

RECEIVED

DEC 17 2007

1399

Sisters and Brothers of the BLM,
Entrusted Stewards and Caretakers of Public Lands,

Being a longterm resident of SW Oregon of 35 years, with children and grandchildren living in the area, i have deep concerns about how we conduct ourselves especially in the extraction of resources.

Over these 35+ years of my adult life i have been a gardener and a builder. I have planted trees as well as harvested (thinned) trees from the forest, so i have a relatively well rounded perspective as well as deep environmental concerns.

I attended the public meeting in Ashland and have read the DEIS summary and have done my best to weigh out the different concerns. I have done alot of hiking and driving on roads in SW Oregon over the years. I have seen first hand the

changes brought forth by clearcut logging as compared to virgin forest as well as different levels of thinning or partial cut logging on both private and public lands.

My position on the proposed revision of the NW Forest Plan is the No Action alternative for the following reasons:

- 1) I am adamantly opposed to clearcutting, regeneration harvest seems to be another version of the same. Alt. 2 proclaims "no green tree retention" in timber mgmt. areas as well as alt. 1. That sounds like all out clearcutting to me. Alt. 2 calls for "12 conifer trees per acre" left in riparian areas and "6 to 9 green trees retained" in alt. 3. This is just not enough green tree retention. If the numbers were reversed, that is harvest 6 to 12 trees per acre, then maybe in some areas that would be acceptable. That would at least

show some concern for the existing forest and a harvest level that could potentially be sustainable. This is the kind of select logging I have done and seen done and if done carefully I can endorse.

- 2) Opening riparian reserves to timber harvest is not a good idea. All of the waterways should be treated with the utmost of care and concern, basically stay out unless on foot.
 - 3) There are many damaged lands and overstocked lands from previous timber harvest. BLM, along with the timber industry, should focus on these areas using planting, thinning, controlled burning, etc. to bring these lands back to a healthy, diverse forest... not tree farms. Then with selective harvest techniques the forests, as well as our ability to harvest trees, could be sustainable!
-

(4)

The Northwest Forest Plan was a response to legitimate environmental concerns. In the 500+ years since white people settled North America we have seen the removal of 90+ % of the virgin forests that were here. That is alarming! and most of that has been done recently in the last century. We obviously have erred on the side of harvest and build, economic growth. Maybe we can learn to build with poles again! Maybe we need to slow down and assess and re-assess what we are creating and get our priorities straight! Maybe we even should have a moratorium on logging on public lands for 50-100 years so we can focus on restoration!

The Northwest Forest Plan was a compromise between environmental and economic concerns. It needs more time to do it's intended job

5
of giving the forests a reprieve, while us
humans evaluate and negotiate. Please give the
NW Forest Plan at least another 20 yrs.!

Thanks for your considerations,

Sincerely,

Dan Gregg

Dan Gregg
PO Box 1195
Ashland OR
97520

P.S. Please recycle this paper