

1996

Liza Crosse
Box 256
Woodacre, CA 94973

RECEIVED

JAN 15 2008

January 11, 2008

Western Oregon Plan Revisions Office
P.O. Box 2965
Portland, OR 97208

Dear Planning Staff,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Western Oregon Plan Revision Draft EIS, and for the excellent online resources related to the plan. I have read the documents carefully. As a property owner in the Applegate Valley I strongly oppose the recommended Alternative 2. Further, I believe that the EIS has not provided an acceptable alternative upon which to comment. It is also clear that the proposed alternatives are all in violation of the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act.

I urge the Bureau of Land Management to revise the Draft EIS to provide an alternative which manages all lands and beneficial uses under the direction of the Western Oregon Plan for the recovery of federally listed species, especially salmonids. Practices which enhance the health of forest lands and watersheds will provide diverse long term benefits, including economic benefits. While the preferred Alternative 2 may provide higher short term economic benefits I believe that the long term and devastating environmental costs of the recommended practices in Alternative 2 will ultimately vastly outweigh the short term increase in revenues.


An acceptable alternative is one which supports maximum forest complexity and protects all old growth trees and does not expand timber cutting. It would diminish, rather than increase fine sediment delivery as is proposed in all of the current proposed alternatives.

I do support the No Action Alternative element which calls for extensive fire management through thinning practices. The No Action Alternative also provides appropriate riparian setbacks, which are critical to stream health, benefiting diverse species and water quality, and I encourage any future alternative to retain these setback areas as provided in the No Action Alternative.

I am concerned about one element of all of the alternatives, and that is the management of off highway vehicles. All of the alternatives fail to protect natural resources from OHV use and I object to the alternatives which propose increase OHV use in sensitive areas. I believe that there is not one beneficial aspect to use of these vehicles, and that they are very harmful, increasing run off of fine sediments and causing extensive damage to vegetation as well as increased use of fossil fuels. I recommend that all lands managed by the WOP be closed to off road vehicles until a comprehensive study of their environmental impacts and identification of areas which can support these vehicles with the least harm is completed. In particular I oppose the proposed expansion of OHV emphasis areas in the Medford District, and I oppose the use of the John's Peak and Ferris Gulch OHV emphasis areas identified in the present Forest plan.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Liza Crosse