

RECEIVED

JAN 11 2008

2306

# Carpenters Opposed to Old growth Logging

As carpenters we rely on trees and wood products to make a living. Wood is the primary material we use every day to build peoples homes. While it may seem logical that carpenters would support logging old-growth forests (since they are plentiful sources of high quality lumber), the carpenters of C.O.O.L realize this is far from the truth. Through the process of building we develop a respect for, and a knowledge of wood. Using wood on a daily basis as the raw material for making a living leads us to revere the trees and the forests that provide that wood. As a voice of the building industry we feel it is imperative to state: *WE DO NOT NEED OLD GROWTH TREES TO BUILD HOUSES – WE NEED OLD GROWTH FORESTS FOR OUR QUALITY OF LIFE. OUR CHILDREN AND OUR FUTURE!* Sustainable second-growth forestry is a better long-term solution to provide our society with wood products and to ensure that the benefits of healthy old growth forests remain viable for ourselves and generations to come.

Outlined below are three reasons we oppose WOPR:

## 1. The WOPR is unnecessary

It is entirely possible to produce high-quality wood and wood products from second-growth forests. While clear vertical grained old-growth wood is prized for its aesthetic quality (similar to ivory), its value is created out of pure human vanity. The desire for such material bears no practical connection with harvesting the forest for wood products; rather it is a driving force behind the destruction of our ancient forests. That said - beautiful, aesthetically-pleasing wood can be milled from second-growth logs, especially those that are allowed to grow past 60-70 years and are selectively cut. Through sensible management of second growth forests and preservation of old-growth, we can secure a more stable source of timber for our society and maintain our prized ancient forests.

## 2. The WOPR is give-away to the timber industry

The (option 2) proposal put forth by the BLM is a blatant give-away to a small segment of the timber industry. It will result in short term profits that will benefit a selective few. It will destroy and further degrade the ancient forests and clear-running streams that we (as citizens) value. The profits that result from the WOPR will do very little to solve Lane County's budget problems and it will neither positively or negatively impact the building trades. In general, the timber industry has managed to adapt and reduce its reliance on old-growth trees. Many new, innovative products have become widely used that require smaller and smaller dimensional lumber, such as glue-lam, micro-lam, truss joists, oriented strand board, etc. These products are now standard and they certainly do not require old-growth timber.

## 3. The WOPR results in short-term economic gain at the price of long-term ecologic and economic stability

C.O.O.L believes that the potential *short-term* economic gain that *might* be amassed by a small group of people pales in comparison to the long term benefits of our old growth forests (ie- biodiversity, watershed health, recreation, tourism, etc.). Although many of us forget, we do have

a responsibility to our children and to future generations to act as stewards for the forest, whether it is an ancient or a managed forest. This forest matrix is what makes our state such a wonderful place to live and it provides critical ecologic function and recreational purpose. Preserving the few islands of existing old growth left is also crucial to maintaining a long term forestry plan that seeks to produce timber without further degrading the landscape. We need to integrate old growth forests with sustainable forests with sustainable forestry, not liquidate our resources for fleeting profits.

As professional carpenters we strive to build structures that are built to last. When building a house a skilled carpenter would like to think that it will have a lifespan of 100 years or more. This is merely an ideal. The fact is that most modern stick-framed houses will not be around in 100 years. We have all witnessed houses that are demolished to make way for new buildings or structures that fall into disrepair beyond salvage. Or, buildings that are completely remodeled, requiring an infusion of new materials. We feel it is an unwise economic choice to trade 100 to 500-year old trees (growing in forest that is much older yet) for structures that will be lucky to make it thirty years. We need to be growing our own trees for these uses. Our old growth forests are much too valuable to liquidate for short term gain and we do not require their timber to construct beautiful, long-lasting buildings. From a larger perspective, there is a reciprocal relationship between a high-quality of living in Oregon's urban landscape and its forest landscape, and we as carpenters are dedicated to both.

List of carpenters opposed to WOPR:

Justin Ramsey	Eugene, OR
Bill Belek	Eugene, OR
Pablo Cheney	Eugene, OR
Corey Holmgreen	Portland, OR
Dave Howard	Eugene, OR
Dave Hopkins	Oakridge, OR
Derik Ludvickson	Eugene, OR
Jeff Long	Eugene, OR
Pete Lassen	Eugene, OR
Jeremy McDonald	Eugene, OR
Brent Reindel	Eugene, OR
Matt Schaffer	Eugene, OR
Nat Slayton	Portland, OR
Gus Slayton	Portland, OR
Rich Slayton	Eugene, OR
Issac Sulentic	Eugene, OR
Jay White	Bellingham, WA
Dave Veldhuizen	Eugene, OR
Daryl Weizer	Fort Collins, CO
Adrian Jones	Fort Collins, CO
Micha Whittman	Fort Collins, CO