

Subject: Re: PABIODIV: ANF: more clearcutting, no significant road removal
From: Rachel Martin rmartin@alleghenydefense.org
To: pabiodiv@webmail.upb.pitt.edu
Sender: owner-pabiodiv@webmail.upb.pitt.edu
Reply-To: kklemow@wilkes.edu
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 19:22:39 -0500 (EST)

Mike,

You state, "Public lands as directed by the government...must be managed in a multiple/sustainable use fashion." This is true for some public lands, such as national forests and PA state forests, however if we take the case of the Allegheny National Forest, where nearly 70% of the forest is designated for "even-age" management and only about 7% of the forest is off-limits to logging, and the Forest Service spends more on the timber sale program than it does on all other "uses" combined, it's hard to argue that this is multiple use. Additionally, the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA) which I assume you're alluding to, does not in any way state that every part of a forest must be available for every use. Nor does it even state that every forest must be available for every use. So often when I hear foresters and the like discussing "multiple use" they are really just referring to logging and maybe drilling, when there are many other "uses" specifically stated in the MUSYA, such as wilderness, wildlife, recreation, and watersheds.

You seem to argue that old growth habitat can be provided by private landowners but that, I think, is idealistic. Private lands can provide timber and ample "early-successional habitat" but they cannot provide large tracts of mature or old growth forest--only public lands can do that. I can manage my four acres for old growth, but how effective is that when my neighbor clearcuts his property? The reality is that 75% of forest lands in PA are privately owned (the majority of them logged and otherwise degraded), and only 3% of PA's forest land is national forest. Is it really that unrealistic or idealistic to set aside 3% of our forest land in PA for the express purpose of maintaining large tracts of mature, interior forest? I don't think so, and neither do the majority of Pennsylvanians, and, indeed, the majority of Americans that wish to see an end to commercial logging in our national forests. Fact is, that's the majority opinion*, though clearly the timber industry has far more sway with the politicians than the public, or we would see some major changes.

*Poll after poll, including a poll commissioned by the U.S. Forest Service, has shown a majority of Americans (from 58% to more than 80%) oppose commercial logging in our national forests. I'd be happy to provide full citations.

Rachel Martin

--

Rachel Martin, Outreach Program Director
Allegheny Defense Project
P.O. Box 245
Clarion, PA 16214
(814) 223-4996 ph
(814) 223-4997 fx
rmartin@alleghenydefense.org
www.alleghenydefense.org

Protecting and Restoring Allegheny Forests

"We deeply need the humility to know ourselves as the dependent members of a great community of life."

~ Howard Zahniser, Pennsylvania native, 1955

From: "Mike Stoltzfus" mstoltzfus@Langan.com

Reply-To: kklechow@wilkes.edu
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 15:32:55 -0500 (EST)
To: pabiodiv@webmail.upb.pitt.edu
Subject: RE: PABIODIV: ANF: more clearcutting, no significant road removal

Phil,

With only 0.5% of the original (pre-settlement) forest in the East left and considering that only 50% of that remaining is in public hands, it appears that a goal of protecting old growth forests is achievable without hindering the sustainable use of the remainder of public forest lands. No doubt there are considerable forest areas that are protected by private conservation organizations in which they may plan for old growth as they see fit. Public lands as directed by the government however must be managed in a multiple/sustainable use fashion. Indeed private landholders (such as yourself) apparently do attempt to marry the needs of development with forest preservation, why should the government be excluded from this option as well? Why didn't you deed restrict your entire forested parcel with the intent of creating an old growth stand? Obviously you needed to realize some minimal use of the land while providing as much conservation as was feasible for that multiple use.

If your opinion was that of the majority obviously things would be different however a realistic blend of conservation, management and multiple-use determined through scientific methods is the best public use of these lands. Please do not mix idealism with reality.

Michael L. Stoltzfus
M.S. Wetland Science
Certified Associate Wildlife Biologist
Certified Associate Ecologist
Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.
30 South 17th Street, Suite 1500
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4005
Office: (215) 446-2996
Email: mstoltzfus@langan.com

----- Original Message -----

From: "Phil Coleman" philipy@verizon.net
To: <pabiodiv@webmail.upb.pitt.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2003 10:48 AM
Subject: Re: PABIODIV: ANF: more clearcutting, no significant road removal

Stan -- If you mean that clear cuts create another ecosystem (or set of ecosystems), then of course you are right. But we have clearcuts galore (especially if you are going to call every farm field and every clearing for a house a clear cut). What we don't have in Pennsylvania is forest that has not been cut.

Let me ask what you mean by "natural clearcutting." I don't know this term. If you mean that occasionally fires create forest openings, then of course, we know that in such a case "forest renewal" will take place. But even in this case it is a mistake to term this "nature's way to assure renewal." "Nature" does not say "I've got to clear some land to assure renewal." Let's quit talking as though nature had intentions.

You say that "I am not willing to give up my home nor am I willing to return farmland to forest. Nor am I willing to move to a city, shut down rural areas, in the name of biodiversity." Of course not. But are you willing to agree that since so much privately owned land has been converted from forest to field (and homes) what we have of public land should be managed as forest? Are you willing to agree that some portion of this public land should be managed in such a way that it can become old growth?

By the way, when I built, I kept as much of my property in trees as possible. One benefit is that I don't air condition. You identify yourself as "service forester." Does this mean you are a forester for the USFS?

Phil Coleman
551 Pittsburgh Road
West Brownsville, PA 15417
724-785-5887

From: "Hess, Stanley" sthess@state.pa.us
Reply-To: kklemow@wilkes.edu
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 09:52:24 -0500 (EST)
To: pabiodiv@webmail.upb.pitt.edu
Subject: RE: PABIODIV: ANF: more clearcutting, no significant road removal

I disagree that clearcuts are detrimental to biodiversity. In the eastern hardwoods, natural clearcutting is nature's way to assure renewal of the forest. It's time to realize what real problems are because we do have them. But scientific application of forestry is not one of them. Forestry may alter, but it doesn't destroy habitat. I live in a clearcut. Farmland is a clearcut. There is no forest any more. I am not willing to give up my home nor am I willing to return farmland to forest. Nor am I willing to move to a city, shut down rural areas, in the name of biodiversity.

Stan Hess
Service Forester for Potter and McKean Counties

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Bonta bontasaurus@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 4:44 PM
To: pabiodiv@webmail.upb.pitt.edu
Subject: PABIODIV: ANF: more clearcutting, no significant road removal

Just passing this along FYI, with apologies for cross-listing. I'm sure the subscribers to this list don't need to be told how detrimental roads and clearcuts are to native forest biodiversity! If you don't agree with the ADP's analysis, that's fine -- but please do consider sending comments. Remember, this is YOUR property they're talking about.

--Dave Bonta

ALLEGHENY WILD! ALERTS #3

Help Protect Allegheny Forests from Industrial Exploitation. Take the time now to act on the following important issues for Allegheny Forests.

- 1) Stop the County Line/Four Mile Timber Sale!!
 - * Nearly 1,000 acres of clearcutting.
 - * Logging in a Wilderness Trout Stream watershed.

- 2) Support Road Obliteration in the Allegheny National Forest
 - * FS Roads Analysis Confirms Major Roads Problem in Allegheny.
 - * Parts of the Allegheny have >12 miles of roads per square mile.
 - * The FS continues to look the other way at oil/gas related roads.
 - * The FS avoids call for large-scale road obliteration.

Send comments TODAY by e-mail. County Line Comments due Monday, March 10.

1) STOP THE COUNTY LINE/FOUR MILE TIMBER SALE

The U.S. Forest Service has proposed yet another massive timber sale for the Allegheny National Forest. The County Line/Four Mile Timber Sale would approved more than 1,200 acres of logging (the equivalent of two square miles) and 1,100 acres of herbicide applications in the County Line/Four Mile watersheds. The Allegheny was one of the heaviest logged eastern national forests in 2002.

The Four Mile Run watershed, where much of the project will take place, is a state designated Wilderness Trout Stream. The Forest Service is leaning towards adopting an alternative that would allow clearcutting on nearly 1,000 acres while refusing to give serious consideration to a restoration based alternative. Despite the fact thousands of tons of erosion would occur annually under the proposal, logging is being approved on 133 acres of poorly drained soils. The Forest Service acknowledges that if approved, the concentration of interfering ferns/grasses which are over-crowding forest understories would increase severely.

Send comments to Supervisor John Schultz at jrschultz@fs.fed.us or at Bradford Ranger District, Star Route 1, Box 88, Bradford, PA 16701.

2) SUPPORT ROAD OBLITERATION IN THE ALLEGHENY NATIONAL FOREST

The U.S. Forest Service just completed a mandated roads analysis of the Allegheny National Forest. According to that analysis:

- * The Allegheny has an \$8 million backlog on road maintenance;
 - * The Allegheny has more than 300 miles of roads where their risks exceed their benefits.
 - * The Highland oil and gas development in the Allegheny is of a size and road density comparable to the city of Warren where the forest is headquartered. Road densities exceed 12 miles per square mile of road.
 - * There are nearly 3,000 miles of roads on Allegheny National Forest lands with most of these dedicated to timber production and oil/gas drilling.
 - * There are 30 unroaded areas within the Allegheny National Forest which are 500 acres or greater.
- The roads analysis process was adopted into law in 2000 with a primary emphasis on identifying roads for decommissioning. However, the Forest Service identified only 12 miles of roads where decommissioning was a priority. The U.S. Forest Service has failed to carry forward on its goal of reducing the strain that roads are causing on our national forests and road maintenance budgets. Send comments to Supervisor Kevin Elliott at kbelliott@fs.fed.us or at P.O. Box 847, Warren, PA 16365.

Jim Kleissler, Forest Watch Director
Allegheny Defense Project
P.O. Box 245
Clarion, PA 16214
(814) 223-4996
(814) 223-4997 (fax)
<http://www.alleghenydefense.org>

* * * END INDUSTRIAL EXTRACTION ON PUBLIC LANDS! * * *

Dave Bonta
PO Box 68
Tyrone, PA 16686
814.684.3113

Check out our nifty Friends of Rothrock poster:
<http://www.mccaughey.net/~sam/rothrock.html>