

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/20/2024 11:34:23 PM

First name: Richard

Last name: Luczynski

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My comments and objections to the Deep Creek CRMP follows.

1) What was the reason for not including the Headwaters of

Deep Creek in this CRMP? There was only mentioned on page 3 of the CRMP plan Paragraph 3. I've stated this paragraph in my June

13&14th comment letter. I worry that something nefarious is being planned in the future for the Headwaters of Upper Deep Creek.

2) Recently the San Bernardino Mts. had a damaging fire. The scope of the damage looks alarming and I wonder if it is possible for the existing staffing of the SBNFS, will they be able to manage the thousands of acres that will need constant monitoring and given Constant service to a job of managing the entire deep creek watershed that is already their responsibility as noted from the USDA.

3) It is very hard to read Forest Service documents because they give the same words over and over with no details of how the words are being used. Management and Monitoring are just two of those words. They sound useful but don't provide much.

4) The Dingell Act of 2019 is just an extension of the National Wild and Scenic River System. Is this just another way for more Confusion for the public to endear and more control over forest issues? Will we see a new policy written? The Forest Service loves to write new rules and policies instead of following the existing ones already made.

5) My thought of the recreational corridor of the head waters of upper Deep Creek really isn't in this CRMP document. I haven't seen the word mentioned only the reference in the paragraph I've mentioned before. I've asked for clarification but it hasn't come

to me yet. I don't see it shown on the CRMP report map either.

There are really ORV's in this section of upper Deep Creek. Just

consider the Ski Resort, a property in motion since 1938 I'm told

The area along the highway would show stream side views if it were managed as some of the policies already written state. If you consider trees as ORV's there are plenty to see. What hides the stream is the abundant's of water thirsty willows for miles.

Neglect of care for this corridor is evident and has been for years.

Just try taking a walk along the stream to see the clutter. Is this Forest Service responsibility or is this responsibility given away by the use of "Special Use Permits"? What other organizations have volunteered to help? Might help come from the CDF&W?

Do both organizations admit that the river basin does need greater management?

6) So the Role of the CRMP as stated "to protect and enhance their free flowing condition, water quality and ORV's" The Forest Service policy on management. "To maintain or enhance wildlife and fishing habitat for threatened and endangered species" Where is your list on those you have maintained and enhanced?

7) Page 8 Under the W&SRA, Under section 7 of the WSRA requires evaluation of federally assisted water resource projects and a determination by the River- administration agency. The same agency proposing the water project which must meet applicable evaluations standards prior to implementation. Who might that be? Maybe he same Forest Service Agency?

8) What we really want to know after reading gob's of information concerning the CRMP is the management direction and certainly the management actions and how and when monitoring is being done?

9) Page 24 Proposed Water Extractions and Diversions: There are

4 different listed sentences. Statements being considered but yet not told where? I don't see a disclaimer for the area not mentioned in the CRMP. Upper Deep Creek concerns me because the area is being neglected for any FS management and monitoring. The only greasy wheel given attention is given the privilege by the use of a

Special Use Permit that the public rarely get to see ,even when asking under FOIA requests.

10) Federal Reserved Water Rights. The amount of Federal reserved water rights is not identified and therefore must be quantified and secured through applicable State base processes. Federal water rights protect the flow necessary to support the ORV"s which include wildlife and riparian vegetation. All these processes never give examples so the public can understand the complete message. It shouldn't be necessary to have a law degree to understand so many policies the Forest Service is writing. Who are they trying to protect when they say future management plans? There are new Forest management plans being made for Ca, Oregon and Washington. To be out next year

what will be in those plans that change plans being made today?

Does the organization realize just how much is being spent in the offices instead of in the field?

11) My interest has been fishing in Deep Creek. I have a place on

Hunsaker Dr. just above the narrows. I have a small stream that runs all year long from springs I call it Hunsaker Creek. It has the

most beautiful water falls in the spring. A stair way waterfalls. It drops into Deep Creek at the narrows where there is another water falls and a setting reminding me of a grand canyon with the rock formations. The stream used to have deep pools with plenty of Rainbow trout at each pool. Now the fish are gone the pools are filled with sediment washed down from upsream activities

. I don't think my area has been mentioned for either ORV"s or WSR status. I'd like to keep it that way but the people have long found the spot. They use Hunsaker to park and walk through private property to get to this marvelous setting on Deep Creek. When I'm at home I can hear those in the canyon sometimes having to much fun. They leave trash and graffiti the area boulders. My love of a place I wanted to spend some retirement time fishing has ended. I now want to protect Upper Deep Creek where I also fished not many years ago. Fish were there and I have many photo's and video's .

This is the end of my comments. But see how quickly a mountain dream can be gone in hours. Please do a better job for those coming in the future.