

United States General Accounting Office Washington, DC 20548

August 31, 2001

The Honorable Larry Craig Ranking Minority Member Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Committee on Energy and Natural Resources United States Senate

The Honorable Scott McInnis Chairman, Subcommittee on Forests & Forest Health Committee on Resources House of Representatives

Subject: Forest Service: Appeals and Litigation of Fuel Reduction Projects

The nation's forests have undergone significant changes over the last century and a half. Human activities, especially the federal government's decades-old practice of suppressing all wildland fires, have resulted in the dangerous accumulation of hazardous fuel on federal lands. To help address this problem, the Congress appropriated over \$205 million to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service for fiscal year 2001 to be used to reduce these accumulated fuels. In an effort to put as much of these newly appropriated monies on-the-ground as quickly as possible in fiscal year 2001, the Forest Service identified and funded those hazardous fuel reduction projects for which it had completed the necessary environmental analyses.

Concerned that appeals and litigation were delaying the implementation of these projects, you asked us to identify (1) the number of hazardous fuel reduction projects for which the Forest Service had completed the necessary environmental analyses and funded implementation in fiscal year 2001, (2) the number of these projects that had been appealed or litigated, and (3) who had appealed or litigated the project decisions.

To obtain the information, we asked officials in the Forest Service's headquarters and in each of the agency's nine regional offices to provide us with the number of hazardous fuel reduction projects, by national forest, that were identified for implementation in fiscal year 2001. We also asked them to provide the name of any project that had been appealed or litigated, the national forest where the project was located, the names of appellants or litigants, and the project's status. The Forest Service's headquarters provided us with the number of hazardous fuel reduction projects by region and national forest that were identified for implementation in fiscal year 2001 as of July 18, 2001, the most recent date for which this information was available (see encl. I). Each of the agency's nine regional offices provided us with the names of projects that had been appealed or litigated, the national forest where the projects were located, the names of appellants or litigants, and the project's status as of early July 2001(see encl. II).

In summary, as of July 18, 2001, the Forest Service had completed the necessary environmental analyses and had decided to implement 1,671 hazardous fuel reduction projects in fiscal year 2001. Of these projects, 20 (about 1 percent) had been appealed and none had been litigated. Appellants included environmental groups, recreation groups, private industry interests, and individuals.

You asked that we provide you with the requested information as quickly as possible. Therefore, as agreed, we did not verify the information that the Forest Service provided to us.

- - - - -

We conducted our review in July and August 2001 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

We are sending copies of this letter to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; the Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Forests & Forest Health, House Committee on Resources; interested congressional committees; and the Chief, Forest Service. The letter is also available on GAO's home page at http://www.gao.gov.

Please call me at (202) 512-3841 if you or your staff have any questions about this letter. Key contributors to this letter were Charles Cotton and Alan Dominicci.

T. Hui

Barry T. Hill Director, Natural Resources and Environment

Enclosures (2)

Enclosure I

Region	Forest name	Fuel reduction projects with complete environmental analyses, as of July 18, 200
2	Beaverhead	2
	Bitterroot	1
	Idaho Panhandle	1
	Clearwater	1
	Custer	
	Flathead	1
	Gallatin	
	Helena	3
	Kootenai	3
	Lewis And Clark	1
	Lolo	2
	Nezperce	1
	Dakota Prairie Grasslands	
	Total Region 1	21
2	Bighorn	
	Black Hills	-
	Grand Mesa/Uncompaghre/Gunnison	
	Medicine Bow/Routt	-
	Nebraska	-
	Rio Grande	
	Arapaho-Roosevelt	
	Pike-San Isabel	
	San Juan	
	Shoshone	
	White River	
	Total Region 2	10
3	Apache-Sitgreaves	
	Carson	
	Cibola	
	Coconino	
	Coronado	
	Gila	
	Kaibab	
	Lincoln	
	Prescott	
	Santa Fe	
	Tonto	
	Total Region 3	23

<u>Forest Service Hazardous Fuel Reduction Projects With</u> <u>Completed Environmental Analyses, as of July 18, 2001</u>

4	Ashley	
	Boise	
	Bridger-Teton	
	Dixie	
	Fishlake	
	Manti-La Sal	
	Payette	
	Salmon and Challis	
	Sawtooth	
	Targhee	
	Humboldt-Toiyabe	
	Uinta	
	Wasatch-Cache	
	Total Region 4	
5	Angeles	
5	Cleveland	
	Eldorado	
	Inyo Klamath	
	Lassen	
	Los Padres	
	Mendocino	
	Modoc	
	Six Rivers	
	Plumas	
	San Bernardino	
	Sequoia	
	Shasta Trinity	
	Sierra	
	Stanislaus	
	Tahoe	
	Lake Tahoe Basin Mgmt Unit	
	Total Region 5	3
6	Deschutes	
	Fremont	
	Gifford Pinchot	
	Malheur	
	Mt Hood	
	Ochoco	
	Okanogan	
	Rogue River	
	Siskiyou	
	Siuslaw	
	Umatilla	
	Umpqua	
	Wallowa Whitman	
	Wenatchee	
	Willamette	
	Winema	
	Colville	
	Total Region 6	1

	Total Region 10 lational Forest System	1,67
10	Chugach	
	Total Region 9	14
	White Mountain	2
	Monongahela	
	Green Mountain	
	Allegheny	
	Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie	
	Wayne	
	Chequamegon-Nicolet	
	Hoosier	
	Hiawatha	
	Superior	
	Shawnee	
•	Ottawa	
	Mark Twain	
	Huron Manistee	!
9	Chippewa	
	Total Region 8	24
	NF Texas	
	Francis Marion and Sumter	
	NFS North Carolina	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Ozark-St Francis	
	Ouachita	
	George Washington/Jefferson	
	Kisatchie NFS Mississippi	
	NFS Florida	
8	Cherokee	
	Chattahoochee and Oconee	
	Daniel Boone	
	NFS Alabama	

Source: GAO's analysis of Forest Service data.

Enclosure II

<u>Forest Service Fiscal Year 2001</u> <u>Hazardous Fuel Reduction Projects</u> <u>Appealed, as of Early July 2001</u>

Region	National forest	Fuel reduction project name	Appellant	Project status
1	Idaho Panhandle	Lakeface-Lamb	Ecology Center et al	Ready for implementation.
1	Kootenai	Foothills	Ecology Center et al	Ready for implementation.
1	Helena	Clancy-Unionville	Ecology Center et al, Native Ecosystem Council, Off- highway vehicle recreation groups	Environmental analysis requires more work and a new decision.
2	White River	Upper Blue	National Forest Protection Alliance, Colorado Wildlife, Breckenridge Ski Area	Withdrawn pending revision of the forest plan.
3	Coconino	Grand Canyon Partnership Assessment	Southwest Center for Biodiversity, Southwest Alliance, Forest Guardians	Withdrawn and replaced with smaller projects.
4	Salmon/Challis	Buck-n-Bird	Ecology Center	Being implemented.
4	Boise	Dankskin	Ecology Center	Appeal withdrawn. Project to be implemented in fiscal year 2002 because current weather conditions prevent prescribed fire.
5	Plumas	Cold	Private Individual, Forest Conservation Council	Pending a decision of the appeal.
5	Plumas	Kingsbury Rush	Private Individual, Forest Conservation Council	Pending a decision of the appeal.
5	Plumas	Lower Slate	Forest Conservation Council	Pending a decision of the appeal.
5	Plumas	Upper Slate	Private Individual, Forest Conservation Council	Pending a decision of the appeal.
5	Plumas	Waters	Forest Conservation Council	Ready for implementation except on 500 acres of original 8,000-acre project.

5	Plumas	Stony Ridge	Forest Conservation Council, Plumas Forest Project, National Forest Protection Alliance	Ready for implementation.
5	Lassen	Pegleg A-21	Forest Conservation Council, National Forest Protection Alliance	Pending a decision of the appeal.
5	Tahoe	End-of-the-World	National Forest Protection Alliance, Forest Conservation Council, Private Individual	Ready for implementation.
5	Tahoe	Liberty Forest Health Improvement	Forest Issues Group, Sierra Nevada Forest Protection Coalition, Forest Conservation Council, National Forest Protection Alliance, Private Individual	Was revised and submitted as Project Liberty II.
5	Tahoe	Liberty II	Forest Issues Group, National Forest Protection Alliance, Forest Conservation Council, Private Individual	Ready for implementation.
8	Daniel Boone	Salvage Harvest Due to 1998 Storm Damage	Heartwood Group	Being implemented.
8	Sabine	Prescribed burning for wildlife habitat improvement and fuel reduction	Texas Committee on Natural Resources	Being implemented.
9	Chippewa	Storm 2000	Superior Wilderness Action Network	Ready for implementation.

Source: GAO's analysis of Forest Service data.

(360113)