

scientific study design, and neither have some of the other reports used as background information by the team. Some of the information is of poor quality due to weather conditions, such as the early stream surveys completed with deep snow packs on the area. The team that was chosen has the duty of reviewing work done by others, and has not been given the opportunity for in-depth study of the watersheds themselves. Therefore they have minimal first-hand information about the conditions on Perry Ridge. Much of the information is generated by GIS and is suspect as to its accuracy.

In a planning process the present conditions are analyzed first; examples would be the channel stability, and the terrain. After the unsuitable terrain is mapped out and the conditions on the ground are well understood, it is possible to start planning different alternative actions on the ground only where suitable. This study started with the activities first, with an assumption that they could be put on the landscape. The Total Chance Plan should not have even been developed yet, let alone been a guiding document for the analysis of risk of any activity. This process has been looking at the management of Perry Ridge in a biased manner and quick time-frame from the start. Accurate on-the-ground studies need to be established first.

Mass failures result from very small starting zones or small changes in the slope hydrology. These are site-specific in areas that are many times less than a portion of a hectare. This could not possibly be analyzed with the level of mapping that was completed for this study. The sensitivity for predicting any impacts is at best a guess with a study looking at units as large as 14 hectares, with the smallest being in the 4 hectare range.

I have not looked at the specifics in each unit as the whole system is flawed and the numbers generated are meaningless.