



The Dixie Ranger

Published quarterly by the Southern Forest Service Retirees Association
\$8.00 per year Vol. XXX No. 3 August 2000

FLORIDA SWAMPLAND FOR SALE

Ever since old "Punchy the Lion" went back to Spain with tales of a marvelous Fountain of Youth, Florida has been famous for fraudulent real estate deals, so it was not without a certain amount of mistrust that in 1960 Ranger Johnny Olson entertained a land claim from a man named Swindle. The man had a deed for 6 acres of St. Johns river swampland on the Lake George Ranger District of the Ocala National Forest.

Title search indicated the claim was valid, Mr. Swindle had title to 6 acres. The only problem being where and in what configuration were those 6 acres located. His deed contained what is probably the most obscurely worded tract description ever written. It contained no discernable starting point, no bearings and distance calls and no corner descriptions. The only definite figure was 6 acres. It read, as nearly as I can recall 37 years later:

"Beginning at a point where the St. Johns River enters Lake George, said point being opposite the Government light as it is now located, thence along the shore of Lake George a distance so that a line inland and thence back to the point of beginning will include 6 acres."

As the St. Johns River enters Lake George on a long, sweeping curve, the starting point could be anywhere in a half-mile stretch as also could be the point "opposite" the no longer existing government light. The rest of the description suggests a rough triangle of indeterminate dimensions.

How to settle? The general area involved is uniformly flat, swampy and wooded with cabbage palms. There is very little reason to pick one 6 acres over another. An old surveyor's term used in jest is "Having reached (Point A), there being no government corner, I set one." This is just what we did. We picked an arbitrary point for the beginning, marked off an arbitrary tract of 6 acres and Mr. Swindle agreed to it. Case closed.

Submitted by John H. Courtenay, retired Forest Supervisor, National Forests in Texas



WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

David A. Hammond (Gloria), 131 Westcliff Cove, Hot Springs, AR
71913, Phone: 501.767.4561

Charles H. Young, (Polly), 703 Jefferson, Lufkin, TX 75904, Phone:
936.634.7908 e-mail: cyoung@lcc.net

Please make the following additions to the e-mail directory:

Keith Homan - jm1421@aol.com

Dave Jolly - pjolly@webshoppe.net

Steve and Helga McCorquodale - stevehelgamcq@centurytel.net

□ □ □

YOU'RE GETTING OLDER IF YOU CAN REMEMBER...

...When you'd reach into a muddy gutter for a penny.

...When you got your windshield cleaned, oil checked, and gas pumped, without asking, for free, every time. And you got trading stamps to boot!

...When women were called "Mrs. John Smith," instead of their own name.

□ □ □



LUNCHEON SEPTEMBER 14

Our next luncheon will be on Thursday, September 14 at 11:30 a.m. at the Petite Auberge restaurant in the Toco Hills Shopping Center on North Druid Hills Road. Lunch is served at 12 noon. Reservations are required. Please phone your reservation to either Peaches Sherman, 770.253.7480 or to the Brays at 770.253.0392 no later than September 12th. We need at least 24 people to hold a luncheon. We had a good attendance at the luncheon in June - 36 attendees. Fantastic door prizes from a selection by Nancy Sorrells are given at each luncheon. Fellowship is always enjoyed before the lunch is served, so please join us for the luncheon on September 14.

LETTERS FROM OUR MEMBERS



Kie Vining, Silver Springs, FL - My dues are due so enclosed is a check. I worked thirty and a half years and served under eight rangers. While I am writing this I am listening to chopper's dropping water on fires now. This brings back old memories. I enjoy reading *The Dixie Ranger*.

John Cathey, Greenwood, SC - I finally noticed my *Dixie Ranger* lapsed in 1999 and as a lot of people my age, I just forgot to mail my payment. Here it is for another 3 years. We enjoy reading *The Dixie Ranger* very much. Each time I read it I find more new names of retirees and unfortunately those who have passed on. Time has been good to the Cathey family with 2 sons-in-law and 1 grandson. Thanks for the good job, and keep it up.

Jim Werner, Hot Springs, AR - You must have stirred up the dust at the local post office because the May issue which you suspected was delayed arrived in Hot Springs on June 3. And it was the usual great issue, too. The best news (from the readers' standpoint) is that you will continue on as editors. Thank you.

All those stories put my "part-himzer's disease" into remission as they stimulate old memories. When I transferred to R-8 in 1966 I was not readily accepted, not because I was a dreaded "Northerner." No, it was because I had not been through the infamous Instructor Training Program. How could anyone still survive in the USFS, others thought, not having that training. Thanks, Pat Int-Hout for so aptly describing what I missed.

When I arrived in Atlanta I brought along a Roliflex camera. Bob Neelands pestered me for four years trying to take possession of that camera. That was when the "professionals" lugged 4x5 cameras around in big suit cases, worried about light leaks in the bellows, and used D-cell batteries to force large bulbs into flashing whenever the sun was not shining brightly on their ASE 25 film. Tell us some of those tales, Bob. And sorry, Bob, the Ouachita surplused the camera when 35 mm became popular. And now we have digital's!

Doug Shenkyr reports that "Times flies." Wow, I've been wondering what happened to it. To illustrate Doug's point, I haven't seen him since I moved in with him and John Courtenay in the "Recreation & Watershed Division" in the Seventh Street RO. Courtenay would remember; he was the inventor of the "modesty screen." At least he named it. Does that need explanation? Well, one of the secretaries was Dianne Wilson. Everyone back then knew Dianne, the most vivacious blond on the face of this earth. And Dianne typed. That's on a typewriter. And if you're old enough to remember a typewriter you'll remember that it was balanced precariously on a flimsy shelf hinged onto a sturdy desk. When Dianne sat there typing the only thing under that typewriter

shelf was a pair of pretty legs kind of moving rhythmically with the clickety-clack of the keys, swaying suggestively with the wosh of the carriage return. Doug and John and all the rest of us were driven crazy by this wonderful sight. (In later years landscape architects coined the term "aesthetics"). We all feverishly wrote extra memos just so Dianne would be at that typewriter. Well, the chief clerk was Laura, old, mean, ya' know, hair in a bun, pencil in the bun (and probably efficient, too). She was driven crazy by all of us crazy foresters slatherin' up the office with drool. The solution was a desk-sized blotter. (Remember ink, the stuff you got all over your hands when you filled your fountain pen? That's why they called it "fountain" pen, the source of ink stains on shirt pockets. Remember blotters? They absorbed the excess fluid from memos you drafted for Dianne to type). Tape that sucker to the back of Dianne's typewriter shelf and all those aesthetics were hidden by the official Forest Service Region Eight Modesty Screen. Forests commented on the decrease in memos. Doug and John didn't need blotters any more which was good because all the persons of female persuasion adopted this new office fixture. And me? I transferred to the Ouachita.

I'm glad to see my last boss, Ouachita Supervisor Mike Curran join this august organization. I'd like to think it was because of my stirring speech at the Daley-Cockerham-Verucchi retirement party, but I'll accept that he did it to keep up with an exceptional bunch of guys and gals. And Buddy Whitlock, one-time Ouachita deputy, came to his senses too; probably missed the chiggers while in Colorado. Welcome, friends, to SFSRA.

On page 15 of the May 2000 issue (Vol. XXXNo. 2 if you don't have a calendar) is a photo of folks most of you remember. But "F.S.Martin (R-7)"? Yeah, that's Ted, who was AO on the White Mountain NF when I served there in 1957-62. Jack Godden, you remember too. Ted drove one of the first VW's to be shipped from Germany, tiny rear window, little tail lights. But engine in the rear? This was so new to all of us that we didn't even know enough to laugh. Ted may have retired in Florida and may no longer be with us. Do any of you Florida folks know?

Thanks, Bert and Betty for continuing.

John Barber, Warsaw, VA - Received my *Ranger* today (June 6) - plowed back through my files (I save them) but seem to have missed the last issue, so didn't know about you and Bert "retiring" almost.

Thanks for all the work you have done for us FS folks. I've been retired 20 years, so there are few people in the FS that I know - guess the turnover seemed as great to those before us.

I stay busy with S&WCD work and efforts to clean up our Chesapeake Bay, plus an occasional round of golf - or fishing - or trying to catch up on work around the house and yard.

John Allen, Crawfordville, GA - Looks like we are behind in our dues, so here's a check to cover them for a while.

You may have heard, but Katherine is back working - she heads up the County Adult Literacy and Education Department. We'll try to make the meetings as we can.

Ernie Finger, Pineville, LA - I was re-reading the May issue of *The Dixie Ranger* and noted that I will not be reading many more unless I pay the piper. So, here is some money. If it does not come out right, put the rest in the coffee kitty (is that sexist?, but coffee tom does not sound quite right). And my attempt at a pun sounds awful!

Dot and I are busy at something all the time. Hers are usually paying things - right now she is cleaning up the mess from the people-counting of the Senseless Bureau. At the top of my to do pile is the March of Dimes Mothers March package with which I've got to do something this week. I confer masonic funerals, six of which I did in June, and at two of those, the deceased's pastor was not there. I am the Shrine Hospital representative in Central Louisiana. That means I help get kids into our hospitals, and for this purpose, a disabled or disfigured child in Bangor, Maine, is in my territory. You know, we do not discriminate for any purpose, not even for having money! For the kids in CenLA I have a travel fund, funded from cracker jack sales at the Shrine Circus. If a child has an appointment in Galveston or Shreveport, I cover the travel expenses without regard to the financial condition of the family. I like to think I was instrumental in changing, somewhat, the direction of our Burn Centers - we don't even call them that any more. Several years ago a grandfather told me he wanted me to come and see his granddaughter. She had been born with a mass of hair across her shoulder, sort of like a big rat lying there. They had it removed when she was a baby, but did nothing else. I did go. Her shoulder front and back was void of any skin. The blood vessels and the entwining of the muscles were just as clear as day. Actually, it was kind of pretty. But the girl was a teenager now, and wanted to play basketball. The uniform she would have to wear would bare her imperfection to her peers, and she would not bring herself to do that. At that time, we did not address such cosmetic surgery, but I made a plea for this one. We did it, but it was time that we did. We wish that all people would be perfect in body, and mind and in soul, but unfortunately, when kids display these cosmetic imperfections, there are some folks who would prey on them, poke fun at them, and in many cases destroy them. Now in everyday business, we handle cases like this. Oh, there is never a charge for anything we do at a Shrine Hospital. I also sell eye care assistance for the Alexandria Lions Club, learning disorders for the Scottish Rites - I told a dentist the other day that about the only child care I cannot address is orthodontics. He told me if I'd bring them to him, he would

treat them free of charge. I would not do that. I could swamp him with business. But I wish the dentists as a group would have an organized program for, in this case, folks who cannot afford it otherwise. I am also chaplain of the Shrine Club and a couple of other masonic groups.

I help with the Kisatchie Retirees' Reunion. Joyce Slayter generally handles the logistics. If she does not send you an invitation, she meant to. Come on over. More than likely, we will have a fish-fry and K Erwin and I will cook the fish and fries. Bill Williams and his lady have their own secret recipe for hush-puppies.

We had a very nice, very quiet, July 4 at K Erwin's place on the lake. I think Carl Wilhelm, K and I were the only FS retirees.

And that's about all. I hope to be able to write to you when I'm in arrears on my dues again. Bless you!

Dave Hammond, Hot Springs, AR - Thought I'd go ahead and send you dues while I have this copy of the DR as a reminder. I'll be retiring on December 31 as DFS on the Ouachita after 39 1/2 years in R-5, WO and R-8. Looking forward to joining your ranks.

IN MEMORIAM

Thomas L. Fendley, Ocala, FL, passed away on July 10. No additional information at this time. Tom retired from Engineering, RO, Atlanta.

Nora Fleck, 86, of Alpharetta, died June 11. Nora worked for the Forest Service in the late seventies or early eighties in Personnel Management and Engineering.

Helen Froula, wife of Jim Froula, died on May 15 in Knoxville, TN. Surviving beside the husband are 7 children and 12 grandchildren. Jim's address is 1704 Covey Rise Trail, Knoxville, TN 37921.

Ted Lacher, 73, died April 22 in Tucker, GA. Ted was born in Krompach, Czechoslovakia. He is survived by his wife, Lynn, one daughter, three sons and grandchildren. Ted worked in Timber Sales, RO, Atlanta, from 1963 to his retirement in January 1986.

Tony Durkas, Timber Sales, Chattahoochee-Oconee NF, GA.

Paul Y. Vincent, 90, passed away April 24 at his home in Green Valley, AZ. After graduating from Michigan State University, Mr. Vincent began his Forest Service career in 1933 as a forester in Flagstaff, AZ. After his service with the U. S. Navy during World War II, he resumed his forestry career in Washington, D.C., from where he was

transferred to Lufkin, TX, as an assistant supervisor. His next assignment was as Supervisor of the Chattahoochee-Oconee NF in Gainesville, GA, until his retirement in 1965. Survivors include his wife of 64 years, Elaine, several nieces and nephews.

Hans R. Raum, 74, passed away March 11 in Leesburg, FL. Hans was a graduate of Iowa State and served 33 years with the Forest Service. He retired in 1980. Survivors include his wife, Peggy, and son, Ronnie who is Forest Supervisor of the NFs in TX.

□ □ □

The following articles are presented for your information. The roadless area controversy has been very much in the news. The period for public comment ended July 17.

Statement of James R. Lyons, Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment , USDA, before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Management Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, regarding the promulgation of regulations concerning roadless areas within the National Forest system - February 22.

Mister Chairman and members of the Committee: Thank you for the opportunity to discuss Forest Service efforts to conserve and enhance the important social and ecological values of roadless areas within the National Forest System. As you know, on October 19, 1999, we published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register that outlined a two part process that could: 1) limit certain development activities such as road construction in inventoried roadless areas across the country; and 2) determine what activities are consistent with protecting the important ecological and social values associated with inventoried roadless areas.

As President Clinton emphasized during his announcement in October, more and more, the American people recognize the inextricable link between the quality of their lives and the health of the lands and waters that surround them. Although roadless areas represent less than one percent of the American landmass, they serve as a reservoir of rare and vanishing resources. They provide clean drinking water, habitat for fish and wildlife, abundant hunting and fishing, recreation opportunities, and reference areas for research. In the face of growing sprawl and urbanization, these values are immeasurable. They act as a barrier against noxious invasive plant and animal species and as strongholds for native fish populations. Roadless areas often provide vital habitat and migration routes for numerous wildlife species and are particularly important for those requiring large home ranges. Many roadless areas also act as ecological anchors allowing nearby federal, state, and private lands to be developed for economic purposes.

By law, we are required to manage national forests and grasslands in a manner that seeks to meet local needs, while recognizing their national value. Roadless areas on national forests need to be viewed from a broader context. For example, between 1992 and 1997, nearly 16 million acres of forest, farms, and open space were converted to urban or other uses. In less than a decade, we have doubled the loss of undeveloped

land. This helps to explain why President Clinton has asked the American people, who own this land, about how they want their remaining wild and undeveloped roadless areas managed.

The American people need to know the consequences of continuing to develop these roadless areas. For instance, road construction may increase the risk of erosion, landslides, and slope failure, endangering the health of watersheds that provide drinking water to local communities and critical habitat for fish and wildlife. These effects can be particularly acute in high elevation, erosion prone roadless areas. Development in such areas can allow entry of invasive plants and animals that can threaten the health of native species, increase human-caused wildfire, disrupt sensitive wildlife habitat, and otherwise compromise the attributes that make these sensitive areas socially valuable and ecologically important to millions of Americans feeling the threat of losing open space all around them.

In recent years, the public rightfully questioned whether the Forest Service should build new roads into controversial roadless areas when the agency has difficulty maintaining its existing road system. The current national forest road system includes 380,000 miles of roads. The agency currently has a road reconstruction and maintenance backlog of approximately \$8.4 billion and it receives only about 20 percent of the annual funding needed to maintain the safety and environmental condition of its road system.

Almost two years ago, I watched as the House of Representatives came within a single vote of cutting \$42 million out of Forest Service roads budget because of these issues. For too long, others, such as the court system and interest groups, have controlled the debate over long-term management of roadless areas. The President's direction puts this issue squarely back where it belongs, into the hands of the American people and the resource professionals of the Forest Service.

To date, the public has engaged in unprecedented levels; evidence that the American people care deeply about this issue. We have already received 500,000 comments even though we have not released a draft environmental impact statement yet. The Forest Service has held over 185 public meetings to date with more to come. This too is an unprecedented public outreach effort by the agency. I think this speaks to the national significance and public concern over this issue. I assure you that when we release an actual proposal and offer alternatives, we will conduct an unprecedented amount of public meetings, open houses, and other public involvement to ensure the American people shape the future management of their lands.

The Forest Service is in the process of developing the range of alternatives that will be analyzed in the draft environmental impact statement and accompanying proposed rule. As we move forward with the rulemaking and developing the draft environmental impact statement, I anticipate that our roadless rulemaking will provide direction for certain national issues while allowing other decisions to be made at the appropriate regional or local level.

Our alternatives will examine a range of prohibitions in inventoried roadless areas such as limitations on road construction and development in unroaded portions of inventoried roadless areas. Alternatives will also consist of procedures and criteria

to determine what activities are consistent with the social and ecological values associated with inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. These procedures could be implemented at the forest level through additional open and public processes. The final rule will delineate a framework for this forest-by-forest implementation process. National prohibitions of certain activities, such as road construction and reconstruction, could affect about 54 million acres of inventoried roadless areas. Roughly 38 percent of these areas are already in management designations that do not allow for road construction. The amount of acres, in addition to the 54 million acres of inventoried roadless areas affected by the procedures, could be determined in the future through local forest planning.

Public Involvement for Roadless Initiative. The initial opportunity for public involvement began on October 19, 1999, with the publication in the Federal Register of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS. Release of the NOI initiated a public scoping period that continues through issuance of a draft environmental impact statement and proposed rule. As I mentioned earlier, to demonstrate how seriously we take this open public process, we held over 185 public meetings, or listening sessions, including a meeting on every national forest and grassland that has inventoried roadless areas. Some forests held multiple meetings, based on what they determined was appropriate to provide adequate opportunity for the public to gain information and provide comment. We left broad discretion to our local forests to determine what they thought was the most effective forum and manner to share information and collect public input.

Along with the numerous public meetings to ensure that the public has access to information on the roadless rulemaking process, we have been posting information on the roadless website as we develop databases and begin the analysis. We have posted both state and forest maps of inventoried roadless areas, acreage figures, meeting schedules, general information and news articles on the website. Among the news items, we have posted a wide range of viewpoints. This level of information sharing is unprecedented for any broad scale proposal of this magnitude. Because not everyone has access to the Internet, this information is also available at national forest and grassland offices. As I mentioned earlier, from the public meetings, letters, cards and e-mails we received over 500,000 comments. Many are pleased with the roadless initiative; many are not. Many believe that the rule should apply to all forests and others feel that some forests should be exempt. There are many concerns about how the rule will affect access, what the impacts will be to communities, impacts to the timber industry, and how will the rule affect the agency's ability to address wildfires and forest health.

Effects. I want to make it abundantly clear that our intention is not to block access to national forests and grasslands, only to ensure that public access to public lands occurs in a manner that conserves the nationally significant values of roadless areas. Some have suggested that we are attempting to create de facto wilderness and to "block access to the people's land". Nothing could be further from the truth.

In 1997, 860 million national forest visitors took advantage of more than 23,000 recreation facilities and hundreds of thousands of miles of forest roads, trails and scenic byways. The issues outlined above, along with others, will be addressed in the draft environmental impact statement. I also want to make it clear that the rulemaking will not close any roads or trails, or block legal access to private or state land.

Timber Harvest Effects. For the past 5 years, less than 4 percent of the agency's timber harvest has been from inventoried roadless areas. Our preliminary data indicates less than 5 percent of our 5 year projected timber volume is dependent on road construction in inventoried roadless areas. Eighty percent of our national forests estimate less than 5 percent of their prospective timber volume is dependent on new road construction in inventoried roadless areas. Similarly, less than 5-percent of national forests estimate more than 25 percent of their total planned volume is dependent on construction of new roads in inventoried roadless areas. Although effects may be more adverse in certain local communities, nationally the effects will not be significant.

Fire Risk. Preliminary data also indicate that the degree of overlap between areas that the agency has identified as having a higher risk from wildfires and inventoried roadless areas is small, only 3 million acres of the estimated 24 million. Part of the reason can be attributed to many inventoried roadless areas being at higher elevations that are typically wetter and cooler, not adjacent to communities, and not influenced by past management activities. Many fire ecologists believe that unroaded areas have less potential for larger, higher intensity, more severe forest fires than roaded areas. This conclusion is based on several factors; fire suppression has been focused more in roaded than unroaded areas allowing more fuels to accumulate in the roaded areas. Also, in some areas, past logging practices have left many acres with additional dead and down woody material on the ground. Also timber stands are generally more dense in roaded than unroaded areas, particularly in logged areas that have regenerated. These regenerated stands are often highly susceptible to forest fire damage. There are exceptions to this and the degree of overlap and consequences will be addressed in the draft environmental analysis. For the National Forest System, the initial fire risk mapping efforts have identified up to 24 million acres at high risk and 32 million acres at moderate risk. The priorities for treating these areas will be to focus on communities at risk, species at risk, and watersheds at risk. In particular, priorities will focus on protections of life and property, usually not a problem for roadless areas, but rather more important for the wildland/urban interface where roads are more plentiful. All areas, not just those within roadless areas, will be priorities based on these risks.

Status of the Environmental Impact Statement. The agency is planning to publish a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) and proposed rule for public review in the spring of 2000. The draft EIS will outline specific alternatives and provide a detailed basis for discussion with the public about how roadless areas should be managed in the future. The Forest Service will provide another period for public

comment and will host two series of meetings and public involvement opportunities upon release of the proposed rule and draft EIS this year. The first series will occur around the release of the draft EIS to share information and answer questions. The second series will occur near the end of the public comment period to take comments on the alternatives. The draft EIS and proposed rule will be accompanied by information and data that state, Tribal and local governments, and the American people need to understand the potential effects of the agency's draft proposal. The final EIS and final rule will be published late this year.

The Forest Service has attempted to address the management of roadless areas for over 30 years. The public, state and local governments and Congress have all been active participants in this debate. As you are aware, in January 1998, I initiated a process to consider changes in how the Forest Service road system is developed, used, maintained and funded and to suspend temporarily road construction in certain unroaded areas. This led to the current "interim rule", that temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in unroaded areas while our proposal to develop a long-term management policy was being developed. The agency received more than 80,000 public comments on these efforts, the majority of which called for a permanent halt to road building in roadless areas. However, the public also agreed with the agency that management policy for the existing road system needed to be developed. Accordingly, we will soon publish the draft road management policy in the Federal Register and begin the public comment period.

As we work on the rulemaking process for roadless areas, we will continue to work on the road management policy. There will be some overlap as we pursue these two separate but closely related actions. This overlap will be resolved as these rulemakings are brought to closure. With the roadless issue finally behind us, I intend to focus the agency's efforts on restoring forest ecosystems that are out of balance due to widespread fire suppression and past management practices. It is my expectation that we will need multiple methods to address our forest ecosystem health needs. In the process, we can supply jobs, revenue, and a more stable flow of wood fiber, all while improving land health. In the absence of adequately addressing the roadless issue, it is questionable whether the public would support the actions needed to restore healthy, diverse, resilient, and productive national forests and grasslands.

Summary. Thirty years of local planning efforts, wilderness debates, appeals, lawsuits, and injunctions have not solved the issue of long-term management of some 54 million acres of roadless areas in our national forest system. As a result, the Forest Service has embarked on a national initiative to determine how the American people want these lands managed. After decades of debate, controversy, and litigation, we are engaging the American people in this important dialogue. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement.

(Jim Lyons will join the faculty of Yale University's School of Forestry and Environmental Studies beginning January 2001- from the Forestry Source, SAF, June 2000)

February 26, 2000, from **The Los Alamos Monitor** by John Marble, **Monitor** Staff Writer

Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., said the Clinton administration probably violated several public participation laws by dealing secretly with environmental groups while proposing the president's "Protection of Forest Roadless Areas" policy, a press release said.

The press release said Domenici addressed the issue at a Forest and Public Land Management Subcommittee hearing on the initiative Tuesday (2/22). The proposal calls for the U.S. Forest Service to end construction of roads on 40 to 60 million acres of national forest land.

"I believe the Forest Service can be fair," Domenici told Forest Service officials at the hearing, according to the press release. "In this case, it should declare the current process invalid and start over."

"If the tables were turned and the Forest Service had met inappropriately with other forest users instead of environmentalists, I cannot believe that the major environmental groups would not already have you in court to have this policy thrown out for violating so many provisions of public participation laws," Domenici said.

"I believe the Forest Service ignored laws by not listening to everyone affected, instead favoring those who concur with your goals," Domenici said.

On Nov. 16, 1999, the Forest Service launched the first of several phases to gather public input by conducting a round of regional hearings on Clinton's "roadless" proposal.

Domenici said in the press release that the Forest Service is duty bound to follow the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), which sets detailed procedures for agency rule-making, including public hearing requirements and disclosure of "ex parte (one-sided) communications." These ex parte communications include closed-door meetings the Forest Service conducted with environmental groups during the development of roadless forest regulations, Domenici said in the press release.

"The public record for the rule-making does not acknowledge that these ex parte communications ever occurred, or disclose what was discussed," Domenici said.

"I believe those meetings with environmental groups violated the limitations on contacts or meetings with outside groups during a rule-making process," Domenici said.

The press release said that based on documents obtained by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the subcommittee took issue with the Forest Service's apparent violation of the APA, National Protection Act, Freedom of Information Act, Federal Advisory Committee Act, as well as questionable fund reprogramming.

Since 1998, the Forest Service has worked on two associated rule-makings - the first deals with a proposed interim rule prohibiting road construction in about 42 million of the 192 million acres of national forests in the United States, which are classified as "roadless" areas. The second rule-making deals with an advance notice

issued by the Forest Service on a proposed new national forest transportation policy. Domenici said in the press release that both efforts were pending when the Forest Service and the administration began to meet in secret with a small, select group of environmentalists with a direct interest in the outcome of both rules.

Proponents for the Protection of Forest Roadless Areas initiative say that, among other things, it will protect the current roadless areas from logging, mining, and other destructive activities while still allowing hiking, hunting, fishing and camping. Opponents say that, among other things, it will eliminate public recreation, including snowmobiling.

New York Times, March 2, 2000 - WASHINGTON (AP) - The Forest Service is proposing a rule that would make it more difficult to build new roads in national forests, a Clinton administration source says.

Forest managers would have to conduct an analysis and an environmental study, gain approval from a regional forester and show a compelling need for the road before a new pathway could be built, said the source, who spoke only on condition of anonymity.

"The theme here is to improve public access to national forests in a way that protects land health," the source said.

The Forest Service was expected to announce the new rule today. The proposed rule is intended to address forests that already have roads in them. The Clinton administration in October announced a separate plan to prevent road construction and development in up to 50 million acres of roadless forests. The Forest Service has been criticized for its handling of 380,000 miles of roads across 192 million acres of federal forests. Environmentalists say the agency gives short shrift to ecology when deciding to build roads, which they say accelerate erosion, disrupt wildlife and make it easier for logging. Industry and recreation groups alike fault the Forest Service for closing roads, saying the agency cuts access to forests and makes it tough to fight fires.

The proposed rule, which will be published Friday (March 3) and could become final in September, aims to address both sides' concerns by requiring forest leaders to consult the public on which roads to build, maintain or eliminate. The rule also aims to give the public better data about roads, as forest managers must keep an atlas with the location of each road in the forest. "It creates a logical, orderly process for people to get involved," the administration source said.

Administration officials hope the new rule helps forest managers make better use of limited resources. The Forest Service faces an \$8.4 billion backlog in road reconstruction and maintenance. Congress annually appropriates less than 20 percent of what the agency says it needs to keep up with road repairs. An additional problem is that forests have 60,000 miles of unauthorized, "ghost roads" that recreationists helped create by driving in roadless areas.

The heyday of road building was in the 1980s, when logging in federal forests reached a peak. But road building has declined from 2,300 miles in 1988 to 215 miles

in 1998. People using the roads have changed too. Roughly 1.7 million vehicles roll across forest roads each day for recreation, compared with 15,000 logging trucks.

The Administration in February 1999 announced a moratorium on new road building in 33 million acres of forests until the roads policy being announced today becomes final. After that, the roadless policy announced in October is expected to continue the protection of those 33 million acres, plus 17 million other acres.

The FSX Club of Washington, D.C. wrote the following letter to USFS CAET, Attention: Roads April 7th. The letter was addressed to Chief Dombeck.

We write in response to the Notice of Intent (NOI) published in the Federal Register on March 3, 2000, Vol. 65. No. 43, proposed rulemaking; and its associated pages 11684 -11693, proposed administrative policy.

The FSX Club of Washington, D.C. consists of over 160 Forest Service retirees in the Washington, D.C. area. We are an organization of highly trained research scientists, forest managers, biologists, engineers and other specialists with, collectively, thousands of years of experience in planning and managing the resources in the National Forests. Our group, thus, has a unique understanding of the art and science of planning and implementing the many facets of land and resource management on the National Forests. Many of us were pioneers in forest management on the National Forests and in the development of the infrastructure necessary properly to protect and improve the various resources therein.

Based on our experience in managing National Forest System lands to meet the statutory objectives of multiple-use and sustained yield, we know that an adequate road system is essential to meeting these objectives. The necessity of an adequate road system is recognized in the National Forest Roads and Trails Act (16 U.S.C. 532-538). We firmly believe that planning for this road system must be accomplished within the context of the congressionally mandated land management planning process.

It is noteworthy that neither the draft land management planning regulation, the roadless area proposal nor the proposed transportation rule and policy contain a coherent explanation of their interaction or integration. The proposals before us seem to envision a separate, duplicative process using an undefined "science-based road analysis." We believe this separate process is contrary to the concept of one integrated plan set forth in Sec. 6 of the Forest and Rangelands Renewable Resources Planning Act (RPA). We also believe you should clarify how doing away with the "Forest Development Transportation Plan" will conform to the requirements of Section 10 of the RPA.

We are concerned by the bias against roads reflected in the overall proposal and in the regulatory impact statement. The bias is evident throughout the proposals, but the most egregious example is the statement in the first paragraph of "Supplementary Information", which states "...few land impacts are more lasting than those associated with road construction." It doesn't take much of an imagination to visualize the greater impacts associated with urbanization, conversion to intensive agriculture, and natural

catastrophes such as hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, volcanic eruptions, wildfire in heavy fuels, global warming, and many others.

We find that the language is often ambiguous and will lead to contention with the public as well as internally. An example is in the definition of an unroaded area concerning its potential size: "The size of the area must be sufficient and in a manageable configuration to protect the inherent values associated with the unroaded condition." Many of our group has experience with past delineation of roadless areas, and we can assure you that this kind of vague, wishy-washy language will generate no end of problems. We urge you to clarify the language throughout the proposal.

The proposal indicates a belief that its adoption would have a positive effect on fire and forest pest management. How did you determine the perceived positive effects of the proposal on fire prevention, fire management, and insect and disease control? To the contrary, review of fire control costs over the last 15 years shows a disproportionate share of the costs, outside of southern California, were associated with suppression of fires in substantially unroaded areas.

The finding in the regulatory impact report that the impacts on recreation are ambiguous, some positive and some negative depending on the type of activity, is disingenuous. Only a small portion of National Forest recreation use is associated with wilderness type use. The proposal is overwhelmingly negative to the vast majority of recreation users.

As in previous proposals, no quantification is made of the "other unroaded areas." Since many roads are being defined out of existence, the size of this category seems destined to grow. Indeed, proposed FSM 7703.1 a. (3) states: "However, maintenance of unclassified roads in roadless and unroaded areas is inappropriate as such activity would lead to defacto road development." This not only indicates vast ignorance or blatant disregard of the possible off-site effects of precluding action to correct drainage and run-off problems; it also eliminates options for future management decisions. This provision is counter-productive and should be eliminated.

These proposals contain no reasonable quantification of effects. No economic effects are quantified whatsoever. The proposed rule cites the Forest Service Handbook in the contention that documentation by an environmental impact statement is not necessary. We point out that the FSH does not preempt NEPA. There are significant environmental effects probable with this proposal. Just considering the annual timber harvest potential foregone (which we believe is a low estimate) would require an EIS under the intent of NEPA. The proposal requires that road construction and reconstruction in roadless and unroaded areas would require an EIS. Any individual action in these circumstances would be a relatively minor action compared to the proposal. This proposal therefor needs an EIS to document fully its effects, physical and economic, on the environment.

Without adequate road access for fire management, insect and disease control and response to other natural catastrophes, significant adverse impacts on soils, water quality and wildlife, including threatened and endangered species, will result. The

failure to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to analyze these direct and substantial consequences violates the National Environmental Policy Act.

We are concerned about the philosophical shift reflected in the proposal to adopt the term "Forest Service roads." These are not Forest Service roads. They are roads financed by public money and managed by the Forest Service for the benefit of the American people. It is important that the leadership of the Agency understand this important distinction. If they did, maybe they would be less cavalier in their approach to denying the public access to these lands.

Finally, the process by which you developed these proposals disturbs us. We take strong exception to the unprecedented actions of the agency in secretly soliciting and relying on the advice of a narrow spectrum of special interest groups in the development of road rules and policies to be submitted for public comment. Regardless of whether the agency is ultimately found to have violated the Federal Advisory Committee Act and other statutes, the credibility and reputation of the agency has been irreparably damaged. By choosing to solicit only one point of view, the agency has, not surprisingly, produced an unbalanced proposal, demonstrated a predisposition clearly inappropriate to the federal administrative process, and undermined public confidence in the notice and comment procedure.

We urge these proposals be withdrawn and rewritten. They are contrary to congressional intent as set forth in the Roads and Trails Act and in the RPA. Transportation planning should be integrated into the land management planning process as clearly contemplated by the Congress. We also urge the agency to use a broader spectrum of advisors in future rule-making.

/s/ Robert C. Van Aken, President.

Bart Stupak, Member of Congress, on May 11th wrote the following to Chief Dombeck:

I am writing to express my displeasure with the tone conveyed in portions of the Roadless Area Conservation Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). These condescending and ignorant statements are disrespectful. I demand that this text be struck from the final EIS and that a public apology be issued to the forestry workers of this country. Specifically, the Social Effects Related to Timber Harvest section (page 3-190) displays a patronizing attitude toward forestry workers and the communities where they reside. It states that "if Forest Service timber management policies are consistent and reliable, then forestry workers and their communities would 'adjust'." It is grossly arrogant to imply that forestry workers would prefer any "reliable" Forest Service policies over their job security. These workers depend on timber harvesting for their economic stability and to remove such jobs would only exacerbate conditions that plague some of their communities.

The Forest Service carelessly dabbles in "pop" psychology by characterizing forestry workers as uneducated, unstable, and unmotivated. It states that "many people enter the wood products industry because it provides opportunities to earn high wages without having a high level of education." Such a poorly referenced statement is particularly offensive. Many forestry workers may have college degrees but are natives

of the area who prefer to live and raise their families in their hometowns while working in a profession shared by their parents. If it is true, as described in the text, that "timber dependent communities are among the least prosperous", can the residents of that area be faulted for turning to forestry jobs that pay "high wages"? The thrust of page 3-190 tries to convince forestry workers, their families, and policymakers that timber related professions should be abandoned because of their inherent risk and lack of job security. It implies that given these conditions, everyone affected by the roadless initiative should naturally agree with Forest Service objectives. We can be certain that all forestry workers are well aware of the dangers associated with their work and are trained to minimize harm. They are aware of the uncertainty of their job security, but steadfastly remain committed to their work and providing for their families. Finally, they are aware of the economic problems facing some of their communities, which only motivates them to try to preserve their jobs and keep their town viable.

When the Forest Service misinterprets the composition, goals, and concerns of people in the timber industry, it mars the entire development of the roadless initiative. Forestry workers will be greatly impacted by the roadless initiative and it is necessary to understand who holds these positions and how they regard their work.

I am dismayed that the Forest Service would include such elitist and divisive comments in its DEIS. Clearly, the DEIS was not carefully reviewed and edited and I think it is appropriate to have such unfair statements removed from the final draft. Moreover, the Forest Service should issue a public apology to avoid undermining an already tenuous relationship between the Forest Service and those most affected by the roadless initiative.

Chief Mike Dombeck's response of May 15 to above letter:

Thank you for your letter of May 11, 2000, expressing concern about the tone conveyed in that portion of the draft roadless area rulemaking environmental impact statement (DEIS) that addresses social effects related to timber harvest.

Having grown up in northern Wisconsin's Chequamegon National Forest, I know first-hand the importance of timber jobs to rural communities across the Nation. Many friends, family members, and I in my younger years made a living from logging, guiding and recreation and tourism. In fact, I believe that we ought to strengthen this connection using timber harvest to accomplish land health objectives, where appropriate.

Like you, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for those who make their living logging and from other forest resources. If there is anything in the roadless DEIS that implies otherwise, I apologize and will ensure it is corrected in the final roadless area environmental impact statement.

Transcript of a letter to the Chief from a Forest Supervisor in the West:

As one of your senior Forest Supervisors, I feel I would be remiss if I did not pass on to you the concerns expressed at our roadless public hearings. We held two public hearings to accommodate the number of people who wanted to testify. Both hearings generated an intense amount of interest and attendance. On December 8, there were

488 people registered plus another 150 who did not register. On December 16, 361 registered with another 150 or so coming and going. So in total we had nearly 1,200 people in attendance and took testimony from 129 over 7 hours of sessions.

I've been a line officer for just over 20 years and a Forest Supervisor for over ten years. In all that time I have never experienced such public disbelief and animosity directed toward any policy proposal as this one. The crowd at our December 16 hearing was particularly interesting because it was just people with no axe to grind or special interest to defend. They were common folks who care about their way of life, families, and the national forests. We heard things like: *"assault on our way of life"; "no representation"; "object to the Forest Service telling me how to live"; "this is disrespectful"; "abuse of the people"; "we will not obey"; "what happened to the Forest Plan?"; "Forest Service arrogance"; "just don't understand"; "what happened to collaboration?"; and "this is my country and I want it back."*

One of the seniors from the high school government class testified saying, *"This initiative is a poor example of the proper workings of government."* This young man represents the next generation and even as a high school student he understands the implications and its fatal flaw.

Mike, I have never been so concerned about where an agency initiative will lead. Quite frankly, I could not agree more with my local public, their perspective and concerns. The track and approach we are on is just flat wrong. It mocks every speech and public statement regarding collaboration you have made since becoming Chief. Please don't jump to the conclusion that I want all roadless lands developed or believe we should log every tree. Nothing could be further from the truth. I believe and cherish what the Forest Service stands for and hold that in the highest esteem. However, in our entire history we have never taken this type of action on such an emotionally charged and controversial issue. It just cuts at the very heart of everything.

I realize in spite of everything, we will move forward. It is important for you to understand that people here are walking on the edge. There WILL be civil disobedience and possibly worse. The local people are that scared, threatened and frustrated. I spent last Sunday on the phone using all my powers of persuasion to convince local folks that civil disobedience during our hearings would not be in their best interest. Luckily, I was successful, but it will not happen a second time.

Another outcome will be opposition to implementation of the Natural Resource Agenda. Even when people understand and realize it is the right thing to do, we will be challenged. Projects like watershed restoration (i.e. road obliteration) and burning will come under increased scrutiny. Why? Fear, plain and simple. The Forest Service will reap the benefits of shattered local relationships long after you and I are gone. These people will not forget.

I ask two things of you. First, if you believe I am way off the mark with my concerns please check it out with my peers, particularly here in the West. Second, I hope that there is serious thought being given to some ongoing type of public involvement as the draft is developed and most importantly after the draft is released. If we do not do this well, it will be real ugly.

Letter from Chief to All Employees, March 14, 2000

I have spoken to many of you in recent weeks and know that you are all very busy. Retirees tell me they cannot remember when the Forest Service was involved in as many important conservation issues as we are today. This is exactly where we ought to be – engaged in the tug and pull of helping our nation to grapple with the most significant public land issues of our day.

Some of you have shared with me your discomfort about the contentious nature of the debate over issues such as roads, roadless areas, planning regulations, and county payments. Others have commended Forest Service leadership for taking on difficult issues that have defied resolution for decades. It is important to remember that most of these issues are not new. It has always been the responsibility of the Forest Service to respond to changing public values and new information.

Consider the issue of roadless areas. Chief John McGuire first attempted to resolve the roadless area question through a wilderness inventory (RARE I) that evolved into RARE II and was completed by Max Peterson. Then followed the first round of forest planning that was brought to completion under the tenure of Dale Robertson. Most recently, my immediate predecessor, Jack Ward Thomas, wrestled with the controversy of roadless areas by instructing that roadless areas be removed from the timber base if managers didn't intend to enter them.

All of these labors were in response to the growing body of scientific information and represented our best effort to reflect the will of the people. I hope that you take the long view when considering the roadless issue. The roadless area initiative does not plow new ground so much as it represents a new approach to an old problem. We went through RARE I and RARE II, we tried 20 years of local planning efforts, and a directive to forest supervisors to address the issue through plan adjustments, yet the controversy still persists.

The plain fact is that we spend so many human and financial resources on intractable issues such as roadless that it impedes our ability to act on other priorities such as: getting ahead of our maintenance backlog; providing jobs through forest and grassland restoration; conducting research to reduce consumer demand for, and recycling of wood fiber; building a highly valued and skilled workforce for the 21st century; and spreading the benefits of conservation from public lands to state and private lands.

We should continually ask what is it that will make the Forest Service unique in 10, 20, 50 years. I don't have all the answers, but I do know that in an increasingly developed landscape, rare and vanishing roadless area values such as wildness, naturalness, clean drinking water, wildlife and fish habitat, and dispersed recreation opportunities will become more and more important.

Finally, I know that many of you are concerned about the political undertone of the roadless dialogue. Natural resource management has always been controversial and political – from the creation of the “midnight reserves” by Gifford Pinchot and President Teddy Roosevelt, through early efforts by the Forest Service to regulate

grazing through Rachel Carson's publication of "Silent Spring," and yes, including our 25 years of wrestling with the issue of roadless areas.

We are moving forward through the roadless rulemaking standing on the shoulders of giants and building on the legacy they left to us. The conservation options before us today are testimony and tribute to the foresight of our earlier leaders. It is a legacy of which to be proud—one that will be remembered and appreciated by future generations. Now it is our turn. I am confident that our approach to conserving roadless lands will ensure that the world's foremost conservation organization stands tall in that accounting.

Thanks for your commitment to conservation.

□ □ □

BOOK REPORT

By Jim McConnell

I went to the library to see if they had a copy of the new book, *The Forest*, by Edward Rutherford. It was in the catalog but not available yet. On the way out I went by the new arrivals carousel and picked up a book called *Smoke Eaters*. It looked more interesting when I found out it was about the Forest Service. The sub-title was A THRILLER but the spine had the library's mystery stamp. It was both but to not give away the plot or the thrilling end, I'll quote the fly cover synopses. "Three years after qualifying for high command in the Forest Service, Mattie McCulloch is finally assigned to her first big fire. She is the first woman to hold the job. Under her are 1700 troops and an operation that costs one million dollars a day to run. Mattie is put in charge of the fire, called Justice Peak, after the camp is plagued with racial troubles, but that is only the beginning of her problems. Her son Jim is stationed at Justice, and she is torn between motherly concern and her duties as IC. Mattie also has to deal with subordinates who do not want her in charge and a group of nudists who do not want any firefighters on their land. As the tension of the firefight heightens, readers also learn that there is a psychopath on the loose. In his computer diary he writes about the games he likes to play with fire, and the amount of rage he displays toward women is frightening. Soon he begins to focus on Mattie and sends obscene and threatening messages." By the way, five firefighters are burned to death in an arson fire. The author, Christine Andreae, did her homework and has nailed the Forest Service culture to the wall. She has an engaging style and will keep you wondering to the very end who the psychopath is that betrays Mattie. Tom Clancy look out, here come the ladies. *Smoke Eaters*, by Christine Andreae is published by Thomas Dunne Books, \$24.95, but you should be able to find a copy in your local library. I recommend it.

(Anyone else among the readership who has read a good book lately and would like to share it with others, please send in a write-up and we'll use in *The Dixie Ranger*. *The Editors*).

I've learned that maturity has more to do with what types of experiences you've had and what you've learned from them and less to do with how many birthdays you've celebrated.

From Howard Burnett

□ □ □

ORAL HISTORY

Jim McConnell, under the auspices of the SFSRA, has interviewed Paul Russell who started his Forest Service career in 1934, and Ric Eriksson, who began his in 1930. Both gentlemen are in their 90's. Jim is using a tape recorder to record the interview. When some of these interviews are transcribed, we hope to use the information in upcoming articles in *The Dixie Ranger*.

□ □ □

No wonder the English language is so very difficult to learn:

He could lead if he could get the lead out.
A farm can produce produce.
The dump was so full it had to refuse refuse.
The soldier decided to desert in the desert.
The present is a good time to present the present.
At the Army base, a bass was painted on the head of a bass drum.
The dove dove into the bushes.
I did not object to the object.
The insurance for the invalid was invalid.
The bandage was wound around the wound.
There was a row among the oarsmen about how to row.
They were too close to the door to close it.
To help with planting, the farmer taught his sow to sow.
The wind was too strong to wind the sail.
I shed a tear when I saw the tear in my clothes.
I had to subject the subject to a series of tests.
How can I intimate this to my most intimate friend?
I spent last evening evening out a pile of dirt.

Coming in the next issue...

A Guide to Atlanta

A note about dues: Please check the date at the end of your name on the address label. (99) means that dues were not paid in 2000 and your name will drop from the rolls on January 1, 2001.

SOUTHERN FOREST SERVICE
RETIREES ASSOCIATION
70 WILKES COURT
NEWNAN, GA 30263-6124

PRESORTED
STANDARD
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
NEWNAN GA
PERMIT #34

IRA L BRAY
70 WILKES COURT
NEWNAN GA 30263 -6124

Note: Please make your luncheon reservations by September 12. See page 2 for phone numbers.

In This Issue:

Welcome	2	Roadless Areas	7
Luncheon	2	Book Report	20
Letters	3	Next Issue	21
In Memoriam	6		

OFFICERS: Robert Bowers, President, (770.205.1902) ; Vice-President (Vacant); Betty Bray, Sec.-Treas (770.253.0392)
BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Peaches Sherman (2000), Robert Johns (2001), Joyce Keith (2002) ,Ex-Officio, Jerry Edwards
EDITORS: Bert and Betty Bray E-mail: brayira@aol.com Phone: 770.253.0392

Published quarterly in February, May, August, and November. Dues are \$8 per year, payable in January. Mailing address:
Southern Forest Service Retirees Association, 70 Wilkes Court, Newnan, GA 30263