

Olympic National Forest

OBJECTION, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range Permit
From: Isaac Gardiner
Author of previous letter questioning access.
1006 49th st
Port Townsend, WA 98368 560-379-6360

JAN 06 2017
Received by: *ema*
Time: 11:15

Project Name: Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range
Responsible Official Name: Reta Laford
Affected National Forest: Olympic National Forest, Pacific Ranger District

MAIL to: Reta Laford
US Forest Service
1835 Black Lake Blvd. SW, Olympia, WA 98512

Dear Ms. Laford,

The recent decision by Dean Millett to allow the ^{DISTRICT MANAGER} Navy to use the western side of the Olympic Peninsula as a practice area for the Navy is a clear misuse of the public trust in any number of ways. Certainly you will be receiving mail that enumerates many of them.

This letter will focus on the specific lack of information on which that decision was based. This questioning of the decision arises from the specific objection in my earlier letter arising from our lack of knowledge about what effects both the flights and emitters would have. Clearly the Forest Service did not undertake any studies of the possible harm of such practice to the environment of the western peninsula nor did it cite any independent research. It based its decision on what the Navy, a clearly biased party to the process, told it and there is much evidence to conclude that that agency presented a case shaded in many ways to obfuscate any realistic assessment of impact. The Forest Service failed to conduct its own research, one of its duties. An agency cannot simply adopt the conclusions of another agency. (See, 747 F2d 1240 Save Our Ecosystems v. P Clark E Merrell.) "NEPA requires each agency to indicate the research needed to adequately expose environmental harms" and alternatives must be "affirmatively studied." Such studies must come before a decision is made.

What studies have been conducted on related matters show that damage to humans is inevitable at levels below what the Navy proposes. We, as a species, do not know what damage might be inflicted on the eco-systems involved. It's difficult to even fathom that the Forest Service would lend endorsement to such hazard.

The remedy for the Forest Service's omission of its own or independent research is, as you know, self evident. Do the research, however long it may take.

I would join with others who say "We urge the Forest Service to rescind the decision to issue this permit, to conduct the necessary science, to consider the impacts that were left out, and to start again, with an EIS, an honest dialog, and a more inclusive public process.

Sincerely,

Isaac Gardiner

