



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF FORESTRY
SACRAMENTO 14

Address Reply to STATE FORESTER
Refer to Number **A/5/10**

May 10, 1948

FOREST PRACTICE
Chapter 85
Inspections

Senator Ed Fletcher
Cuyamaca Water Co.
1020 - 9th Avenue
San Diego 1, Calif.

Dear Senator Fletcher:

Reference is made to our recent correspondence in regard to the logging operations of the Coast Redwood Company in Humboldt County.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of memorandum report by Mr. McCanlies, our Forest Manager, and a copy of the inspection report of the operation made at the time of his visit to the area on April 27.

I believe you will find each of these reports complete, factual, and self-explanatory. Thorough check indicates that the violations committed on the lands in which you are primarily concerned were largely the result of operations prior to the effective date of the Forest Practice Rules in the Redwood District.

There can be no question but that the Company now has full knowledge of the Forest Practice Rules and Laws. I feel confident that they will abide by them. We will make a follow-up check inspection in approximately 30 days and periodically thereafter.

I cannot but commend the judgment of our field men in their treatment of the Fire Rules under the current weather conditions.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

DeWitt Nelson, State Forester

10

cc: Mr. Brede, Coast Redwood Co.
Klamath, Calif.
FHRaymond
WSiler

LOGGING AND SAWMILL INSPECTION REPORT

1. Operator Coast Redwood Company 5. Operating Area (Acres) Pvt. _____ Gov. _____
2. Operator's Registration No. _____ 6. No. Employees: Woods _____ Mill _____
3. Address Klamath, California 7. Type (Band, circular, shingle, etc.) _____
4. Telephone 444 County Del Norte 8. Capacity: (B.F. per 8 hrs.) _____ (B.F. per yr.) _____

Forest Practice District No. _____

PRACTICES	Type Used (Check one)	COMPLIES
I. CUTTING	9. Diameter limit _____ Selective _____ Seed tree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ Other _____ Remarks: <u>Current cutting practices comply with rules.</u>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No _____
II. LOGGING	10. Protects residual trees by good logging methods. Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11. Instructs employees in such methods. Yes _____ No _____ Remarks: <u>Choppers have been instructed to comply with rules. Hook tenders and other woods personnel are careless and have had no instruction.</u>	Yes _____ No _____
III. FIRE PREVENTION	12. Slash disposal. Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How _____ 13. Slash burned during safe time. Yes _____ Not burned _____ 14. Snag Disposal. Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How _____ 15. Fire breaks—at landings. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No _____ Yes _____ No _____ 16. Protection roads open Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No _____ Remarks: <u>Slash has not been burned as relogging by Coast Redwood is intended</u>	Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. FIRE SUPPRESSION	17. Fire Chief: Name <u>None appointed</u> 18. Fire Plan. Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filed with State Forester. Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 19. Fire Tools and Equipment LOCATION _____ NO. AND KIND ON HAND _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Remarks: <u>Fire tool boxes have been made and tools are ready. Due to rain Mr. Brede (Gen. Mgr.) said, tools have not been placed in woods.</u>	Yes _____ No _____
V. INSECTS AND DISEASE	20. Any known outbreaks: Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 21. Action Needed: Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Taken: Yes _____ No _____ Remarks: <u>No insects or disease.</u>	Yes _____ No _____

22. Do Forest Practice Rules fit this operation? Yes No _____
23. Is alternate plan used? Yes _____ No Needed: Yes _____ No
24. Is this operation trying to comply with the intent of the Rules? Yes _____ No

Remarks and recommendations: An inspection was made of this operation last Sept. 13th. Mr. Brede was given copies of the Forest Practice Rules and an inspection report showing violations. With the exception of improved cutting practices, due largely to using diesel yarders instead of slack-line settings, there has been no improvement.

Operator Coast Redwood

STATE FIRE LAWS

ITEM	Ref. Nos.	PRC CODE	REQUIREMENTS	COMPLIES
1. Burning, Blasting	27, 32	4153	Permit, Clearance	Yes..... No. <u>Burning</u>
2. Engines, motors, torches, grinders, etc.	30	4155	Clearance	Yes..... No. <u>X</u>
3. Camp tool caches	36	4156	Tools for 1/2 men	Yes..... No. <u>Camp</u>
4. Woods tool caches	34	4156	Tools for 10 men; boxed	Yes..... No. <u>X</u>
5. Steam powered equipment	38	4157	Pump, hose, etc.	Yes <u>X</u> No.....
6. Debris burner	29	4165	Adequate (Inspection of woods only)	Yes..... No.....
7. Clearing lieu of burner	29	4165	Adequate " " " "	Yes..... No.....
8. Boiler stack	41	4167	Effective screen	Yes..... No. <u>X</u>
9. Engines, motor vehicles, tractors	41	4167	Spark arrester or other effective device	Yes..... No. <u>X</u>
10. Mobile equipment	42	4167	Shovel	Yes..... No. <u>X</u>
11.				Yes..... No.....
12.				Yes..... No.....

Remarks: No shovels on trucks - of 4 trucks inspected, only 2 had spark arrester. One Ford and one International trucks had straight pipes. Spark arrester for boiler stack laying on ground alongside boiler, not on stack. No spark arresters or clearance for Skagit Loader. No tool cache at landing.

County Ordinances (if any). Complies: Yes..... No..... Explain:

Remarks: No county ordinances.

General remarks and recommendations as regards Forest Practice Rules, State Laws, or both:

The woods personnel should be informed of the provisions of the Pub. Resources Code and the Forest Practice Rules which apply and should be held responsible for carrying them out. Contractors should be required to operate according to the provisions of the Pub. Res. Code and For. Pract. Rules.

Inspection No. 1 2 3 4

Date of Inspection Sept. 10 1947

/s/ David H. Erb

Ass't. Ranger

Date for Compliance 19

NOTES:

- Information as to number of employees, type and capacity of mill and area cut over yearly are not required by law and the operator may decline to furnish such information.
- A signed copy of this report should be left with the operator. The operator may be requested, but not required, to sign the copy retained by the State.

Dr. David Nelson, State Forester

May 7, 1948

Mr. DeWitt Nelson, State Forester

P. H. McCanlies, Forest Manager

FOREST PRACTICE

Chapter 85

Inspections

Pursuant to your instructions, the undersigned, on April 27, 1948, accompanied Forestry Investigator S. M. Schick, Ranger William Siler and Forest Technician A. F. Wallen on an investigation of the logging operations of the Coast Redwood Company in Sections 1, 2 and 11, T. 12 N., R. 1 E., H. M.

The inspection form was filled out by Forest Technician A. F. Wallen and I am in complete agreement with the information placed thereon. In addition to endorsing the report as submitted, the following statements are made:

- This Company is a registered timber operator with 1948 registration number 1796.
- As nearly as can be determined, little of the destructive slack-line logging has been done on lands being handled by the law firm of Hardin, Rank, Meltzer and Fletcher.
- All the destructive timber falling and most of the slack-line yarding was done prior to the effective date of the Forest Practice Rules. A slack-line yarder will destroy nearly all small timber which will be left on a setting and it is therefore customary to fell all small timber that has any commercial value when a slacker is to be used. As a consequence, when timber has been felled for a slacker very little is to be gained by doing the actual logging by less destructive methods. Mr. Brede, manager of the operations, states that the slacker will not be used after the present setting.
- The slash has not yet been burned on the slacker settings since Mr. Brede states the area is to be re-logged. From the amount of merchantable material left on the ground, there is no question but what re-logging is the proper procedure on this area.
- On timber felled after the effective date of the Forest Practice Rules the falling and any logging to date is well within the requirements of the rules. One area which was cut logged has been left in very good condition.
- This operation has a number of technical violations of the Forest Practice Rules and State Fire laws, however, none of the violations do any damage or create any risk under the wet conditions prevailing. Our examination was made 12 days after the beginning of the statutory fire

Mr. DeWitt Nelson, State Forester

May 7, 1948

AF-5-7

season and it had rained nine of the twelve days and rained on the day we were there. The country has been very wet and the actual fire season has not begun. We ourselves are not on a fire season basis at the present time, since we could not justify the manning of all of our fire stations under present climatic conditions. There apparently have been a number of operational difficulties and these, in connection with the wet weather, have prevented the operation management from becoming fire conscious. It would appear somewhat absurd to take any legal action in connection with failure to post no smoking signs, for example, when the sign would have to be posted under cover to prevent the rain from melting it. It would be impossible to get any support if we attempted to take legal action against this operation under the conditions which exist.

- 7) In my opinion the most serious omissions on the part of the management has been the failure to prepare and file a fire plan. This could well have been done regardless of the weather so that the plan could be in existence and be known to all concerned prior to the period of fire danger.
- 8) Mr. Brede has stated that he will get this operation in compliance with all State laws and practice rules in the immediate future and then request another inspection from Ranger William Siler. It is suggested that if this is not done, steps be taken to secure the most rigid enforcement. As pointed out to Mr. Brede, some of the requirements are rather new and the first inspection was primarily for informational purposes. It is essential that we give operators a reasonable chance to place their operations in compliance with the laws and rules, not only in fairness to the operators but in order that we may have a strong case if court action is required. At the same time it was pointed out to Mr. Brede that we could only report the facts as they exist and would be expected to enforce all laws and Rules applicable to his or any other operation, and that the management therefore determines the reports that will be made and the actions which the Division will take.
- 9) In line with No. 8 above, it should be noted that while the first inspection made September 13, 1947, showed practically no compliance with the Forest Practice Rules, most of the conditions which were not in compliance had been created prior to the effective date of the Rules and were, therefore, not violations. The inspection was made mainly to become acquainted with the operation, and so the management would know what they would be expected to do on future operations under the Forest Practice Rules.
- 10) The letter written to the law firm of Hardin, Rank, Moltzer and Fletcher by Deputy State Forester F. H. Raymond is heartily endorsed. Under the circumstances prevailing no other reply could have been made. Any attempt by Mr. Raymond or any other representative of the Division of Forestry to strictly enforce the violated fire laws and the fire provisions of the Forest Practice Rules in the pouring rain would appear ridiculous to the local citizens and undo much good work that has been done in the field of fire prevention and fire law enforcement in District I.

COPY

Respectfully submitted,

(COPY)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS
1211 Sixteenth Street Sacramento 14

July 29, 1953

Mr. Clare Hendee
Regional Forester
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
630 Sansome Street
San Francisco 11, California

Attention: Mr. C. Wilsey

Dear Mr. Wilsey:

May I acknowledge your letter of July 15, 1953, regarding the exchange of 198 acres of timber on the Klamath River.

Mr. Barnum visited this office a few days ago and I wish to confirm what I have already told him. During Mr. Barnum's visit I called in Mr. E. E. Powell, Supervisor of Land Planning and Acquisition to double check with him that we did not have any plans for acquisition of property in this vicinity at the present time. Mr. Powell assured me that he had no current project along the Klamath and did not see how the exchange of these lands could affect any plan of the State Division of Beaches and Parks. We assured Mr. Barnum that we did not object to any plan that you have in mind.

I wanted to confirm this statement inasmuch as you no doubt would like to have it for your files.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Newton B. Drury

NEWTON B. DRURY, Chief

(COPY)

(COPY)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF FORESTRY
SACRAMENTO 14

July 21, 1953

Address Reply to State Forester
Refer to Number A/7/21

PUBLIC RELATIONS
U.S.F.S. Region 5
XR: LANDS
State Forests
Acquisition

July 29, 1953

Mr. Clare W. Hendee, Regional Forester
U. S. Forest Service
630 Sansome Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Clare:

Reference is made to your letter of July 15 in regard to the possible purchase by the State of California of certain timber lands situated along the Klamath River in Del Norte County.

Under State law, the acquisition of forest lands for State Forest purposes is restricted by the following language:

"It is further declared to be the policy of the State to acquire by purchase, exchange, lease or grant (1) such cutover lands, the reforestation of which is not assured under private ownership, to reforest such lands during periods of unemployment and at other times, (2) liquidating forest lands primarily suitable for timber production which may be acquired under precutting agreements, (3) demonstration forests of 2,000 acres or less adapted to furnish local needs of investigation, demonstration and education in those timber counties where the ownership pattern is such that management of small areas is an important problem, and (4) one area not to exceed approximately 40,000 acres in each of the following forest districts, Coast Range Pine and Fir District, North Sierra Pine District and the South Sierra Pine District, for the purpose of demonstration of economical forest management. These areas shall not include virgin timber except that which is incidental to areas previously harvested."

Under the above provisions, the Division of Forestry can not acquire the lands in question for the following reasons:

1. We presently have a State Forest unit in the Redwood District in excess of 50,000 acres. (The Redwood District was not included in the legislation because of the previous existence of the Jackson State Forest.)

(COPY)

July 21, 1953

2. The land in question is primarily virgin timber.
3. We have no authorization for the acquisition of forest lands primarily for esthetic and recreational purposes.

In addition to the above statutory limitations, all of our current State Forest acquisition money is under commitment. Therefore, it does not appear to be possible from the standpoint of existing law, Board of Forestry policy, and financing that the Division of Forestry will be in a position to acquire these lands within the foreseeable future.

Yours very truly,

/s/ DeWitt Nelson

DEWITT NELSON, STATE FORESTER

10
04

Approved:

WARREN T. HANNUM, DIRECTOR
Department of Natural Resources

By /s/ D. H. Blood

Deputy Director

Ed Fletcher Papers

1870-1955

MSS.81

Box: 20 Folder: 6

General Correspondence - Nelson, DeWitt



Copyright: UC Regents

Use: This work is available from the UC San Diego Libraries. This digital copy of the work is intended to support research, teaching, and private study.

Constraints: This work is protected by the U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S.C.). Use of this work beyond that allowed by "fair use" requires written permission of the UC Regents. Permission may be obtained from the UC San Diego Libraries department having custody of the work (<http://libraries.ucsd.edu/collections/mscl/>). Responsibility for obtaining permissions and any use and distribution of this work rests exclusively with the user and not the UC San Diego Libraries.