

Forest Plan Revision Comments Received from February 8, 2008 through August 14, 2008		
Comment	Source / Location	Date
<p>Re: Wilderness Recommendation for the Black Mesa Ranger District Grand Canyon Wildlands Council is devoted to the protection and restoration of wild nature throughout northern Arizona and southern Utah. The Center for Biological Diversity is a non-profit, public interest environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. Arizona Wilderness Coalition is an organization of groups and individuals whose mission is to protect and restore wilderness lands and waters in Arizona.</p> <p>Enclosed are our wilderness proposals for the Black Mesa Ranger District, submitted as part of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest Plan revision process. If you or your staff has any questions regarding the proposal please contact us.</p>	Letter-Flagstaff- 1930	2/1/2008
<p>Grand Canyon Wilderness Council and Arizona Wilderness Coalition wilderness the Black Mesa Ranger District (Available upon request)</p> 	Letter-Flagstaff- 1930	2/1/2008
<p>Leave all as is !! We camp at all of these. It is our primary source of recreation. We leave any site we camped clean.</p>	Comment Form -Holbrook-2878-1	2/13/2008
<p>Good afternoon: I am writing about the "Forest Plan Revision" Why is Washington, DC making decisions about Arizona forests? Arizona forests have different different needs than other states. Arizona people should make the decision concerning our forests. The forest is public land. I should not be restricted from any part of public land, nor should I be charged for the use of public land.</p>	Comment Form-Overgaard- 2879-1	2/15/2008
<p>I would prefer that no forest roads be closed: 50 - 51 - 166 - 125 - 124 - 87 - 86 - 210 - 122 - 179 - 504 - 95 - 228 - 99 - 88 - 88A - 916 - 146 - 300 - 110 - 149. I use these roads to access the lakes, firewood-cutting, to enjoy wildlife, scenery, hunt for food, to visit Indian ruins, see old homesteads, to have family picnics, camping, to ride ATV, etc. Again, leave Arizona forests to Arizona jurisdiction. Thank you for your attention in this matter, and please contact me when you receive this letter.</p>	Comment Form-Overgaard- 2879-1	2/15/2008
<p>Upon review of your proposed plan of work for developed recreation sites I wish to make these comments: Willow Springs Boat Launch, Big Lake Cove Boating Site & South Cove Boating Site Bunch, Crescent Dam Area: Fees should not be added for use of these areas. We already buy a boat tag, are taxed on some fishing gear, purchase of fishing license. Add to this the average user is driving several hours or miles to get there. More fees will be a burden on the average family who wants to have their family experience this type of recreation. You will turn away future users by more fees. Years ago we quit fishing the Apache Reservation as they kept increasing fees. In addition to fishing license, a permit to picnic was needed. I would not object to raising a boat tag \$5 a year. But to charge more each time a boat is launched is ridiculous.</p>	Letter-Overgaard-81	2/20/2008

<p>The health and protection of the forest should be your greatest priority, even if it means the extreme rule of prohibiting people from using it. It is evident that wide spread abuse from off highway vehicles is occurring. Signs about non-motorized trails are inadequate. There is inadequate enforcement. The forest too big. The greater good needs to be kept in perspective. Do not bow to greedy selfish people who care only about themselves and their pleasures to the detriment of the forest. The forest is home to all kinds of wildlife etc.... Would you like to have an ATV whizzing in front of you while you are watching television? I think our Wildlife matters!!!</p> <p>Thanks for allowing people to give their input! Bottom line: Close roads and narrow the use of off-road use.</p>	E-mail-Show Low-2121	2/22/2008
<p>Enclosed is our proposal for the Mogollon and Chevelon Wildlife Conservation Areas. Please include this as part of our submission for Special Area designation as part of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest forest plan revision process.</p>	Letter-Flagstaff-2540-+	2/29/2008
<p>Grand Canyon Wildlands Council proposal for the Mogollon and Chevelon Wildlife Conservation Areas (available upon request)</p> 	Letter-Flagstaff-2540-+	2/29/2008
<p>Is there any new information regarding the timeline for the A-S Forest Plan revision process?</p>	E-mail-Grand Canyon-2681-+	3/1/2008
<p>RE: Development of New Electric Transmission Corridors on United States Forest Service Lands</p> <p>The transmission regulators, governmental entities, transmission users, owners, operators, and environmental entities that participate in the Southwest Area Transmission (SWAT) Planning Group would like to convey their support for the identification of new transmission line corridors across lands managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS). The goal of SWAT is to promote responsible regional transmission planning in the Desert Southwest while maintaining the integrity of the existing facilities. SWAT strongly supports the identification of new transmission line utility corridors across federally-managed forests in Arizona as part of the ongoing Forest Plan Revision process. For more information about the SWAT Planning Group and the SWAT members please visit our Web site at http://www.westconnect.com/init regionalplan.php.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-2880-1	3/6/2008
<p>Electric utilities operate and maintain hundreds of miles of electric transmission lines on federally managed forests in Arizona and throughout the Southwest. The location of current and future power sources and locations of electric load have increased the likelihood that new transmission lines will need to cross one or more of the forests within Arizona. For example, many of the existing and proposed generating resources that provide energy to Arizona's metropolitan areas are located in northeastern Arizona and northwestern New Mexico. These same geographic regions have been identified as having favorable resource conditions for the development of renewable energy generation projects, including solar, wind, and biomass facilities. Based on a recent mandate by the State of Arizona that will require utilities to incorporate renewable energy resources for 15% of their base energy load by 2025, additional electrical transmission lines across forests in Arizona will be required.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-2880-1	3/6/2008

<p>The designation of separate corridors for future power lines crossing USFS-managed land in Arizona will enable utilities to reduce the potential for multiple transmission line outages resulting from forest fires or other significant events impacting multiple transmission lines within the same corridor. The effects of the ongoing regional drought and bark beetle damage have been well documented. These effects have significantly increased the potential for prolonged and devastating forest fires, evidenced by several large-scale fires in recent years. These fires put at risk all built elements within their path, including transmission lines and associated infrastructure. Electrical outages from fire damage can have wide-ranging implications on a utility's ability to provide electric service, especially when the typical fire season occurs during the same timeframe as peak electric usage. The concept of locating new transmission lines immediately adjacent to existing like facilities, as has been the guideline in current Forest Plans</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-2880-1</p>	<p>3/6/2008</p>
<p>The energy industry believes that creating new corridors can be done in an environmentally sensitive manner and consistent with NEPA requirements. The industry further recognizes the importance of US Forest Service values and goals. SWAT is not requesting the Forest Service to abandon their existing policy on co-location of energy facilities. As previously noted with DOE, co-location is acceptable but only when regional reliability studies indicate additional separation is not required. We believe new plans can be developed, with stakeholder participation, for criteria and processes to be utilized to site new lines in existing or new corridors.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-2880-1</p>	<p>3/6/2008</p>
<p>SWAT has participated in the Department of Energy (DOE) efforts to implement provisions of EPAct 2005 Section 368 (Energy Corridors on Federal Lands). During the public scoping process SWAT submitted verbal and written comments on the need for new transmission corridors from the Phoenix metropolitan area to the Arizona-New Mexico border area. SWAT reiterated the need for new transmission corridors in its comments on the draft corridor map issued by DOE. For your convenience, SWAT's written comments are attached.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-2880-1</p>	<p>3/6/2008</p>
<p>SWAT understands that Arizona Public Service has provided written comments to the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, Coronado, Kaibab, Prescott, and Tonto National Forests regarding the need to identify and designate new utility corridors as part of the Forest Plan Revisions. SWAT supports APS in its efforts and would like to work with the U.S. Forest Service to support a process that will allow utilities to site and construct new facilities in a responsible and efficient manner. Please contact me if you have questions or would like to discuss this matter. Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-2880-1</p>	<p>3/6/2008</p>
<p>1) Preliminary Issue: Dispersed Camping - Are there enough designated dispersed camping sites identified on the Proposed Action? No, there are not enough designated dispersed camping sites in the proposed action. I believe that this number should be greatly expanded. Out of over 6,000 miles of roads in the Apache Sitgreaves NF, only 1,700 existing individual campsites will be available. That is just over one campsite every 3.5 miles of road. That alone is ridiculous; however, when you consider the fact that many "campgrounds" are bunched together in small areas, it becomes even more absurd. Even with the "recreational corridors," this is not enough. A partial solution: make every road in every district a recreational corridor as well as triple the number of individual campsites.</p>	<p>E-mail-Dublin, OH-2881-1</p>	<p>3/11/2008</p>

<p>2) Preliminary Issue: Big Game Retrieval ? Is the proposed policy satisfactory? Under the new proposal, big game retrieval would be allowed up to a mile off of an open road. There are two components to this: (1) up to a mile; and (2) of an open road. First (#1 above), why limit it to only a mile? Why not two or five? How are you expected to retrieve your big game over a mile? Second (#2 above), what if you are not near an open road? While the current proposal provides an exception for big game retrieval, the exception is too narrow. This needs to be changed to allow unlimited access for big game retrieval.</p>	E-mail-Dublin, OH-2881-1	3/11/2008
<p>3) Preliminary Issue: Adequate Forest Access ? Is the proposed transportation system adequate for your planned activities? The proposed transportation system is not adequate for my travel activities. Because of the road closures throughout the Apache Sitgreaves NF, not only will I not be able to camp in certain areas, but I will also not be able to travel on many of the roads currently open. The Forest Service is using the maintenance of the roads as a reason to close them, but they rarely maintained the roads anyway. The transportation system should be expanded in every district to provide for increased travel and camping needs.</p>	E-mail-Dublin, OH-2881-1	3/11/2008
<p>4) Other Issues: Firewood retrieval: the firewood retrieval plan is completely inadequate. When you close many roads, you are decreasing the opportunity to cut firewood while increasing the impact on the environment by targeting specific areas to increased traffic. This conflicts with the "goals" of the TMP. The Forest Service should leave more of the forest open to minimize the environmental impacts on certain areas. An unlimited and uninhibited firewood retrieval plan would allow for that.</p>	E-mail-Dublin, OH-2881-1	3/11/2008
<p>I would like to comment on the proposed Public Motorized Travel Management Project. I have several concerns with the Project as proposed: Destructive and unrestrained ATV and OHV use is being blamed for the majority of proposed changes. If this is indeed the case, why place so many restrictions on lawful users, rather than trying to regulate these abusers? Why is my access to the forest being controlled to punish those who are doing the damage? I believe most of those doing the damage do it out of ignorance rather than mischief. A well-organized public education program (billboards in the forest!) would be a strong deterrent that would allow the forests to remain open.</p>	E-Mail-Heber-127-+	3/11/2008
<p>The Forest Service is using this travel management plan to close roads they want to close, regardless of public concern. As proof of this, you are already closing roads, even before the plan goes into effect. Evidence of this fact is apparent all over the forest. One such area is along Highway 260, west of Heber. Forest Roads 9555, 9568, 9566, 9567, 9596 and others are already closed. Why the hurry to lock me out? Why not at least wait until this sham of public input is completed? Why not leave all posted numbered roads open and punish abusers? Another example is the failure to rotate quiet areas such as Snowcrest, Turkey Beaver, etc. These areas have been closed with no intent to ever reopen them, even though this goes against the current Forest Plan. All over the Rodeo-Chediski area roads have been permanently closed, supposedly for public protection against falling trees, but these roads will never be re-opened, and all this has been done far in advance of this plan. A few examples are: Roads 9555Y, 9317, 95871, 9586P, 50F, 9572E, etc. I could go on and on, but you see my point.</p>	E-Mail-Heber-127-+	3/11/2008

<p>Firewood cutting is another concern. The Forest Service news release on the modified proposal states that "Firewood gathering would continue using the current Forest Service permit system with some minor modifications to ensure the gathering is done in accord with the Travel Management Rule." This sounds fine until you find out all this means is that firewood gathering will be done only in specific, designated areas at the discretion of the Forest Service, which is a far cry from the current permit system. Forest-wide fuelwood permits should continue to be available at a reasonable cost, since to do otherwise will place an unwarranted economic hardship on those of us who depend on fuelwood from the forest for our winter heat.</p>	<p>E-Mail-Heber-127-+</p>	<p>3/11/2008</p>
<p>Off road cross-country big game retrieval, as proposed, is unacceptable. First, it is restricted to only deer and elk. Why allow thousands of deer and elk hunters the privilege and deny the same to a few antelope, bear and lion hunters? Also, none of the Game Management Units on the Sitgreaves side of the forest have a firearms deer hunt before the cut-off of October 31. So it is disingenuous to say that deer hunters can utilize cross-country motorized travel to retrieve their game since there is no firearms deer season during the allowed time.</p>	<p>E-Mail-Heber-127-+</p>	<p>3/11/2008</p>
<p>At the public meeting in Heber on March 8, I was told the cut-off date was chosen not because of likely habitat damage, but that after November 1 the weather is cool enough to greatly lessen the chance of meat spoilage due to hot weather, and that if the weather was always cool enough to mitigate spoilage, there would be no off road retrieval allowed at all. Who decided that the only acceptable method of big game retrieval is to pack it out on your back? If I am not damaging the habitat, I should be allowed to drive to my down animal. Another point: On designated roads, I can drive 300 feet off road to camp, but I can't drive 30 feet to retrieve an animal. This makes no sense. Please have the courage to resist the lock-it up crowd and keep our forests open for multiple use as they are intended to be used. Thank you</p>	<p>E-Mail-Heber-127-+</p>	<p>3/11/2008</p>
<p>I would like to submit my comments regarding the Forest Plan Revision in the Apache Sitgreaves National Forest. I have lived in AZ for 17 years. My husband and our three dogs use the forest quite frequently. We also have a 35' fifth wheel and a Yamaha Rhino. We drop camp. We ALWAYS obey and respect the forest and it's wild inhabitants. We feel very priveleged to be there. We stay on trails of which there are plenty of!!! There is also adequate drop camp sites and public camping.</p>	<p>Email-Glendale-2882-1</p>	<p>3/13/2008</p>
<p>Over the years we have seen a definat increase in the use of the forest by the public. Many people are not as "nice" as we are to the forest. We have witnessed shooting of wildlife- not during hunting season and OHV's not staying on the trails. As an avid outdoor family, my husband and I sincerely feel that there should not be any more roads added or opened up in this forest. There are plenty!!! If we keep opening up pristine areas to the masses and the all too "heavy-hands" of man, when does it end?? Once we ruin the forest, it will never be the same and what will be left for future generations? Please have foresite and leave it like it is. Thank you for giving me this opportunity. Please feel free to contact me if need be. I would be more than happy to speak in public as an OHV user that strongly disagrees!</p>	<p>Email-Glendale, AZ-2882-1</p>	<p>3/13/2008</p>
<p>Grazing Plan Revision. We have enclosed some of the references for this paper. We hope you will take th etime to read all of the information. We feel the new plan should address two critical issues. *Misplaced reasoning that disturbance is harmful to riparian areas. We have over the past 70 to 80 years removed disturbance form th eforest with catastrophic results. Let's not make the same mistake with our streams. *The one tool that can be intricately managed on our forest lands by the district ranger, range con and rancher is livestock. this coop is adaptable to the multiple changes and chaos presented by nature. Recreation, mining, logging, etc are not so malleable. If we can be of assistance to you in any way, please let us know.</p>	<p>Letter - Safford - 709, Clifton-408, 781</p>	<p>4/9/2008</p>

 <p>Grazing Plan Comments (Available Upon Request)</p>	<p>Letter - Safford - 709, Clifton-408, 781</p>	<p>4/9/2008</p>
<p>"Forest Areas" on the mountain, but lately I've seen some rather disturbing changes happening around my home.</p> <p>1-I feel it important for the National Forestry service to work more closely with the Game and Fish Dep. (you can't have one without the other.)</p> <p>2-I'm glad to see the 4x4's have been restricted to designated areas. I remember when they were still allowed to go everywhere, and man can those little machines sure tear-up everything! way to go!</p> <p>3-My main concern as of late has been the extensive and vast "clearing-out" of all the underbrush from the local forests. I understand the necessity for good tree management and fire control, but the current measures being taken seem rather devastating. Where will the deer and other wildlife go? Do they not need this ground cover for shelter, camouflauge, bedding, food, nesting & hiding for their young? how can they stay in a place that has been entirely stripped of all these things? I don't feel this is an overstatement. there are many places where you can "see st</p>	<p>Email-White Mtns-2892-1</p>	<p>5/14/2008</p>
<p>The Town of Pinetop-Lakeside inquired about a special designation for Woodland Lake Park, part of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest. Based on the Park's resource values and existing and future public uses, we believe that special designation as part of the ongoing Apache-Sitgreaves national Land and Resource Management Plan revision process could be appropriate. Michele Davalos, Forest Plan Revision Team leader, and planning staff members conducted a site visit May 22nd to assess the merits of a special designation based on watershed, riparian, recreation, and educational values. Councilmember Norris Dodd and I were able to join and benefit from the site visit led by Ed Collins, Lakeside Ranger District Director.</p>	<p>Letter-Pinetop-Lakeside-2895</p>	<p>5/23/2008</p>
<p>We appreciate your interest and expertise in evaluating our Park for what we hope is one of your riparian habitats in good condition. As partners sharing the National Forest, we want to work with you to preserve this scenic beauty. We realize we must weave the Town's economic and social infrastructure into the basic fabric of our trees, creeks, and meadows.</p> <p>Thank you to you and your staff for considering our request.</p>	<p>Letter-Pinetop-Lakeside-2895</p>	<p>5/23/2008</p>
<p>Re: Comments on Revised Forest Plan (Apache- Sitgreaves National Forest)</p> <p>The Arizona Cattle Growers Association (ACGA) would like to take this opportunity to comment on the ongoing forest planning.</p> <p>In many cases, the past Forest Plan attempted to address resource concerns or desired conditions through the setting of general standards. In many instances, use of those standards proved to be impracticable, unrealistic and unsupported by science when they were applied specifically to many of the ecosystems of the Southwest Region. Therefore, we strongly support the Regional Forester's direction that new forest plans be "scientifically credible" by ensuring that "the [Forest Plan] revision efforts consider and utilize the best available science."</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>

<p>Forest Plans should provide management direction that is broad in scope covering large geographic areas by ecosystem type (i.e., while 30% bare ground may be a sound standard for predominantly grassland or oak / savannah communities, it is inapplicable to lower elevation Sonoran Desert communities where bare ground occurrence is naturally far greater than 30% as a general rule). Revised plans should also address fire treatment and ecological restoration work and the possibilities of using livestock in conjunction with those efforts.</p> <p>There are numerous studies showing that controlled grazing benefits many ecological communities. More often than not, however, these studies are ignored while other studies that compare uncontrolled grazing to no grazing at all are relied upon. This practice is improper and not scientifically credible. Therefore, we are providing a list of relevant and reliable scientific publications (attachment A) that we believe should be referenced and used whenever decisions are made with the regard to livestock grazing.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>
<p><u>Planning and Management of Forest Lands</u></p> <p>The FS should work cooperatively with other federal agencies, state land management agencies, local and tribal governments and state and local organizations, associations and leaders of affected communities when developing and implementing land management decisions. These groups should have ample time to review and provide input into the planning and decision-making processes. No particular special interest group should be given unfair weight in influencing these processes or decision.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>
<p><u>Access, Recreation and Tourism</u></p> <p>Traditionally, the communities impacted most by forest planning decisions are rural communities. These communities enjoy and have become accustomed to having reasonable access to FS lands. The quantum increase of recreational use over the past decade, however, has produced substantial, negative effects in many areas that need to be addressed in the revised forest plan. These effects include resource degradation due to increased ATV and other off-road, motorized vehicle use. Canyon bottoms and flats are also degraded because of their ever-increasing use as campsites. All too often, it is the grazing permittee who bears the entire cost for this recreational use excess in the form of reduced livestock numbers. This situation is fundamentally unfair. Therefore, we urge you to specifically address the issue of resource degradation attributable to excessive recreational use in the revised forest plan.</p> <p>There are occasions where accesses to public lands are through private property. In those cases, agencies should re-evaluate their access routes to public lands and identify those where the cross</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>
<p><u>Customs and Cultures</u></p> <p>The rancher and cowboy are known worldwide and play an important role in American History and the "Wild West". This culture and lifestyle is important to present and future American lives. Past generations were racially and culturally diverse and consisted of Native Americans, miners, ranchers, loggers, explorers, and religious leaders. These customs and cultures are an important part of the interracial fabric of the rural communities that rely on FS lands for an economic base.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>
<p><u>Economy and Tax Base</u></p> <p>Historically, the economic and tax bases of rural communities have been extremely dependant on FS lands and those products derived from the harvest of resources off of those lands. This still holds true today. Extractive industries, such as mining, and renewable resource industries, such as livestock production, are the bases of the economic well-being of many rural communities. Decision making in regard to these types of industries must therefore be pursued with the greatest sensitivity to economic impacts in mind, and with the goal of maintaining sustainable resource production over time.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>

<p><u>Ecosystems and Wildlife</u> Well-managed Forest Service lands play a vital and corresponding role in ensuring the health of the Region's rural communities' economies and tax bases. People, such as ranchers, are integral parts of the fabric that sustains objective and responsible management of these lands over time. Ranchers provide services as a function of their grazing operations that benefit wildlife enormously. Without the ranchers, these benefits would be lost. Therefore, it is imperative that assessments of both ecosystem and wildlife population health, and ultimately any long term management strategy, recognize and factor these contributions in by use of relevant and reliable scientific methodology.</p>	Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894	5/27/2008
<p><u>Land Exchanges</u> Early on in proposed land exchanges, the FS should apprise and actively involve city and state governments in the land exchange process. Lands containing archeological sites, riparian and watershed critical areas should include mitigation provisions. When land exchanges are made, there should be no net loss of private land within a county. Land exchanges should minimize sprawl and value "open space". Grazing allotments should not be impacted negatively nor made valueless due to land exchanges.</p>	Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894	5/27/2008
<p><u>Mining and Extractive Industries</u> Mining and other extractive industries are important parts of the economies of rural communities. These industries have a long history of customs and cultures that are important to our nation. These industries supply jobs and goods to countries around the world while creating a better quality of life for individuals in rural areas by creating new wealth through resource production. Where applicable, the FS should support and encourage mining and other resource production industries in rural Arizona.</p>	Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894	5/27/2008
<p><u>Multiple Uses</u> The FS is mandated by congress to carry out the multiple uses of FS lands. When the FS administers policies regarding the multiple uses of these lands, it should also evaluate the revenues generated by such use to local, state, and national economies. The harvesting of natural resources, both renewable and extractive, should be encouraged and supported because such is vital to the economic health of rural economies.</p>	Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894	5/27/2008
<p><u>Ranching and Livestock Grazing</u> Historically, in many counties throughout Arizona, successful ranching operations have depended, and continue to depend in large part, on responsible, well-managed use of FS lands. In most rural counties of the Southwest Region, the economic contribution of ranching is a large part of the resource base. Ranching also provides the citizens of these counties other, more intangible benefits in the form of a historical context of being, sense of place, culture and custom. To maintain and enhance the benefits of ranching to rural counties and their citizens, the adaptive management method of livestock management should be used in place of more scripted methods whenever practicable. The best available science should be the guideline to be used.</p>	Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894	5/27/2008
<p><u>Timber- Forest Maintenance</u> Forest health has long been a subject of controversy. In all cases, forest health is interrelated with watershed health. For years, fire suppression and diminished timber harvest have combined to cause our forests to become over-choked by woody vegetation. Fire, timber harvest and livestock grazing are important tools to be used in reestablishing healthy forests. Forest land should be managed to encourage beneficial fire while reducing the threat of catastrophic fire. Timber sales should be encouraged to produce products and monies for rural schools through the outlying counties by sales and fees. After harvesting, reforestation should follow for future harvesting. Livestock grazing should be managed to encourage scientifically-supported, sustainable harvest of resources and as a tool to reduce the potential for catastrophic wild fire.</p>	Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894	5/27/2008

<p><u>Water, Watershed and Riparian Areas</u> Existing water rights need to be protected. Vegetation and uplands should be actively managed to increase water quantity. Grazing should be used as a tool to manage watershed, uplands and riparian areas. Riparian vegetation use by livestock should be managed by timing, intensity and season of use rather than by stubble height. Only peer-reviewed scientific methods should be used to gauge the health of and monitor riparian areas and their inhabitants. Internally created models of conditions, or other methods similarly lacking in reliability (because of their lack of ground-truthing, peer-review, or both) are not scientifically credible and therefore should not be used for the purpose of gauging riparian, rangeland, watershed or other resource health.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>
<p>Lastly, your statement contained in "Humans in the Ecosystems" page 5, that you are going to "identify" land that is "suitable" for grazing and other multiple uses, seems contradictory to the Regional Direction cited above.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Forest Planning, and we look forward to continue working with you on this matter,</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix- 2893, 1931, 2894</p>	<p>5/27/2008</p>
<p>I stopped at Aspen campground on 6/19/08 to fix a sandwich using a picnic table. I had spent \$16 the previous night staying at Grayling campground at Big Lake. Upon getting my food out of the truck, I was approached by a man on a golf cart who said it would be a \$3 charge to picnic or fish in the area. This is wrong! That table was probably the same one I used in 1965 and was paid for many times over by my federal tax money. I was going to get zero services for the \$3 and I told the man so and left. You are killing the USA by charging user-fees for such things. In two days in the Forest I did not see a single Forest Service truck. the only Forest Service people I saw were fire control folks, thank God for them! Don't charge us for what we have already paid for!</p>	<p>Email-2896</p>	<p>6/20/2008</p>