

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2008

1771

1/5/08

COMMENTS ON THE BIRDSEYE FOREST MANAGEMENT PROJECT

To the Bureau of Land Management:

I read with disgust your Proposed Action for the **BIRDSEYE FOREST MANAGEMENT PROJECT**. My comments are as follows:

1. Given the BLM's past actions, the BLM cannot be trusted to improve the health of the forest nor to reduce fire danger (except immediately after the operation, after you've cut, extracted the logs and burned the slash). This "Project" appears to be a manouever to extract as much timber as possible before the next elections, when we may hopefully have a less environmentally destructive leadership in the Department of the Interior. Your euphemisms for "clearcutting" and for "greedy extraction" do not convince me – on the contrary, they add to my ill feeling about this proposal.
2. The attempt by the Off Road Vehicle pressure groups to have the forest surrounding, and above, Birdseye Creek made into a designated area where they can run rampant – seems to not have succeeded on its own. I expect that they are therefore piggybacking on this BIRDSEYE FOREST MANAGEMENT PROJECT, to achieve the same purpose.
3. I protest that BLM started to improve, maybe build, the roads above Birdseye Creek, WELL BEFORE the BIRDSEYE FOREST MANAGEMENT PROJECT was open for public comment. Furthermore I object to you opening more roads to access all the many places you intend to log. This will increase pollution of the creek, endanger the stability of hillsides, both in themselves and through the actions of the Off Road Vehicle Use that you are opening the area to. I know from your previous plans that, behind the scenes, the logging interests and the Off Road Vehicle interests are hand in glove, and that the BLM inclines itself to accomodate both and write "management proposals" in deceptive language to pull the wool over the public's eyes.
4. I absolutely oppose what you call "Douglas-Fir Reinitiation (Regeneration Harvest). Do you have no shame at all?!!! Those areas are to be left absolutely untouched. There is a minuscule percent of old growth and older growth forests left in the West, and not one acre more of it should be touched, most especially not by such not credible managers as the BLM.
5. You will de-stabilize the soil of the hills behind my property with your operations (and the ORV's that will follow), causing danger of a slide and polluting my well and other wells in my area. **I am warning you now, and I will keep this letter, so if it happens and you are sued you will not be able to say you were not warned.**
6. I oppose what this plan will do to fill our pleasant area with noise pollution and air pollution for many months at first – and permanently, through the increase of traffic exhaust fumes and noise. I oppose also the use of helicopters and heavy machinery in the Birdseye area because of the noise pollution and air pollution it will bring. So will the ORV people, who are often aggressive, substance abusers and throw lots of garbage about. Your plan will increase access to

other people who come dump their garbage out on the land.

7. Your destruction of the beauty and tranquility of our area will decrease our property values.

8. All this area is deer habitat, as well as habitat for a varied wildlife, big, small, animals and plants— one, the Gentner's fritillary flower is in the Endangered Species List. Several of the areas you will degrade with your proposed plan are designated critical deer habitat. You will further, severely, destroy habitat and viability for other wildlife species, and cause silting of streams and affecting steelhead spawning and other aquatic life.

When the BLM demonstrates, in fact, integrity in its practices: that it is committed to the health of the forest and the environment in general, I will reconsider my view of the BLM. But not with the deceptive proposal you have submitted.

Claudia Chaves
Birdseye Creek Rd., Gold Hill