

Editorial pages oppose the Bush Administration's plan to gut the Roadless Area Conservation Rule

(As of Wednesday, August 11, 2004)

"The national forests belong to all the people in this country, not to a state or town. Some resource development in these forests is appropriate, but it ought to be based on the best use of the land, not on the gas company guy having the right ties to the White House."

-- *Los Angeles Times*, "Two-faced forest policy," August 11, 2004

"Bush's plan will fail not only because it's too big: It will fail because Americans haven't seen evidence it will work."

-- *Boise Idaho Statesman*, "Crapo wrong to back Bush's roadless plan gimmick," August 10, 2004

"The proposed new policy is the work of Mark E. Rey, a former timber lobbyist and now undersecretary of agriculture. Since taking office, President Bush has made it clear that he wants to accommodate loggers, who have gone to court to block the Roadless Rule."

-- *Hartford Courant*, "Protect The National Forests," August 09, 2004

"Forest officials say 75 percent of New Mexico's 1.5 million acres of roadless woods already are protected by one plan or another. Still, gouging timber roads into 375,000 acres could be catastrophic — and once those lands are, uh, exploited, we can already hear the hue and cry for the revision of individual forest plans."

-- *Santa Fe New Mexican*, "Drive to Duke City, Rally for our Forests," August 7, 2004

"The greater peril for America's national forest system is the Bush administration's determination to (1) "streamline" the process for approving prescribed burns and (2) scrap the Clinton administration rule barring new roads — and, with them, most logging, mining and other development — in almost 60 million public acres."

-- *Louisville Courier-Journal*, "Only you can stop forest destruction," August 02, 2004

"Proponents say this rule would promote a "partnership" between the federal and state governments. But it is more likely to become a collaboration between politicians and those who stand to gain financially from commercial logging and drilling, to the detriment of the nation's forests."

-- *Salt Lake Tribune*, "The wrong road," July 29, 2004

"The Forest Service will be accepting written comments through Sept. 14 on this misguided plan to scrap protection for roadless forest areas. It's time for the public to speak up again."

-- *Winston-Salem Journal*, "Protecting Forests," July 27, 2004

"Still, it's indefensible to put the future of an irreplaceable national treasure in the hands of state governments that may be stymied, if not dominated, by powerful interest groups that consider our national forests to be tree farms."

-- *Charlotte Observer*, "Clueless on roadless; Bush's plan undermines federal protections for forests," July 26, 2004

"For now Wisconsin Gov. Jim Doyle should act quickly to get the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest protected. And all of us should let the politicians up for election this year know that saving our precious national resources and taxpayers' money are top priorities."

-- *Sheboygan Press*, "Old-growth trees at risk by dumping roadless rule," July 25, 2004

"The most troubling provision would give governors substantial say about the future of roadless areas. In many states, that's a procedure that favors industry rather than public land policy."

-- *Denver Post*, "Forests still lack protection," July 24, 2004

"It's hard to find anything President Bush wants to help business get its hands on more than oil, but trees seem to be running a close second lately."

-- *Nashville Tennessean*, "No to roads, save forests," July 24, 2004

"In effect, the Bush approach trashes an extraordinary display of public support that preceded the Clinton administration's adoption in 2001 of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. It also gives short shrift to any consistency in the management of forests that are national treasures."

-- *Raleigh News & Observer*, "Bushies and trees; Bush administration plans to give governors responsibility for protecting federal forests are no favor to trees," July 24, 2004

"That a president facing election would push to give special interests taxpayer-subsidized access to publicly owned wilderness speaks to Bush's complete contempt for environmental concerns."

-- *Concord Monitor*, "Roads to ruin; Bush plan to open wilderness to logging should be stopped," July 22, 2004

"Once you take the wild out of the wilderness, you can't put it back. Once you deprive the environment of the air-cleaning lungs that trees provide, and the water-cleaning filters of forests, you're stuck with polluted rivers and obscured vistas and foul air."

-- *Hampton Roads Daily Press*, "Under assault," July 22, 2004

"Now with 60 days for comments, the Bush Administration's new scheme would force

governors to petition the federal government to protect the last remaining pristine forests in their states - national forests that belong to all the people of America."

-- *Nevada County (The) Union*, "Oppose Bush rule," July 22, 2004

"Three years ago, when that rule was signed into law, the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued a statement saying, 'Never before have the American people so actively participated in helping to decide how their public land should be managed.' Now the American people are being told to butt out and make way for the bulldozers."

-- *Keene Sentinel*, "Bulldozer rule," July 21, 2004

"It is not clear why any new plan wouldn't be subject to the same contentious litigation any earlier plan would have faced ... And it certainly is not clear why an administration that purports to abhor bureaucratic red tape would want to add more of the same to no apparent effect."

-- *Helena Independent Record*, "Another bureaucratic level," July 21, 2004

"We urge everyone to contact their representatives and encourage them to pressure the Bush administration to reinstate the roadless rule if for no other reason than the safety of our community."

-- *North Lake Tahoe Bonanza*, "Roadless rule rollback could threaten Incline," July 21, 2004

"BULLDOZING ROADS through formerly pristine, protected federal lands is the environmental equivalent of destroying a village in order to save it. Incredibly, the Bush administration is trying to spin it as an act of conservation."

-- *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "NATIONAL FORESTS; Road to ruin," July 21, 2004

"Not since the first Forest Reserves were set aside in 1891 have the National Forests been more threatened than by the Bush administration's plan to turn the future of 58.5 million acres of roadless areas over to state governors."

-- *Harrisburg Patriot-News*, "ROADLESS AREAS," July 20, 2004

"There is an odd sort of Orwellian quality to statements out of the Bush administration on its latest policy for roads in protected national forests and grasslands... [T]he practical effect is to gut the roadless rule, rather than extend cooperation in enforcing it."

-- *Honolulu Advertiser*, "New wilderness rule threatens our forests," July 20, 2004

"Already, the U.S. Forest Service has \$10 billion worth of maintenance that's waiting for funding. Opening up more wilderness to roads will make that problem much worse."

-- *The [Lewiston, ME] Sun-Journal*, "More on roads," July 20, 2004

"Nor is there much time to waste. By Sept. 14, all those who value clean air and drinking water, habitat for wildlife and endless opportunities for recreation and solitude on lands like those experienced by native Americans and explorers must let their voices be heard."

Don't mess with the roadless rule."

-- *Shreveport Times*, "Keep national forests roadless; Fate of 7,000 acres in Kisatchie National Forest in question," July 20, 2004

" 'We now have a roadless process that can be accomplished by respecting state sovereignty,' said Kempthorne, who had failed in a legal effort to stop implementation of the roadless rule. He should have added: 'Timberrrr!' "

-- *St. Petersburg Times*, "Timberrrr!; The U.S. Department of Agriculture wants to change the rules to allow for more roads for logging to be built in our national forests," July 20, 2004

"The public soon will be asked to comment on the agency's proposed rules. Once again, they ought to be unequivocal in demanding that America's wild forests be preserved for posterity, no matter who's sitting in the White House or in the statehouse."

-- *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, "No room for roads in forests," July 19, 2004

"These are national forests, meaning their ownership rests just as firmly with Iowans as with the loggers of Idaho and Washington. They are not the personal property of timber-state governors and their logger patrons, anymore than the gold in Fort Knox is the personal property of the state of Kentucky."

-- *Des Moines Register*, "Hey, they're our forests, too," July 19, 2004

"They say if a tree falls in the forest, and no one is out there to hear, it doesn't make a sound. We hope millions of people will come out to comment on this plan, and that they will be rewarded by the sound of its fall."

-- *Las Vegas Sun*, "Bush's plan would harm our forests," July 19, 2004

"There are just no good environmental or fiscal reasons that make this a worthy idea. The rule-making process was exhaustive, and the administration shouldn't arbitrarily toss this rule away."

-- *Portland Press Herald*, "Changes to roadless rule are reckless fiscal policy," July 19, 2004

"Unfortunately, the Bush administration remains government by and for the timber and oil companies."

-- *Santa Rosa Press Democrat*, "Roadless areas; Bush administration continues assault on the environment," July 19, 2004

"It won't take too many road-building petitions from logging-happy governors to rekindle largely dormant interest nationwide in formally, permanently protecting notable roadless areas - not with another all-too-easy-to-change rule, but with congressional designations adding them to the system of protected wilderness areas."

-- *Missoula Missoulian*, "Governors may ask, but will they receive?; Roadless rule change may not produce roads to ruin, but could bring a backlash," July 18, 2004

"[I]t boggles the mind that the White House should choose an election year to dismantle one of the most important and popular land preservation initiatives of the last 30 years — a Clinton administration rule that placed 58.5 million acres of the national forests off limits to new road building and development."

-- *New York Times*, "Surrender in the Forests," July 18, 2004

"Governors have no business managing the national forests within their boundaries. That's the federal government's responsibility, and the public has clearly stated its preference for preservation of this national treasure."

-- *Olympia Olympian*, "Roadless ban should be kept," July 18, 2004

"In announcing its proposal, the Bush administration never mentioned loggers as it spoke warmly of empowering the states. Yet the sad fact is that timber and mining lobbyists have an even stronger grip on the state capitals than they do on Washington."

-- *Providence Journal*, "They're national forests," July 18, 2004

"The national forests belong to all of us. We should tell the loggers and road builders to stay out."

-- *Rock Hill [SC] Herald*, "Bush guts roadless rule," July 18, 2004

"Maybe we've followed Alice into an alternate universe, where words really do mean just what the speaker says they do. That would help explain the Bush administration's upside-down lexicon, in which our national forests are protected by stripping away their protections."

-- *Salem Statesman Journal*, "The fairytale has ended for roadless forests; Bush needs to stop playing games with forest protection plans," July 18, 2004

"Forest Service rules that are in place work. No one can articulate any urgency for more logging roads taxpayers cannot afford. Stick with the balanced approach in place."

-- *Seattle Times*, "Roadless policy should be salvaged," July 18, 2004

"Political gain and short-term profit will translate into a chainsaw massacre unless Congress or another administration does something to stop it."

-- (*Springfield, MA*) *The Republican*, "If a tree falls in a forest, is it national policy?"
July 18, 2004

"What's going on here is not an attempt to protect publicly owned lands but the first bulldozer blade into the wilderness to exploit natural resources that are owned collectively in trust for the American people."

-- *Toledo Blade*, "Fire up those chainsaws," July 18, 2004

"Returning to the old Wild West policy of commercial exploitation -- logging, cattle grazing, mining, and oil and gas exploration -- of our forest lands runs counter to the wishes of millions of Americans hungry not only for outdoor recreation, but also for

unspoiled places where they can find solace."

-- *Ventura County Star*, "Bush should ax forest plan; Road ban remains better policy,"
July 18, 2004

"The administration is painting its chainsaw green because it knows the American public sees the national forests as a public trust, not a playground for industry."

-- *Berkshire Eagle*, "No tree left behind," July 17, 2004

"Citizens also can raise their voices, once again, to protect the roadless areas. It's worth one more try."

-- *Detroit Free Press*, "National Forests: Roadless areas lose protection as new plan lifts ban," July 17, 2004

"Governors in western states like Idaho, where huge timber and mining companies are headquartered, greeted Veneman's announcement with possum grins."

-- *Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel*, "Wilderness sellout; Bush administration guts Clinton roadless rule," July 17, 2004

"With a single blow of the policy hammer, the Bush administration wants to shatter a farsighted wilderness protection rule into dozens of smaller - and probably ineffective - pieces. Taxpayers will lose."

-- *Buffalo News*, "Can't see the forest; Administration reversal on road policy throws wilderness land to industry wolves," July 16, 2004

"If the Bush administration has its way, the federal government will shirk its responsibility for the stewardship of national forests."

-- *The [Lewiston, ME] Sun-Journal*, "Roads less traveled," July 16, 2004

"The rollback of a popular forest-protection rule, announced Monday by the Bush administration, is a prime example of how monied special interests can undermine good public policy."

-- *Miami Herald*, "Reversal on protecting roads in national forests; PETITION FOREST SERVICE TO PUSH FOR RESTORATION OF RULE," July 16, 2004

"Forest Service chief Mark Rey, the onetime timber lobbyist, has spent much of his public tenure lobbying his boss, ag-secretary Ann Veneman, to turn the bulldozers loose on the 60 million acres Clinton had set aside."

-- *Santa Fe New Mexican*, "GOP should loosen ties to bulldozers, chainsaws," July 16, 2004

"There's so much wrong with the Bush administration proposal to end 'roadless rule' protections for national forests that it's hard to know where to begin."

-- *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, "Public can affect 'roadless rule' outcome," July 16, 2004

"Yet the administration wants to encourage more costs, more subsidies and more wilderness destruction. This is poor stewardship of our lands and tax dollars. Let the administration know how you feel."

-- *Tampa Tribune*, "Axing of roadless rule hits taxpayers, wilderness," July 16, 2004

"But no one should buy the Bush administration's effort to give this anti-environmental action a green spin: It had pledged to uphold the roadless measure, but its proposal would instead eviscerate protections for some of the country's last unspoiled wilderness."

-- *Washington Post*, "Roadless Rules Write-Off," July 16, 2004

"The very idea that now governors will get more of a say on road-building (translate, logging and mining), that they will have to petition Washington for 'roadless' designation, seems to go against the spirit of a 'national' forest system as it was imagined by President Theodore Roosevelt in the first place."

-- *Anniston Star*, "Roadless no more," July 15, 2004

"Of course, the rules change is an election-year bow to Bush supporters in those mostly Republican areas and the timber and mining industries."

-- *Baltimore Sun*, "Unwinding the West," July 15, 2004

"The predictable effect of the Bush maneuver is that governors — particularly those hostile to the conservation ethic — will urge the federal government to build more roads to accommodate more logging and oil drilling."

-- *Boulder Daily Camera*, "This land is our land; Roadless rule empowers exploitive minority," July 15, 2004

"The President... surrendered wholeheartedly to the logging, mining and drilling industries. The American public, and this nation's heritage and future generations, deserve far better."

-- *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, "Axing wilderness area protection," July 15, 2004

"An election-year maneuver to court favor with rural parts of the West."

-- *Corvallis [OR] Gazette-Times*, "Keep wild forest land protected," July 15, 2004

"National forests, by their very name, demand a management ethic that reflects national priorities and values, and this new plan leaves national treasures at risk."

-- *Fresno Bee*, "Politics trumps preservation: New forest policy turns national treasures over to state whims," July 15, 2004

"The public has already overwhelmingly spoken about roadless areas. Bush should stop listening to logging interests for once and start enforcing the sensible rule that's already in place."

-- *Hendersonville [NC] Times-News*, "Wild areas deserve protection," July 15, 2004

"In another payoff to campaign contributors, the Bush administration has swept aside federal protections for the nation's forests."

-- *Kansas City Star*, "Forests are losing this election year," July 15, 2004

"The rule goes through a 60-day public-comment period, likely to make little difference because the Bush administration has ignored the fact that there was extraordinary public support for the Clinton roadless rule before it was originally adopted."

-- *Lexington Herald-Leader*, "Bush's forest-road rule an affront to taxpayers," July 15, 2004

"Meanwhile, it's clear why we hear so many fewer complaints these days from the famously anti-government timber and mining industries. They like government — now that they're running it."

-- *Louisville Courier-Journal*, "Surrender on forests," July 15, 2004

"Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman says the new rule will end expensive legal challenges to the Clinton rule. She's wrong. There will be more lawsuits under the new scheme as environmentalists challenge the state-by-state forest plans."

-- *Newark Star-Ledger*, "Wrong road on forests," July 15, 2004

"[T]he federal government still must exercise strong oversight to ensure the integrity of national forestlands. America must preserve their beauty for generations to come."

-- *Watertown [NY] Daily Times*, "NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT; ADMINISTRATIONS CLASH OVER LAND USE," July 15, 2004

"President Bush leaves governors largely in command, overlooking that politicians at the state and local level easily bend to the wishes of logging and other interests, that litigation may actually expand."

-- *Akron Beacon Journal*, "Clear-cutting tradition; George Bush departs from Teddy Roosevelt," July 14, 2004

"Finally there is the price that future generations will pay when precious ecological treasures are diminished over time. And that price is simply too high to justify the White House's rush to development."

-- *Albany Times-Union*, "Imperiling forests; The Bush administration abandons protections for 60 million acres," July 14, 2004

"New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson rightly walloped the Bush administration for 'walking away from environmental protection,' when it announced on Monday a plan to permit road building in parts of national forests now off limits."

-- *Albuquerque Tribune*, "Brickbat: forest roads," July 14, 2004

"This is about more than logging. It's about maintaining the existing balance."

-- *Erie [PA] Times-News*, "Protect balance in national forest," July 14, 2004

"Imagine the condition of the West's forests in another four years of Bush Inc. opening the doors to rampant digging, drilling and cutting, the public's opinion be damned."

-- *Idaho Mountain Express*, "Here come the chainsaws," July 14, 2004

"Department of Agriculture officials sing the praises of "locally supported" forest plans, but that just means the support of local logging and mining companies, because conservationists and recreational users oppose the road-building."

-- *Los Angeles Times*, "Roads to Forest Ruination," July 14, 2004

"Instead of providing national protection for some of the last remaining wild areas in the country - protection that has wide public support - the administration would allow timber operations to proceed unless states, through their governors, provided the necessary protection."

-- *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, "Hardly the road to progress," July 14, 2004

"We no longer live in the Wild West. Natural resources and treasures are disappearing. It behooves us, as stewards of what pristine forests and lands remain, to preserve part of it for other species, our grandchildren and posterity."

-- *Oakland Tribune*, "Policy threatens forests, West's natural legacy," July 14, 2004

"Couched in the ideological glow of states' rights, the Bush administration proposal, announced Monday in Idaho, abdicates the federal government's responsibility to protect the nation's resources for future generations."

-- *Philadelphia Inquirer*, "National Forest Management; Keep loggers out, keep feds in charge," July 14, 2004

"The proposal undermines the very concept of the national forest system. It gives private economic interests an opportunity to exert greater influence over the management of public lands. And the almost certain result will be new road-building that will do irreparable damage to increasingly rare wild areas that act as watersheds and provide essential wildlife habitat."

-- *Roanoke Times*, "A road plan for eroding the forests," July 14, 2004

"National forests, by their very name, demand a management ethic that reflects national priorities and values, and this new plan leaves national treasures at risk."

-- *Sacramento Bee*, "National forests, goodbye; Bush's roadless plan a state turnover," July 14, 2004

"These forests are part of America's heritage, the priceless sources of our water, the irreplaceable homes of plant and animal life, the last vestiges of solitude. They should not be bargained away to loggers and politicians who seek their support."

-- *Salt Lake Tribune*, "America's forests," July 14, 2004

"Roads are not good for national forests. Roads usually are built to provide access for loggers, drillers or miners. Even if they're built just to make it easier for campers to get farther away from civilization, they split up wildlife habitat, foster erosion, and facilitate the introduction of alien species of plants and animals."

-- *San Jose Mercury News*, "With roads in finuawsn f

RNORS WOULD HAVE SOME CO

Bush administration apparently has not: That there is value, both ecological and economic, in protecting America's remaining wilderness areas against logging, drilling and strip mining."

-- *Gainesville Sun*, "The usual suspects; Major corporations have joined the fight for national forests in response to President Bush's initiatives for more roads," July 11, 2004

"No. They are the people's forests -- and not just the people who fell trees and run pulp mills, but people who visit them for quietude. People who recognize that the forests are irreplaceable sources of clean air, clean water and wildlife habitat. People who have grown disgusted with a road-building program that lavishes timber companies with subsidies and burdens taxpayers with maintenance bills."

-- *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, " Wild forests; 'Roadless rule' gets gutted," July 11, 2004

"Logging is a permitted use in national forests, but it should not take precedence over other uses, especially the preservation of the nation's remaining wild areas."

-- *Asheville Citizen-Times*, "We must have logging, but it shouldn't take precedence over other uses of national forests," July 08, 2004