

Are you saying that the over all impact of any of the alternatives will be to reduce jobs and have a negative impact on the economy?

Alternative 2 would have the most favorable impact on local economies and would result in a net increase of 3,442 jobs and \$136.5 million of earnings (wages). The No Action Alternative would have the least favorable impact on local economies and would result in a net decrease of 3,770 jobs and \$125.5 million of earnings. Under all four alternatives, economic losses would be greatest in southwestern Oregon where the O&C lands are concentrated. [*Table 2 \(Total economic impacts by alternative\)*](#) shows that under all, but Alternative 2, the loss of [Secure Rural Schools](#) funding, coupled with the reduction in the [plywood industry](#), would be greater than the increased employment and earnings that would be linked to increased BLM harvest levels.

Of course those of us living out here know that there wasn't any kind of study done regarding the negative benefits on those of us at the lower end of the spectrum. Most of us as artists and or players in the tourist industry know that our income goes when the forest does. No one here was asked and we know each other pretty well.

It's a pretty big assumption that it won't harm the land to scrape it clean of life and then let the Oregon rains have their way destroying property and water systems here.