

From: [David Tvedt](#)
To: [BLM_OR_RMPs_WesternOregon](#)
Subject: Feedback for developing the BLM Western Oregon Forests RMP
Date: Thursday, July 05, 2012 3:24:40 PM

Feedback to the Oregon BLM for developing the BLM Western Oregon Forests RMP:

A successful plan will have to satisfy the majority of Oregonians and not cater to special interests, particularly large corporate timber companies that may seek financial gain from BLM lands at the public's expense. The plan should take into account a broad range of externality costs that occur with timber harvesting and this total cost of harvesting should not end up being at the expense of taxpayers and forest communities. Road costs, watershed damage and all types of costs tied with timber harvest need to be included in the plan for it to be successful. A successful plan will need to incorporate providing for the wide range of values on BLM land and not just primarily resource extraction.

In order for the plan to have a chance at being successful, it will be very helpful to have a planning process that:

- Uses a formal collaborative community process and not just focus groups and is also not just an agency internal project.
- Uses a deep consensus-building process involving a full spectrum of political, economic, environmental, social, and geographic interests.
- Involves listening deeply and respectfully to plan critics and potential critics around the spectrum of interests and concerns
- Supports constructive interaction and conflict resolution among plan critics and potential critics, rather than trying to carry all conflict resolution on the agency's own shoulders.
- Seeks real long-term win-win solutions, not just short-term political compromises.

Important things that should be considered in the EIS and RMP:

- The short term and long term ecological impact of various level of thinning.
- The ecological impact of decommissioning logging roads.
- What are the maximum feasible options for salmon habitat and watershed restoration?
- What are the maximum feasible options for overall ecological restoration?
- How can best practices in stewardship contracting be applied in western Oregon forests?
- What is the medium term potential for sustainable economic benefits from recreation as opposed to timber harvesting?
- Incorporate the true spirit and details of the Council on Environmental quality draft guidance on climate change in NEPA processes - not the erroneous prevailing BLM mis-construction of that guidance - as a minimum standard.

Economic outcomes of a successful plan would:

- Engineer economic benefits specific to small entities, rather than for large timber companies.
- Create actual economic benefits available to rural residents, not payments to county governments.
- Look for win-win solutions in which intact forest supports revenue, with such things as: non-motorized recreation, ecosystems services payments, and sustainable low-impact harvest of non-timber forest products.
- Focus timber harvest activities in ways that increase the public value per board foot, not just the number of board feet.
- Develop revenue streams from intact forest for carbon sequestration and for other ecosystems services.

I favor a plan that also:

- Plans for true long-term sustainability of native forest, watersheds, and related ecosystems and species
- Completely preserves critical habitat for threatened and endangered (T&E) species
- Does not allow logging of any old trees anywhere (defined as trees more than 75 years old).
- Does not allow logging in previously unlogged native forest or in mostly intact native forest that has seen limited high-grading.
- Creates strict and substantive protection of riparian corridors, pocket wetlands, and remaining native uplands

I am very interested in working with others to develop a management alternative.

I would like to hear from the BLM via Website, email and in-person.

David Tvedt
801 Lynn Lane
Eugene, Oregon
david@dtvedt.com