

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/13/2024 1:39:34 AM

First name: Richard

Last name: Luczynski

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I'm making comments on the Deep Creek and White Water River comprehensive River Management Plan # 61613. My comments will be directed to an area I'm familiar with Deep Creek, particularly upper Deep Creek in the San Bernardino Mts. I have owned property in the area for 51 years. My comments follow:

1) I believe the initial part of the CRMP process was to complete

a Resource Assessment describing the Baseline conditions of the ORV's. When was the previous (RA) completed? When was the starting point and finish draft of the current (RA)? If ORV.s become the basis for managing the (WSR Corridors) they must become the basis for the CRMP?

2) Does the San Bernardino National Forest have the personal to manage such a large area of this CRMP plan? I haven't seen what efforts the Forest Service has made for such services and how they don't communicate very well with the general public.

3) What is the current definition of the Forest Service Policy on Forest Management? I've seen mentioned it is to "maintain or enhance wildlife and fishing habitat for threatened and endangered species" If this is so then they must have a list of such threatened and endangered species showing a history of the management skills they will use on this WSR system a quarter of a mile on both sides of Deep Creek? Where will the Forest Service get the resources to do a proper job? Will they request help from the Calif. Department of Fish and Wildlife? That organization isn't communicating either with the public. What have they done as a partner organization for many issues dealing with fish habitat issues on Deep Creek?

4) It has been said that "If you control the process you control the outcome" Where has the Forest Service been on this procedure through out the entire process with communicating with the public? If only 3 meetings between the Forest Service and the BLM put together this project what does it say about what will happen looking forward with Forest Service management plans that they will need to carry out?

I will be writing several comment letters for my comments to the CRMP. Page (1)

Page 2: Is asphalt allowed to enter the Deep Creek water shed under the CRMP plan? It happens at Snow Valley.

Who is monitoring the Water Quality down stream in the Recreational corridor of Deep Creek from Snow Valley as it passes government land as well as private land that is within the 1/4 mile on both sides of the stream?

2) Under the CRMP plan is it possible to finally establish the connection or not with Deep Creek surface flow and groundwater

well extraction occurring several months of the year without any monitoring being done to collect data on stream flow with and without extraction taking place in a manner that might solve one of the issues in the CRMP Plan Recreational corridor? Currently an issue that has been neglected,

3) As a follow up, The water basin in which Snow Valley has a 1000' groundwater well, that isn't named by the State and is not

State monitored. Who is protecting the Groundwater when the same Organization that will be managing the resource is giving it away with no public knowledge of the value the water would benefit the larger communities for many other purposes?

4) Could we find out more about who inserted the paragraph into the CRMP document without greater explanation as to why it was necessary for the Recreational Corridor? It was certainly something that a lawyer helped to craft? As Stated: This CRMP doesn't withdraw or invalidate existing rights within the corridor.

Notably special provisions associated with Deep Creek (WSR)

designation. State that the operation of the Snow Valley Ski Resort as well as the State regulations of water rights and water quality associated with operating the resort would not be affected by the designation (Public Law-9) existing land uses in the Deep Creek WSR corridor are discussed in the land uses and access in River

Corridor Boundaries." This seems as if some Public

Trust Resources relating to the CRMP are being given away with the use of Special Use Permits, not mentioned. This paragraph needs much more discussion to flush out its true meaning and why it was necessary and for who's protection? Does the Management of the Forest work for the people or are they beholden to corporation needs without any responsibilities ?

5) If groundwater is extracted in the summer/fall month's has the Forest Service, Snow Valley or Department Fish and Wildlife

considered the rising water temperature in the stream? I don't believe they even consider the problem. If they did they might have done greater studies for longer periods of time than just one day and make only spot observations with no follow ups. If constant groundwater extraction continues there will never be the realization that surface flow that was once in the stream longer in the past when no groundwater was extracted will never return to the dry warm months of summer and fall. The

mention these past 20 years of global warming and water resource conservation efforts hasn't been a strong suit for the Forest Service Management. Just looking at the greater use in just one venue during severe drought makes me feel that the current Forest Management team is not up to the task looking forward.

Page 3

1)How will the CRMP plan work along side other public agencies

when considering public Safety issues? Patrolling stream corridors on a greater necessity when more people realize the WSR status of all that Deep Creek offers? Earthquakes and Fires need a plan to get greater numbers of people off the mountain in time of confusion.

2) Will the CRMP include public service projects for individuals and organizations?

3) What other Recreational assets exist currently in Upper Deep Creek that will be managed by the CRMP

4) Why does the Forest Service have such a high turn over rate and how will long term management be preserved?

5) Have all the intermitted water sources been identified entering the Deep Creek drainage? How will they be identified and protected from future development projects?

6) How will the narrows be managed under this plan? Many people come to this location and have done great harm over the

many years I have monitored the location. It does have all the features of ORV's values.

7) will the CRMP create special additional area's for off roading?

8) In 2005 when all ORV's were studied no further revisions or additions were added. It's hard to believe that some revisions would seem necessary after 20 years. The mountains just doesn't look the same since I arrived many many years ago. The choices are still The River, Scenic, Recreational, Geologic, Fish and Wildlife.

I believe this is the end of my comments for the up coming

decisions to be made on this project. There is certainly room to

hear so much more from the Forest Service which I don't have

high esteem of like I had in the past. They were much more helpful and friendly. Today some maybe that way but

I haven't met them yet. Maybe it's because the organization is still short handed and they still hide behind covid. I

never knew a person who got Covid from answering the phone. I look forward to working with others and

developing the best plan for water

resources and all that can't live without it.

Richard Luczynski

