Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/9/2017 4:34:52 PM
First name: Mike
Last name: Vandeman
Organization:
Title:
Comments: FW: Tracy Ridge Shared Use Trails and Forest Plan Draft Decision

From: Mike Vandeman [mailto:mjvande@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 08, 2017 5:25 PM
To: FS-comments-eastern-allegheny-bradford <comments-eastern-allegheny-bradford@fs.fed.us>
Cc: info@pawild.org
Subject: Tracy Ridge Shared Use Trails and Forest Plan Draft Decision

From: Mike Vandeman [mailto:mjvande@pacbell.net <mailto:mjvande@pacbell.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2017 4:14 PM
To: Hatfield, Richard - FS <rhatfield@fs.fed.us <mailto:rhatfield@fs.fed.us> >
Subject: Re: Tracy Ridge Shared Use Trails and Forest Plan Draft Decision

At 09:50 AM 7/28/2017, you wrote:

Thank you for your interest in the Tracy Ridge Shared Use Trails Project.

Allegheny National Forest Supervisor Sherry Tune has decided to authorize the project as described in the attached draft decision. Please see attached cover letter and draft decision for more information.

Please contact me with any questions.

Why no mention of the procedure for objecting?

"Response: The research referenced in the EA was cited in literature reviews compiled by non-IMBA researchers. The EA referenced the research that was available and consistently cited by researchers. Other than Vandeman (addressed below), the commenter did not provide any additional research that would invalidate the findings in the EA.
Comment #126: I am skeptical of the conclusions provided in papers cited on IMBA's website; and I am not the only skeptic. Michael J Vandeman analyses several of these research papers in "The Impacts of Mountain Biking on Wildlife and People", http://www.culturechange.org/mountain_biking_impacts.htm, with references at the end of the paper. The bottom line is that the research quoted in at least 3 of the papers quoted is flawed. The details are available at the web reference. (Commenter #17)
Response: Mr. Vandeman's analysis appears to be an opinion piece or is in a "blog-post" format it was not published or peer-reviewed. There is no conclusion that the research is flawed the overarching argument from Mr. Vandeman seems to be that since bikers travel farther on trails, the impacts will be seen further from trailheads (when compared to hikers). Despite the lack of peer review, Mr. Vandeman's piece was reviewed and did not provide any information that invalidates the conclusions in the EA."

This response indicates that your reviewer knows nothing about science and/or is being dishonest. The format, whether it was published (it was), and whether it was "peer-reviewed" have nothing to do with its scientific quality! "There is no conclusion that the research is flawed": on the contrary, that is exactly what my review was about! All 7 of the "studies" reviewed by IMBA are bad science, and their conclusons should have been opposite to what they were. "The impacts will be seen further from trailheads (when compared to hikers)": this totally misses my point, whch is that mountain bikers cause several times the impact of a hiker. "Mr. Vandeman's piece ... did not provide any information that invalidates the conclusions in the EA": nonsense; I demonstrated that mountain bikers' impacts are significant and much greater than that of hikers! An EA is totally inappropriate. An EIS is the document requires by law, because the impacts of mountain biking are significant.

Please direct my objections where they belong, and send a copy to Commenter #17.

Mike Vandeman
2600 Camino Ramon #3s300d
San Ramon, CA 94583-5099
510-697-5368

--

I am working on creating wildlife habitat that is off-limits to humans ("pure habitat").
Want to help? (I spent the previous 8 years fighting auto dependence and road construction.)

Wildlife must be given top priority, because they can't protect themselves from us.

Please don't put a cell phone next to any part of your body that you are fond of!

http://mjvande.info <http://mjvande.info/>