

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/4/2020 3:07:45 AM

First name: Dick

Last name: Artley

Organization:

Title:

Comments: October 3, 2020

Dear Ranger Tripp and Ranger Ryan, and selected Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF specialists who will learn something when they read the truth below,

After reading the September 2, 2020 "Dear Planning Participant" letter its clear the goons on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF have crawled from under their rocks to backhand the public that provides the money for their salaries.

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: The first sentence in the September 2, 2020 "Dear Planning Participant" letter states "This letter introduces the proposed Selway Saginaw Vegetation Management Project and begins the formal combined scoping and 30-day comment period." You do not provide the public with any reasons why you have chosen to take away the public's right to comment on your draft NEPA document. Are you frightened that the public will uncover tragic actions that will decimate the natural resources of the sale area. Are you afraid your IDT cannot prepare a legal EA or EIS? Clearly, this stunt violates:

40 CFR §1500.2 Policy.

Federal agencies shall to the fullest extent possible:

(d) Encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment.

40 CFR §1506.6 Public involvement.

Agencies shall:

(a) Make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures.

You don't stand a chance when you try to explain to the plaintiff's attorneys why you combine scoping and the 30-day review and comment period on the pre-decisional EA. It shows me you people do not understand why NEPA requires scoping BEFORE preparing a NEPA document. Perhaps you should hire children to explain it to you.

Someday the kids of Montana will need a place to experience solitude and Nature sounds. They will soon learn that they won't find it in the Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF currently guided by the mismanagement of Supervisor Ford. They will wonder why she felt it was more important to provide short-term corporate profit opportunities than it was to assure the forest remained intact and the resources functioned properly. They will wonder why the specialists paid to protect these resources from harm turned belly up and supported the plunder.

Until I read your September 2, 2020 "Dear Planning Participant" letter for the proposed Selway-Saginaw timber sale I thought the USFS had stopped mindlessly harming the national forests for volume when Mike Dombeck was Chief (1997-2001). For some reason the employees on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF rejected his wisdom

and advice in order to better serve their corporate masters.

An Explanation of the Opposing Views

Science Attachments attached to these Comments

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 contains multiple quotes authored by Ph.D. scientists who are experts in their fields. Each quote is clearly labeled with an electronic link to the source of the quote..

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 were true, then why do independent scientists repeatedly describe why and how logging inflicts massive damage to the fragile forest natural resources? You are all aware of this disparity yet you choose to reject independent, unbiased science and instead embrace the flimsy, baseless USFS science. In Attachment #1 I will refresh your memories. After you read each quote ask yourself how the USFS would justify this timber sale. Ask yourself if the USFS used "best science" to develop this sale as your agency claims. Please see Best Science Attachment to learn which USFS leaders said "best science" would be used. Finally, ask yourself of the Selway Saginaw timber sale is based on "best science."

I suggest you all read 40 CFR 1502.9(b). After you read the science quotes in the Opposing Views Science Attachments you will have a little more work to do than you thought

"(b) Final environmental impact statements shall respond to comments as required in Part 1503 of this chapter. The agency shall discuss at appropriate points in the final statement any responsible opposing view which was not adequately discussed in the draft statement and shall indicate the agency's response to the issues raised."

You Propose to Log 11.3 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.

None if you can even comprehend the damage that will be inflicted by 11.3 square miles of logging.

Your Scoping Package fails miserably to convince me the natural resources in and downstream from the sale area will benefit from logging and roading.

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 health. 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 ... but you will sleep at night.

If you were normal, caring, intelligent human beings you would be overcome by guilt each time you see the harmful after-effects of what your logging will cause. The public is no longer clueless. They know volume motivates USFS employees. The quotes in Opposing Views Science Attachment #1 and the photos in Opposing

Views Science Attachment #29 show why the public feels the way they do about logging.

Your claim that you serve the public is laughable.

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 Americans 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

Dear Ranger Tripp and Ranger Ryan you ignore the wishes of the public for personal gratification don't you? You know in the USFS line-officer promotion opportunities are based on one's skill to generate volume.

You Propose to Construct 14 Miles of New Road.
You know Road Construction Causes more
Long-Term harm to Aquatic Resource Health
(especially so-called temporary roads) than
any other Human Activity in the Forest.

You people are insanely zealous about generating volume at any cost.

Table 2 says you will construct 14 miles of new temporary road:

On spite of what the agency hammers into your heads, a temporary road is a road. A reasonably intelligent person would reject this USFS "temporary" road dogma. Your so-called "temporary" roads will be used many times in the future. Intelligent, professional, competent USFS employees build system roads with gravel surfacing and a ditch when they will be used in the future. Saving money by building temporary roads is unacceptable!!!

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document n: A report authored by Gerald Coghlan, WO Acting Director of Engineering in 1998 indicated there are 372,956 miles of national forest system road (page 5). The agency currently constructs 2,170 miles of system road per year. At this rate there are 420,000 miles now. In addition to that, there are about 3,000 miles of unsurfaced, sediment producing, outsloped, temporary roads built each year. The average distance to the moon (it varies) is 384,403 miles ... and you propose more? None of you can comprehend a road system that stretches to the moon and back ... and you propose to increase it. Does this please you?

See: http://www.fs.fed.us/eng/road_mgt/roadsummary.pdf

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Opposing Views Science Attachment #4 contains the statements of scores of Ph.D. scientists and engineers (including Chief Dombeck) who discuss the tragic natural resource damage caused by temporary road construction. You know USFS so-called temporary roads are not temporary because the running surface exists for future logging after your ineffective decommissioning

Please consider the following articles. Assure the source documents for the articles are included in the References section and cited in the pending draft NEPA document for this sale. These articles represent "best-science." If they don't appear in the References section it means you are frightened to show the public the truth which might jeopardize attainment of your precious volume.

Article Name: "Road Woes for the Forest Service", March 2002

Short excerpt of article: "Since 1975, the construction of timber roads has cost taxpayers in excess of \$5 billion. In addition, the Forest Service gives trees free of charge to logging companies in exchange for building access roads. This system has resulted in enough roads in the national forests to circle the globe more than 17 times, or to travel to the moon and back."

Link to total article online: <http://www.taxpayer.net/library/weekly-wastebasket/article/road-woes-at-the-forest-service>

Article Name: "The United States Forest Service: the World's Largest Socialized Road-Building Company", May 1993

Short excerpt of article: "As implausible as this may seem, the numbers do not lie. So far, the Forest Service has constructed 343,000 miles of road on our national forests. This alone is eight times the entire mileage of the United States Interstate Highway System. Think about that the next time you're driving cross-country on I-80, or heading for Florida on I-95."

Link to total article online: <http://fff.org/explore-freedom/article/united-states-forest-service-worlds-largest-socialized-roadbuilding-company/>

Article Name: "Think Like a River: the Cumulative Effects of Roads on Aquatic Systems", November 1998

Short excerpt of article: "In addition to the site-specific effects of roads on aquatic systems (for reviews see RIPorters 1:1 and 2:5), one of the least-known and most compelling examples of the cumulative impacts of a road network is found within Montana's Bitterroot National Forest. In 1991 and 1992, U.S. Forest Service researchers examined watersheds within west-draining slopes of the Sapphire Range and found a highly significant correlation between low road densities and healthy watersheds. Additionally, bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) populations were directly associated with low road density watersheds (BNF 1991, 1992). Subsequent research supported these findings by attributing the decline of fish presence (Eaglin and Hubert 1993) and aquatic biointegrity (Roth et al. 1996; Rothrock et al. 1998) to increasing road densities. Even the aquatic assessment for the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP), concluded that "...increasing road density is correlated with declining aquatic habitat conditions and aquatic integrity" (Lee et al. 1997, p. 1347). The implication is that not only do roads impact local areas, but their cumulative effects can fundamentally alter landscape processes (e.g. seasonal migrations of anadromous fish) which result in a series of cascading ecological effects."

Link to total article online: <http://www.wildlandscpr.org/road-riporter/think-river-cumulative-effects-roads-aquatic-systems>

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: Chief Dombeck knew there was nothing more damaging to forest resources than road construction. Chief Dombeck's statement to USFS employees is quoted below. Please include this quote in a conspicuous location in your draft NEPA document.

"Roads often cause serious ecological impacts. There are few more irreparable marks we can leave on the land than to build a road."

Dr. Mike Dombeck, Chief, US Forest Service
Remarks to Forest Service employees
and retirees at the University of Montana
February 1998

Link to total article online: <https://www.hcn.org/issues/129/4106>

I know today's USFS line-officers are taught Chief Dombeck was an "enviro" and should be dismissed and disliked? Why? He wasn't afraid to put the needs of the American public above the natural resource extraction corporations. He took action to serve the public. See below.

"Michael Dombeck, the chief of the United States Forest Service, will soon announce a moratorium on construction of new logging roads in remote sections of most of the national forests."

The moratorium will protect millions of acres from new logging, elevating the forests' environmental values -- clean water and wildlife -- above commercial values."

Published by the NY Times, January 14, 1998

Link to story: <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/01/14/opinion/a-positive-shift-in-forest-policy.html>

Comment for which I'd like a meaningful response in the Response to Comments section in the draft NEPA document: In spite of the fact the volume will be reduced, please analyze an Action alternative in detail that eliminates all (emphasis added) new road construction. This will eliminate the natural resource damage inflicted by new roads. This will serve future generations of kids. A real professional would not be frightened to jeopardize some volume. A competent USFS line-officer would honestly analyze a no new roads alternative and display the natural resource impacts that will not occur.

Federal Officials who Knowingly put the Public at Risk are subject to Civil Laws. They could be indicted and if Convicted they might Face Prison, Fines or both. I cannot comprehend how anyone could voluntarily be part of an action knowing that the action might kill another human being.

Your Scoping Package at page 11 says this:

"Noxious weeds will be treated and prevented and/or controlled through best management practices (BMPs) following procedures in the BDNF Noxious Weed Control Program ROD (2002) Appendix H."

The BDNF Noxious Weed Control Program ROD allows the use of the lethal chemical glyphosate.

Here's Recent Information the USDA is keeping from you. Indeed, the USDA has been cuddling with corporations that manufacture toxic (sometimes lethal) chemicals for decades. This includes, Monsanto.

Roundup Court Case #1

On March 27, 2019 a San Francisco jury said Monsanto (now owned by BayerAG) was liable for Mr. Edwin Hardeman's non-curable cancer called non-Hodgkin lymphoma. The judge ordered Monsanto to pay Mr. Hardeman \$200 million.

The jury went on to state:

"It is clear from Monsanto's actions that it does not care whether Roundup causes cancer, focusing instead on manipulating public opinion and undermining anyone who raises genuine and legitimate concerns about Roundup. It speaks volumes that not one Monsanto employee, past or present, came live to trial to defend Roundup's safety or Monsanto's actions. Today, the jury resoundingly held Monsanto accountable for its 40 years of corporate malfeasance and sent a message to Monsanto that it needs to change the way it does business."

Here are 4 of the many links to the case:

Monsanto trial: cancer patient says he used herbicide for three decades
<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/mar/05/monsanto-roundup-trial-cancer-weed-killer>

Second Jury Trial Implicates Roundup in Lymphatic Cancer
<https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2019/04/03/roundup-guilty-non-hodgkin-lymphoma.aspx>

Jury Awards Edwin Hardeman \$80.2 Million in Roundup Cancer Lawsuit
<https://www.lawyersandsettlements.com/legal-news/monsanto-facing-lawsuits-over-alleged-roundup-cancer/jury->

awards-edward-hardeman-80-2-million-in-roundup-cancer-lawsu-23071.html

Did weed killer Roundup cause cancer in Sonoma County resident Edwin Hardeman?
<https://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/9363655-181/did-weed-killer-roundup-cause>

Roundup Court Case #2

On May 13, 2019 a jury in Alameda County California ruled that the couple, Alva and Alberta Pilliod of Livermore, Calif., both contracted non-Hodgkin's lymphoma because of their use of a glyphosate-based herbicide. They were each awarded \$1 billion in punitive damages and an additional \$55 million in collective compensatory damages.

Here are a few of the many links to the verdict:

California Jury Awards \$2 Billion To Couple In Roundup Weed Killer Cancer Trial
<https://www.npr.org/2019/05/13/723056453/california-jury-awards-2-billion-to-couple-in-roundup-weed-killer-cancer-trial>

Alva Pilliod & Alberta Pilliod: 5 Fast Facts You Need to Know
<https://heavy.com/news/2019/05/alberta-alva-pilliod/>

Pilliod v. Monsanto Company | California Roundup JCCP
<https://www.baumhedlundlaw.com/pilliod-v-monsanto-trial/>

The EPA says a chemical in Monsanto's weed-killer doesn't cause cancer - but there's compelling evidence the agency is wrong
<https://www.businessinsider.com/glyphosate-cancer-dangers-roundup-epa-2019-5>

Bayer Loses Third Glyphosate Lawsuit; Plaintiffs Awarded More Than \$2 Billion in Damages
<https://www.agriculture.com/news/business/bayer-loses-third-glyphosate-lawsuit-plaintiffs-awarded-more-than-2-billion-in-damages>

Bayer-Monsanto Ordered to Pay \$2 Billion to Glyphosate Cancer Victims
<https://healthimpactnews.com/2019/bayer-monsanto-ordered-to-pay-2-billion-to-glyphosate-cancer-victims/>

Bayer's stock falls after \$2 billion verdict against Roundup maker Monsanto
https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2019/05/14/bayers-stock-falls-after-billion-verdict-against-roundup-maker-monsanto/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d1848f7731e6

Roundup Court Case #3

In July 2018, Dewayne Johnson (a former school groundskeeper) was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. He sued Monsanto alleging the chemical glyphosate (an ingredient in Roundup) caused his cancer. Mr. Johnson used Roundup as part of his job. On August 10, 2018 a jury in San Francisco delivered a verdict in Mr. Johnson's favor. The judge ordered Monsanto to pay Mr. Johnson \$289 million in total damages.

Here are a few of the many links to the verdict:

4 Must-See Videos of the Huge Win in the Monsanto Trial
<https://www.organicconsumers.org/blog/monsanto-trial-verdict-videos>

San Francisco Jurors Hear Hours of Scientific Data About Herbicide's Link to Cancer
<https://www.law.com/therecorder/2018/07/09/san-francisco-jurors-hear-hours-of-scientific-data-about-herbicides->

[link-to-cancer/?slreturn=20180713081135](#)

Monsanto Loses Landmark Roundup Cancer Trial, Set to Pay USD 289 Million in Damages
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#inbox/FMfcgxvxBxtJCGsfZgnVKVKfStZmxqSM>

Monsanto "Taken To The Cleaners" In Jury Verdict Dwayne Johnson v. Monsanto
<https://www.activistpost.com/2018/08/monsanto-taken-to-the-cleaners-in-jury-verdict-dwayne-johnson-v-monsanto.html>

Jury rules Monsanto liable in weed killer case
<https://abc7news.com/society/verdict-reached-in-lawsuit-against-monsanto/3925454/>

Monsanto ordered to pay \$289 million in world's first Roundup cancer trial
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-monsanto-cancer-lawsuit/jury-orders-monsanto-to-pay-290-million-in-california-roundup-cancer-trial-idUSKBN1KV2HB>

Monsanto Loses \$289 Million Verdict in Roundup Cancer Trial
<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-08-10/monsanto-s-roundup-caused-groundskeeper-s-cancer-jury-finds>

Jury orders Monsanto to pay nearly \$290M in Roundup trial
<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/jury-orders-monsanto-pay-290m-roundup-trial-n899811>

Only a fool would ignore these trials and 2nd guess the 3 juries.

Here is information the American public is reading

Article Title: The Monsanto Papers: MDL Glyphosate Cancer Case Key Documents & Analysis
Published by US Right to Know, November 2017
Link to Article: <https://usrtk.org/pesticides/mdl-monsanto-glyphosate-cancer-case-key-documents-analysis/>

Excerpts:

"More than 270 lawsuits are pending against Monsanto Co. in U.S. District Court in San Francisco, filed by people alleging that exposure to Roundup herbicide caused them or their loved ones to develop non-Hodgkin lymphoma, and that Monsanto covered up the risks. The cases have been combined for handling as multidistrict litigation under Judge Vince Chhabria. The lead case is 3:16-md-02741-VC. Additionally, at least 1,100 plaintiffs have made similar claims against Monsanto in state courts. The first trial in the Roundup litigation is set for June 18, 2018 in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco."

Article title: OF MICE, MONSANTO AND A MYSTERIOUS TUMOR
Published in Truthout, June 16, 2017
Link to full article: <https://usrtk.org/pesticides/of-mice-monsanto-and-a-mysterious-tumor/>

Excerpts:

"It's been 34 years since Monsanto Co. presented US regulators with a seemingly routine study analyzing the effects the company's best-selling herbicide might have on rodents. Now, that study is once again under the microscope, emerging as a potentially pivotal piece of evidence in litigation brought by hundreds of people who claim Monsanto's weed killer gave them cancer."

This month, tissue slides from long-dead mice in that long-ago research study are being scrutinized by fresh eyes as an expert pathologist employed by lawyers for cancer victims looks for evidence the lawyers hope will help prove a cover-up of the dangers of the weed killer called glyphosate."

"But EPA toxicology experts were unconvinced. EPA statistician and toxicology branch member Herbert Lacayo authored a February 1985 memo outlining disagreement with Monsanto's position. A "prudent person would reject the Monsanto assumption that Glyphosate dosing has no effect on kidney tumor production," Lacayo wrote. "Glyphosate is suspect. Monsanto's argument is unacceptable." "

Article title: Patients: Roundup gave us cancer as EPA official helped the company

Published online by CNN, May 16, 2017

Link to full article: <https://www.cnn.com/2017/05/15/health/roundup-herbicide-cancer-allegations/index.html>

Excerpts:

"Christine Sheppard fantasizes about her life before cancer. Before she had to take painkillers "all the time." Before she had to seriously worry about when she might die."

"For 12 years, Sheppard had no idea what might have caused her non-Hodgkin's lymphoma -- until a group of cancer researchers reported (PDF) that glyphosate, the key ingredient in the popular weed killer Roundup, is "probably carcinogenic to humans" (PDF)."

"Sheppard is one of more than 800 cancer patients suing Monsanto, the maker of Roundup, claiming the company failed to warn consumers about the risk of cancer associated with Roundup products."

Article title: The Monsanto Tribunal's Legal Opinion Reinforces Movements' Struggle for Basic Human Rights

Published online by Common Dreams, April 19, 2017

Link to full article: <https://www.commondreams.org/views/2017/04/19/monsanto-tribunals-legal-opinion-reinforces-movements-struggle-basic-human-rights>

Excerpt:

"The Monsanto Tribunal confirmed how poisonous products and toxic chemicals such as Round Up (Glyphosate) & Basta (Glufosinate), neonicotinoids, atrazine, and other pesticides have led to the destruction of soils, to desertification, to the extermination of bees, to the rise in health epidemics such as cancer, birth defects, and respiratory disease, to name just a few. They are contaminating people by polluting areas and poisoning our food systems. The recent UN's Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver, provides a clear account on the negative effects of global pesticide use in agriculture and its impact on human rights. Last September, the International Criminal Court declared it would prioritise crimes that result in the "destruction of the environment", "exploitation of natural resources" and the "illegal dispossession" of land and that it would now take many crimes that have been traditionally under-prosecuted into consideration. The ICC, though not formally extending its jurisdiction, will assess existing offences, such as crimes against humanity, in a broader context."

Article title: GLYPHOSATE: HEALTH CONCERNS ABOUT THE MOST WIDELY USED PESTICIDE

Published online by Truthout, April 5, 2017

Link to full article: <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40106-glyphosate-health-concerns-about-the-most-widely-used-pesticide>

Excerpt:

"More than 50 lawsuits against Monsanto Co. are pending in US District Court in San Francisco, filed by people alleging that exposure to Roundup herbicide caused them or their loved ones to develop non-Hodgkin lymphoma, and that Monsanto covered up the risks. The litigation has been consolidated as multidistrict litigation (MDL) for more efficient processing. Several hundred similar actions are pending in state courts.

"In March 2017, the federal court judge overseeing the MDL unsealed some internal Monsanto documents that raised new questions about Monsanto's influence on the EPA process and about the research regulators rely on. The documents suggest that Monsanto's long-standing claims about the safety of glyphosate and Roundup do not necessarily rely on sound science as the company asserts, but on efforts to manipulate the science"

Do you really want to be responsible for this?

- *birth defects,
- *miscarriages,
- *premature births,
- *cancer - non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and hairy cell leukemia,
- *DNA damage,
- *autism,
- *irreparable kidney and liver damage,
- *infertility,
- *learning disabilities,
- *ADHD and other neurological disorders (especially in children),
- *mitochondrial damage,
- *cell asphyxia,
- *endocrine disruption,
- *bipolar disorder,
- *skin tumors,
- *thyroid damage,
- *decrease in the sperm count, and
- *chromosomal damage.

How will you live with yourself knowing there are alternative, effective treatment options to spewing poison where families play?

Article title: USDA drops plan to test for Monsanto weed killer in food

Published online by Nation of Change, March 28, 2017

Links to full article: <http://www.nationofchange.org/2017/03/25/usda-drops-plan-test-monsanto-weed-killer-food/>

<http://gmwatch.org/news/latest-news/17519-usda-drops-plan-to-test-for-glyphosate-residues-in-food>

<https://www.organicconsumers.org/news/usda-drops-plan-test-monsanto-weed-killer-food>

<http://todayeco.com/pages/91671667-usda-drops-plan-to-test-for-monsanto-weed-killer-in-food>

<http://ecotopical.com/ecowatch/171587/usda-drops-plan-to-test-for-monsanto-weed-killer-in-food/>

Excerpt:

"The USDA does not routinely test for glyphosate as it does for other pesticides used in food production. But that stance has made the USDA the subject of criticism as controversy over glyphosate safety has mounted in recent years. The discussions of testing this year come as U.S. and European regulators are wrestling with cancer concerns about the chemical, and as Monsanto, which has made billions of dollars from its glyphosate-based herbicides, is being sued by hundreds of people who claim exposures to Roundup caused them or their loved ones to suffer from non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Internal Monsanto documents obtained by plaintiffs' attorneys in those cases indicate that Monsanto may have manipulated research regulators relied on to garner favorable safety assessments and last week, Congressman Ted Lieu called for a probe by the Department of Justice into Monsanto's actions."

Article title: BEHIND A CORPORATE MONSTER: HOW MONSANTO PUSHES AGRICULTURAL DOMINATION
Published online by Truthout, March 19, 2017

Link to full article: <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/39904-behind-a-corporate-monster-how-monsanto-pushes-agricultural-domination>

Excerpts:

"Independent studies on Roundup found that the full formulation was much more toxic than glyphosate, the active ingredient, itself. Monsanto's tests were only conducted on glyphosate, not Roundup.

Public laboratories are reluctant to conduct research on Roundup and other product toxicity because most biotechnology research is only funded by the biotechnology companies. Researchers know their careers will suffer if they do this type of research. Monsanto refuses to supply GM seeds for independent research."

Ranger Tripp and Ranger Ryan, how will you live with yourself knowing you have consciously chosen to plant the cancer seed in your forest?

You will ignore and/or reject the many research conclusions of independent scientists unaffiliated with the USDA I present below showing glyphosate is sometimes lethal. I suggest you learn about the USDA's cozy relationship with the toxic chemical manufacturing corporations. I present science below that reasonably intelligent, caring people would consider. The USFS glyphosate safety conclusions are diametrically opposed to the conclusions of hundreds of independent scientists. A human being would not take action where the preponderance of the science shows the action could or might kill someone. Most people draw the line at what they will do for a paycheck.

The United States has a cancer epidemic. We have a much higher incidence of cancer than any other developed country in the world. More pounds of Roundup are applied per-capita in America than any other country. You know from reading the obituaries that the cause of death in most cases is cancer. You know there are equally effective alternatives (other chemicals, hand pulling and biological control) to achieve your goals besides Roundup application.

Identifying your Roundup treatment areas with signs to keep people out is an unacceptable option. Nobody in their right mind would apply poison to public land anywhere.

Reasonably intelligent, caring people (especially if they are being paid to serve the public) would never take action that could or might harm members of families (including children) visiting the forest and wildlife that inhabit the forest. You have alternatives to achieve your goals. Use them!

You will not be reprimanded by your supervisor for not applying a herbicide containing glyphosate will you? If you will then you have good reason to seek other employment.

The science showing glyphosate exposure is sometimes lethal is widespread. Just the information above would convince any intelligent, caring human being to use an alternative to herbicides that contain glyphosate. Please read Opposing Views Science Attachment #6.

You have all been Programmed

You have all been unknowingly subjected to a sophisticated mind manipulation technique. You have been programmed to believe a forest is sick when natural processes kill trees. It's tough to admit to yourself that they played you like a fiddle and you were unaware that you were being programmed.

You were taught that the best way to "restore" a sick forest and bring it back to health is to kill the trees with chainsaws. Incredibly, you took the bait and believed it without question.

In college you became aware of road and logging caused damage described by the experts in Opposing Views Science Attachments #1 and #4. The USFS brainwashing convinced you this was wrong and you must embrace the USFS way of doing things if you want to be considered a "team player" by your line-officer.

A few of the IDT members know the USFS's 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. These IDT members remain obedient. They have bills to pay.

Incredibly, you have been taught that an "unmanaged" forest is an "unlogged" forest ... and you believed it without question. Do you really think logging is a synonym of management?

I would be embarrassed to send the Selway Saginaw Scoping Package to the public.

You have Read this Far, how do you Feel?

None of you are indifferent.

You fit into one of the following two categories. Ask yourself which one. Then ask yourself why and if your reaction to what you have read so far serves the public and if it will cause you to question and evaluate your future actions that might harm the countless natural resources in and downstream from the project area. Your jobs pay well but no amount of money is worth casting away your land ethics and values.

1) are you angry wondering "who is this rabid enviro trying to tell me how to do my job."

2) have you admitted to yourself that the issues I discuss above have crossed your mind in the past and you were frightened to let anyone know.

The people on category 1 should seek other employment. To those of you lucky enough to be in category 2, please be guided by your feelings at work. You can say "no." Your peers will admire you.

Intelligent Resource Specialists would
understand the Wisdom of these People
and let it Guide them

"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

"When the last tree is cut down, the last fish eaten, and the last stream poisoned, you will realize that you cannot eat money."

Cree Indian proverb

"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

"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)

Sincerely,

Dick Artley USFS-forester/logging engineer retired (Duties--forest planner, NEPA legal compliance reviewer, forest NEPA coordinator, and forest appeals/litigation coordinator on the NezPerce NF)

Grangeville, Idaho 83530

da99333@gmail.com

CC: selected forest staff