108

Subject: Fw: My response to message
Sender: pln3767 /Internet (pln3767@blackfoot.net)
Attached Date: 04/22/00 11:09
Priority: normal
Sensitivity: normal
Importance: normal

Part 1

FROM: pln3767 / Internet
DDT1=RFC-822; DDV1=pln3767@blackfoot.net;

TO: cleanwater / wo, caet-slc

Part 2

ARPA MESSAGE HEADER

Part 3

To whom this concerns

You can see by the letter that I've been informed as to the latest water/land/property grab by the government. Yes, this is how I feel, and would appreciate the answer of the riding questions presented in this letter. I'm concerned. All this leads to squeezing the little guy, namely us. We're tired of paying taxes to be sqandered on things that we don't believe in or support and when we see and talk to many, many other people who feel the same as we do we begin to wonder if our "public servants" understand what their jobs are. Consider this as my response to your latest "Act", understand that we are in OPPOSITION to the Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds and count it as such.

Thank you,

Dick and Debbie Martin
----- Original Message -----
From: People for the USA <pfusafnd@springsmail.com>
To: People for the USA Members, Supporters & Affiliates <pfusafnd@springsmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2000 2:51 PM

Fax Alert

April 21, 2000

To: PFUSA members and supporters
From: Jeff Harris, PFUSA executive director

April 24 is deadline for watersheds comments

Administration minds are hard at work thinking of new and better ways to complicate, regulate, or remove legitimate land uses. The latest version, a Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds (UFP), is the second phase of the infamous "Clean Water Action Plan." You remember the CWAP, don't you? That great scheme was unveiled in February 1998 and presented 111 actions desired by the Clinton Administration to insure "clean water!"
Funny part is, the CWAP was never released to the public for review and comment and was not mandated by Congress -- even though it suggests changes to virtually every activity existing today on public and private lands! CWAP attempts to expand the authority of the feds way beyond the intent Congress adopted with the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act speaks to water bodies -- CWAP speaks to watersheds. Quite a difference! The Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts took the bull by the horns and filed a lawsuit against CWAP in June 1999. Sixty-five other organizations and individuals, including PFUSA, joined in with WACD to challenge the authority

CAET RECEIVED
APR 24 2000

108

and validity of CWAP.
Undeterred by the pending litigation on CWAP, the Administration is requesting public comment on the UFP. Although some federal areas have experienced small watershed analyses, this policy requires planners to delineate, assess, and classify watersheds for all lands under federal control. These assessments will be the basis for determining which watersheds are "Priority Watersheds." Factors used in the evaluation of priority watersheds include "vulnerability to degradation" and "extent of public interest." Other key words ("desired future conditions" and "restoration") tell you where this is headed. And what about private lands or water rights? "The proposed policy would not apply to tribal, state, or private lands.however collaboration and partnerships are essential. In priority watersheds with a mix of federal and private lands, we will work with private sector landholders to involve them in the watershed management process."
Please spend a few minutes to jot a note to our "public servants" before the April 24 deadline OPPOSING this Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds. It is outside the intent of the Clean Water Act and undermines state and tribal authority to implement the CWA.
Some questions you can ask:
· Why weren't all land users and property owners notified about this new watershed emphasis? Why were only 4 public meetings scheduled? Why are you pushing this while litigation is pending?
· Where does multiple use fit in? Will existing plans have to be revised? Why isn't a cost-benefit analysis required? What is the cumulative impact of the UFP with the other 110 CWAP actions?
· How will public interest be gauged and used in the decision making process? Why didn't you define "significant public use values"?
· What are the indicators of improvement? What kinds of "special protection" do you propose?
· What is the expected cost and timeframe for implementation?

Here's the contact info: USDA - Forest Service/CAET, RE: Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds, Building 2, Suite 295, 5500 West Amelia Earhart Drive, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, fax (801) 517-1021, email: cleanwater/wo_caet-slc@fs.fed.us

Contact Pueblo for a copy of the PFUSA comment letter with more detail.
THANKS!

CAET RECEIVED
APR 24 2000

Subject: Fw: My response to message
Sender: pln3767 /Internet (pln3767@blackfoot.net)
Attached Date: 04/22/00 11:09
Priority: normal
Sensitivity: normal
Importance: normal

Part 1

FROM: pln3767 / Internet
DDT1=RFC-822; DDV1=pln3767@blackfoot.net;
TO: cleanwater / wo, caet-slc

Part 2

ARPA MESSAGE HEADER

Part 3

To whom this concerns
You can see by the letter that I've been informed as to the latest water/land/property grab by the government. Yes, this is how I feel, and would appreciate the answer of the riding questions presented in this letter. I'm concerned. All this leads to squeezing the little guy, namely us. We're tired of paying taxes to be sqandered on things that we don't believe in or support and when we see and talk to many, many other people who feel the same as we do we begin to wonder if our "public servants" understand what their jobs are. Consider this as my response to your latest "Act", understand that we are in OPPOSITION to the Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds and count it as such.

Thank you,

Dick and Debbie Martin
----- Original Message -----
From: People for the USA <pfusafnd@springsmail.com>
To: People for the USA Members, Supporters & Affiliates
<pfusafnd@springsmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2000 2:51 PM

Fax Alert

April 21, 2000

To: PFUSA members and supporters
From: Jeff Harris, PFUSA executive director

April 24 is deadline for watersheds comments

Administration minds are hard at work thinking of new and better ways to complicate, regulate, or remove legitimate land uses. The latest version, a Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds (UFP), is the second phase of the infamous "Clean Water Action Plan." You remember the CWAP, don't you? That great scheme was unveiled in February 1998 and presented 111 actions desired by the Clinton Administration to insure "clean water!"
Funny part is, the CWAP was never released to the public for review and comment and was not mandated by Congress -- even though it suggests changes to virtually every activity existing today on public and private lands! CWAP attempts to expand the authority of the feds way beyond the intent Congress adopted with the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act speaks to water bodies -- CWAP speaks to watersheds. Quite a difference! The Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts took the bull by the horns and filed a lawsuit against CWAP in June 1999. Sixty-five other organizations and individuals, including PFUSA, joined in with WACD to challenge the authority

and validity of CWAP.
Undeterred by the pending litigation on CWAP, the Administration is requesting public comment on the UFP. Although some federal areas have experienced small watershed analyses, this policy requires planners to delineate, assess, and classify watersheds for all lands under federal control. These assessments will be the basis for determining which watersheds are "Priority Watersheds." Factors used in the evaluation of priority watersheds include "vulnerability to degradation" and "extent of public interest." Other key words ("desired future conditions" and "restoration") tell you where this is headed. And what about private lands or water rights? "The proposed policy would not apply to tribal, state, or private lands.however collaboration and partnerships are essential. In priority watersheds with a mix of federal and private lands, we will work with private sector landholders to involve them in the watershed management process."
Please spend a few minutes to jot a note to our "public servants" before the April 24 deadline OPPOSING this Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds. It is outside the intent of the Clean Water Act and undermines state and tribal authority to implement the CWA.
Some questions you can ask:
· Why weren't all land users and property owners notified about this new watershed emphasis? Why were only 4 public meetings scheduled? Why are you pushing this while litigation is pending?
· Where does multiple use fit in? Will existing plans have to be revised? Why isn't a cost-benefit analysis required? What is the cumulative impact of the UFP with the other 110 CWAP actions?
· How will public interest be gauged and used in the decision making process? Why didn't you define "significant public use values"?
· What are the indicators of improvement? What kinds of "special protection" do you propose?
· What is the expected cost and timeframe for implementation?

Here's the contact info: USDA - Forest Service/CAET, RE: Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds, Building 2, Suite 295, 5500 West Amelia Earhart Drive, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, fax (801) 517-1021, email: cleanwater/wo_caet-slc@fs.fed.us

Contact Pueblo for a copy of the PFUSA comment letter with more detail.
THANKS!