149

TO: Contents Analysis Enterprise Team

FROM: Ned and Arleen Pence

DATE: April 24, 2000

RE: United Federal Policy for Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management

FAX: 3 pages

149

PO Box 8484
Moscow, ID 83843
April 24, 2000

USDA-Forest Service
Contents Analysis Enterprise Team
Attn: UFP
Building 2, Suite 295
5500 Amelia Earhart Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

RE: United Federal Policy for Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management

To Whom It May Concern:

It hardly seems worthwhile to respond to what seems like yet one more approach to locking up federal lands in the West. However, those of us interested in maintaining the economics of Western industries really have no choice even though it is apparent the decision has already been made.

The Fact Sheet is well prepared and for those not familiar with the tactics being used to lock up federal lands in a preserve it will sound very good. The following are our concerns:

1. A Unified Federal Policy is not called for and cannot work unless the goal is to stop economic activity. Every watershed is different and the management should be specific to each individual watershed. NFMA provided a planning approach that should accomplish a specific watershed approach on a local level.

2. How will the best science be determined and who will decide? Where this term has been used in the past 8 years it usually means the decision will be a political decision that has little to do with science.

3. It is amazing to notice that the term economics is never used in the document--which means that economics and the needs of society will not be a consideration.

4. One has to wonder if those involved in this effort realize how many watersheds and sub-watersheds there are in the West. The "unified planning" being proposed is a massive effort that will require many years and much funding. Do those proposing such a massive project really believe that Congress will appropriate the funds for an effort that promises little to no economic or societal benefit? Do they recognize that there is little promise of the massive funding required and see this as merely another means of further locking up federal lands?

CAET RECEIVED
APR 25 2000

149

5. The track record of the past eight years indicates that when the words "restore" and "protect" are used they actually mean no use.

We know it is of little use to comment on this policy. However, please record us as being opposed. There is plenty of existing law such as NEPA and NFMA that is designed to accomplish the advertised intent of this policy. We do not need additional complications to management of federal lands in the West.

Sincerely yours,

Ned N. Pence

Arleen Pence

Arleen Pence
208-882-0833

cc: Senator Larry Craig
Senator Mike Crapo
Representative Helen Chenoweth-Hage
Representative Mike Simpson

CAET RECEIVED
APR 25 2000