

## **KFOI Radio - Shasta Environmental Alliance Program Sep. 21, 2018**

**David Ledger:** My name is David Ledger reporting today on KFOI Radio's Shasta Environmental Alliance program. This is a weekly program that starts every Friday at 1:00 PM, and this is the second time that the show will have an extended version, so we will have time to interview Marilee Woodhouse of Battle Creek Alliance. And next week we will have Jennifer Gibson, who is chief of interpretation at Whiskeytown National Recreation Area. She has also in the past been the acting director of the park and also an ecologist.

Shasta Environmental Alliance, or SEA, is a nonprofit organization which has 14 supporting groups. You can see our website at [ecoshasta.org](http://ecoshasta.org), and we have a Facebook page at [facebook.com/shastaenvironmentalalliance](https://facebook.com/shastaenvironmentalalliance).

### **Trails Update**

Most City of Redding and BLM trails are now open in the greater Redding area. According to Travis Menne of Redding Community Services, only the South Sacramento River Trail, the Buenaventura Connector, and the Francis Carr BLM Trail are currently closed. All Whiskeytown Park trails are closed except for a small trail at the Visitor Center.

For the most current maps of the Redding area and beyond, go to [reddingtrails.com](http://reddingtrails.com). There you will find a current map of all trails from Clear Creek to Shasta Lake, and if you look at their website you can click on different areas and it will cover the whole county, including the Pacific Crest Trail. Once again, the website is [reddingtrails.com](http://reddingtrails.com).

Now, when you're out on these trails, to prevent serious erosion this winter, please remember to stay on the trails and don't take shortcuts. This is especially true for mountain bikes. With a wet winter, those shortcuts will become impassable ditches and pollute our streams and rivers with sediments. Do you have a trail update? If so, let us know at [ecoshasta@gmail.com](mailto:ecoshasta@gmail.com).

### **Made in the Shade Film Screening**

*Made in the Shade*—this is a film that I talked about last week, but because it is playing tonight in Redding at 6:30 PM, I wanted to just review it for you. This is a film that will be shown at the First United Methodist Church at South and East Street in Redding, and it's a documentary of how a group of citizens in Sacramento got together with the city and with the municipal utility district and, over a period of about 35 years, planted almost 600,000 trees in an effort to provide more shade to the city and reduce the utility's peak electric demand from summer air conditioning, as well as create an urban forest. Some of those tree advocates that made the film will be there to explain how they did it.

Following the showing of this 50-minute film, to supplement the talk and make it more relevant to Redding, Travis Menne of Redding Community Services will explain how the City of Redding has already planted 1,200 trees last year and are planning 1,000 more this fall, and 2,000 through 2019 to '20. He will also discuss a recent grant from Cal Fire, which will allow the city to plant more street trees in downtown Redding. Redding also has a program to replace oak trees that were burned during the Carr Fire along our trails and in open spaces. Questions from the audience and a panel discussion will follow the film.

## **National Public Lands Day**

It is National Public Lands Day this September 29th, and the Redding offices of the Bureau of Land Management and Horsetown Clear Creek Preserve will be observing this day starting at 9:00 AM at the Horsetown Preserve parking lot. This is located on Clear Creek Road, 7 miles west of Highway 273 at the Clear Creek Bridge. Work crews will clean up litter and debris, remove graffiti from rocks, repair trails, remove invasive weeds, and repair signs at the Horsetown Preserve as well as the Clear Creek Greenway. BLM will provide gloves, tools, and eye protection, and a BBQ lunch will be held at 2:00 PM following the cleanup. For more information, call the BLM at 224-2100. And once again, that is Saturday, September 29th at 9:00 AM.

## **Water Dynamics in Shasta County**

Is there ever anything that you wanted to know about water in Shasta County? For the last several years, a person who wishes to remain anonymous has been studying water issues in the area and compiling information about it. For instance, she has a map of Shasta County showing where many of the water districts are located, where tunnels are located, and on the back of her map she has a list of 62 water systems in Shasta County, from the tiny 25-customer Sunrise Mobile Home Park to the City of Redding with its 70,000 or so customers. Locating all of these water systems took a considerable amount of time and a number of sources. She emphasizes that there's a vast amount to know about water issues in our area and she is just learning the process. However, looking at her maps will help you learn a little bit about water issues.

If you would like to see one of these maps, you can attend a film sponsored by Whole Earth and Watershed Festival, Shasta Environmental Alliance, and KFOI Radio. That film is *Between Troubled Waters*, and it will be shown on October 5th, which is a Friday. This film is an excellent documentary, and it explains the water wars and threats that have been going on over Sacramento River water for many decades, and it talks about the threats to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the San Francisco Bay, and of course the river from the various water diversions. Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla, who is executive director of Restore the Delta, which produced the documentary, will be at the presentation to answer questions, and there will be a discussion panel after the film. Once again, that film will be shown Friday, October 5th at the First United Methodist Church, 1825 East Street, at 6:30 PM, and admission is free.

## **The Recyclables Crisis**

Where will we put all of our recyclables? In 2017, China passed a law banning imports of all recyclable plastic unless it is 99.5% pure, and stricter standards were also applied to paper and metals. That plastic standard is almost impossible to meet. So basically, China is not importing anymore recyclable plastic. Some 106 million metric tons, or about 45% of the world's plastics set for recycling, have been exported to China since 1992, and in 2016, China imported 65% of the world's recycled plastic. Well, no more.

Part of the reason China is cutting back on this is because countries such as the United States, Australia, and some European countries are exporting dirty recyclables. That is caused by people recycling plastic milk cartons and egg cartons or greasy pizza boxes, which causes contamination and an inferior product of recycled plastic and/or paper. So now China is getting its own citizens to recycle more and buying more virgin plastic from the United States due to low natural gas prices. Natural gas is a source of raw material for plastic. Countries such as Vietnam, India, and Indonesia are taking up some of the slack, but they cannot absorb all of China's former imports. So what is happening is some paper and plastics are ending up in landfills.

According to an Arcata, California city staff report, the city used to receive \$8 a ton for their curbside recycling materials, but they will now have to pay \$69.56 a ton to have those recyclables picked up. As a result, Arcata residents who are using recycling services will be charged a processing fee, and that fee is \$2.95 for residential customers and higher amounts for apartments and commercial customers. Many other cities are facing the same issues: should they charge for recycling, should they take it to a landfill, or just stop their recycling programs? I did talk to the City of Redding recycling program several months ago, and they said they still have a market for their recyclables. Maybe those bumper stickers you used to see on cars—the white ones where they would have a drawing of a plastic water bottle with the "no" sign, the circle with a slash through it—perhaps that would be a good way for us to start and stop this mess of recycling.

## **Redding City Council Candidates Forum Preview**

A Redding City Council Candidates Forum focusing on Redding's hiking and biking trails, the tree ordinance, riparian areas, parks, and climate change is being sponsored by Shasta Environmental Alliance and many other groups, and this forum will be held on Monday, October 1st at the First United Methodist Church at 1825 East Street, Redding, on the first floor in the social hall, which has the South Street entrance, and that will start at 6:00 PM. The forum will be based on the same format as the League of Women Voters, with no candidate being favored or endorsed, and they will be asking questions relating to environmental issues. We're asking a lot of people to show up who are concerned about those issues.

Some of the co-sponsoring groups are Shasta Environmental Alliance, KFOI Radio, KKRN Radio, Wintu Audubon, North State Climate Action, Trails and Bikeways Council

of Greater Redding, Friends of Redding Trails, Shasta Chapter of the California Native Plant Society, Friends of Oregon Gulch, Redding Parks and Trails Foundation, the Shasta Group of Sierra Club, Streams and Greenways Alliance (or SAGA), and the Whole Earth and Watershed Festival. So we hope you can make this and listen to your candidates. And once again, that's October 1st, a Monday, at 6:00 PM.

Now, next week once again, I want to mention that Jennifer Gibson of Whiskeytown National Recreation Area—she's been there for many years and has held probably every position out there—will be talking to us about the effects of the Carr Fire at Whiskeytown.

### **Interview with Marilee Woodhouse (Battle Creek Alliance)**

**David Ledger:** Today we have with us Marilee Woodhouse, who is director of Battle Creek Alliance, who has been working to make sure timber companies protect our natural resources when they harvest timber. She describes herself as an environmentalist who loves and believes in the wisdom of the natural world and works endlessly to protect it, which is always an uphill battle. Welcome to KFOI, Marilee.

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Thanks. I appreciate you inviting me.

**David Ledger:** OK, and can you tell us, what is Battle Creek Alliance?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, Battle Creek Alliance was formed in 2007 when we became aware of the excessive clear-cutting that was going on near where we live. It became a larger group as I met some other people, and then eventually we got under the umbrella of a fiscal sponsor so that we could apply for grants. So we're an environmental group that has been working on this issue for about 12 years now.

**David Ledger:** Can you summarize some of the things that Battle Creek Alliance does?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, our main thing is that we started the Citizens' Water Monitoring Program in 2009, and so this is our 10th year of collecting water quality data in the Battle Creek watershed. At this point, we've collected nearly 10,000 samples. These are all manual samples, not collected by in-stream monitors which do it by machine. The data has been analyzed by six different hydrologists over the years now, and then it was used for a research paper that was written several years ago but just finally got published in the journal *Environmental Monitoring* this year.

And then this year we have also been really focused on writing some extensive comments regarding a timber harvest plan that was filed at the end of last year. This timber harvest plan was the first one that has been filed since the 27,000-acre Ponderosa Fire that burned in 2012. This current plan wants to come back and start cutting more by clear-cutting the watershed when they already salvage-logged all those 27,000 acres on top of the clear-cutting that was already done. We also rescue and rehabilitate injured eagles, hawks, and owls—that's something we started doing three

years ago—and we also made a documentary about the issues here that can be found on YouTube; it's called *Clear Cut Nation*.

**David Ledger:** Before we get into the details of your work, can you tell our listeners who may not be up to date on this: who regulates timber harvests on private lands, and a little bit about the group that does the regulation?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, Cal Fire is the lead agency for the timber harvest plan review process, and we actually received data from Cal Fire about a year ago that says that nearly 9,000 timber harvest plans that cover over 3 million acres were filed between 1998 and the beginning of this year, and out of all those 9,000 plans, there are only several that have *not* been approved. The approval rate is 99.9%. In Shasta County—there are a number of timber counties in the North State, but Shasta County has had the most acres cut of any of the California counties, and Siskiyou County next door to us is the second most cut.

**David Ledger:** What types of land and timber harvest do they regulate? For instance, if someone wanted to cut just a few trees on their 10 acres in Shingletown, for example, do they need a permit?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, Cal Fire regulates any logging on non-federal timberland. So anything that doesn't belong to the federal government is under Cal Fire's jurisdiction. That includes industrial timberland, from timberland owners that own multiple thousands of acres, or it includes people that just have a 10-acre parcel. It is two different processes, though; small acreages are covered under what's called an NTMP, which is a Non-industrial Timber Management Plan, and so that is a different process than the regular THP (Timber Harvest Plan) process that industrial timber goes through.

**David Ledger:** Briefly, what is involved in getting a permit, as long as you need to explain that?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, an industrial logging company has to file a Timber Harvest Plan, and these timber harvest plans are supposed to substitute for an environmental impact report or statement. But the thing is, the timber harvest plans are always written by an employee of the company that stands to make the profit. And then that plan is reviewed by the timber harvest review team at Cal Fire, with some other agencies as well, and then it's recommended for approval. In our experience, the approval is always made before the close of the public comment period, which kind of shows you how important the public comment is to them. Even though as public commenters we have put in mountains of science at this point, it's always pretty much ignored in favor of whatever the timber industry says.

**David Ledger:** Now, how about following a forest fire? Do they have to get a permit then?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** That is included under an emergency exemption rather than a Timber Harvest Plan. And the emergency exemptions don't require any kind of environmental review whatsoever, and so that leaves out a great amount of the potential cumulative impacts which occur from multiple cuttings over and over again in the same space. There's no acre limit on the size for emergency exemptions either, which is a big thing, because in a Timber Harvest Plan there are some limits on how much they can cut in one plan, but the emergency exemption will go for many thousands of acres.

**David Ledger:** Now getting back to the work that you're doing collecting water samples, what is the area you are collecting water data on? I know it's in the Battle Creek watershed; maybe you can tell us where that area covers?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, the Battle Creek watershed—basically, it's not exact, but roughly it's between Highway 44 to the north and Highway 36 to the south, the ridges there. That's how a watershed is defined, by the highest ridge in the drainage area, and so those two high ridges that those highways run along make the drainage area for the Battle Creek watershed. Our highest site where we collect data is near Viola up off of Highway 44, and then our lowest site is on the South Fork of Battle Creek itself, and that's west of Manton.

**David Ledger:** How much of this area covers the 2012 Ponderosa Burn, which went from, as I recall, Manton to Shingletown? In the area of the watershed or the area of your data collection—the area of your data watershed collection, I'm sorry.

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Yeah, the data collection is—some of it is above the fire area, some of it is within, and some is below.

**David Ledger:** Now, what was the severity of the burn, and did you find any differences in the way the area burned, let's say, the burned area from the non-burned area?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, two-thirds of the area that was burned was on industrial timberland, so it was close to 17,000 acres, and that was the area that had been heavily clear-cut in the previous 15 years. Most of that area was 100% mortality. Normal fires in a normal forest that hasn't been clear-cut tend to burn at different severities, like low, moderate, and high, but where it had been clear-cut, it all burned at 100% high severity. The only place that it didn't on the industrial timberland was on the edges of the fire where it didn't continue to burn.

Fires in older forests with large trees tend to burn at lower severities because the bark on older trees is thicker and they've self-pruned over the years, so they don't have low limbs which carry the fire up higher. But of course, in an area that has been clear-cut, there is a lot of slash on the ground—you know, logging slash, little branches and things left over—and then you have these huge, dry, hot areas that when a fire burns, it creates its own wind, and it hits those areas and it just flashes across them really fast. There's no moisture or humidity that a normal forest would have anymore, so there's

nothing to slow them down. So clear-cutting actually increases the fire speed, spread, and intensity.

This is really important to realize in Shasta and the surrounding counties here, because so much of the land has been clear-cut in the past 20 years and turned into young ponderosa pine plantations since the late '90s. Those pine plantations, when they're planted basically like rows of corn really close together with just single-species trees that are all the same size, burn really well if the fire gets into them. They're not fire-resistant for 60 to 80 years, and of course, the way that industrial clear-cutting has been going, they are planning to cut them before they're 80 years old. This is a big problem in our area. Just in Shasta County between 1997 and 2016, 52%—almost a half a million acres—of the industrial timberland has been cut, and that doesn't include all the salvage-logged acres that were done after fires. It's a huge amount of land that's been cleared and turned into these unnatural places. Lots of fire cover loss is one of the leading causes of climate change, too, and higher temperatures lead to more fires, so this is creating this vicious circle or a positive feedback loop that is really dangerous.

**David Ledger:** And you mentioned 52% of the private timberland has been cut. Now, is that all clear-cut or is some of that selective cuts?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** It's a mix of both, but the predominant method in this area is clear-cutting. When you go to coastal areas, they tend to have less clear-cutting, but all of our Northern California inland counties have mostly clear-cutting.

**David Ledger:** What differences did you find in your water samples that you took following the fire, both temperature and turbidity?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Both the temperature and turbidity increased really significantly downstream of the salvage-logged areas that were salvage-logged after the fire.

**David Ledger:** Did you find differences both visually looking at the landscape and/or through water samples—see differences in erosion between areas that were salvage-logged following the fire and between the areas that were left unlogged?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** The landscape in this area is much hotter and drier now, and it gets a lot less snow than it used to. I've lived here for almost 30 years, and the weather conditions have changed immensely in that time, especially since the fire in 2012. When there is snow in the higher forested—or what used to be forested—areas now, it melts off really quickly, where it used to stay all winter. There was none of the fire area that was left unlogged, so we do have two sampling sites for our water quality that are about four miles apart on one of the tributary creeks of Battle Creek here. The upstream site has some uncut and unburned forest above it, while the acres below it and the lower site, in the four miles between, has been completely salvage-logged. What we're seeing is that in the summer, the water at the lower site is 10 to 12 degrees warmer than the higher site, and during rainstorms, the lower site always has significantly higher turbidity. There have been downsides in the salvage-logged areas as well, which also

eventually ends up in the streams because water flows downhill, and it carries whatever loose soil there is down to the lowest place, which is always the drainage of whatever creek is there.

**David Ledger:** OK. Now, I'm sort of repeating myself here a bit, but what are the major issues that you find in your water samples and your personal observations?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, yes, the increases in the turbidity during the winter and spring storms are a major thing. The higher sedimentation in the water is really unhealthy for aquatic organisms, but it's a problem for downstream users too, because turbid water costs cities downstream more for water treatment, and it creates more wear and tear on their water treatment machinery. The water temperature is increasing also, and the higher water temperatures affect the fish and other aquatic life. If you don't know, the Battle Creek watershed is the site of a taxpayer-funded salmon restoration project which began in 1999 and has cost over \$100 million so far. That project is all downstream of the temperature and turbidity effects from the clear-cutting and the salvage logging, and no one has ever even wanted to pay any attention to that.

**David Ledger:** What other issues are you working on now?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, we're still collecting our water data all the time and we're doing our wildlife rescue. We have been also presenting evidence to the Board of Forestry regarding their rules, particularly the lack of the cumulative impacts analysis. This problem has been going on for decades now, and the cumulative impacts are the root cause of the escalating problems we see, and those are consistently ignored by the regulatory agencies.

**David Ledger:** Can you clarify, what do you mean by cumulative impacts?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, cumulative impacts are defined by CEQA as anything that is caused by multiple projects in the relative same space. The easiest way I always think to understand it is the old phrase "death by a thousand cuts," and a lot of people don't realize where that came from. It was an ancient form of torture, and it killed the victim really slowly and painfully because it was done by making small cuts all over the body over a period of time, day after day. Where one small cut can heal—your body can fight that, or even a few small cuts—when you keep adding cumulatively to those cuts and making more and more, eventually it's too much and it overwhelms the body's ability to heal. The land is the same. Anything that is done in a massive amount and not given time to recover is going to cause massive problems. The timber industry, most recently especially with all the fires and everything, is pushing for more logging—they're saying more logging is going to solve the problem—so all the intensive logging that has already occurred... but we can't log our way out of climate change or the myriad of problems that are escalating every year. Only actions that are going to reduce our impacts are going to make a difference.

**David Ledger:** Who regulates water quality in streams?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** By law, the regional and the state water boards do, but then this is that thing with the government where there's a lot of different folks that have jurisdiction over different things. Partially, some of the water issues are regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. In the face of logging on industrial timberland, Cal Fire is the lead agency, though, and they always are the lead decision-maker in approving the logging plans. They consistently say there are no cumulative impacts occurring to the watersheds from the massive clear-cutting and salvage logging, and this is completely contradicted by worldwide research and our local data. The evidence is that the impacts are occurring and they're being ignored, but Cal Fire and the timber industry keep closing their eyes and covering their ears whenever we say that.

**David Ledger:** Now, what is the California Board of Forestry, and who are the members?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** The Board of Forestry is a governor-appointed 9-member board, and they're supposed to make regulations that uphold any legislative actions regarding forestry practices. So if a Senate or an Assembly bill is passed about forestry by the legislature, it's sent to the Board of Forestry for them to enact rules that will uphold that legislation. On paper, the board has five public members, three timber industry members, and a member from the range livestock industry. But in our experience, there's almost never anyone on the board who represents environmental interests. The board, when it does make any rules, moves at or below a glacial pace. It takes them years to do anything, and then they don't fulfill what they're supposed to do. There are a number of Senate and Assembly bills that have been passed in the past five or seven years now that the board has failed completely to take any action on, and they just keep putting it off till some future time.

**David Ledger:** The representatives, despite what it says on paper, are they primarily representatives from the timber companies? I know that Mary Rickert, who's the current Shasta County supervisor, did serve on the board representing the farming and rangeland industry.

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Yeah, she was the one member for the range livestock industry.

**David Ledger:** And the other members, are they—you said there were no environmentalists on the board—are the other members primarily from the timber industry, or do they represent the general public?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** There are three specifically from the timber industry, and then the five public members are mostly people who don't have a lot to do with forestry, except that the person that was appointed to be the chairman of the board is from UC Berkeley, from the forestry department there. And the forestry department at UC Berkeley is funded by the timber industry. They are always—sorry, I'm not saying this very clearly.

**David Ledger:** You're doing fine.

**Marilee Woodhouse:** The UC Berkeley Forestry Department is endowed by the timber industry, and so there are close connections there which you find when you look behind the scenes. On the surface, it's different than when you look under the surface and see what's actually going on.

**David Ledger:** Now, do you and other people go in person to the Board of Forestry meetings, or do they primarily send in written comments?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** It depends on the organization. You know, most environmental organizations don't have a lot of funding, so we don't have lobbyists and things like that. There are several people who often attend the meetings, but generally we send in written comments because the meetings are usually in Sacramento, which is a 2-and-a-half-hour drive each way. And then when you get there, you're only allowed three minutes to speak. So if you send in written comments, you can make them complete and not be constrained by the three-minute time limit.

**David Ledger:** Now, I understand. I know you are a critic of some of Sierra Pacific Industries' practices, and that once a public hearing field trip was held on Sierra Pacific land, you specifically were banned from this public hearing field trip that went through the Board of Forestry. Is that correct?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Yes, they said I couldn't be allowed on their land—myself and somebody from the Center for Biological Diversity, actually.

**David Ledger:** How often does the Board of Forestry overturn a Timber Harvest Plan?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** You know, I've never heard of anybody overturning a plan because I don't think there is even a process to petition them to do so that I'm aware of. Once the plan is approved by Cal Fire, there is no appeal process, whereas if you are working on federal timberlands, there is an appeal process if they approve a plan so that you can go through another level. But with Cal Fire, once they approve the plan, the only choice that you have is to file a lawsuit, and lawsuits are very expensive. So there's really no incentive for them to ever disapprove a plan, because they know that generally speaking, they're not going to ever have a problem.

**David Ledger:** All right. Now, last week KFOI reported on the Redwood Summer protests against Pacific Lumber, and this was back in 1998 when a young man, 24 years old, was killed when a huge timber tree cut by a logger fell on him. There was a huge uproar following his death, and it turned out that Pacific Lumber had had over 250 citations for violations of forestry regulations from 1995 to 1997, with more accumulating in the following year, 1998. But the Board of Forestry during all of this time continued to approve their timber harvest plans. And of course, the uproar following that caused the federal government to step in. Does it seem like it's that bad today, or what do you see today as far as the approval of Timber Harvest Plans?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** Well, I actually think it's worse here in the inland areas because there isn't a mass, organized protest group like there was for that area on the Redwood Coast in the late '90s. Now, you know, there has been so much cut without basically any public outcry for 20 years—I mean, small groups like ours, but not anything major. And so there's a lot going on that nobody's even paying any attention to. I don't know that there are very many violations even being issued over here, not that I know of. The regulatory agencies just take the industry-written plans at face value; they don't question anything that's said in them. Even when science completely goes against what the timber industry is saying, it doesn't matter. They still believe or take the timber industry's word over everybody else's and don't take any action to follow up themselves. They never collect data themselves. They do some field visits, but really nothing that actually makes any difference in the overall process.

As long as they continue to ignore the cumulative impacts—which they have a really tricky little system to do by taking a main watershed and splitting it into tiny little parcels of smaller watersheds so that they can say, "Oh, there's no impacts," even when there are timber harvest plans directly across the road from each other, because it's divided by their imaginary line—they don't take that into consideration. So they've got this perfect little system that they get away with year after year.

**David Ledger:** So in other words, they don't use an ecosystem look at a Timber Harvesting Plan, they just look at somewhat arbitrary lines, right?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** They have extremely arbitrary lines to work from.

**David Ledger:** OK. Well, now, thank you very much, Marilee. Is there anything else you want to add to what we've talked about?

**Marilee Woodhouse:** No, I don't think so. I think this covers it, you know, as basically as we can.

**David Ledger:** OK, well, I want to thank you very much, Marilee, for coming with us here on KFOI. I wish you luck in your battles with the California Board of Forestry.

State that this has been David Ledger with KFOI Radio's Shasta Environmental Alliance program. I want to thank you for listening and remember that Jennifer Gibson—who is in the past an ecologist, temporary manager of Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, and now she's in charge of interpretive services (she's had about every position out there)—she will be with us next week. Thank you very much for listening.