

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/7/2019 4:43:40 AM

First name: Larry

Last name: Beane

Organization:

Title:

Comments: RE: OPPOSING South Red Bird Wildlife Enhancement Project DBNF, Project 52340

I am so disgusted with the treatment of our national forests by loggers, I have to oppose this project, South Red Bird Wildlife Enhancement Project DBNF, Project 52340. It is unacceptable. I also oppose it because of the environmental impact, and damage to the recreational treasure that I love. It is used by multiple users. This project is unneeded, and detrimental, and opposed by many.

I have visited in, camped in, hiked in, climbed, fished, and kayaked in the national forests for over 50 years. I love them. I have also worked in, volunteered in, and participated in special events in national forests including the Daniel Boone National Forest which I usually visit at least one or two times a year, and sometimes more. As a citizen and taxpayer, I object to public resources being used for corporate profits. The forest service should get almost all profits and require replanting and remediation.

The logging of national forests is done for the profit of the logging industry. I know that part of the national forest purpose is to provide sustainable timber for industry, but the industry should pay for it a fair price. The key word is sustainable. The proposed project is arguably NOT sustainable. Loggers are being allowed to cut steep slopes creating erosion, later landslides, and roads that change the flow of water. This causes siltation, and great damage on a watershed scale. They do not follow required practices and litter streams, lose hydraulic fluids in leaks, some have even changed oil onsite making messes. The national forests also are required to be environmentally responsible, which the plan is not.

- The Daniel Boone National Forest has been unsuccessful in achieving the proposed results of wildlife habitat improvement in other areas. How will this project not fail too? If logging is needed, consider selective cutting and horse/mule removal. Skid tracks and bulldozed roads are unacceptable.

-Alternatives could be selective careful logging of younger tulip poplar and maples, along with well timed prescribed fire to enhance oak and hickory. If this is the goal, then why are places cut 30-50 years ago dominated by tulip poplar and red maple?

-What assurances do you make to be sure there will be no landslides such as has happened in other sections logged in the Daniel Boone National Forest?

-Logging roads and logged areas are often taken over by non-native species. How are you going to prevent this?

-Has an archaeological survey on the ground, meeting the standards, and agreed to by SHPOs and THPOs, and all consultations been held? If not, there can be no ground disturbance.

-Has each drainage downstream been surveyed for aquatic benthic species including caddisflies, by scientists? If not, new species may be likely. You must follow the Clean Water Act until it is repealed completely.

-Many of the streams have been designated as Critical Habitat for the Kentucky arrow darter (*Etheostoma spilotum*), listed as "threatened" under the Endangered Species Act in 1973. The project area also provides habitat for the federally-endangered snuffbox mussel (*Epioblasma triquetra*). Have recent surveys studied these species, done species counts and determined that this plan will have no impact on these species?

-Have surveys for spiders, bryophytes, other mussels, crayfish, fish, frogs, salamanders, and turtles been done for the area, and streams downstream from this project? If not, this is potentially impacted from any spills, runoff, siltation, and landslide changes and must be done.

-Best management practices, even when followed are not close to being adequate for this environment. The logging people don't follow them all the time. What assurance, that they will, do you have? When they don't, can you make them pay to mitigate the damage?

Replanting of native species in areas already logged is not being followed through on. Please fix this and remove invasive species.

I hope that alternative, less invasive and less damaging options are found. Please listen to people's concerns. As for timber, there are newer, faster growing alternatives, like bamboo and hemp. The industry has not always been good in our forests, my and your forest. I know many who work for the National Forest Service, good

federal employees that make the extra effort. They do science, follow the science or try to, help the recreational user. Listen to them without political pressure.