97

Richard R. Swift
180 Lake Almanor W. Dr.
Chester CA 96020

USFS CAET
Attention: UFP
Building 2, Suite 295,
5500 Amelia Earhart Dr.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Subject; Unified Federal Policy for Ensuring a Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management.

Dear Sirs,

I find your use of UFP as an excuse to close roads with gates brumes and tank traps. decommissioning roads by changing the land back to it's original state an excuse to keep the public out of the forests. Not a water quality concern.

I live a stones throw from the Lassen Forest and here they have cleaned up their area along side of our tract and made the area relatively fire safe. Roads not only give access to the forest, they also act as fire brakes. The excuse I hear for closing roads is to cut down on soil erosion. When you decommission a road you are going to have more soil erosion then you had. Old logging roads that are used only in a limited manner are relatively erosion free. Soil erosion is a natural phenomenon of nature. We wouldn't have mountains and valleys if it weren't. To my knowledge the water in our area is quite clean. People fish, swim and drink the water. The only ground water pollution is from MTECB down in Oroville. A result of a US Government requirement to put MTECB in our gasoline. Clean up the air, dirty the water.

In our area I would say that the local lumber company Collins Pines does a better job of taking care of there forest than the US Gov. managing Lassen Forest. They have roads for access and fire brakes. They keep the under brush cleaned out so there is no fire ladder. They cut timber and make a profit. That is more than I can say for the US Forest Service.

If the Forest Service continues to make the government lands into effectively wilderness areas, I predict that in 20 yr. a fire will start in Los Angeles and burn all of the way to Washington State. As it is now the Parks and Wilderness areas are fire hazards. Especially when Rangers let fires burn and they burn off of US lands and on to private lands. Yellowstone, the Ish Wilderness and our own Lassen Park are examples of Park Service's stupid rules keeping roads out and letting things be natural and let it burn. Friends came back from Yellowstone and complained that they had hundreds of firemen and they would not let them put equipment into the forests to fight the fire. A National Tragedy.

Attached are FS notes from meetings held in our area. You can see that new federal policies concerning care and management of federal lands is not going over very well with people who live near the forest-lands.

Sincerely Richard R Swift

CAET RECEIVED
APR 21 2000

Road Management Policy Meetings held in Susanville, Fall River Mills & Chester.

Susanville

1. If roads have been developed in unroaded areas, they are not roadless.
2. People are upset about land being taken away from them.
3. How is the Sierra Framework going to influence how we use the land?
4. Maybe logging should be opened so we can afford to fix the roads.
5. There is public sentiment against timber sales, not against roads.
6. It is frightening when the President can take land away from the people without representation.
7. We want notification throught the paper which roads are proposed for closure.
8. The urban majority are imposing issues on the rural minority.
9. Use e-mail lists for notification.
10. We want to see an overall list of proposed meetings with the Forest Supervisor and District Rangers here. We want a written report of proposed road closures.
11. We need better notification.
12. It seems we are in a hurry to get this done.
13. We need a road out for fire safety in the Spalding/Christie area.
14. There is a fire safety concern about access at Eagle's Nest.
15. Consideration for economec issues of local residents seems to be less and less.
16. The federal government has much money for highways, why not some for forest roads?
17. I want you to double check the miles of road constructed in roadless areas.

Fall River Mills

1. Specific needs should be addressed by local input who know more about the area.
2. Majority rule should not apply, rural communities are not adequately represented..
3. Lack of access leads to no log removal and catastrophic fires.
4. There should be a cost analysis between fixing a road versus decommissioning it.
5. Seasonal closure is "ok" in order to protect toads during the wet season, but obliterating the roads entirely is "not OK".
6. There is concern about a proposal that is top-down and not based on the needs of the ground.
7. Timber should be cut and cut wisely. Standing salvage increases fire risk and is wasteful.
8. A clean water standard is being applied to the west which should be applied to the east where all the point pollution is, ie, factories and farms.
9. We need to have specific needs addressed by people who know about the area.
10. Big Bar Fire was a fire where the forest burned down and no one got any money or resource use out of it due to lack of access.
11. We want copies of this presentation.
12. It would be more cost-effective to maintain the road versus decommission 30 miles of road each year..
13. If there is no fuels treatment in wilderness areas, they will burn.
14. We are concerned about who chooses the members on the committee of scientists and about member choice being made from the top-down.

CAET RECEIVED

APR 2 1 2006

19. Are science-based evaluations going to be available for the public view.
20. The Forest Service needs to be forthright.
21. It is my understanding that 40% ot the roads not maintained on the Lassen are eligible for decommissioning.
22. How much polluted water is on the Lassen?
23. Do not close any roads without presenting the proposal to the county Board of Supervisors.
24. Ghost roads are fun to use, don't improve them.
25. Publicize specific roads and maps proposed for closure.
26. There has been no response to comments made specifically to the regional Framework initiative. The material out at this point does not address ur requests and concerns.
27. Getting a Forest Supervisor to listen is difficult.
28. Planning regulations are changing the mission of the Forest Service.
29. The Prattville scooping letter has a map that has a possible mistake regarding road decommissioning/closure. See below.
30. How are local people able to give input? How local is Local?
31. If there is a decision made from the top, how will it be implamented?
32. Count the number of people in this room (there were approximately 136)
33. All people in the room stood up in opposition to this proposal.
34. Present proposals in public forums.
35. How are the roads classified? Ghost roads/system roads/etc.? Getting a map that gives information on the roads and their classification would be helpful.
36. What is the penalty for using a closed road?
37. Limiting access is a concern.

A statement was made that they had not scientifically accessed any roads and so were as yet planning to decommission any roads. And yet this is in one of their publications.

Prattville Scooping letter from the Almanor Ranger District. A direct quote of the last paragraph.

Existing transportation system roads would be used and maintained for this project. An exception would be roads 27N44 (1.9miles), 27N73 (.25 miles), and approximately 1/2 mile of road 27N03A (going west from the junction of road 27N03), would be prohibited from use during DFPZ construction and would be decommissioned following the completion of DFPZ construction. Roads 27N75 (.5 miles) and 27N78 (.25 miles) would be decommissioning would be funded through watershed improvement dollars. Temporary and non-system roads that are used to access DFPZ units would be closed upon completion of DFPZ construction. Existing closure structures on roads 27N52, 27N52B, 27N72, and 27N03C would be re-established following completion of DFPZ construction.

CAET RECEIVED
APR 2 1 2000