

From: [CRAIG M PATTERSON](#)
To: [BLM_OR_RMPs_WesternOregon](#)
Subject: Comments on Planning process.
Date: Friday, September 14, 2012 7:57:21 AM

Dear BLM planning process,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on your planning process. I have a few ideas for your consideration.

First and foremost, I believe Dr Jerry Franklin and Dr Norm Johnson and most other forestry scientists have been remiss in their understanding and analysis of where we have come (understanding history) which impacts our present circumstances. To illustrate this point, I will recap a statement and question I asked Dr Franklin and Dr Johnson on the BLM tour a couple weeks ago.

Looking at the history of the Willamette National Forest the last 103 years of its history can be very revealing as to the trends of the past. When one looks at the cut per generation (20 years) definite trends emerge. (source - History of the Willamette Nation Forest by Lawrence and Mary Rakestraw and person correspondence)

1909 - 1929 - 405 million board feet
1930 - 1949 - 1,3 Billion board feet
1950 - 1969 - 11 Billion board feet
1970 - 1989 - 14.5 Billion board feet
1990 - 2009 - 1.5 Billion board feet

Then I mentioned that right in the middle 1960 - The Multi- use, sustained yield - even flow act was passed.

So my questions are two fold.

- 1) How come no one went to jail for obviously not following the law and
- 2) Where is the 'learning' that incorporates our past history?

Now I know I am mentioning a Forest Service example, however I believe its still very relevant and applicable to BLM as well. Where is the learning for past history: how come it follows the model of 'greatest good for the fewest number for the shortest time' as this history demonstrates? Where is the learning that incorporates that a plantation isn't a forest any more than a golf course is a prairie? Where is the learning that understands the short boom then long term Busted environments, economics and society that following in the wake of Industrial forestry has become the rule and not the exception? Unless these issues and questions are directly addressed, we can't possibly learn from past. The Franklin/Johnson model does not learn from past history and not create integrated solutions that address environmental health, economic vitality and social equality (triple bottom line). Why do you see this as a solution?

Another major disconnect with our management and thinking is found in what we don't count in our analysis. When we don't give an intact ecosystem any 'value' other than the commodities we can take essentially rendering our environment a subset of our economy. We don't realize that the evolution of our forests happened without any 'management' costs, but once we liquidate the forest for short term profits, the management costs begin as an endless stream of prep.planting. thinning, erosion, invasive and disease and insect control, roads and road maintenance and other costs mount and become payable, while the small trees in plantations which have very little value can't possibly cover the on-going 'management costs'. A classic economic death spiral where liabilities increase and the ability to pay decreases. This management disconnect has lead us to the brink of total collapse. In retrospect, we have witnessed the forestry and economics of a drunkard, total binge management and no holistic accounting nor analysis. Until this happens, no real solutions can or will be found, period.

However there is a different approach that can reverse the tide of past management. It is embodied in the wisdom of Gifford Pinchot when he stated the mission of the forest service is to provide, the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time, in direct opposition to the Industrial model. In order to achieve that, we must learn from the past while understanding that sustainable forestry can ONLY be practiced in multi age and multi species forests where we live off the 'interest' and the interest only. Examples include the Menominee tribe who have been selectively harvesting their forests for 150 years. The key to sustainability is NO Industrial clear cut forestry, period. Those lands already clear cut will take generations to come back into real and diverse forests, if we let them. These plantations will continue to demand 'management funds' because we allowed the profits of liquidation to be privatized and the liabilities to be socialized and passed on to future generations with impunity.

It's time to realize the direction of Industrial forestry with feller-butchers and automated mills does not create jobs but for a very select few for a very short time frame. The jobs of the past will NEVER return as long as capital intensive, Industrial focus is maintained, supported and holistic analysis is ignored.

There is another approach that can lead toward sustainable forests and communities, if we have the resolve to return to Gifford Pinchot's wisdom. That is to apply the concept of greatest good for greatest number for longest time to every natural resource decision we make and encounter. Unfortunately there is no evidence this ever gets consideration in my 35 years of exploring this. However if we did apply his wisdom we would realize 3 things.

1) Mature trees are the only ones that potentially can provide value added job creation which is horizontally and vertically integrated with local processing and end-product forest management. If we want sustainable jobs and forests we must stop the forestry of drunkards and stop the liquidation mentality.

2) We must give nature and ecosystems value in our analysis and equations, hold those who degrade them accountable and liable and stop privatizing the profits and socializing the liabilities.

3) Lastly we must seek a totally different approach which focuses on local and sustainable job creation which protects and enhances all the values of Eco-system services without any degradation. Instead of focusing on centralized mill operations, we must decentralize and focus on job creation with portable mills to address single tree selection.

There is a path out of this mess, but Jerry Franklin and Norm Johnson are too invested in the Industrial model to understand it. Unfortunately for us all.

If you care to explore a more decentralized approach to sustainable forestry, I'm ready, willing and able to help with that transition.

Sincerely,

Craig Patterson