invasion by exotic species, dispersal of pathogens, degraded water quality and chemical contamination, degraded aquatic habitat, use conflicts, destructive human actions, lost solitude, depressed local economies, loss of soil productivity, and decline in biodiversity"

Quote below is from: Forest Fragmentation and Roads

Published by Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center
U.S. Forest Service - Southern Research Station, February, 2023
http://www.forestthreats.org/publications/su-srs-018/fragmentation

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quote:

"Fragmentation caused by roads is of special interest because the effects of roads extend tens to hundreds of yards from the roads themselves, altering habitats and water drainage patterns, disrupting wildlife movement, introducing exotic plant species, and increasing noise levels. The land development that follows roads out into rural areas usually leads to more roads, an expansion process that only ends at natural or legislated barriers."

Comment #16: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing USFS scientists agree with the following statement?

"effects of roads extend tens to hundreds of yards from the roads themselves, altering habitats and water drainage patterns, disrupting wildlife movement, introducing exotic plant species, and increasing noise levels"

Quote below is from: Watershed's Response to Logging and Roads: South Fork of Caspar Creek, California, 1967-1976
By Raymond M. Rice Ph.D., Forest B. Tilley and Patricia A. Datzman.
USDA Forest Service, Research Paper PSW-146, 1979
http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/rice/Rice79.pdf

Quote:

"Disturbances from roadbuilding and logging changed the sediment/discharge relationship of the South Fork from one which was supply dependent to one which was stream power dependent, resulting in substantial increases in suspended sediment discharges."

"Road construction and logging appear to have resulted in increases in average turbidity levels (as inferred from suspended sediment increases) above those permitted by Regional Water Quality Regulations."

Comment #17: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Rice, Mr. Tilley and Ms. Datzman (all USFS employees) agree that:

"road construction and logging appear to have resulted in increases in average turbidity levels above those permitted by Regional Water Quality Regulations"

Quote below is from: Forest Road Erosion, Sediment Transport and Model Validation in the Southern Appalachians
By Mark S. Riedel Ph.D. and James M. Vose Ph.D.
USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory
Presented at the Second Federal Interagency Hydrologic
Modeling Conference, July 28 - August 1, 2002.
http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/ja_riedel002.pdf

Note the quote below is authored by 2 USFS scientists.

Quote:

"Sediment eroded from gravel roads can be a major component of the sediment budget in streams in this region (Van Lear, et al, 1995)."

Comment #18: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Riedel and Dr. Vose (both USFS employees both say:

"Sediment eroded from gravel roads can be a major component of the sediment budget in streams in this region"

Some USFS employees who have read this far who trust the science conclusions written by experts would believe there is no place in the forest where commercial logging/roading will not degrade the forest ecosystem. Thus, they will believe the taxpayer's money will be better spent on another project without logging and roading.

Some USFS employees who have read this far reject claims by independent scientists that are inconsistent with the USFS way of doing things. Sadly, these people are afflicted by confirmation bias and do not serve the public.

Quote below is from: Predicting Road Surface Erosion from Forest Roads in Washington State
By Walter F. Megahan, Ph.D.
from a presentation presented at the 2003 Geological Society of America meeting.
http://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2003AM/finalprogram/abstract_67686.htm

Quote:

"Erosion from forest roads can be a large source of sediment in watersheds managed for timber production."

Comment #19: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Megahan is sure:

"Erosion from forest roads can be a large source of sediment in watersheds managed for timber production"

Quote below is from: Statements at a Press Conference with Senator Robert Torricelli, April 28, 1998
By David Montgomery Ph.D., about S. 977 and HR 1376), the Act to Save America's Forests
Dr. Montgomery is an Associate Professor for the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of Washington.
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/news/ScientistsStatement.htm

Quote:

"Today, addressing the adverse impacts of forest roads is consistently identified as one of the highest watershed restoration priorities in U.S. forests-in many forested watersheds in the western United States there is a greater road density than stream density. It is simply irrational to spend millions of dollars subsidizing further forest road construction when we are simultaneously spending millions of dollars to offset detrimental effects associated with similar actions in the past."

Comment #20: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Montgomery says:

"we are simultaneously spending millions of dollars to offset detrimental effects associated with roads"

Quote below is from: Statements at a Press Conference with Senator Robert Torricelli, April 28, 1998
By Seth Reice Ph.D., about S. 977 and HR 1376), the Act to Save America's Forests
Dr. Reice is Associate Professor of Biology in the Department of Biology and Curriculum in Ecology, University of North Carolina
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/news/ScientistsStatement.htm

Quote:

"Clearcutting, along with the vast network of logging roads, result in sedimentation and soil erosion into our national forest's rivers and streams. Sedimentation degrades the water quality, impairs the habitat for fish and macroinvertebrates, and limits the ecosystem functions and services of streams.

The Act to Save America's forests bans clearcutting, restores damaged areas by allowing regeneration of native species, and reduces road building by prohibiting further road construction in core areas of biodiversity. These are necessary steps, to prevent further erosion and will help rehabilitate our forests our streams, and protect our wildlife.

Comment #21: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Reice says:

"Clearcutting, along with the vast network of logging roads, result in sedimentation and soil erosion into our national forest's rivers and streams"

Quote below is from: Hydrological processes and pathways affected by forest roads: what do we still need to learn?
By Luce, Charles H. Ph.D., USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station
Published in Treesearch USFS, 2002
https://www.fs.usda.gov/research/treesearch/23954

Note the quote below is authored by a USFS scientist.

Quote:

"Almost everywhere people live and work they build and use unimproved roads, and wherever the roads go, a range of environmental issues follows."

"Among the environmental effects of unimproved roads, those on water quality and aquatic ecology are some of the most critical. Increased chronic sedimentation, in particular, can dramatically change the food web in affected streams and lakes."

"The nearly impervious nature of road surfaces (or treads) makes them unique within forested environments and causes runoff generation even in mild rainfall events, leading to chronic fine sediment contributions."

"If we look at the issue of what we need to learn or the research priorities for forest road hydrology, I would argue that the areas of cutslope hydrology and effectiveness of restoration efforts are perhaps most critical."

"At a few sites in the mountains of Idaho and Oregon a substantial portion of the road runoff (80-95%) came from subsurface flow intercepted by the cutslope (Burroughs et al., 1972; Megahan, 1972; Wemple, 1998)."

Comment #22: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr. Luce (a USFS employee) says:

"among the environmental effects of unimproved roads, those on water quality and aquatic ecology are some of the most critical"

Quote below is from: Erosion on logging roads in northwestern California: How much is avoidable?
By John McCashion and Raymond Rice Ph.D.
Published by the Journal of Forestry, January 1983
https://www.fs.usda.gov/research/treesearch/3445

Quote:

"A study was made on 344 miles of logging roads in northwestern California to assess sources of erosion and the extent to which road-related erosion is avoidable. At most, about 24 percent of the erosion measured on the logging roads could have been prevented by conventional engineering methods. The remaining 76 percent was caused by site conditions and choice of alignment. On 30,300 acres of commercial timberland, an estimated 40 percent of the total erosion associated with management of the area was found to have been derived from the road system."

Comment #23: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Mr. McCashion and Dr. Rice say:

"an estimated 40 percent of the total erosion associated with management of the area was found to have been derived from the road system"

Quote below is from: Road Development, Housing Growth, and Landscape Fragmentation In Northern Wisconsin: 1937-1999
By Hawbaker, Todd J. Ph.D., Volker C. Radeloff Ph.D., Murray K. Clayton Ph.D., Roger B. Hammer Ph.D., and Charlotte E. Gonzalez-Abraham Ph.D.
Published in Ecological Applications, 01 June 2006
https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016%5B1222:RDHGAL%5D2.0.CO%3B2

Quote:

"Roads remove habitat, alter adjacent areas, and interrupt and redirect ecological flows. They subdivide wildlife populations, foster invasive species spread, change the hydrologic network, and increase human use of adjacent areas." (abstract)

Comment #24: Acting Ranger McNeil, are you wrong to believe logging and road construction restores "Watershed, Beaver Habitat and aquatics" knowing Dr.Hawbaker, Dr. Radeloff, Dr. Murray, Dr. Clayton, and Dr. Gonzalez-Abraham agree that:

"Roads remove habitat, alter adjacent areas, and interrupt and redirect ecological flows"

Acting Ranger McNeil, perhaps now you understand why some Americans are outraged that the USFS serves its corporate masters using tax dollars.

Some resource specialists on the IDT cast away their land ethics and values they had when they graduated from college to fit in with the USFS. When the draft NEPA document for the proposed Carbon River timber sale still contains treatments that will cause damage to the resources and my daughter's objection is rejected by the DRF she will have court standing. The IDT members will be asked to testify.

Acting Ranger McNeil, I'm sorry you did not learn earlier that your IDT is not capable of completing the NEPA process honestly. Even a child knows commercial timber sales like this one will inflict tragic damage to the natural resources in and downstream from the sale area. Your IDT members know this too. Your IDT members will write anything to please you. Do you think this timber sale is what the public really wants?

Your IDT members should be ashamed. Anyone besides a silviculturist would be embarrassed that a USFS line-officer would propose such a thing. Acting Ranger McNeil you should have visited the sale area yourself before now to determine if the trees were in such bad shape they needed to be killed with chainsaws. If this weren't so tragic it would be laughable to think that so-called professionals would come up with such nonsense.

Even lay members of the public know commercial timber sales "restore" nothing except the purchaser' s financial bottom line.

The pictures shown in Photo Attachment #15 were taken by members of several environmental groups in R-6. Pictures don't lie. The NEPA documents for several of these timber sales said at least 1 natural resource would be "restored" by the timber sale. The line-officers across the nation who are Responsible Officials used the words "restore" and "restoration" willy nilly without thinking. Many of them (like you) don't know the definition of "restore." (see below) I suggest you read timber harvest science in Opposing Views Attachment #1 before you assume commercial logging will bring the land "back to an original or normal condition."

restore

(ri-stôr')
tr.v. re*stored, re*stor*ing, re*stores

1. To bring back into existence or use; reestablish: restore law and order.
2. To bring back to an original or normal condition: restore a building; restored the patient to health.
3.
a. To place in a former position or location: restored the book to the shelf.
b. To put (someone) back in a former position or role: restore the emperor to the throne.
4. To make restitution of; give back: restore the stolen funds.

"return (someone or something) to a former condition, place, or position"

I hope you can see your problem.

It's easier and less stressful to do a good job from the beginning than it is to mess things up and then try to justify your mismanagement later.

A scanned signature is contained in the "signature" attachment.