

Hi, Fred Nelson for Community Comment,

With the weather improving, I hope that all of you are having improved dispositions. The flowers and trees are in bloom, the birds are lively, the heavy rains are passing and when you drive down the street, you can actually see the bottom of the chuck holes and avoid those that are extremely deep thus saving some front-end repair work on your vehicle. You nature lovers and trail buffs can now get out and start using our new network of trails. Newly paved with fancy aluminum foot bridges, there are no chuck holes to worry about (yet). The bridges are very attractive and the cost is in the millions. Of course the trails don't usually lead to your place of work (if you have a job) so you working folk are faced with limited time available for hiking even though your tax dollars pay for the trails with limited attention given to our vehicle thoroughfares which many of us have to use throughout the week. The possible removal of some speed limit signs or lowering of some of the posted maximum speed limits might be in order because if you try and meet the posted limits in some cases, the wear and tear on your vehicle might increase due to the depth of the potholes. The City Council of Eureka seems quite lackadaisical about the city problems except for the drug and homeless situations. Why? Afraid of stepping on someone's toes or don't you care about the good citizens who pay the bills? This past Sunday, I was a bit shocked when I read the headlines "New Idea Takes Root to Save Redwoods", "Losing Smaller Trees Could Help to Save Grand Old Ones". A new idea? The thinning of vegetables, such as carrots, fruit such as apples and trees in general is a new idea? Agricultural thinning is a process that has been going on for years in order to grow healthier crops. Only in the heads of environmentalists is the capacity to generate what is true while the rest of us are expected to shut up and wait for the holy words to be spoken. Do the environmentalists want to cut down all of those commercial trees that were planted as part of reforestation in the Nineteen Sixties because the loggers planted them too close together or do they want to thin the trees? The article is not clear according to what I read. I thought the idea was to thin out the smaller trees. Taking all of our reforested trees is just another way of clear cutting which, I thought, was now taboo. I also sensed up coming dissension between the various environmental groups as to the proposed cutting and the use of logging equipment which they fear could damage the forest floor. First we had the war between the timber industry and the environmentalists. Could this turn into a war among the tree huggers?

Fred Nelson for Community Comment