

The following are Kristi Wrigley's comments in their entirety excerpted from a series of emails she sent as his formal public comments:

15, 2019

Jim, you never talked to us once about this revision. You don't have your history right. A wise person would check with someone who has been in the watershed 70 years to fact check before continuing to publish timber promoted myths.

We would love to have the water quality we had in 1968.

The logging that destroyed our water, our property and so degraded our lives took place from 1988 -1995. The logging done in the 50's & 60's that timber likes to blame is minimal compared to Maxxam/PL logging of the early 1990's.

Please try to really protect and return our water rights as you are paid to do. You always seem to favor industrial logging. We little people have lost so much that you do not show any comprehension ofWhere is the economic analysis? The conclusions are wholly inadequate to the costs that logging pollution has caused; it can never be in the people of the State of California's interest to destroy water, private properties and their value, public/private access, and individual incomes.

Kristi

March 20, 2019

Jim,

I thought it was your job to protect water quality in Elk River for fish and the residents.

Seems odd first that you would not discuss with us the measures you proposed in this revision of the revision of the WDR because we have been living in the watershed and understand loggings dynamic affects on the river and our land for longer than anyone else and better than any computer program. You certainly came to a very poor conclusion of the Antidegradation Act with your inadequate and untrue analysis...you did a magnificent job of discounting its importance. The same is definitely true of any economic analysis that was done...there are hundreds of people living up the Berta Road area and dozens up here in upper Elk River who have experienced a cavalcade of economic impacts; once estimated to be in the realm of 14 million dollars to which you give no appreciation.

One can see from your answers to Jess's questions that you are not fully engaged with the citizens to use your expertise to protect our water quality, our property or our lives.

As an engineering geologists we expect you should be able to fully address our inquiries with more than just a perfunctory reference to CDF. Adona certainly did.

I also would like to remind you that science does not have a monopoly on truth and if you want to have a true understanding of the dynamics of a situation you talk to the people who have been there a long time to get a fuller picture of what the numbers represent in the real world on their land and in their water.

We are fully aware of 75 sq ft minimal basal area...we are also fully aware of how inadequate that is in Elk River at protecting water quality. We see some reference to 50% canopy retention but wonder what is the 50% reduction/retention from. Before Maxxam/ PL started their program of devastation logging canopy cover was 400+. What is the canopy cover that triggers a logging plan; HRC has been logging areas with less than 250. Greg Bloomstun in one of our many symposiums said they us 250 as a starting point for retention. He also spoke to 200 being a rock bottom minimum for a Redwood forest. With the Elk River watershed having such an unstable fine grained geology and already being severely degraded conditions would demand that a higher canopy retention that the minimum recommendation would be needed at the very least. And not the minimum required by the Board of Forestry which gives less than minimal protection for water quality. Winter operations clearly lead to high ground impacts in our watershed...we have seen them on the various tours we have taken since 1998 that many of us have been on. Those need to be clearly evaluated and openly discussed.

Also what analysis are you doing for DO? We residents have been telling the Board and staff for a number of years now how summer water quality has been steadily deteriorating. That is a sure indication that DO is negatively impacted.

We residents are imperilled at every angle from logging. Raising the roads, building new bridges and designing new sources of domestic water supply to enable industrial logging are very high public/private costs. And they are all attributable to too much poorly controlled pollution from logging. These costs should be included in the analysis of "logging being in the best interests of the people of the State of California." As a taxpayer I certainly do not believe that is in our best interests, not to mention all the private damage I and my neighbors have experienced after 1997 for which there has been no compensation.

More to come but I must go.

Thank you,

Kristi Wrigley

March 22, 2019

James,

What input did you seek on the revisions to the revisions of the WDR from HRC?

What input on the revisions to the revisions did you seek from residents...science does not have a monopoly on knowledge.

As I asked earlier...50% of what is retention? HRC logs at 135 and definitely 150 so that is not much. Even 250 would only 125; certainly no margin of safety in the unstable fine grained soils of our watershed. 200 should be a bare minimum and 250 would give some margin of safety. Do you not understand how imperilled our lives are here...I've

pushed people out of DWC more than once when they have gotten stuck in the flood water.

Have you gone back to when conditions were when water quality and watershed stability/health were improving[do you even know when that was] for residents, to examine watershed/logging conditions at the time?

I felt the ground movement when they fell the trees across from our house/ranch; how are you evaluating that kind of activity in winter when the ground and the trees are so super saturated? Water clarity was much improved when there was no winter logging back in the late 60's to late 70's. We have seen that new logging/falling trees and associated activities in the winter is destructive to water quality; how are those impacts being evaluated in the light of the extreme damage we residents have experienced with destroyed water quality all year round now; not to mention residents' destroyed property from logging sediment which has gotten continuously worse since 1997 when it was acknowledged by the agencies..

Are you looking at Elk River's deteriorating DO which is certainly caused by continuous logging?