



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/06/02/state/export158805.txt>

Published on Wednesday, June 02, 2004.

Last modified on 6/2/2004 at 1:06 am

## Feds to use firefighting aircraft

Associated Press

BOISE, Idaho (AP) - The heads of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service on Tuesday announced their agencies would acquire more than 100 additional aircraft to battle this summer's wildfires after ending contracts for 33 aging air tankers last month.

Under attack from western congressmen for cutting the old planes, BLM Director Kathleen Clarke and Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth said earlier in the day they couldn't justify using the old tankers because of safety risks.

But the two directors later announced they would contract with private companies for up to 36 single-engine air tankers, 26 large helicopters, 45 medium helicopters and two CL 215 air tankers. In addition, eight U.S. military C-130 aircraft equipped with a retardant-dropping system are available.

The additional aviation will cost about \$66 million.

"We are committed to using available resources to stop fires before they become unmanageable," Bosworth said. "These additional aircraft will enable fire managers to fully maintain their ability to stop nearly 99 percent of all fires on initial attack and continue to protect communities."

Officials at Boise's National Interagency Fire Center, the nation's hub for fire suppression equipment and manpower, characterized Clarke and Bosworth's first statements as personal opinions.

The newly contracted aircraft join an existing fleet of more than 700 firefighting planes and helicopters, officials said.

The suspension of the 33 aging air tankers came after a recent National Transportation Safety Board report on three fatal air tanker accidents. All happened within the last 10 years.

In 2002, three crewmembers were killed when a 46-year-old Lockheed C-130A crashed after it lost both wings. Similar problems were found in an aging PB4Y-2 that broke up and crashed fighting a Colorado fire that year, killing both crew members.

In 1994, a C-130A crashed when its right wing came off in flight, killing three people aboard.

The Chamber of Commerce of Chico, Calif., on Tuesday criticized the federal government for grounding the 33 planes. It said a local business, Aero Union, has more than one-third of the

planes. Last summer, Aero Union had 230 employees, but had to laid off 50 because of the canceled contracts.

The chamber asked residents to join its "Green Ribbon Air Tanker Support" program and contact their congressional delegation.

The acquisition followed pledges from some lawmakers last month to get the 33-tanker fleet back in the air right away. Rep. Peter DeFazio, D-Ore., Rep. J.D. Hayworth, R-Ariz., and others have sharply denounced the government's decision to ground the big fixed-wing aircraft.

During a hearing at the House Resources subcommittee on forests, DeFazio said there was no adequate substitute for the air tankers.

The two directors said that with or without the big air tankers to lay down swaths of fire retardant, they still planned to maintain a success rate of stopping 98 percent of fires on initial attack with thousands of firefighters, engines and bulldozers.

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.

- Hot Topics:
- Repeat DUIs
- Soldier killed
- Native lacrosse
- Bubba Watson
- Elections 2012
- Bitterroot Libertarians

/ Uncategorized

## Bosworth defends forest rules as crucial to fuel reduction

- Story
- Discussion

Bosworth defends forest rules as crucial to fuel reduction

SHERRY DEVLIN of the Missoulian missoulian.com | Posted: Friday, December 13, 2002 12:00 am | No Comments Posted

Font Size:

Default font size

Larger font size

- retweet
- Be the first of your friends to recommend this.

The U.S. Forest Service proposed and will honestly implement new rules hastening projects that reduce the wildfire-feeding buildup of fuels in the national forests, Chief Dale Bosworth said Thursday.

Announced a day earlier by President Bush, the procedural changes are neither politically motivated nor a ruse - as environmentalists have charged - to increase commercial logging in the name of fire protection, Bosworth said.

"That would defeat everything I'm after - for us to go out and misuse some of these things," he said. "It would just defeat everything I'm after."

"My feeling is that we really have to deal with our fuels problem," Bosworth said in a telephone interview from the agency's Washington, D.C., headquarters. "And the only way we are going to be able to be effective in that is by improving our processes and showing people work on the ground, and building trust that way."

Since he was appointed chief in April 2001, Bosworth has pushed for a more efficient, closer-to-the-people approach to environmental reviews and land-management decision-making - and an end to what he calls the agency's "analysis paralysis."

The rule changes proposed this week do exactly that, while also addressing the need to thin fuels on millions of acres of public land nationwide, Bosworth said. All, he said, came from foresters and land managers, not from politicians.

"We need to put more time into working with the public and getting work done on the ground," he said. "We spend way too much time on paperwork."

The new rules would allow forest-thinning work and post-fire rehabilitation projects to move forward without full-blown environmental impact statements, but instead with streamlined environmental assessments.

"In the last 10 or 15 years, things have evolved to where environmental assessments sometimes run hundreds of pages," Bosworth said. "They weren't intended for that. We still need to do the documentation, but it shouldn't be this huge massive stack of paper that nobody can understand or wade through."

Fuel-reduction projects would be identified cooperatively with local communities and state or tribal foresters, said Gail Kimbell, the agency's associate deputy chief for national forest systems. The emphasis would be on early participation, including a formal 30-day public comment period before a project is proposed.

"We would still go through the same analysis that we currently go through, abiding by all the environmental laws and regulations that we work under," Kimbell said. "We just wouldn't write a long environmental document."

Public comment would not be formally taken after a project is proposed, and citizen appeals would not be allowed on projects considered an emergency by a regional forester.

This week's announcement also included two "letters of guidance" clarifying government regulations and processes, Kimbell said. One came from the Council on Environmental Quality, reminding foresters that environmental assessments are to be "brief, concise statements."

The other is yet to come from the secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture departments, asking biologists to "bundle" similar projects for review of their impacts on threatened and endangered species - thereby speeding the review - and to evaluate projects for both their long-term and short-term benefits.

"Sometimes, something might not be desirable in the short run, but in the long run might be highly desirable," Kimbell said. "The letter won't tell biologists how to make their decision, but will guide them to consider a project's long-term benefits in arriving at a decision."

Kimbell also defended the rule changes as essential - if forests are to be less prone to massive, unstoppable wildfires.

"We saw way too many homes burn up this last summer," she said. "We lost 21 firefighters. None of those things are good for communities. When the president announced his Healthy Forests Initiative last summer, he called it Healthy Forests, Healthy Communities, and that really is the focus - to work with communities to improve the health of the forests they live in and around."

"These new provisions are simply tools for implementing the National Fire Plan and working with

communities," Kimbell said. "They help us get the job done."

Said Bosworth: "What I hope people will see is a lot more efficiency in terms of the length of time it takes us to get a job done when we collaborate with people and come to a conclusion about what we want to do - and then implement that in just a few months, rather than in a year or two."

"We want to get more work done for the amount of money we are appropriated," he said. "We want more public involvement. We want to get out there, on the ground, and get the job done."

*Reporter Sherry Devlin can be reached at 523-5268 or at sdevlin@missoulian.com.*

Copyright 2012 missoulian.com. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

Posted in Uncategorized on *Friday, December 13, 2002 12:00 am*

Share This Story

Print Email ShareThis

## Other Stories

## Sponsored Links

### [A \\$6 Trillion Opportunity](#)

Learn Why This Penny Stock Could Go Stratospheric  
[www.PennyStockWizard.com](http://www.PennyStockWizard.com)

### [Woman is 52 But Looks 28](#)

Her clever solution to aging angers dermatologists.  
We reveal how.  
[SmartConsumerMagazine.com](http://SmartConsumerMagazine.com)

### [Mortgage Rates Hit 2.50%](#)

If you owe under \$729k you may qualify for 3.01%  
APR Govt Refi Plans.  
[www.MortgageRatesExperts.com](http://www.MortgageRatesExperts.com)

Ads by Yahoo



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/06/06/opinion/export159361.txt>

Published on Sunday, June 06, 2004.  
Last modified on 6/6/2004 at 1:53 am

## Guest opinion: Firefighters can do jobs without large air tankers

By **KATHLEEN CLARKE** Bureau of Land Management Director and **DALE BOSWORTH** U.S. Forest Service Chief

Since the mid-1950s when we began using air tankers on wildland fires, we have relied primarily on older, surplus military aircraft. They served us well, reliably, and safely for many years. However, as fire seasons passed, these aircraft aged, and the stresses of working in a wildfire environment, where frequent and aggressive low-level maneuvers and high levels of turbulence are the norm, began to take a toll. That toll turned tragic.

In the last decade accidents began to happen. Most recently, in 2002, two air tankers fell from the sky, with the crews giving their lives. We must guard against the possibility that not only additional crews, but also lives and property on the ground could be lost in a crash.

That's why we terminated the contract for these tankers pending a determination that they can be operated safely. The National Transportation Safety Board has determined that the tankers have potential structural problems that might lead to a catastrophe if we send them to fight a fire. The NTSB has further determined that there is no means to immediately ensure the air worthiness of these aircraft.

We're working overtime with the Federal Aviation Administration on both short- and long-term plans, but in the meantime we can still do our firefighting job. We have hundreds of aircraft providing water-, foam-, and retardant-dropping capability, including medium and large helicopters, smaller single-engine air tankers, and military air tankers. In addition, we have thousands of firefighters - including smokejumpers and hotshot crews - as well as fire engines and bulldozers ready to fight fires on the ground, which is critical to stopping fires from spreading. Contrary to widespread belief, fires are stopped on the ground - not from the air. Our objective is to continue our record of success, suppressing 98 percent of fires upon initial attack.

We understand public concern, but the American people expect us not to place lives at needless risk. Safety is our core value in firefighting.

There is nothing we do in fighting wildfires that is worth losing one life.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of [Lee Enterprises](#).

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.

Billings, Mont., June 10 (AP) — A fleet of 100 Boeing Stearman biplanes is being used to help fight fires in the western United States, a move that has drawn attention from aviation enthusiasts and historians alike.

The planes, which were built in the 1920s, are being used to drop water on fires in California, Arizona and New Mexico. The planes are being used by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

The planes are being used because they are able to fly at low altitudes and can land on short, rough airstrips. They are also able to carry a large amount of water, up to 200 gallons.

The planes are being used in a variety of ways. Some are being used to drop water directly on the fire. Others are being used to drop water into a fire's path, creating a firebreak. Some are being used to drop water into a fire's base, cutting off its oxygen supply.

The planes are being used because they are a cost-effective way to fight fires. They are also a fun way to experience aviation.

The planes are being used by a group of volunteers called the Stearman Project. The project is a non-profit organization that is dedicated to restoring and flying Stearman biplanes.

The planes are being used in a variety of ways. Some are being used to drop water directly on the fire. Others are being used to drop water into a fire's path, creating a firebreak. Some are being used to drop water into a fire's base, cutting off its oxygen supply.

The planes are being used because they are a cost-effective way to fight fires. They are also a fun way to experience aviation.

The planes are being used by a group of volunteers called the Stearman Project. The project is a non-profit organization that is dedicated to restoring and flying Stearman biplanes.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/06/16/state/export160752.txt>

Published on Wednesday, June 16, 2004.  
Last modified on 6/16/2004 at 12:57 am

## Full fleet of planes pushed for fires

By TED MONOSON Gazette Washington Bureau

Western lawmakers on Tuesday stepped up efforts to get the air tanker fleet used to fight wildfires back to full strength.

An amendment offered to the Defense Department's 2005 spending bill by Sen. Mike Enzi, R-Wyo., would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to buy 10 aircraft designed to fight forest fires.

The amendment would not provide any money for the purchase of the planes. Enzi offered it as an amendment to the Defense Department's spending bill because it is unclear how soon the Senate would take up the Agriculture Department's spending bill.

Contracts with private companies that provide the federal government with the nation's fleet of 33 air tankers were terminated on May 11.

The decision was a response to a National Transportation Safety Board study of two 2004 accidents in which the wings fell off planes owned by Hawkins & Powers Aviation Inc., based in Greybull, Wyo.

A NTSB report on the study released in late April said the Forest Service and BLM had no way to certify that the air tankers can operate safely. The planes were old military cargo jets that had been retrofitted to fight wildfires.

"Fire is a perennial problem in need of an enduring solution," Enzi said. "Patching together planes from the junk pile has finally caught up with us. We need new planes that are built solely to put out wildland fires."

Missoula-based Neptune Aviation Services Inc. had contracts for seven of the planes that were grounded, and Hawkins & Powers had contracts for two.

On Tuesday, Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., sent a letter to U.S. Forest Service chief Dale Bosworth urging the agency to act quickly on safety information that Neptune has sent to the agency.

Agency officials have told Neptune that if the information is adequate to prove the planes are capable of safely fighting wildfires, the contract to use the company's planes would be restored.

Sen. Conrad Burns, R-Mont., also urged Tuesday that Neptune's safety information be considered quickly.





Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/06/25/nation/export161971.txt>

Published on Friday, June 25, 2004.

Last modified on 6/25/2004 at 7:03 pm

## Some large air tankers could be flying by July 4, officials say

Associated Press Writer

CARSON CITY, Nev. (AP) – The first group of old, heavy air tankers grounded last month might be flying again for the U.S. Forest Service by July 4 if inspections begun Friday prove the planes are safe, federal officials said.

"We're making headway," Rep. Greg Walden, R-Ore., said after meeting Thursday in Washington, D.C., with representatives of the Forest Service, Federal Aviation Administration, National Transportation Safety Board and the Bureau of Land Management. Walden chairs the Resources Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health.

DynCorp Technical Services technicians were "probably up to their armpits in grease and aircraft parts" as they began inspecting planes operated by Aero Union of Chico, Calif., said Mark Rey, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's undersecretary for natural resources and environment, who oversees the Forest Service.

DynCorp is supposed to complete the inspections by July 2.

"We don't know yet how these air tankers will fare," Rey told The Associated Press in a telephone interview. But if the company determines any of the planes is safe for high-stress firefighting duty, "within about 24 hours we can have them ready and flying."

The inspections are more thorough than the "somewhat simpler evaluation" conducted by Sandia National Laboratories that failed to satisfy the NTSB after twin fatal air tanker crashes two years ago, Rey said. The government permanently banned both types of aircraft involved in those California and Colorado crashes, but kept other tankers flying until it canceled \$30 million in contracts with operators of the 33 air tankers May 10.

The Forest Service and FAA have since given air tanker contractors criteria they must meet to have their planes certified as air worthy. Four companies, accounting for 20 of the grounded tankers, have submitted new engineering reports for review. Walden expects decisions on all the aircraft by mid-July.

While Walden and Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth were optimistic the planes might soon be flying, Rey's caution echoed that of Corbin Newman, the Forest Service's national fire plan coordinator. Newman told Western governors last Sunday that the odds of using the decades-old planes are slim.

The tankers can drop up to 3,000 gallons of fire-retardant on wildfires, and the groundings upset some Western governors whose states rely on them.

Even without the heavy tankers, federal firefighters have increased their efficiency so far this year, Rey said, though he cautioned it is too soon to draw long-term conclusions. In Arizona and New Mexico, about 99 percent of fires have been stopped with an initial air and ground attack, up from about 94 percent for the same period last spring, despite drier fire conditions that have sparked hundreds more wildfires.

"We're showing at least the right performance so far," Rey said. He speculated the improvement is because "a larger number of aircraft are more broadly deployed. That's helping us get to fires faster. Of course, it's also a more expensive system, too."

The government is increasingly relying on heavy helicopters that are slower getting to fires, but can drop more water or retardant in a shorter period than can a heavy air tanker that has to return to a distant airfield.

In two hours over a recent wildfire, a Sikorsky Sky Crane helicopter made 48 passes and dropped 88,000 gallons of water, Rey said. A heavy air tanker with the same capacity could have made only five passes and dropped 12,000 gallons during the same period, he said.

Still, the government wants air tankers in its arsenal, Rey said. It's soliciting proposals to either build new aircraft specifically designed for that purpose, or convert more modern aircraft to replace the generation of World War II vintage planes that currently are grounded and will soon wear out even if they fly again temporarily.

"Our firefighters believe you're best off having a mix of both" fixed-wing and rotary aircraft, Rey said. Proposals could be one to three years away, he said.

The Forest Service has also been relying more on smaller single-engine air tankers ♦ basically retrofitted crop-dusters ♦ one of which crashed while battling a wildfire last week in southern Utah, killing the pilot. Eight military C-130s also are available across the region.

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/07/12/nation/export164256.txt>

Published on Monday, July 12, 2004.

Last modified on 7/12/2004 at 11:33 am

## Administration confirming plans to open more forests to logging

Associated Press

BOISE, Idaho (AP) - The Bush administration proposed a new plan to open up national forests to more logging Monday, confirming a draft plan published two weeks ago.

Under the plan, announced by Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman here, governors would have to petition the federal government to block road-building needed for logging in remote areas of national forests.

The rule replaces one adopted by the Clinton administration and still under challenge in federal court. It covers about 58 million of the 191 million acres of national forest nationwide.

"Strong state and federal cooperation in the management of roadless areas will foster improved local involvement in the process," Veneman said.

The Bush administration for nearly two years has been weighing changes to the so-called roadless rule, which blocks road construction in nearly one-third of national forests as a way to prevent logging and other commercial activity.

Officials call the new roadless policy a commonsense plan that protects backcountry woods while advancing a partnership with the nation's governors, particularly in the West.

The Natural Resources Defense Council made its opposition clear even before the official announcement.

"This is a roadblock to roadless protection," spokeswoman Amy Mall said. "The administration is not concerned about states' rights."

"Any governor who cares about protecting his or her residents from wildfire risks would not want more roadbuilding in the backcountry," Mall said.

Veneman, whose department includes the Forest Service, made the announcement flanked by Gov. Dirk Kempthorne and Sen. Larry Craig, both Republicans.

As part of the plan, the administration said it would reinstate an interim rule for the next 18 months, requiring that Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth approve any new road construction in previously protected areas.

The administration had let the interim rule lapse last year as it considered a permanent rule to replace the Clinton policy.

As a practical matter, officials said they expect few, if any, changes in roadless policy during the next 18 months, noting that Bosworth did not approve a single new road during the two-plus years the interim directive was in place.

Environmentalists howled when the draft rule was made public earlier this month. Without a national policy against road construction, they said, forest management will revert to individual forest plans that in many cases allow roads and other development on most of the 58 million acres now protected by the roadless rule.

Environmentalists say it is unlikely that governors in pro-logging states such as Idaho, Wyoming, Montana and Utah will seek to keep the roadless rule in effect. Kempthorne is among several Republican governors in the West who have strongly criticized the rule, calling it an unnecessary restriction that has locked up millions of acres from logging and other economic development.

Citing such complaints, the Bush administration said last year it would develop a plan to allow governors to seek exemptions from the roadless rule. The latest plan turns that on its head by requiring governors to petition the Agriculture Department if they want to protect against timbering in their state.

The Clinton administration adopted the roadless rule during its final days in office in January 2001, calling it important protection for backcountry forests. Environmentalists hailed that action, but the timber industry and some Republican lawmakers have criticized it as overly intrusive and even dangerous, saying it has left millions of acres exposed to catastrophic wildfires.

Federal judges have twice struck down the three-year-old rule, most recently in a Wyoming case decided in July 2003. That case, which environmentalists have appealed, is one of several pending legal challenges, complicating efforts to issue a new plan.

The new plan will be published in the Federal Register this week, with a 60-day comment period extending into September.

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/07/13/nation/export164368.txt>

Published on Tuesday, July 13, 2004.

Last modified on 7/13/2004 at 12:52 am

## Plan seeks to boost logging

Associated Press

BOISE, Idaho - The Bush administration proposed a new plan to open national forests to more logging Monday, immediately drawing criticism from environmentalists who called it the biggest timber industry giveaway in history.

Under the plan, announced by Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman at the Idaho Capitol, governors would have to petition the federal government to block road-building needed for logging in remote areas of national forests.

The rule replaces one adopted by the Clinton administration and still under challenge in federal court. It covers about 58 million of the 191 million acres of national forest nationwide.

The administration heralds the plan as an end to the legal uncertainty overshadowing tens of millions of acres of America's backcountry.

"Our actions today advance the Bush administration's commitment to cooperative conserving roadless areas," Veneman said.

Environmental groups called it a thinly veiled scheme to open the land to loggers and other developers.

Amy Mall at the Natural Resources Defense Council said the plan was an obstacle to protecting unroaded federal land that "promises only delay and eventual forest destruction."

The proposal continues protection from development for 18 months for the 58.5 million acres designated as roadless among the 191 million acres of national forest.

In 2006, each governor must submit a proposal for either continued protection or release for multiple use of the roadless land. The federal government would consider each state petition and then issue a regulation determining the extent of future roadless protection.

Idaho has the most land in the lower 48 states affected by the roadless designation - 9.3 million acres - and was one of the first states to challenge the Clinton rule.

Veneman and Idaho Gov. Dirk Kempthorne, a Republican, both argued that the proposal ends the legal uncertainty over the old rule and leaves forest management decisions with people closest to the land so they reflect local needs.

"They've affirmed there are going to be roadless values," Kempthorne said. "We're going to determine where."

But New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson, a Democrat and Clinton administration energy secretary, accused the Forest Service of "walking away from environmental protection."

During a conference call organized by the National Environmental Trust, Richardson said he would petition for protection of all 1.1 million roadless acres in his state and urge other governors to do the same, declaring that "they should not open these areas, period."

Philip Clapp, president of the National Environmental Trust, called the administration proposal the biggest giveaway to the timber industry in history, arguing that many western states would likely press for development to help struggling rural economies.

"The administration's proposal doesn't give governors any more power to protect national forests in their states than they already have now," Clapp said.

"The idea that many governors would want to jump head first into the political snake pit of managing the national forests in their states is laughable," he said. "Besides, the timber industry has invested heavily for years in the campaigns of governors with the largest national and state forests, giving almost equally to Republicans and Democrats."

Undersecretary of Agriculture Mark Rey said that if a state does not offer its own proposal on roadless land, the land would become part of the traditional planning process for each national forest. That process has called for development on 24 million of the 58 million acres that Clinton moved to protect.

Rey maintained that taking on the roadless issue state by state rather than nationally could reduce the heated political rhetoric and confrontation that have marked attempts to resolve it countrywide in the past.

"This approach has one simple advantage in that no one's tried it yet," he said.

During the next 18 months, Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth will continue to exercise sole authority over intrusion into any roadless area. Bosworth hasn't use that authority at all in the two years he's had it.

Federal judges have twice struck down the Clinton rule, most recently in a Wyoming case decided in July 2003. That case, which environmentalists have appealed, is one of several pending legal challenges that have complicated efforts to issue a new plan.

The new plan will be published in the Federal Register this week, with a 60-day comment period extending into September.

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/08/20/state/export169641.txt>

Published on Friday, August 20, 2004.  
Last modified on 8/20/2004 at 1:02 am

## Watershed pollution decried

Associated Press

MISSOULA (AP) - The Blackfoot River drainage is imperiled by continuing pollution from more than 100 abandoned hardrock mines in its upper reaches, says a new report released Wednesday by Trout Unlimited.

The report says several other watersheds in the West also are imperiled.

In the case of the Blackfoot, it "has the chance to be great again," said Rob Roberts, Western field coordinator for the conservation group. The basin was included in the report "because it holds the potential for significant progress, if people work together," Roberts said.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that there are more than 500,000 abandoned mines in the Western United States, and that at least 40 percent of the West's mountain streams have been adversely affected by hardrock mining.

Roberts said Trout Unlimited is trying to "bring a new focus to the lingering problem."

The report highlights both accomplishments and ongoing challenges on the Blackfoot River, Utah's American Fork, Colorado's Animas and Upper Arkansas, Oregon's Rogue, New Mexico's Red, Idaho's Salmon and Washington's Kettle and Methow basins.

"Abandoned mines are the environmental equivalent of the crazy aunt in the attic," Roberts said. "They're a huge problem about which no one wants to talk."

On the Blackfoot, Trout Unlimited has worked with the Blackfoot Challenge, the U.S. Forest Service and state of Montana to restore more than 350 miles of waterways in the drainage, but more work remains in the years ahead, he said.

Along with Wednesday's release of a report entitled "Settled, Mined and Left Behind," Trout Unlimited and the Forest Service announced a new partnership intended to hasten the cleanup of abandoned mines.

"There should be no doubt federal land stewards need to remain diligent in finding ways to deal with abandoned mine sites," Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth said in a telephone news conference from Salt Lake City.

"Nothing short of the quality of some of the West's best rivers and streams - and the public's drinking water - are at stake," he said.

By working together, Trout Unlimited and the Forest Service will be able to restore entire watersheds, tending to the needs of both public and private land, Bosworth said.

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.





Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/08/28/wyoming/export170728.txt>

Published on Saturday, August 28, 2004.

Last modified on 8/28/2004 at 1:48 am

## Leasing protested in Bridger-Teton

Associated Press

JACKSON (AP) - Nearly 75 people crowded a meeting to criticize Bridger-Teton National Forest officials for deciding to offer parts of the forest for oil and gas drilling leases.

Among those at Thursday's meeting was Steve Dicenso, who moved from Jackson to Alpine last year so he could get out more in the Wyoming Range, the Casper Star-Tribune reports.

"It's irreplaceable," he said. "The terrain's perfect."

The forest plans to offer 157,000 acres for lease in October and December. The area is mainly on the eastern slope near Merna.

"I think we're moving way too fast in there," Dicenso said.

The three-hour meeting was marked with shaking heads, emotional speeches and eruptions of applause.

Sava Malachowsk, of Jackson, kicked off the question-and-answer session by asking forest Supervisor Kniffy Hamilton how it was possible to make the decision to lease without any public involvement.

"How can you assume that responsibility?" Malachowsk said, to the applause of the crowd. "Are you getting pressure? Are you getting calls from the vice president? How can you do this?"

Malachowsk asked two more times whether the forest was being told from Washington to "get with the program" before Hamilton said "yes."

John McQuillan, of Jackson, asked why there was no formal comment period, since the last study of the area was done in the early 1990s.

Hamilton said the forest was "very successful" last year when it decided not to lease 376,000 acres around the Gros Ventre and Teton wildernesses.

"The Forest Service is a multiple-use agency," she said. "We said (at the time of that decision) we were going to go ahead and process leases on the forest. We are going to have to pick and choose where we develop. There are going to be other parts of the forest where we have to do some leasing."

Hamilton told the group that her agency is "part of the executive branch of the United States," and "our bosses are part of the executive branch."

"They give us a lot of direction in what we do on the forest," she said.

Hamilton's boss, Dale Bosworth, head of the U.S. Forest Service, answers to Ann Veneman, Secretary of Agriculture.

The forest completed a brief study this year to determine if anything had substantially changed in the area since the early 1990s and determined the decision to lease was still valid, Hamilton said.

But many feel many things have changed since the last substantial study, mainly gas drilling in the nearby Green River Basin, where up to 10,000 new wells may be forthcoming.

Environmentalists also say Canada lynx, grizzly bears and gray wolves may also be using the area.

Brent Larson, Bridger-Teton deputy supervisor, said the areas subject to leasing have a tremendous amount of "no surface occupancy" stipulations, which means well pads cannot occupy an area because of terrain, recreation or wildlife considerations.

But Tim Preso, an attorney with Earthjustice of Bozeman, said companies have a right to create roads through "no surface occupancy" areas to gain access to areas that are under development.

The 157,000-acre leasing area contains 92,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas and four rivers eligible for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.





Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2004/11/17/wyoming/export181569.txt>

Published on Wednesday, November 17, 2004.

Last modified on 11/17/2004 at 4:28 pm

## Freudenthal says existing forest planning better than Bush proposal

Associated Press

CHEYENNE - The Bush administration's proposal for governing roadless areas in national forests should be scrapped in favor of existing policy and law, Gov. Dave Freudenthal told the chief of the U.S. Forest Service.

A federal judge in Wyoming last year struck down the Clinton-era ban on building roads in national forests, and the Bush administration decided not to appeal, offering its own plan instead.

Freudenthal said the Bush administration's proposed roadless rule gives states and their governors no more authority than they already have under existing rules.

In a letter sent Monday to Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth, Freudenthal outlined his basic objections to the administration's plan to oblige states to engage in forest planning that should be done at the federal level. He noted that he objected to the Clinton roadless plan as well.

"As a practical matter, I do not see the proposed roadless rule as a viable way to address management or protection of roadless areas," Freudenthal wrote. "The proposed roadless rule is a cosmetic attempt to shift the Forest Service's responsibility for land use planning to the state without shifting any authority or funding to see the plans implemented."

The governor said he remains convinced that the best process to develop management of roadless areas is through the existing forest plan revision and amendment processes. As the law stands, governors can already petition the Forest Service to have an area managed differently. Governors can already hold public hearings to discuss forest management, and governors can already submit research as to the resources affected by any land management decision.

Freudenthal said the current forest-planning process is sufficient for providing opportunities for state and local interest to be represented, while the new rule would be disadvantageous.

"Wyoming does not have the fiscal or technical resources to drive the public involvement needed to adequately complete the roadless review," the governor wrote. "The notion that Wyoming can review every Forest Service plan and develop petitions in less than 1,000 man hours is absurd."

Copyright © 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

NEWS RELEASE  
USDA Forest Service  
Washington, D.C.



Release No. FS-0518

Contact: Dan Jiron, (202) 205-0896

**FOREST SERVICE PUBLISHES PLANNING RULE  
FOR BETTER MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS AND GRASSLANDS**  
*Environmental Management System will be adopted; new rule will allow forest managers to  
adapt more quickly to changing forest conditions*

WASHINGTON, Dec. 22, 2004 — The U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service today released its final rule that provides the framework for individual forest management plans governing the 155 national forests and 20 grasslands. For the first time, an Environmental Management System (EMS) will be used during the planning process to improve performance and accountability. The rule establishes a dynamic process to account for changing forest conditions, emphasizes science and public involvement, and ultimately will help local forest managers provide future generations with healthier forests, cleaner air and water, and more abundant wildlife while sustaining a variety of forest uses.

“The new rule will improve the way we work with the public by making forest planning more open, understandable and timely,” said Forest Service Associate Chief Sally Collins. “It will enable Forest Service experts to respond more rapidly to changing conditions, such as wildfires, and emerging threats, such as invasive species.”

The agency will adopt an EMS for each forest and grassland—a management tool used widely by the public and private sector both nationally and internationally that includes internationally-accepted standards. EMS connects planning with implementation so that plans can be dynamic, and outcomes of project-level decisions can be assessed for continuous improvement. A key feature of the EMS is the requirement for independent audits of the Forest Service’s work. This new review and oversight of agency performance will help the Forest Service more fully account for its management of more than 192 million acres of public land.

The new rule will make forest planning more timely and cost effective. Currently, the forest planning process generally takes 5-7 years to revise a 15-year management plan. For example, the management plan for the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado took seven years and \$5.5 million to revise. Under the new rule, forest plan revisions will take approximately 2-3 years, with a comprehensive evaluation of the plan to be completed every five years to ensure it is meeting goals and objectives. Desired land conditions will be outlined in each management plan, and local managers will be held accountable for their efforts to achieve them. This will make planning more relevant to on-the-ground practices and outcomes.

“This rule applies the most current thinking in natural resources management,” said Collins. “It takes a 21st Century approach to delivering the full range of values that Americans want for their quality of life: clean air and water, habitat for wildlife, and sustainable uses that will be available for future generations to enjoy.”

The new rule directs forest managers to take into account the best available science to protect air, water, wildlife, and other important natural resources at a landscape-level. Plant and wildlife protections will be provided first by conserving ecosystems as a whole, with more targeted protections for listed species and other species of concern. Management decisions will consider ecological, social, and economic sustainability, consistent with broadly accepted international standards.

Under the new rule, local experts will be able to more effectively comply with environmental laws, like the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act. Because information gathered and analyzed at the local level will be current and constantly updated, the Forest Service will have a better basis for evaluating the environmental effects of projects.

Land management plans under the new rule will be strategic in nature. Generally, these plans will not include specific project management decisions. If a plan does include decisions with on-the-ground effects, it will require an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement as appropriate, consistent with NEPA. This provision is in a separate proposal identifying how plan development, amendment and revision will comply with NEPA requirements.

The final rule moves many detailed procedural requirements to the Forest Service’s directive system, which is the agency’s “how to” internal manual. For example, broad species protection goals remain in the new rule, but the analytical procedures on how to achieve those goals will be spelled out in the directive system. The proposed directives will be released soon for public review and comment.

The new rule neither promotes nor discourages any particular forest use, such as recreation, grazing, timber harvest, or mineral development. Decisions regarding such uses will be made on a forest-by-forest basis and will be informed by local conditions, science and public input. Guidelines on activities, such as timber harvesting, will be placed in the directives.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 requires the Forest Service to develop, periodically revise and amend all forest and grassland plans. The first generation of forest plans was developed under a regulation adopted in 1982. There are currently 49 revisions underway using the

22-year-old regulation. Those forests and grasslands may now choose to change to the new rule or wait to use the new rule for their next revision or amendment. An additional 42 are awaiting revision and must use the new rule.

The new rule and the proposal identifying how plan development, amendment and revision will comply with NEPA are expected to be forwarded to the Federal Register today for publication. Both documents are available at [www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma](http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma).

The public will have 60 days to comment on the NEPA proposal. Written comments may be sent to: Forest Service Content Analysis Team, P.O. Box 22777, Salt Lake City, Utah 84122. Comments also will be accepted by electronic mail to [planningce@fs.fed.us](mailto:planningce@fs.fed.us) or by facsimile to 801-517-1015.

#



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/01/02/nation/export187756.txt>

Published on Sunday, January 02, 2005.  
Last modified on 1/2/2005 at 12:53 am

## U.S. Forest Service turning 100

Associated Press

WASHINGTON - In January 1905, as debate raged over clear-cuts and devastating wildfires ravaging the nation's forests, President Theodore Roosevelt convened an American Forest Congress - a landmark event that led to creation of the U.S. Forest Service.

Now, as the Forest Service prepares to mark its 100th anniversary, debate still flares over an agency that manages nearly 192 million acres of public lands - including some of the country's most spectacular vistas.

Environmentalists question whether the Forest Service under President Bush has lived up to Roosevelt's goal to "perpetuate the forest as a permanent resource of the nation."

The timber industry, meanwhile, complains of bureaucratic delays that can make it nearly impossible to log on federal lands. Just 2 percent of U.S. wood production comes from national forests, down from 25 percent in the early 1980s.

Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth acknowledges the agency's challenges, but says its 37,000 employees do their best to care for forests and grasslands encompassing 8 percent of the nation's land - roughly the size of Texas.

Bosworth, who has long complained of what he calls "analysis paralysis," laments that forest management decisions often take years to complete. Actions, once made, are frequently challenged in court, and disputes persist over issues from fiscal accountability to how well the Forest Service protects clean water, wildlife and habitat.

"A hundred years later the whole picture is significantly more complex" than when legendary forester Gifford Pinchot took charge as the agency's first chief in 1905, Bosworth said in an interview.

The U.S. population has increased, as has the number of national forests - from 83 forest "reserves" a century ago to 155 national forests and 20 national grasslands today.

"There are much more demands than there were 100 years ago in terms of recreation and solitude," he said, as well as the increasing threat posed by overgrown forests that contribute to devastating wildfires. Officials also must contend with problems never imagined by Pinchot, including the spread of invasive species, urban encroachment on open space and unmanaged outdoor recreation.

Bosworth, the agency's 15th chief, will be a featured speaker at a Jan. 3-6 Centennial Congress, which will also include speeches by all the living former chiefs and panel discussions on the agency's changing role and lessons for the future.

### **'Sort of hobbled'**

Jack Ward Thomas, who ran the agency from 1993-96, said Roosevelt and Pinchot would hardly recognize the agency they created.

"I think they would be distressed with the current state of affairs - the confusion and the lack of a clear mission," he said. "I think they'd despise that."

Thomas, who now teaches forestry at the University of Montana, compared the Forest Service to a racehorse.

"Right now it's sort of hobbled and unable to move, but that's not their fault," he said, blaming legal challenges - often brought by environmentalists - for keeping the agency at a standstill. Officials frequently find themselves waiting for a judge to decide policy, whether it is development of remote roadless areas or approval of a timber sale or mining lease.

Chris West, vice president of the American Forest Resource Council, a timber industry group, said relentless litigation is obstructing the agency's mission.

"The public didn't entrust the courts with the management of these lands. They entrusted the Forest Service," said West, who worked for the agency for seven years before joining the timber group.

Environmentalists concede the number of lawsuits has increased, but accuse the Bush administration of flouting long-established law in an effort to boost logging and gas and oil development. Courts are often the only way to protect the environment, they say.

"Over the last four years we have seen a remarkable step backward," said Steve Holmer of the United Forest Defense Campaign, a coalition of environmental groups such as the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club and Defenders of Wildlife.

Under Bush, the Forest Service "is rapidly reverting to industry-biased policies from decades past that made logging and drilling the highest priorities," Holmer said.

He and other critics cite the administration's efforts to transfer control of remote, roadless forests to governors, and the Dec. 22 announcement of new forest rules that give regional managers more discretion to approve logging and other commercial projects without lengthy environmental reviews.

Forest Service officials say the new rules will allow managers to respond more quickly to changing conditions, such as wildfires, and emerging threats such as invasive species.

But critics say the rules weaken environmental protections and make it easier to log vast swaths of public lands.

Andy Stahl, director of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics, a watchdog group, called the Centennial Congress an exercise in self-congratulation.



"I think it makes a lot of sense to celebrate the national forests. I think it makes no sense to celebrate the Forest Service management of the national forests," said Stahl, who accused the agency of a history of mismanagement based on an ingrained bias toward logging.

Copyright © 2005 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/02/20/nation/export194869.txt>

Published on Sunday, February 20, 2005.

Last modified on 2/20/2005 at 1:24 am

## Wildfire study says strategy is incomplete

Associated Press

GRANTS PASS, Ore. - The U.S. Forest Service and Department of the Interior need to develop a long-term wildfire strategy that gives Congress a better idea how much money is really needed to thin forests and where the work is needed most, the Government Accountability Office said.

"While the agencies have adopted various strategy documents to address the nation's wildland fire problems, none of these documents constitutes a cohesive strategy that explicitly identifies the long-term options and related funding needed to reduce fuels in national forests and rangelands and to respond to wildland fire threats," said the GAO report released last week.

The report, the latest in a series from the investigative arm of Congress on the continuing threat of wildfire, noted that a Forest Service team concluded in 2002 that reducing the wildfire risks to communities and ecosystems would require \$1.4 billion a year for a few years, triple the current spending level.

With 40 percent of federal land - 190 million acres - at risk of wildfire and the size and intensity of wildfires growing in recent years, GAO urged the Forest Service and Interior to come up with the strategy and cost estimates in time for planning the fiscal year 2006 budget.

Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth and Assistant Interior Secretary P. Lynn Scarlett both said in letters responding to a draft of the report that two essential elements needed to develop such a strategy are not finished yet.

They said a \$40 million program known as LANDFIRE, a system of maps and computer models that more accurately identifies wildfire risk areas and wildfire behavior, and an analysis of fire programs would likely be ready in time for the fiscal 2007 budget analysis.

Rep. Greg Walden, R-Ore., chairman of the House Resources forestry subcommittee, requested the GAO report. He said he hoped that when the GAO looks at the issue again in five years it will find that the forests are less susceptible to wildfire.

Rep. Peter DeFazio, D-Ore., who also sits on the subcommittee, said the tight budget climate makes it difficult to significantly increase wildfire funding, but suggested better information on the cost-effectiveness of wildfire prevention and the economic boost of employing people to thin the nation's forests could change people's minds.

Mark Rey, who oversees the Forest Service as agriculture undersecretary for natural resources and environment, told the subcommittee Thursday that the 4.2 million acres of federal lands treated with

thinning and prescribed burning to reduce fuels in 2004 exceeded goals, and the president's budget request includes \$867 million to prevent wildfires and restore forest and rangeland health.

Copyright © 2005 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of [Lee Enterprises](#).



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/10/17/state/export229254.txt>

Published on Monday, October 17, 2005.

Last modified on 10/17/2005 at 4:42 pm

## Forest Service chief: Focus needed on pressing land issues

By **BECKY BOHRER** Associated Press

The chief of the U.S. Forest Service said he worries "lesser issues," such as logging and road-building on public lands, are drawing too much attention and too many agency resources away from more serious threats to America's forests and grasslands.

"I think we need to change the national dialogue to focus on the things that really count the most," Dale Bosworth said in written remarks he was scheduled to deliver Monday night at a scientific conference at Yellowstone National Park.

He said he sees the four greatest threats as fire, loss of open spaces, invasive weeds and unmanaged recreation.

"Yet our national focus is on other issues, like whether too much timber is coming off national forest land or whether we're building too many roads," he said. "My biggest fear is that these other, lesser issues are absorbing all our energy, while more important things are falling by the way."

Chris Mehl, a spokesman for The Wilderness Society, agreed the Forest Service's focus should be on those four areas. By comparison, logging's importance has decreased dramatically, and the agency already has so many roads that it cannot keep track of all them, he said.

The use of the lands is changing, he said, with recreation becoming a bigger issue.

Michael Garrity, executive director of the Alliance for the Wild Rockies, said the biggest threat "is the Forest Service itself, and their huge appetite for taxpayer dollars."

"Less timber means less money for the Forest Service, and building fewer roads means less money for the Forest Service," he said. Garrity's group has fought the agency on logging proposals, including one in the Gallatin National Forest, over potential environmental harms.

Bosworth said the Forest Service faces longer-term challenges, as well. These include addressing a backlog of maintenance and restoration projects; dealing with the demands of a growing population on resources; better understanding climate changes; and encouraging a sound "consumption ethic."

"Taken together, the threats and the challenges we face today are as great as any we've ever seen," he said. "But we can't address them by acting alone; we need to work together across the

landscape."

**Copyright © 2005 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.**

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/10/18/state/export229396.txt>

Published on Tuesday, October 18, 2005.

Last modified on 10/18/2005 at 12:29 am

## Switch focus to key issues, Forest Service chief says

By BECKY BOHRER Associated Press

The chief of the U.S. Forest Service said he worries "lesser issues," such as logging and road-building on public lands, are drawing too much attention and too many agency resources away from more serious threats to America's forests and grasslands.

"I think we need to change the national dialogue to focus on the things that really count the most," Dale Bosworth said Monday night at a scientific conference at Yellowstone National Park.

He said he sees the four greatest threats as fire, loss of open spaces, invasive weeds and unmanaged recreation.

"Yet our national focus is on other issues, like whether too much timber is coming off national forest land or whether we're building too many roads," he said. "My biggest fear is that these other, lesser issues are absorbing all our energy, while more important things are falling by the way."

Bosworth said the Forest Service faces longer-term challenges, as well. These include addressing a backlog of maintenance and restoration projects; dealing with the demands of a growing population on resources; better understanding climate changes; and encouraging a sound "consumption ethic."

"Taken together, the threats and the challenges we face today are as great as any we've ever seen," he said. "But we can't address them by acting alone; we need to work together across the landscape."

Chris Mehl, a spokesman for The Wilderness Society, agreed that the Forest Service's focus should be on the four areas identified by Bosworth. By comparison, he said, logging's importance has decreased dramatically, and the agency already has so many roads that it cannot keep track of all them. The use of the lands is changing, he said, with recreation becoming a bigger issue.

But Julia Altemus, of the Montana Logging Association, said she disagreed with Bosworth that logging was a lesser issue, noting that it has important economic and ecological benefits.

"Restoration is logging, and they just don't understand it," she said of environmentalists. "To them, if you cut a tree and make a profit, it's a terrible thing."



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/10/23/nation/export230103.txt>

Published on Sunday, October 23, 2005.  
Last modified on 10/23/2005 at 1:31 am

## Forest Service reallows mushroom picking, Christmas trees

Associated Press

PORTLAND, Ore. - The U.S. Forest Service said Friday it will resume issuing permits for mushroom picking, hunting outfitters, Christmas trees and other small projects after a federal judge clarified his ruling in a lawsuit over public participation in forest management decisions.

"We are in the process of issuing permits again," said Rex Holloway, spokesman for the Northwest regional office of the Forest Service.

Clarifying an earlier ruling, U.S. District Judge James K. Singleton Jr. wrote Wednesday that the Forest Service needs to take public comments and consider appeals on major projects, such as timber sales and new off-highway vehicle trails - not on minor things like permits for hunting guides, or gathering mushrooms.

"It was clear from his ruling that he wasn't intending for that to apply to, for instance, personal use permits for forest products and outfitters," Holloway said.

The ruling stemmed from a 2003 lawsuit by Heartwood and other environmental groups challenging the harvest of burned trees on the Sequoia National Forest in California.

The harvest had been approved under what is called a categorical exclusion, which does not allow for public comment or appeals. The case was aimed at striking down rules adopted by the Bush administration in 2003.

The Forest Service had suspended nearly 1,500 activities nationwide, including cutting an 80-foot spruce in New Mexico to serve as the U.S. Capitol Christmas tree, the transfer of an operating permit for a ski area outside Los Angeles, and permits to pick mushrooms on national forests in Oregon.

Environmentalists have characterized the shutdowns as a politically inspired effort to create public outrage to justify legislation to reduce public participation in public lands management.

Forest Service chief Dale Bosworth sent a letter Thursday to regional foresters around the country directing them to resume issuing permits that had been suspended in recent weeks, except for those expressly mentioned in the judge's order as requiring public comment. Those projects include timber sales, forest thinning, prescribed burns, oil and gas exploration, and off-highway vehicle trails.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/11/03/nation/export231657.txt>

Published on Thursday, November 03, 2005.

Last modified on 11/3/2005 at 12:18 am

## Groups blast USFS off-road trails policy

Associated Press

WASHINGTON - Environmentalists and recreation groups decried a Forest Service plan to restrict off-road vehicles, saying the policy could legitimize hundreds of illegal trails carved out by off-road enthusiasts.

The Forest Service announced Wednesday that it intends to halt the roughhewn roads and trails that proliferate in public forests because of increased traffic by dirt bikes and other off-road vehicles.

The new policy would require all 155 national forests and 20 grasslands to designate roads and trails that are open to motor-vehicle use. But for the first time, heavily traveled "renegade routes" created illegally by off-road drivers could be designated for legal use.

"Instead of a bold stride, we got a baby step," said Jason Kiely, director of the Montana-based Natural Trails and Water Coalition. "The practical effect is that you are going to have to take out rogue routes created by off-roaders one at a time."

The agency said it will take up to four years to designate roads and trails on all 193 million acres of public lands. Each forest or grassland will publish a map of approved routes that riders can use, with penalties specified for riding on unmarked trails.

Environmentalists and other critics said the plan did not go far enough to ensure effective enforcement. In the past three decades, the number of off-road vehicle users has increased sevenfold to about 36 million, causing conflicts with other users such as hikers, horseback riders and the growing number of homeowners who live near national forests.

"This is like throwing a bucket of water on a raging inferno. It's the right medicine - it's just not nearly enough of it," said Jim Furnish, a former deputy Forest Service chief who has been critical of the agency under the Bush administration.

"It's almost an oxymoron that there is a good illegal route," he said.

Forest Service officials defended the plan, saying some of the illegal routes have been used for so long they no longer pose a threat.

"Some of the routes have evolved over the years to the point where they are enjoyed by the public," said Jack Troyer, a regional forester who led the Forest Service team that developed the policy.



Routes that cause erosion and other problems will be removed, he said.

Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth said the new policy encourages off-road enthusiasts to use the forests in an environmentally friendly way.

"It's my belief that most users want to do the right thing," Bosworth said.

More than 200,000 miles of forest roads are currently open to off-highway vehicle use as well as more than 36,000 miles of trails.

Copyright © 2005 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of [Lee Enterprises](#).

November 3, 2005

## U.S. Forest Service Will Impose Standards for Off-Road Vehicles

By FELICITY BARRINGER

The United States Forest Service announced Wednesday that it would begin a nationwide process of designating which trails are suitable for use by off-road vehicles, a move intended to limit damage to national forests.

Until now, the nation's 155 designated forests and 20 grasslands have not had uniform policies for off-road vehicles. Some Western forests gave them virtually unlimited access; others, like the Chattahoochee-Oconee forest in Georgia, provided designated trails.

Under the final regulations announced Wednesday by the Forest Service chief, Dale Bosworth, designated trails will be the rule everywhere. Individual forest supervisors will decide which trails are available to the vehicles, whether free-form trails created in recent months or years by riders going cross-country should be included, and whether vehicles and their riders will be allowed to stray off into open country under limited circumstances.

Mr. Bosworth said in a conference call that he hoped the plans would be completed in four years.

Environmental advocates gave lukewarm praise to the decision to enforce standards to keep the vehicles on trails but criticized the lack of firm legal deadlines and of local forest supervisors' ability to include what the environmentalists call "renegade trails," paths carved willy-nilly by all-terrain vehicle users.

Sales of all-terrain vehicles have risen tenfold, to 51 million, since 1972, said Jack Troyer, a regional forester. In that period, the vehicles have become a source of conflict on public lands. They provide their users access to beautiful, remote country and an adrenaline rush. In the eyes of their detractors, they inflict a combination of noise and industrial odors, and deep scars into quiet, unspoiled landscapes.

"Some of these routes have evolved over the years, have been enjoyed by the public, don't do damage and are good routes," Mr. Troyer said. "It's our expectation that some of the user-created routes" will become part of the approved system of trails for motorized recreation.

But Jim Furnish, a former Forest Service employee who is now a consultant to the Natural Trails and Waters Coalition, which seeks tighter restrictions on motorized recreation, said he worked for the service for 35 years and saw motorized recreation "on public land go from nonexistence to running amok."

Mr. Furnish said the new regulations were inadequate.

"This is a runaway fire," he said. "They needed a three-alarm response with engines. They're throwing a bucket of water on a raging inferno."

At the Idaho office of the Blue Ribbon Coalition, a group of all-terrain vehicle users, the founder, Clark Collins, said he welcomed the new rules. "We feel pretty good about the final product," he said. "In fact we've worked cooperatively with the chief and his staff throughout this process."



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/11/04/state/export231913.txt>

Published on Friday, November 04, 2005.

Last modified on 11/4/2005 at 12:44 am

## New forest rule bans use of vehicles off roads

By Nick Gevock Montana Standard

BUTTE - A nationwide Forest Service rule requiring off-road vehicles to stay on designated roads that was enacted Wednesday has something for just about everyone to like.

Motorized-access enthusiasts hailed the rule, which was approved Wednesday by Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth, because it recognizes motorized use as a legitimate recreational activity throughout the national forests.

Environmentalists, on the other hand, were equally happy, but came away with a different message from Bosworth's announcement. They said the agency has recognized that allowing all-terrain vehicles to drive everywhere has long been a problem that needs to end.

"Rather than having the national forests wide open to any kind of motorized use, any place, they're saying they will designate what areas are open," said Michael Scott, executive director of the Greater Yellowstone Coalition. "It's commendable that the Forest Service has taken this step forward."

And motorized users agree because they recognize that while they want access to public lands, all-terrain vehicles can't be allowed everywhere, said Clark Collins, executive director of the Blue Ribbon Coalition. The Pocatello, Idaho-based group pushes for motorized access on public lands.

"This says that motorized recreation is a growing and important use, but it just needs to be managed in a particular way," Collins said. "We support that."

The policy requires all-terrain vehicles to stay on designated trails, putting an end to the practice in many forests of allowing riders to go anywhere. The rule is nearly identical to the policy in place on Montana forests since 2001 that Bosworth implemented when he was chief of the northern region.

Bosworth has identified uncontrolled motorized recreation as one of the four biggest problems on the forests because the vehicles can tear up native vegetation, pollute streams with sediment from eroded areas and spread noxious weeds.

"(The rule) will better protect the environment, it will provide for better public safety and it will provide for better public access to the national forest system," he said.

Each forest must now establish a trail system and mark designated routes. The goal was to develop consistency throughout the forests, Bosworth said.

However, the number of trails and roads on each forest can vary widely.

"The rule itself doesn't open or close a single route, those decisions will be made at the local level," Bosworth said. "I don't expect that they'll be a significant increase in the number of miles of roads that will be open to motorized use, but I don't think they'll be a big decrease on most forests."

A forest's trail system can include so-called "renegade" trails that have been created over the years by riders as long as they're not causing problems, Jack Troyer, chief of the intermountain region, said during the conference. Other trails may be closed if they're causing erosion or other problems.

The agency might build new trails to connect dead ends into a looped trail to improve the trail system, Bosworth said.

Scott said the Forest Service has allowed some areas to become riddled with renegade routes. If those will remain open, they need to ensure that the vehicles aren't polluting streams or harassing wildlife.

The Forest Service will need more money from Congress both for implementing the plan and beefing up enforcement of off road violations, Scott said.

But Collins said closing even renegade routes should be the last resort for the Forest Service. Those routes are often in areas people want to ride, and often can be improved to reduce erosion.

"There are some folks who want to designate user-created routes as somehow being created in an irresponsible manner," he said. "That's something that we think can be addressed."



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2005/11/11/nation/export232878.txt>

Published on Friday, November 11, 2005.

Last modified on 11/11/2005 at 12:36 am

## Ex-fire crew chief accused of arson

PHOENIX (AP) - The former commander of an elite team that directed the fire crews who battled some of the nation's largest wildfires, and aided in recovery efforts at the World Trade Center, has been indicted for arson, prosecutors said Thursday.

Van Bateman, 55, was indicted Wednesday by a federal grand jury for allegedly setting two fires in the Coconino National Forest in 2004. He was a Type I incident commander, the equivalent of a general in the war against wildfires.

The 34-year veteran of the Forest Service was put on paid administrative leave.

After his four-year term as a Type I commander expired in 2004, Bateman served as the leader of a slightly lower level team for two years - a post he no longer holds because of the indictment, said Raquel Poturalski, a spokeswoman for the Coconino National Forest.

He faces two federal counts of setting timber afire and two counts of arson on public lands. Setting timber afire carries a maximum prison sentence of five years, while arson is punishable by up to 20 years, federal prosecutors said.

Bateman was accused of setting the tenth-of-an-acre Mother fire on May 8, 2004, and the 21-acre Boondock fire on June 23, 2004.

The investigation was conducted by the Forest Service, said U.S. attorney's office spokesman Patrick Schneider. He declined to comment on the possible motive or other aspects of the case.

"I am deeply disappointed that one of the members of our firefighting community has been charged with four felony counts," Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth said in a written statement. "I expect the highest standards of ethics and conduct from each Forest Service employee. If an employee violates those standards, then that employee will be held accountable."

Messages left at Bateman's home in Flagstaff weren't immediately returned Thursday.

The veteran firefighter was commander of a Forest Service management team sent to the World Trade Center site after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks to aid in recovery efforts.

He has fought wildfires across the West, including leading one of four elite teams that managed crews that battled the largest wildfire in Arizona history. The Rodeo-Chediski fire burned 469,000 acres in 2002, destroyed 491 homes and forced the evacuation of 30,000 people in eastern Arizona.

"I've been on some big fires, but this is far and away the largest fire I've ever been on, and I've been

doing this for 30 years," Bateman told the Arizona Daily Sun in Flagstaff weeks after the big blaze.

The nation's 17 Type I crews are on call to respond to fires and disasters. Each team has 37 to 42 members with expertise in logistics, planning and finance and is outfitted with equipment and supplies to carry their duties as a self-contained operation. The incident commander is the overall commander of the firefighting effort.

Bosworth said the accusations against Bateman shouldn't damage the reputation of good firefighters.

"The Forest Service has a long and proud tradition of protecting our country's natural resources while providing for employee and public safety," Bosworth said.

Bateman isn't the first firefighter to be accused of starting a wildfire in Arizona.

Part-time firefighter Leonard Gregg was accused of starting part of the Rodeo-Chediski fire in 2002. Gregg pleaded guilty in March 2004 to two counts of intentionally setting a fire and was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

The second half of that fire was started by a woman who was lost in a remote area and set a signal fire to get the attention of a news helicopter. The woman, who wasn't a firefighter, wasn't criminally prosecuted because federal officials said there was insufficient evidence of criminal intent on her part.



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2006/04/26/news/state/50-forest-service.txt>

Published on Wednesday, April 26, 2006.

Last modified on 4/26/2006 at 12:07 am

## Judge: Public deserves say in Forest Service issues

By The Associated Press

HELENA -- Three rules imposed by the Bush administration unlawfully limit the public's ability to influence U.S. Forest Service decisions on management of the nation's forests, a federal judge has ruled.

U.S. District Judge Donald Molloy of Missoula issued an injunction Monday against a rule that requires people to specify objections to Forest Service projects while they are under consideration or forfeit the right to challenge them later. The injunction applies nationwide.

"The substantive comment requirement was a serious problem because under these rules, members of the public might not even know that a project threatened their interests until after the Forest Service deadline for public comment," lawyer Doug Honnold said Tuesday.

"Whether you're a hunter, hiker or neighboring landowner, the Bush rule could cut you out of the process," said Honnold of Earthjustice, which represented The Wilderness Society, American Wildlands and Pacific Rivers Council in a lawsuit challenging rules issued in 2003. Named as defendants were Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns, Undersecretary Mark Rey and Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth.

A timber industry group on Tuesday defended the requirement for substantive comment. Timber-sale protesters "should come in ahead of time and have real reasons, rather than this boilerplate language that so many of the groups or individuals use," said Ellen Engstedt, executive vice president of the Montana Wood Products Association.

"You don't wait until the process is finished and then say, 'I don't like it.' "

The Forest Service had said the rules would help hasten removal of trees from overgrown forests that pose a wildfire hazard.

Forest Service spokesman Dan Jiron said agency officials had not read Molloy's decision and had no comment. "We'll comply with court orders, and if something else needs to be done, we will work with our lawyers," Jiron said.

Molloy also struck down a Forest Service rule that exempted some Forest Service projects from requirements for environmental analyses. The third rule allowed the government to bypass public involvement in national forest management by having the agriculture secretary or undersecretary sign decisions on agency projects. Molloy agreed with federal court decisions in California that invalidated those two rules earlier.

He said Congress wants the public to have "expansive" rights to appeal Forest Service decisions. The rules challenged in the lawsuit contradict a 1992 law on Forest Service decision making and appeals, and could shield some logging projects from administrative appeal entirely, the judge said.

The Wilderness Society, American Wildlands and Pacific Rivers claimed the rules violated not only federal laws that were on the books, but also a 2002 ruling by Molloy.

In Montana's Bitterroot National Forest, he had prohibited the Forest Service from logging thousands of acres burned by wildfires in 2000 -- logging the agency said was necessary for forest health. Molloy agreed with environmental groups that the logging decision bypassed the Forest Service process for appeals. Under an eventual settlement, some logging took place, but trees in areas where concerns included waters with vulnerable fish were not removed.

Copyright © 2006 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.





Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2006/04/28/news/wyoming/45-bighorn.txt>

Published on Friday, April 28, 2006.

Last modified on 4/28/2006 at 12:42 am

## Bighorn decision upsets wildlife groups

By The Associated Press

CASPER, -- A U.S. Department of Agriculture official in Washington has overturned a decision that provided special protections for bighorn sheep in the Sierra Madre Mountains of southern Wyoming.

Conservationists criticized the action last week by USDA Undersecretary David Tenny. They also criticized the state Game and Fish Department for advocating Tenny's action.

Tenny overturned an earlier decision by U.S. Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth that provided special protection to a small bighorn sheep herd near Encampment from domestic sheep herds in the area. Bighorn sheep are susceptible to some diseases carried by domestic sheep that can be fatal to bighorns.

Laramie-based Biodiversity Conservation Alliance sought the protection for the bighorns, while the state Game and Fish Department petitioned to overturn Bosworth's decision.

Erik Molvar, of the Biodiversity Conservation Alliance, said Tenny's ruling could be a death sentence for the Encampment bighorns, which number about 50.

"This is a native species that should have a place to survive, and one day flourish, in the Sierra Madre Range," he said.

He criticized the state Game and Fish Department for essentially abandoning a bighorn sheep herd it established decades ago.

"This agency has a serious crisis in leadership when it takes a hard stand in opposition to the welfare of the very wildlife it is charged with protecting for the benefit of sportsmen and all Wyoming citizens," Molvar said. "Heads should roll."

Molvar said Tenny's ruling could be challenged in federal court and his group was looking at its options.

But Game and Fish Department officials said the bighorn sheep protection measures were contrary to a compromise struck in 2004 by ranchers and wildlife advocates concerning conflicts between bighorn sheep and domestic sheep in Wyoming. That agreement emphasized separation of the two species in areas of northwest Wyoming where historic bighorn sheep populations have persisted, but placed less emphasis on protection of transplanted herds elsewhere in the state.

Jim Magagna, executive of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, said Tenny's ruling validates

the 2004 agreement and the Game and Fish agency deserves credit, not criticism, for standing by the compromise.

"That agreement was a product of a lot of work, and certainly the bighorn sheep biologists had a lot of input into it," he said. "For Game and Fish to have done anything else would have been to impugn the department's credibility in seeking agreements with groups that it needs to work with."

Grant Stumbough, manager of natural resources and policy for the Wyoming Department of Agriculture, said there's no reason to assume that continued domestic sheep grazing in the Sierra Madre will result in the demise of the Encampment bighorns.

Tenny's ruling "will keep a lot of sheep producers in business. At the same time, with responsible management, we can retain a very viable bighorn sheep herd as well," Stumbough said.

Copyright © 2006 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of [Lee Enterprises](#).



Story available at <http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2006/07/20/news/state/32-prevention.txt>

Published on Thursday, July 20, 2006.

Last modified on 7/20/2006 at 12:21 am

## Fire prevention efforts too slow, senators say

By NOELLE STRAUB

Gazette Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON - With wildfires raging in the West, senators of both parties slammed the Interior Department and Forest Service on Wednesday for carrying out wildfire prevention work on less than half of 1 percent of land set for treatment under the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003.

With only about 77,000 acres treated out of the 20 million acres identified by the legislation, senators said it would take the administration more than 200 years to carry out the law at the current rate. No acreage in Montana and Wyoming has been treated under the act, witnesses said.

"The implementation of this is light years away from the U.S. Senate vision of what was to be done," said Sen. Ron Wyden, D-Ore. "I just consider that unacceptable. We have big chunks of the West on fire. We just cannot afford foot-dragging."

Sen. Craig Thomas, R-Wyo., said at the Senate Energy Committee hearing that there haven't been any projects in Wyoming to this point despite the potential for wildfires in the forests there. Thomas later called the Forest Service's inaction unacceptable and said it "could compromise people's safety and make firefighting efforts that much harder."

### Fire grows

The Little Venus fire in the Shoshone National Forest increased to about 10,000 acres Tuesday, Forest Service officials said.

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee Chairman Larry Craig, R-Idaho, said that more than 4 million acres have burned in wildfires already this year and called the implementation of the act a disappointment.

But administration officials said the program is just getting ramped up.

Dale Bosworth, chief of the U.S. Forest Service, said he's proud of the efforts made but acknowledged the need to continue pushing forward.

Bosworth said he tells Forest Service staff to get the work done on the ground and not worry about whether they're using authority under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act or other authorities.

Bosworth said that by the end of next year, Interior and Forest Service will have completed 20 to 25

million acres of fuels treatment using all authorities.

"We're not lagging behind," he said. "I didn't come here to say we need a bunch more money."

Craig said 30 percent more acres have been treated this year than last under the act, so the pace has been increasing, but added that it has been a struggle to find the funding for firefighting for Interior and the Forest Service.

"That money is hard to come by," he said.

Several senators said that 40 percent of the spending on total fuels reduction work has gone to the southeastern U.S., which has only 7 percent of forested land.

"You're still pitting the South against the West and much of the West has been ablaze," Wyden said. "We're not seeing that in other parts of the country."

But Bosworth disputed that there has been an overemphasis on the South, saying only 17 percent of total dollars go to the South. He said many acres could be treated there by burning, which was cheaper than mechanical means and an effective use of federal money.

## **Targeting the highest priorities**

He also said the most important projects have come first. "I believe we're going generally to the highest priority areas," Bosworth said.

Wyden said there is no system for accountability and no one place where all projects are listed under the various funding sources.

"You can't get your arms around any clear system to measure how this work is being accomplished," Wyden said. "I cannot coherently track all this mumbo jumbo."

Thomas also questioned why the Forest Service has treated areas as small as 300 acres and not larger areas, saying it could cost more time on the regulatory process than the actual treatment. Bosworth said such small treatments can sometimes protect a larger area.

Thomas' staff said areas that could benefit from the act in Wyoming include areas hit by the lodge pole pine beetle in the Medicine Bow, the spruce beetle in the Shoshone, and the Douglas fir and pine beetles in the Bighorn National Forest.

Matthew Koehler, executive director of the WildWest Institute in Missoula, said very little fuel reduction had been accomplished under the act in the Northern Rockies, with none in Montana and Wyoming and 103 acres in Idaho.

Koehler said the major limiting factor is a lack of funding. He expressed concern that "misplaced funding priorities will continue to hamper" community wildfire protection efforts.

In 2002, President Bush authorized the Healthy Forests Initiative, directing federal agencies to improve regulatory processes to reduce the risk of wildfires. In 2003, Congress passed the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, which identified 20 million acres and streamlined the regulatory process for

Copyright © The Billings Gazette, a division of Lee Enterprises.

**U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Forest Service  
Region Five History Project**

**Interview with:**      **Mary Ellen Bosworth**  
**Interviewed by:**    **Bob Smart**  
**Location:**            **Placerville, California [verify]**  
**Date:**                 **February 17, 2004**  
Transcribed by:      Mim Eisenberg/WordCraft; February 2004  
Corrected by:         Linda Nunes

BOB SMART: Good morning. I'm Bob Smart, and I'm doing an interview with Mary Ellen Bosworth. It's ten-fifteen on February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2004, and we're in Mary Ellen's kitchen in Placerville and just taking a couple of pictures of Mary Ellen, much to her—I don't know how you can describe that, but if she'd had known I was going to be taking pictures, I might not have got the invitation, so here we are.

MARY ELLEN BOSWORTH: [Laughs.]

SMART: Well, Mary Ellen, today we're going to be talking about the history. The way this works is I'd like to kind of plant some open questions with you and then you just respond to it, and if we need to stop, just let me know, and we'll just do that.

I guess, going back—when was the first time you became aware of the Forest Service?

BOSWORTH: Let's see, right out of college. We were married the year before Irwin graduated. That was '38, we were married, and he graduated in '39, and then he just had summer work for two years.

SMART: So Irwin didn't work with the Forest Service, or did he?

BOSWORTH: No, not until—well, those summer jobs, he worked for the Forest Service, on lookouts, and that's where we lived, on the lookout. Well, we didn't live on the tower the first year; we lived in a little rock house below the tower. The tower was a twenty-foot tower. And then the second year, we lived in the tower.

SMART: What location were you?

BOSWORTH: They were both on the Angeles.

SMART: Do you remember the names of the towers?

BOSWORTH: Yes, Mount Islip was the first one, and Pine Mountain, I believe, was the other one. It's a long time ago. I remembered that far back!

SMART: So this is the first you really had run into the Forest Service, that there even was a Forest Service?

BOSWORTH: Yes, I didn't know anything about it, but Irwin was bound—he was going to be a forester, that's all. In those years, you had to take the junior forester exam to get appointment, you know. He had a little trouble passing it for the first couple of years, and so that's why it was just summer work. And then we were transferred up to Susanville. We made thirteen moves those first four years.

SMART: Wow.

BOSWORTH: On the Angeles.

SMART: Were you a city girl or a country girl when you married?

BOSWORTH: Not a city girl but a small-town girl.

SMART: Where did you and Irwin meet?

BOSWORTH: In high school, in Covina High School down in Southern California.

SMART: So you were both Southern California products.

BOSWORTH: Yes, mm-hm.

SMART: And you think of Covina as being rural?

BOSWORTH: Yes. [Laughter.]

SMART: I need to show you what it looks like now. [Laughter.] Well, that's marvelous. So a huge number of moves right off the bat, it seems like.

BOSWORTH: What?

SMART: You sound like you had a huge number of moves right off the bat.

BOSWORTH: Well, let's see, how far do you want me to go with this now?

SMART: What I really would like to capture is, through the eyes of a spouse and a mom, what it was like to see the Forest Service through your eyes, from when the time begins.

BOSWORTH: Well, in the very beginning, living on a lookout, I remember making the remark, "And is this what you went to college for?" [Laughter.] But afterwards, later on, it turned out to be a real good outfit. Those days, lots of times when he was out on a fire, working on a district, I'd think, *It sure would be nice if we were on lookout again because he'd be home all the time.*

SMART: When you first met Irwin, how would you characterize the way people thought about the Forest Service?

BOSWORTH: Oh, golly. I don't think the Forest Service was known to the general public that much then. After all, that was in '38 and '39, but he got started with the idea that he wanted to in the Boy Scouts. What was his name, the supervisor of the Angeles at that time? Mendenhall, I think it was.

SMART: Was it Sam Mendenhall?

BOSWORTH: No, it was Bill. In those days, you didn't have to have a college education to work for the Forest Service. But Mendenhall told him it was going to be necessary in a few



years. He hadn't taken a college course in high school, so he wasn't prepared to go to college, but then he took another year of high school so he could go to college and got his degree in forestry then at Cal [University of California], Berkeley.

SMART: You had known each other in high school. Did you both go to college together?

BOSWORTH: No, I didn't. I went to junior—well, we both went to junior college in Pasadena, and then he went up to Berkeley, and then after the first year in Berkeley, we were married, and I helped put him through the last year. I think I did more of his work than he did. [Laughs.]

SMART: And what were *you* doing?

BOSWORTH: I finally passed the state—oh, what did they call it, for the state personnel board? Anyway, you had to take a test, and I worked for the Department of Motor Vehicles, and that helped.

SMART: So Irwin graduates from college in—

BOSWORTH: In '39, uh-huh.

SMART: In '39, and then what happens?

BOSWORTH: And then we went to Mount Islip, and that was just a summer job, of course. And then he worked at Vultee Aircraft for a few months in the winter, and then he got another summer job for the Forest Service the next summer, and then he worked that winter for Lockheed. And then after that, why, he got his—it was actually a War Service appointment to Susanville in 1944, and he—let's see how was that? He went up there as a timber cruiser, and he was gone all week long. By that time, we had two little boys, three and probably six months, I guess it was, and he had to use his own car, and I was without a car.

SMART: Wow.

BOSWORTH: Way out of town.

SMART: Were you living on a ranger station?

BOSWORTH: No, no. No, we didn't get that until—that was a little later on. Then—let's see, where were we? We were in Susanville. Then he was made dispatcher in Susanville. We stayed there for four years, and then he got his permanent appointment that wasn't a War Service appointment, as the assistant ranger at Dunsmuir. That was on the Shasta.

SMART: I'm not familiar with the War Service Department. What was that about?

BOSWORTH: Because the Japanese were sending those fire balloons over, dropping them into the forest and so on and so forth. I guess that was one reason. I don't know, really.

SMART: So it was kind of a public defense kind of—

BOSWORTH: Yes, mm-hm, mm-hm.

SMART: Civilian defense kind of thing.

BOSWORTH: Yes.

SMART: Tell me, two children appear on the scene, and who are they?

BOSWORTH: Who are they? Well, Ron was the oldest one. He lives in Santa Rosa now. And Dale, of course, is in D.C. right now. Hopefully he'll get back to Montana before too long. And then nine years later we had a little girl, Linda. She's married and lives in Elk Grove. Her husband is a high school teacher, and she works for the school district.

SMART: So she's close by, anyhow.

BOSWORTH: So she's very close, and they come up every other week or something like that.

SMART: Nice.

BOSWORTH: The one in Santa Rosa is—I don't know what his title is now. He works for the city. He used to be, like, a director of finances. I think they call it—well, he's in charge of administrative services, that's it, right now, but he'll be retiring before long.

SMART: Okay, so you guys are in Susanville, and—

BOSWORTH: Then he was transferred to Dunsmuir. He was assistant ranger. He was assistant ranger for about ten months, I guess. And Pike Boehm—people wouldn't remember him—was the ranger, and then he was transferred someplace else, and Irwin was made ranger. And we moved from the assistant ranger's house to the ranger's house, a beautiful big home. It was right on the highway. The ranger station was down below, and we were up on the hill. Lots of snow in the winter. Living on a ranger district was probably the best time that we ever had, living with other Forest Service people. We were getting together. Everybody was in the same boat. Their husbands were gone all the time, and you couldn't go anyplace in the summer. You had to be on call all summer long. And so we made the best of it, and really and thoroughly enjoyed being on a ranger district. We were there for four years.

SMART: What would be a typical day for you all on the compound?

BOSWORTH: A typical day? Well, the kids were in school by that time, and the office was down below, right on the freeway, and we were up on the hill. Mainly it was watching out for fires, just because it was the heavy fire district at that time. A lot of good people were around then. They're all gone now. I think I'm the only one that's still around. [Both chuckle.]

So. Now, what would you like me to—

SMART: As you look through that era, you know, you're living on this compound, you've got two children that are in school. I'm trying to get a sense of what it was like as a member of the community, what it was like to be a member of the compound.

BOSWORTH: We got very involved in Cub Scouts while we were there. Irwin was Cub master, and I was a den mother, and we spent a lot of time in Scouts while we were there. It was very enjoyable. I enjoyed it. That was the main thing. Oh, of course, I was in PTA, and Irwin

was in Lions Club or something like that. I don't think it was Rotary; I think it was Lions Club. It was a small town, mainly a railroad town at that time. Southern Pacific [Railroad] had their roundhouse down below, in town. Every year they'd have Railroad Days. People in the Forest Service really went all out to make floats for that.

And I remember one year that the Forest Service—Dale was about five years old, and Ann Erhart (Henry Erhart was an old Forest Service employee) made a Smoky Bear costume, so he was Little Smoky Bear, and then she made another Smoky Bear for one of the fellows that was on the fire crew, and he was Big Smoky Bear, and it was really quite a float with these two Smoky Bears on there.

But we were quite involved in things that went on in the community then. It was a small town. We enjoyed it. Hated to leave there after four years. And then—do you want me to go on to—

SMART: So you're now leaving Dunsmuir, so the year is about 1952?

BOSWORTH: We left Susanville in '48 and went to Dunsmuir and stayed there till '52. Then in '52 we went to Quincy, from Dunsmuir.

SMART: So '48 you leave Susanville. What was Dunsmuir like when you were there?

BOSWORTH: Dunsmuir was a very small town. We knew everybody in town. Of course, some of the Forest Service wives worked downtown, but I didn't because I had a job raising two boys, and I was too involved in Cub Scouts at the time anyway. It was a very nice little town. We had everything we needed there: grocery stores and clothing stores, everything we needed, and if we really had to have something, we'd go down to Redding. It took an hour to get to Redding, but if you'd want to get furniture or something like that, why, you'd go to either Redding or Reno [Nevada].

Let's see...

SMART: How did the citizenry of Dunsmuir view the Forest Service?

BOSWORTH: Oh, the Forest Service was really tops in Dunsmuir. They thought the Forest Service was ideal, because everybody at the ranger district took part in the community, and even if it was a railroad town, the Forest Service, as far as I know, was accepted very well and was thought a lot of. But those were really good, enjoyable days, living on the ranger station on the compound. That was the only time we ever lived in a compound. Then we moved to Quincy after that. We were there from '52 till '60, eight years. That was a long time to be anyplace in those days. We were involved with things in town there, too, pretty much. The Forest Service was really well thought of then, in those days.

SMART: What job was Irwin doing then?

BOSWORTH: He went up there as a staff officer in timber. He worked at that for four years, and then he was changed over to staff in—what was it? Grazing and wildlife, I guess it was, for the next four years. And then we found out that we were going to—oh, before we moved back to Susanville again, he was offered a job up in Alaska as a supervisor, but we turned it down after a lot of thinking, because my parents and his parents were getting up in years, and the boys were in high school at that time, and we didn't think it was fair to them to make a move right at that time. It turned out real well because six weeks later, why, he was offered the job as supervisor at Susanville.

SMART: Turning down the job to go to Alaska was fairly unusual, would be my guess, at the time, wasn't it?

BOSWORTH: Yes, people—you didn't turn down jobs very often then. We knew it was bad, but we were going to take our chances anyway. He was supposed to go to Ketchikan, I think—what's the name of the place down in the southern part of Alaska?

SMART: Anchorage perhaps?

BOSWORTH: No, not that far north.

SMART: But the general idea at the time was you pretty well took the assignments that were given to you, so Irwin kind of stood out at the time by saying, "No, I don't think my family wants to go there."

BOSWORTH: Yes, he did it for family reasons only, and he knew that it wasn't a good idea. Both of us knew that, and we spent one horrible weekend trying to decide whether we should or not. As it turned out, it worked out fine, but we knew that he was ruining his chances of going ahead by turning it down, but it just worked out real well because then we moved back to Susanville again. He was supervisor there for seven years.

SMART: What year are we now, moving back to Susanville?

BOSWORTH: We moved back there in '60.

SMART: Nineteen sixty.

BOSWORTH: Mm-hm. We lived there until—wait just a minute now. I'm wrong on that. Yes, we were there from '52 till '60—I mean in Quincy from '52 to '60, and then to Susanville from '60 to '67.

SMART: Okay.

BOSWORTH: Mm-hm.

SMART: And that's when I first met y'all, was in 1967.

BOSWORTH: Yes, over here, mm-hm.

SMART: So what was going on in Susanville when you came back?

BOSWORTH: I didn't like the idea of going back to Susanville because I had bad memories of Susanville before because Irwin was gone all the time and I was raising two little kids, but it turned out that it was fine. We had always lived in Forest Service houses before. Not always but after he got started. And so this time we bought a house, our first place that we bought, and got well acquainted with the townspeople there, and real active in—of course, I got active in Cub Scouts wherever I was, it seems [chuckles], and PTA. In fact, I was kind of glad when we left Susanville to come here because I was going to be president of PTA and I was going to be president of Women's Club and—I was tired of that! [Laughter.]

SMART: With your activities in the Cub Scouts, did the boys—they must have participated in the Cub Scout program the same time you were—

BOSWORTH: Yes, they were, uh-huh, mm-hm.

SMART: And then did they go on into Boy Scouts?

BOSWORTH: They did. Dale did. Ron didn't. Dale did. He didn't go all the way, but he went quite a ways. I don't know how far he really went. I can't remember that.

SMART: When did he leave the scouting program?

BOSWORTH: Pardon?

SMART: When did Dale leave the scouting program?

BOSWORTH: While we were in Quincy, I think it was After he was in high school, yes.

SMART: What kind of activities were the boys involved with when they were in high school?

BOSWORTH: Dale was involved in sports, and he was determined—he decided when he was twelve years old he was going to work for the Forest Service, and he had a hard time. He graduated from high school, and then he went to junior college for a year there in Susanville, but

he had a very hard time passing chemistry, that was required. I don't know why it was required for forestry, but it was. But he finally made it. Ron didn't want to have anything to do with the Forest Service. [Laughs.] He was more of a city boy.

SMART: What do you suppose it was that caused Dale to decide he wanted to be a forester?

BOSWORTH: What was that?

SMART: Why do you think Dale decided he wanted to be a forester at twelve?

BOSWORTH: I think that he went out one time with his dad in the pickup and saw him talking with people and checking on fires and so on and so forth, and he just thought it was something that he was going to do. And his brother said, "No way. I want to live in the city, not in a small town." [Laughs.] But it was fine.

I don't know how far you want me to go on this, but...

SMART: I think you're doing just wonderful. Your daughter has come along now.

BOSWORTH: Oh, yes, yes, my daughter—she was born when we lived in Quincy. Spoiled by two brothers, spoiled horribly. She's turned out to be a great gal. In fact, all three of them are.

SMART: Now, she's eleven years younger than Dale?

BOSWORTH: Nine years younger. Let's see, I don't know whether you want any names of people that we knew in the Forest Service or not.

SMART: If they stand out, that would be fine, but again, my focus is really kind of on you and your life and raising the kids. It sounds like you were just super involved while you were in Susanville. Have the attitudes about the Forest Service changed at all?

BOSWORTH: No, no, Forest Service was still tops.

SMART: And what about the employees? Did they seem to—



BOSWORTH: The Forest Service was just like a big family. Wherever you moved, you were never a stranger because there were other Forest Service people there, and they just took you in right away. Got together all the time. Once a month, the women used to always get together, go out to dinner or have—in Quincy we went from house to house. Everybody would take a turn. Sometimes they'd have twenty people at the house. No, I think we [rented Denny Halls?] at that time. Maybe we did, on Christmas parties, when the whole forest got together. Of course, at Dunsmuir, at the ranger station, on the compound we were together all the time, probably every weekend, having a party or something or other. You couldn't do anything else because we couldn't leave.

SMART: [Laughs.]

BOSWORTH: So you had to stay there, and you had to make your own fun. [Laughs.]

SMART: This second time that you're in Susanville, you kind of became an empty nester, I guess. You have Ron and Dale both leaving home about that time. Is that right?

BOSWORTH: In Susanville?

SMART: Mm-hm.

BOSWORTH: Yes, yes. Ron left home when we were in Quincy. He went to college in Sacramento, Sac State [Sacramento State College], and then Dale went to Idaho after he went to junior college for a year there; then he went to Idaho, University of Moscow. And that was all before we moved here to Placerville.

SMART: So you came to Placerville in 1967?

BOSWORTH: Yes, mm-hm.

SMART: And Irwin came here as?

BOSWORTH: As a supervisor. He came here with the idea that this was an ideal place to retire.

[Laughter.] And it turned out to be. [Laughter.] I'm still here. [Laughs.]

SMART: I happen to share that view with you.

BOSWORTH: Huh?

SMART: I happen to share that view with you.

BOSWORTH: It *is* a good place.

SMART: So you've gone from Susanville, which is still pretty rural. Placerville at the time was probably a little more—

BOSWORTH: Well, Placerville wasn't too far from Sacramento, either, and that's one thing that we liked about it: it was a nice little town, and it was still—we weren't big-city people at all, but it was close to Sacramento. At that time, Highway 50 wasn't like it is now. It was the old Highway 50.

SMART: What was the community like, and how were you involved in Placerville?

BOSWORTH: Let's see, Irwin was in Rotary [Club], I think, in Placerville. In the beginning, I wasn't going to do anything; I was tired of it.

SMART: [Laughs.] From Susanville.

BOSWORTH: But I ended up—Dorothea Engstrom worked on me when they first started the college here, and I didn't want to get into the Patrons Club right away. Then after Irwin died, why, I thought, *Well, maybe that's one thing that I would like to do.* In fact, I stayed with Patrons Club at the college and worked there for—well, I just quit last year, retired last year from there after twenty-five years there, or more.

SMART: Almost matriarch of our local college here, then.

BOSWORTH: The local college, uh-huh. It was doing things for the college. They didn't have much money. Now they have a new building, but when we started out, we used to meet down at the fairgrounds all the time. Well, that's where the college was, at the fairgrounds. They had portable buildings then. They didn't have a regular college, themselves. Every year we'd put on a luncheon and make money—sell tickets, you know, to the townspeople, for scholarships. We really worked. It was a working organization. I don't think there were any other Forest Service people involved in that. Maybe a couple a couple of them went in for, oh, a year or so and then dropped out, but I kind of enjoyed it because it was different, and it was a way to get acquainted with the local people as well. I enjoyed that.

SMART: What kind of employee group did Irwin find when he got to the Eldorado?

BOSWORTH: When he came here, you mean?

SMART: Mm-hm.

BOSWORTH: The other Forest Service employees were fine, as far as that goes. Real good, real good. It was a real good outfit here. The whole staff was good, and the rangers were good, and they all worked together. I don't know how things are now. I have no idea.

SMART: Just to share a little personal history that I have with Irwin, was that he began—he was one of the leaders as far as looking at organizations and saying, “I think we need to make some changes.” That's how he and I developed some kind of personal relationship. He was very progressive.

BOSWORTH: Yes, up to a point. You know, you don't want to go too far.

SMART: Say some more about that.

BOSWORTH: [Ignoring the request.] But anyway, I don't know now any more than—no, that wouldn't have anything in—Dale said, “Be sure and show Bob that book.” He said, “That'll give you some ideas on questions to ask.”

SMART: Okay.

BOSWORTH: I told Dale over the weekend that you were coming.

SMART: Oh, great.

BOSWORTH: And he said, “Oh, good,” he says, “I like Bob.” [Laughter.]

SMART: Well, I think the world of Dale, too, so we're in really good shape.

BOSWORTH: He just got back from Israel.

I'm still on, isn't it? [She has moved, and her voice has become somewhat muffled.]

SMART: That's fine. Part of what I'd like to do, Mary Ellen, is get some insight as far as Dale growing up, too, and if you don't mind, we can talk a little bit about that.

BOSWORTH: Yes, let's see.

SMART: You started with him saying when he was twelve he—

BOSWORTH: That's when he decided he wanted to work for the Forest Service when he was twelve.

SMART: Would you like to try A History of Dale According to Mom?

BOSWORTH: [Laughs.] No, I don't think that Dale would appreciate that. [Laughs.]

SMART: Knowing your son, I think that there's not a thing in the world he's the least bit concerned about.

BOSWORTH: No, Dale has always been easygoing, easy to get along with, a big tease, and not so much a tease anymore. He's working too hard to be a tease. But you could always count on Dale. Both the boys were that way. Neither one of them, or my daughter either, would ever lie

about anything. When I mentioned it to my oldest son one time, he said, “How come”—all three were that way, determined to not tell—you know, you just won’t lie about anything. He said, “We were all raised by the same man.” That was the way they feel. I didn’t get any credit for it at all.

SMART: [Laughs heartily.]

BOSWORTH: [Laughs.] I just did all the work. [Laughs.]

SMART: Well, that’s neat. I think that’s really important, to understand—that’s exactly my perspective, too. Just a basically honest person you could trust from the moment you met him.

BOSWORTH: Yes.

SMART: So I think you and Irwin were both successful, and if he’d thought a minute, he’d probably have his mom in there, too.

BOSWORTH: Yes. [Laughs.] So anyway, after Dale left for college, why, he was gone all the time, so I don’t—and then he met his wife in college, and then I think they were married—he still had a year left in college, too, if I’m not mistaken. Maybe not. Maybe he graduated, yes. They started out just like we did, way back in nothing. We started on a lookout, but they started way back in a little town, the town of Avery, Idaho, which wasn’t a town, really. But I don’t know. I don’t know anything else to say.

SMART: Okay. Well, let me just take a quick look at some notes—

BOSWORTH: Probably can think of a lot of things if I...

SMART: The Forest Service today is different—

BOSWORTH: Yes.

SMART: —than the Forest Service that you and Irwin knew. Can you speak to that, the changes that have occurred that you’ve seen?

BOSWORTH: The what?

SMART: The changes that occurred? Have you got any insight of what caused those changes or...

BOSWORTH: I don't know. The people in the Forest Service today are just as good as the people way back, but times have changed, and it has to make changes. I mean, you can't stay the same way they did fifty years ago. If everything is stopped and did the same way they did fifty years ago, we wouldn't have TV, we wouldn't have airplanes, we wouldn't have anything. There's bound to be changes, and they're probably good except that they're pretty hard to accept some of them, but...Nowadays it's an eight to five job, but it didn't used to be. It used to be a twenty-four-hour job, I think.

SMART: [Laughs.]

BOSWORTH: Because you could get called in the middle of the night, and off you'd go to a fire, and you'd have to be home all the time. That was the hard part in the summer, never getting a vacation. If you wanted to use your leave, you had to use it in the winter. You should know all about that. You were raised in the Forest Service, weren't you?

SMART: Yes, I was. It's fun for me to hear the parallels because your history and my history match very well.

BOSWORTH: [Laughs.] Yes. Well, I still think that the Forest Service is probably about the best outfit in the country. It still is. I don't know if the public thinks so altogether, as much as they used to. Maybe they do. I don't know. A lot of it depends on where you are, too.

SMART: What do you think about the challenges that Dale's had to face?

BOSWORTH: The what?

SMART: The challenges that Dale has had to face. What do you think about all that?

BOSWORTH: All I know—Dale doesn't tell me everything. I mean, I don't know what's going on, really, which is just as well. But yes, there's a lot of challenges, but that's what Dale likes.

He likes challenges. He lives on challenges.

SMART: [Laughs.]

BOSWORTH: I keep saying, "When are you going to retire?" "Oh, one of these times." Just the other day, "Oh, I haven't decided yet." He says, "I'm enjoying my job." He said, "I am tired, but I'm enjoying it."

SMART: I think he's doing extremely well at it, I'll tell you that. Organization will really miss him when he leaves.

BOSWORTH: Just got back from Israel last week. That was kind of interesting, to see how their forestry is over there.

Would you like a cup of coffee?

SMART: Let me just make one more quick look here [at his notes], and then we can stop, and then I think we'll come back and do some other...This is a good place to stop. We'll stop now and, yes, a cup of coffee sounds great.

[End CD 1. Begin CD 2.]

SMART: We had a short break for a cup of coffee, and we're going to come back now, and I've got a few questions I want to go over with you. Mary Ellen, was there anything that struck you the first go-around that you'd like to share?

BOSWORTH: Let me see. From the beginning, you mean?

SMART: Uh-huh.

BOSWORTH: I can't think of anything right offhand.

SMART: Okay. As we go along, if something pops in, let's just go ahead and capture that.

BOSWORTH: Yes. Well, I remember one thing. When we first started out and Irwin went to a meeting down in Southern California, when he first started working for the Forest Service, and he came home and he said, “You’re not going to like this,” he said, “but they tell us that working for the Forest Service is not a job, it’s a way of life.” And how true that was. [Laughs.]

SMART: It really is true.

SMART: I didn’t capture, the first go-round—when were you born?

BOSWORTH: When was I born? Nineteen seventeen.

SMART: Nineteen seventeen. I’d like to go back to the lookout, because you mentioned when we were off the tape there about—you were living at the lookout, and—how much did you pay for rent there?

BOSWORTH: We paid five dollars a month rent for the lookout. We had a one-room—that first lookout at Mount Islip. It was just a tower, and we’d come down at night and sleep and cook our dinner in this little stone cabin, it was. Cement floor, just one room. And the cement floor was full of little holes, and Irwin asked his boss, “What are all those little holes?” And he says, “One of the fellows that stayed here used to sit in bed and shoot the rats.” [Laughter.] He had the nerve to tell *us* that. I was scared to death. [Laughter.] So anyhow...

SMART: Describe that tower. How big was the tower?

BOSWORTH: It wasn’t very big. Gosh, as far as—just had a tower up there, and in the middle of the tower was—what did they call it, when they mapped out where the fire was?

SMART: Fire finder?

BOSWORTH: Yes, something like that. There was just room for two people to sit there, that’s all. Oh, I didn’t tell this: We had to pack in. It was four miles to pack in there to this lookout, and they would bring groceries up once a month. Every week, we would get twenty gallons of



water, and there was a spring down about two and a half miles. You could go down there and get a little extra water, and we kept the water in a great big garbage can, clean garbage can.

SMART: [Laughs.]

BOSWORTH: But we had to keep a chain on it with a padlock because people would hike up there, and they would want a drink of water. This was all the water we had for cooking, for bathing, for cleaning dishes and everything else. You learned to get by with it, with twenty gallons of water a week.

SMART: How did they pack it in to you?

BOSWORTH: With a mule. No helicopters then. [Chuckles.] But we got by. We always appreciated the fresh food because then we'd have milk and fresh meat, and we got so we used canned milk altogether, and fresh vegetables. You just learned to get by with it, that's all.

Didn't think anything of it.

SMART: How did you keep things cool?

BOSWORTH: Golly, I don't remember whether we even worried about that or not. Probably there was a little—people in those days didn't have refrigerators even down below, at home. They had what they called a cool closet that was built in a kitchen, and it had screens from the outside, and the outside air would come in, and I think we had one in that place there, too, yes, mm-hm. But no water, or no ice. But that didn't last too long, just that one summer.

SMART: It sounds like a great adventure, though.

BOSWORTH: It was fun. It was fun. Looking back, we enjoyed it. We had lots and lots of hikers that would come in and come up to the tower and climb the tower and talk. I remember one time—it was very quiet up there; all we had was a telephone and the Forest Service radio. One time we heard music coming up the trail, and Irwin's oldest brother had bought a radio that

was battery operated, which we didn't know anything about, really, for us to use up there, and boy, that was wonderful, to have that little radio. It was battery operated. No electricity. Of course, we didn't have that up there. In fact, we didn't have electricity in lots of places. But you get by without it. If you don't have it, you don't miss it. You would nowadays. When you get used to things, why—[laughs].

SMART: It's pretty hard to go back.

BOSWORTH: Go back, yes. It would be pretty hard.

SMART: When we were having our cup of coffee, you described that you tried hard to stay out of Forest Service business as a forester's wife.

BOSWORTH: Yes.

SMART: Tell me again the role that you played.

BOSWORTH: The only thing I ever did was answer telephones at night, when Irwin was gone. It seemed like there was an awful lot of that to do, or take care of—people, though, wanted the information, you know, and he'd be gone and I'd have to give them information, as much as I knew.

SMART: You also touched on that you felt some responsibility about the employees?

BOSWORTH: You felt like you were responsible for all of them to be happy and have a good time and be comfortable. And every place we went, it seemed like I was always walking around town, making myself acquainted with the people that already lived there, the Forest Service employees, you know, from the time that we first started out. It's just what you did, that's all, in those days.

SMART: When a child was sick or somebody was ill, how would you describe that?

BOSWORTH: I remember, especially when we were at Dunsmuir, when he was ranger there, Mel Dimmick—some people will remember; he just passed away a few years ago—was dispatcher-clerk in the office, and they lived in a little tiny place there. His wife worked downtown. One morning she called me up and said—she had arthritis, the beginning of arthritis, and she was only thirty, I think. She called me up and said, “Will you help me get dressed because I’m having problems?” I said, “I’ll come over and help you get dressed, but I’m going to take you to the doctor instead.” And that was the beginning of her arthritis, and she lived until—she was crippled. She had two new knees and two new ankles and two new hips, and she still got by. She just passed away about ten years ago, I guess it was.

But we always felt like we were responsible for anybody that was sick, to go help them if we could, especially when you lived at the ranger station. Living there is a different experience. If you weren’t on a station, you didn’t feel quite that close, but...I can remember when Irwin was supervisor that every time anybody new would come in, I would make a point to go see them right away and see if I could help them out, get them situated and so on and so forth. I enjoyed it. It was fun doing that.

But my part in the Forest Service, I felt, was that kind of a part, nothing with the job, itself, but to make everybody else happy.

SMART: So if somebody had problems with cows, that wasn’t your department? Your department was—

BOSWORTH: [Laughs.] Yes.

SMART: You mentioned that there was a little bit of competition between you and Irwin when you were in the lookout tower?

BOSWORTH: Oh, yes. I found the first fire, and that bothered him terribly [both chuckle] because I found the first fire. But we played cribbage. We played cribbage day in and day out. You know, there wasn't anything else to do. You can only look around so much and keep looking and so on. We played lots of cribbage. But we had to stay up in that tower from daylight till dusk. That was fun.

SMART: If there had been a lightning storm, what were the directions?

BOSWORTH: We had to be up there then.

SMART: You stayed on the tower?

BOSWORTH: Yes, we had to be up there with the lightning all around us. I didn't like that, a metal tower, and Irwin said, "Don't worry about it. It's taken care of so it won't hurt us at all." It was grounded. But you'd have lightning flashes all over the place. We had to be right up there. But I don't think we found many fires that one summer. We found a few, I guess. I can't remember. That was a long time ago! [Laughs.]

SMART: While we were on the break there, you showed me the marvelous album. Tell me a little bit about how that album came into existence.

BOSWORTH: Well, Dale's wife Carma just was determined that I had to have a history of myself, the Forest Service and the family, so she started asking me questions, and then she wrote to a lot of other people and asked them to send in what they knew about it, about the family and about the Forest Service, and she started it, oh—I think she has a date in there, but I can't remember just when she worked on it. [Noise as microphone is moved.]

SMART: It was just beginning to make—picking up a little static there, so I just moved it a little bit.

BOSWORTH: Oh. I was making a little static, huh? [Laughter.]

SMART: As I was saying, that is a wonderful book of memories there, and it's got lots of good pictures of Dale as a child and your husband as a child, the whole family.

BOSWORTH: The whole family, uh-huh.

SMART: I can see that if one was doing a Forest Service history, there are a lot of people in there that are identified by name.

BOSWORTH: Yes, mm-hm, there's a lot of them. A lot of them aren't around anymore, but some of them might be. I can't remember. I can't think of anybody that... Well, the Schmidts, of course, are still around, and the Turners were in there, but they're both gone now.

SMART: Like, she has some of the old forms that the Forest Service used and operated with.

BOSWORTH: Yes.

SMART: It's really a wonderful, wonderful document for her to have prepared there.

Tell me about women in the Forest Service. When was the first time you ever saw a woman employee working with the Forest Service?

BOSWORTH: Woman employee? The only women employees then were in the office.

SMART: So what did they do?

BOSWORTH: No, none otherwise, none otherwise at all. It wasn't thought of, in fact, in those days. Well, it might have been other places, but not where we were, anyhow. But I think if it's the right job, a woman can do the job just as well as a man. It has to be the right kind of a woman and the right kind of a job. In fact, I think they can maybe even do better than some men. [Laughs.]

SMART: You're not to get any argument out of me on that one.

To go back and look at the whole span, do any adventures ever—I mean...

BOSWORTH: No, I can't think of anything like that. Kind of a dull life, really, huh?

SMART: I think not. It appears to be a really wonderful, colorful life, actually. Adventures with fire?

BOSWORTH: Can't think of anything exciting, though.

SMART: Fires, politics, controversy in the community?

BOSWORTH: As far as what I was aware of, there were no controversies ever with the Forest Service and the community or in the Forest Service, itself. Just everybody got along and did what they were supposed to do. And it seemed like the communities that we were in, anyway, accepted everything that the Forest Service did as just right. But I don't know whether those same places may be different now than it was then, too. I don't know.

SMART: Do you have any stories about Dale that you'd like to share?

BOSWORTH: [Chuckles.] I've got one story I won't tell, though, when he was in the first grade, I think it was, because this will be made public. [Laughs.]

SMART: As I said, if there was something that really was truly objectionable—

BOSWORTH: Oh, it's not objectionable at all, it was just kind of cute, I thought.

SMART: I'd sure like to hear it.

BOSWORTH: Turn it off, then. I'll tell you. [Laughter.] No, see, the ranger station in Dunsmuir was out of town, oh, about two miles, I guess, three miles out of town, and the school was in town. Of course, the kids would take a bus to come home, and I would watch for them because they'd get out on the highway and have to cross the highway and then I'd go down and meet them as soon as I saw the bus. Well, the bus came that Dale was supposed to be on. Dale didn't get off of it. I didn't see him. I was kind of panicky because he was only just a little kid, you know. Well, he was always just a tease, even when he was a little kid. He walked from school. Across from the ranger station, the far side of the highway, was a pond that was full of

frogs, little frogs, and he knew that I was going to be mad at him for being late, so he filled his lunchbox with frogs, so when I opened his lunchbox, the frogs all jumped out. [Laughs.]

SMART: [Laughs heartily.]

BOSWORTH: And he said, “Well, I knew you would be mad at me,” and says, “If I put all those frogs in there, you couldn’t be mad at me.” [Laughter.]

SMART: Oh, that’s wonderful.

BOSWORTH: Anyway, I’ll never forget that. Neither will he. [Laughs.]

SMART: I’m sure not.

BOSWORTH: But I can’t think of any...Forest Service. I know that this one year we had so much snow in Dunsmuir that you couldn’t get around unless you used snowshoes. Mel and Adeline Dimmick lived just below us down the hill, and we lived up at the top, and you couldn’t go anyplace because you just didn’t dare leave because of the snow, and so we played canasta—was it canasta? We’d pack those two little kids down and go to the Dimmicks on snowshoes and packing ourselves down there, and played canasta all the time, in the evening, because we knew that we were on the telephone, too. We used to have a lot of fun with other people around there, too, doing that, but this one family, we used to go—I’ll never forget the snowshoes. And I’m not that kind of a person. I didn’t like walking in the snow. And the kids, if they’d walk in it, why, it would go clear up to their waist. It was deep. Lots of it.

And then the one year that it snowed the hardest, we had a big snow and I was keeping a path shoveled out, and it was getting to be pretty hard to do. The kids were little, or not very big, anyway. My oldest son, Ron, said, “Mom, why don’t we just walk on top of it and pack it down instead of shoveling it?” And, boy, that was the best thing that ever happened! And they had more fun walking on top of it and packing it down, and I didn’t have to shovel it anymore.

[Laughter.] Irwin was gone for a whole week that time, too. He was always gone when something like that happened.

SMART: [Laughs.]

BOSWORTH: When the kids were sick, he was always gone, or when something happened at the house, he was always gone. The heaviest snowstorm, he was always gone. Oh, yeah.

During this one snowstorm, the fellows decided that they would take a Forest Service pickup and get into town. There was no way to drive in otherwise. And so the wives all gave them a list, and I gave them my list, and we were out of toilet paper. When he came home [chuckles]—toilet paper used to come in three rolls, and it looked like a paper towel. He came home with three rolls of paper towels instead of toilet paper. [Laughs.]

SMART: Oh, no.

BOSWORTH: But that's just the way it was. And we used it.

SMART: Ah, me.

BOSWORTH: Now, you can eliminate any of those things that you want to eliminate.

SMART: I think there are some real messages in the stories that you're telling about what life was like.

BOSWORTH: Those were all things that happened at the ranger station, when we lived at the compound. Then the fellows would always go hunting every year, hunting season, deer season. Then they'd come home with a buck or two, and then they would cut it up themselves, down in the warehouse. I never went down there. I couldn't stand that. [Laughs.] And then we'd take it downtown. There was a freezer downtown, a company that had lockers for freezers. You'd put it in there.



Then one time the word came out that there was a big—oh, there were a lot of truck accidents on that Highway 99 at that time, and word came out that a truck had turned over down a couple of miles. It was full of frozen chicken pies, and they were all in the water, so the driver said, “Tell everybody you know to come down and get all the chicken pies they want.”

SMART: [Laughs.]

BOSWORTH: We ate chicken pies till it was coming out of our ears. [Laughs.] And so did everybody else in the station. [Laughter.] But the trucks would get going down the hill, you know, and their brakes would go out, and that would be it. It happened a lot of times, but I remember especially the chicken pie one.

I can't think of anything else right now that happened. I'm sure there are.

SMART: One thing you remember is probably you don't like chicken pie anymore.

BOSWORTH: We didn't eat chicken pies for a long, long time. I use them now, but they're better now than they were then.

SMART: When you reflect on Dale, you've got to be a proud mom.

BOSWORTH: Oh, sure.

SMART: When you think of Dale's accomplishments. What are some of your thoughts?

BOSWORTH: What are some of my thoughts about what?

SMART: Dale.

BOSWORTH: About Dale? Well, I'd like to see him retire. [Laughs.] Well, they bought this house, you know, in Missoula for their retirement place, and then he had this offer for a job in D.C., so Carma is a gardener and loves to garden, so she goes back to Missoula every April and spends the summer there, working on the yard because nobody can do the yard to suit her, and then in the fall she goes back to Washington again. But now it's getting harder and harder for

her to leave D.C. because she's gotten to know so many people there, and she likes it, so she's kind of torn between the two places now, so I'd like to see him retire.

SMART: I think we've probably come to the end of this Mary Ellen, but if you want to come back and visit another part of it, let me know and I'll be glad to do that.

BOSWORTH: I don't think I've done a good job on it. There's probably a lot of things that you'd like for me to talk about, when it comes to the job, the Forest Service, the work and the goings-on and so on and so forth. I tried to keep out of it as much as I could. I mean, it wasn't my—you know, it wasn't for me to do, make any decisions or anything like that. That was Irwin's job. But being a ranger's wife in those days, why, I guess you'd say you were part of the Forest Service, and as far as I'm concerned, there's no better life than the Forest Service. I don't know how it is now, have no idea how it is now, but in the years that we were in the Forest Service, it was tops. And according to Dale, it still is.

SMART: I think so, too. I think so, too.

Well, okay, I think that will wrap us up.

BOSWORTH: Yes, and if you don't like it, you scratch the whole thing. [Laughs.] It won't hurt my feelings at all.

SMART: I loved it, actually.

BOSWORTH: Huh?

SMART: I loved it, actually.

BOSWORTH: No, I don't know why you wanted me, because there's other women. I don't know that there's many of them around anymore.

SMART: Of course, the unique thing about it, among others, is that your being the mom of Dale. That's certainly a part of it. I think we captured what it was like to be a spouse going through this stuff, because it's really quite different today.

BOSWORTH: Yes, it's different today. I'm sure of that. I know that. Now, a lot of depends upon where you are, too.

SMART: This is still on.

[End of interview.]



---

**The Forest Service: A Story of Change**

Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth  
Centennial Forum  
Boise, ID—November 18, 2004

Welcome! It's a pleasure to be here today with so many of our partners and collaborators. This is a part of the country I know pretty well, having been regional forester down in Salt Lake City and over in Missoula for a number of years. We have some huge fire and forest health issues here, and I'm happy to see from your agenda that you'll be getting into those later on.

But I'd like to set the stage by looking at the Forest Service as a whole, not just at this or that region or this or that issue, as important as it might be. And when I look at the agency as a whole, I see more than the sum of our parts—more than the National Forest System, more than the research and development we do, more than our State and Private Forestry programs, and more than our international programs. I see more than our own employees. In my view, the Forest Service has always been about partnerships—about getting together with our collaborators and figuring out how we can work together to reach our common goals.

That's part of what we're here to talk about today, and I'll come back to that at the end of my remarks. We're here to celebrate a hundred years of partnership and collaboration and to prepare for the next hundred years by seeing what we can learn from the past. Specifically, we're here to prepare for the Centennial Congress next January.

**Forest Service Mission**

As we look to the future, I think it's fair to ask: What is the Forest Service mission? You sometimes hear that we don't have a clear purpose anymore—that our mission isn't clearly enough defined by Congress, and that therefore we're in deep trouble.

Here's our mission statement: "To sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations." To me, that seems clear enough. But somebody else might see "health, diversity, and productivity" a little differently than I do. And different people are going to have different needs that will sometimes come into conflict. That was pointed out a hundred years ago by the first Forest Service Chief, Gifford Pinchot, and it's just as true today.

But does that ambiguity doom our enterprise? For a hundred years, the answer was no, so why should it suddenly be yes? In fact, I would argue just the opposite—that the ambiguity inherent in our mission has given us the flexibility we need to adjust to changing times. Unless we can adjust to change, we can't sustain the changing landscapes we care for, nor can we meet the changing needs of the people we serve.

# Speech

USDA Forest Service  
Washington, DC



I think our history bears that out, and that's what I'd like to talk about today. I'll focus on the National Forest System, although I think it also applies to our State and Private Forestry and Research programs. How have the challenges we face as land managers changed over time, and how have we risen to those challenges? After looking at parts of our past, I'll look forward to some of the challenges I think we'll face in the future.

I say "parts of our past" because I'm a forester, not a historian. Historians have their own ideas of the eras we've gone through in the story of conservation, and their ideas might be more complete and accurate than mine. But I don't think that matters, because I think our stories come out the same in the end. So I hope the historians among you will bear with me.

## Conservation

A century ago, our nation faced a crisis caused by the unrestrained exploitation of our natural resources. Bison, elk, and other wildlife species were going extinct, and we were seeing disastrous fires and floods. There were also widespread fears of a timber famine.

Conservation came out of that crisis because people wanted to stop the waste. They wanted to conserve timber for future generations. They wanted to conserve water and stop the floods and disastrous fires. They wanted to save America's wildlife from extinction.

In response, a Division of Forestry grew up within USDA, later becoming the Bureau of Forestry and then the Forest Service. Under Gifford Pinchot, the Division worked with private landowners to improve forestry techniques on hundreds of thousands of acres. Pinchot also promoted systematic studies of commercial forest trees. State and Private Forestry as well as Research were underway even before the Forest Service started managing the forest reserves.

Pinchot spelled out the purpose of the forest reserves in the first *Use Book*: "Forest reserves," he wrote, "are for the purpose of preserving a perpetual supply of timber for home industries, preventing the destruction of the forest cover which regulates the flow of streams, and protecting local residents from unfair competition in the use of forest and range."

The mission of protecting timber supplies and watersheds comes from the Organic Act of 1897. Protecting local residents from unfair competition was Pinchot's interpretation of our mission, and it implies social responsibility. I'll come back to that in a minute.

The first *Use Books* explicitly promoted several uses—timber, water, range, minerals, game, and even recreation. We went in and put those uses for the first time under careful management. For example, overgrazing had been a problem, and we got that under control. We also protected the game and started to get the fires under control. It was a period sometimes known as custodial management.

# Speech

USDA Forest Service  
Washington, DC



---

## **Social Responsibility**

Then came the Great Depression, and we were faced with a whole new set of values and challenges. People now wanted more from their government than ever before. The social role that Pinchot had anticipated for our agency now became a broad public expectation. And because he'd already planted the seed, we were able to quickly respond.

Our State and Private Forestry and Research branches helped plant shelterbelts in states from North Dakota to Texas. The idea was to help prevent future Dust Bowls, and much of the work was done by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Every national forest had at least one CCC camp, and we gave jobs to thousands of unemployed Americans in all those CCC camps. The CCC helped us control fires and built a lot of our infrastructure—roads, trails, campgrounds, ranger stations, and so on. It was a period of new social responsibility for the Forest Service.

World War II ended the CCC, but I guess you could say our social responsibility continued through the war effort, which we strongly supported. A lot of our employees enlisted, and we ramped up timber supplies needed by our troops.

## **Timber Focus**

After World War II, we entered a new period. Our troops came home, and the demand for housing soared. The war effort had depleted state and private timber stocks, and the national forests were needed to fill the gap. From the 1960s through the 1980s, every administration, with strong congressional support, called for more timber from the national forests. In those 30 years, we went from producing very little timber to meeting 20 to 25 percent of our nation's sawtimber needs. We helped millions of Americans fulfill the American dream of home ownership.

I don't want to oversimplify. The 1940s and 1950s were a difficult period of transition. Some of the folks who'd grown up under the old custodial model of the Forest Service found it hard to adjust to the new timber model. Some actively opposed it.

And timber production wasn't all we did in the postwar period, not by any means. We got a system of multifunctional research centers supporting forest and range management needs of all types in every ownership. State and Private Forestry made huge advances in forest protection through pest control and fire control.

On the National Forest System, outdoor recreation grew by leaps and bounds, and popular demand for more of a balance between timber and the other uses led to the Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act of 1960. We also had the Wilderness Act of 1964. These developments show that public values were changing. The first Earth Day in 1970 sent another major signal. And if there were any lingering doubts, the environmental legislation of the 1970s put them to rest—the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Forest Management Act, and so on. We learned that the public wanted more of a say in our management, and they wanted us to focus more on delivering values and services like wildlife, water, wilderness, and recreation.

# Speech

USDA Forest Service  
Washington, DC



## **Restoration and Recreation**

In response, we started moving toward a new ecosystem-based model of land management. The 1990s were a transitional period, where we no longer focused primarily on timber production. Again, the transition was difficult. Some of the folks who grew up under the old timber model weren't too thrilled.

But in my view, it was the right and the necessary thing to do. It was necessary because both our landscapes and our social needs are constantly changing. If we don't adjust to those changes, then we can't fulfill our mission of caring for the land and serving people.

That brings me back to what we can learn from our past. No matter how you tell the story, I think it comes out the same in the end. It's a story of changing values—of changes on the land and changes in the people we serve. It's also a story of how we responded to those changes to protect the land and deliver the goods, services, and values that people want.

Today, I believe we are in a new period—a period of ecological restoration and outdoor recreation. Maybe more than ever before, we focus on delivering values and services like clean air and water, scenic beauty, habitat for wildlife, and opportunities for outdoor recreation. These are the main things people today want from their public lands. We know that from our surveys and from talking to our partners and to people in our communities.

And, yes, we also deliver opportunities to harvest timber, graze livestock, and extract minerals. With goods like these come important values, like jobs and community stability. We know that Americans want these values, too.

To deliver all these goods, services, and values, we've got to manage the land for long-term ecosystem health while meaningfully engaging the public in our decisionmaking. We believe that what we leave on the land is more important than what we take away.

## **Scale of What We Face**

The period we are in will some day end, just as every period did before it. What will the future bring? I believe that a few key strategic concerns will drive future change, at least for the next decade or so and possibly beyond. These concerns have nothing to do with timber harvest or livestock grazing or roadbuilding. Those debates are essentially over—or they should be. They have become huge distractions from the major concerns we face today.

The major concerns are, in particular, the Four Threats we've been talking about. In some cases, these are more of a threat to state and private lands than to national forest land.

- First, fire and fuels. As you know, we're seeing fire effects in some places that are way outside the historical range of variability. We're also seeing beetle epidemics in a number of places that are unprecedented in modern history. As you know, beetle-killed stands pose huge fire hazards in many parts of the West and South.

# Speech

USDA Forest Service  
Washington, DC



- Second is the spread of invasive species. All invasives combined cost Americans about \$138 billion per year in total economic damages and associated control costs. The ecological costs are even worse. One study has found that invasives have contributed to the decline of almost half of all imperiled species.
- Third is the loss of open space. Every day, America loses more than 4,000 acres of working farms and ranches to development. That's more than 3 acres per minute, and the rate of conversion is getting faster all the time. We're also losing forest cover in many areas, even in parts of the East, despite gains we've made as agricultural land has reverted to forest. We're losing valuable corridors that wildlife needs and rangeland that many plants and animals need to survive. We're also losing a piece of our cultural heritage as Americans.
- Fourth is unmanaged outdoor recreation. In many places, recreational use is outstripping our management capacity and damaging resources, particularly the unmanaged use of off-highway vehicles. This is a legitimate use of public lands, but we do need to manage it better.

These threats aren't particularly new. We've been dealing with them for some time, and there are lots of other things we do as well. But if you talk to our employees, I think you'll find overall that we spend a lot more time and resources on these Four Threats than on most other things, and certainly more than on timber harvest or grazing issues or roadbuilding, although you'd never know it sometimes from the papers. I believe that in the years to come, the Four Threats will drive a lot of the changes we'll see.

There are also some other concerns. For the past 2 to 3 years, we've been conducting Chief's Reviews. These are strategic reviews of the Forest Service at the regional level, and we've found some common themes. One common theme is the sheer scale of what we face. Besides the Four Threats, our review teams noted several concerns:

- First, we've got a huge backlog of work to complete. We've got thousands of deteriorating culverts to replace. We've got roads to restore, abandoned mines to reclaim, watersheds to repair, vegetation to treat, and all kinds of deferred maintenance and ecological restoration to catch up on. These problems are only made worse by altered vegetation conditions, the loss of milling capacity for removing vegetation, and public distrust of active forest management.
- Second, we've got oversubscribed water resources and deteriorating watersheds in many parts of the country. As our population rises, the problem is only going to get worse. As a nation, I'm not sure we're thinking this problem through enough or doing enough about it.
- Third, the levels of ozone and other substances we're seeing in the atmosphere threaten long-term ecosystem health. Our ability as a nation to furnish clean air and water, biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and other environmental services from forested landscapes and other natural areas is increasingly open to question.

Again, these are not new problems, and we've been addressing them for some time. But what struck our review teams was the sheer scale of what we face. When you take these concerns and combine them with the Four Threats, you get some idea of the scale of what we face. I believe



# Speech

## USDA Forest Service

### Washington, DC

---



that the Forest Service is at a crucial moment in history. In the past century, there've been only a few similar moments where we've faced challenges on a similar scale. Meeting these challenges will lay out a career's worth of work for the next generation of Forest Service employees.

Some of these challenges might already be affecting the values that people want from public lands. Recall how the environmental legislation of the 1970s responded to changes in public values. Last December, Congress passed the first major legislation affecting national forest management in a generation, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. The legislation responds to the threat from fire and fuels. Does it signal the beginnings of a change in public values? I'm not sure, but maybe so.

#### **Global Issues**

Before closing, let me again emphasize that we face most of these challenges on *all* of America's forests, including the 500 million acres under state and private management. Today, we live in a global economy, and market dynamics are challenging some longstanding assumptions about delivering goods and services from forests in the United States, whether private, state, or federal.

A good example is a study conducted by Temple-Inland Forest Products Corporation in Texas. They looked at cost plus transportation, and they found something pretty amazing. They found that it's *more* expensive to bring logs to Baltimore, Maryland, from Atlanta, Georgia, than from Canada, Europe, or even South America. Unless something changes to make American timber producers more competitive, foreign imports are only going to grow.

This has a couple of serious implications. First, if we buy cheaper logs from overseas, are we supporting unsustainable logging practices in other countries? For example, are we contributing to illegal logging or deforestation?

Second, and equally important, if forest landowners here at home are undercut by foreign competition, are they then forced to sell their lands to developers? When we import those cheap logs, are we contributing to loss of forest cover not only overseas through deforestation, but also here at home through land conversion to urban uses?

Today, the challenges we face are often at a global scale. This is part of the sheer scale of what we face. I don't think we're going to be able to meet these challenges unless we understand the global connections and address them through international partnerships.

#### **Community-Based Forestry**

That brings me back to our mission and purpose. Our story is a story of change, and our mission focus has changed accordingly over the years. Just to recap:

- A hundred years ago, we focused mainly on timber, water, and general forest protection.
- Seventy years ago, we incorporated more social responsibility into our mission through the CCC.

# Speech

## USDA Forest Service Washington, DC

---



- Forty years ago, we focused heavily on timber, but we also sought to balance that use with other uses, particularly recreation, range, watershed, and wildlife and fish.
- Today, we focus on sustaining the health, diversity, and productivity of forests and grasslands to meet present and future needs. Given the scale of what we face, I think our main focus has to be on ecological restoration and outdoor recreation.

In a general sense, our mission has always been caring for the land and serving people. But what that specifically means has changed over time. I think our history makes that clear.

Something else has changed, too: the way we deliver what people want. A hundred years ago, Gifford Pinchot recognized the need for working in partnership with local communities if we were to succeed. He planted the seeds of partnership in our first *Use Book* by directing our employees to work closely with local communities to promote conservation.

Ever since then, we've always been committed to fulfilling our mission through partnerships. Today, the scale of what we face leaves us no other choice: We have got to work together. But the way we work with people has changed over time. In particular, we've learned the need for more upfront public involvement in our decisionmaking.

Today, I believe that we need a community-based collaborative approach, sometimes called community-based forestry. It involves getting everyone interested to state their ideas upfront and then getting them to talk through their differences and come to some agreement based on shared values.

That's easy to say, but it can be really, really difficult. Sometimes, people believe we aren't giving them enough of a say in our decisions. Sometimes, they see things in terms of good and evil and want to have it all their own way. In a lot of places, we've got a ways to go before we get the kind of full upfront collaboration with our partners we want. We've got to do better.

Another thing we've got to do better has to do with our own organization. Our society is rapidly evolving. Our average age is changing, our average complexion is changing, and our attitudes toward gender are changing. We are far more urban today than we were a century ago, and in a few decades, the majority of Americans will come from what today we call ethnic minorities. Our organization has got to keep up. We need to promote diversity within our organization to reflect the way that we as a society are evolving.

### **Improving Collaboration**

In closing, we've come a long way together over the last hundred years. Values have changed and so have the challenges we face. In the period we're in now, where our focus is on ecological restoration and outdoor recreation, the sheer scale of what we face is overwhelming. I believe that the only way we can rise to the challenge is through community-based forestry—by working upfront through collaborative partnerships, at home and abroad, for long-term ecosystem health.

# Speech

USDA Forest Service  
Washington, DC



---

For that, we're going to need help from our partners. Community-based forestry is relatively new for us, and we're still working it out. I believe that these Centennial Forums and the upcoming Centennial Congress are suitable forums for this issue. The Congress will not be about the issues we deal with every day, like what to do about roadless areas or whether the planning rule for national forests should be this or that. These are indeed critical issues, but they don't rise to the level we envision for this Congress. We expect the Congress to take the long and the broad view—the view across decades and centuries.

The question of collaboration takes the long and the broad view. It transcends the specific challenges we face. It rises to the strategic level we envision for these events. I urge you to carefully consider it. With your help, we can improve the way we work together to meet the challenges of the future—and to prepare ourselves for the changes to come.