

RECEIVED

NOV 19 2007 1078

TO: BLM WESTERN OREGON PLAN REVISIONS TEAM  
PO Box 2965 – Portland OR, 97208

Nov. 7, 2007

FROM Mr. & Mrs. Daniel and CLAUDIA BEAUSOLEIL  
4495 Cedar Flat Rd. Williams, OR. 97544

The following comments are for public record. We oppose the selected proposed BLM WOPR alternative being considered for the following reasons:

1. We oppose the WOPR, it cannot comply with the NEPA act. We want BLM to take seriously and accept a "Community-Conservation Alternative" which has been submitted by the Oregon Heritage Forest & Klamath Siskiyou Wildlands Center. If this alternative is unacceptable, then keep the NW Forest Clinton Plan in tact. Save our tax dollars and stay out of court.
2. We support logging, by thinning old clear cut plantations on public lands.
3. We oppose the cutting of native trees over the age 125 years old. The WOPR proposes 109,600 of old growth trees be clear cut, this is unacceptable. The WOPR wants to harvest the remaining 12% of the land base and clear cut 143,000 of public forest lands. This is 224 square miles, this is moving backwards, not forward, and this is unacceptable! Clear cutting down entire ecosystems is insane. Increasing logging from 268 mbf a year to 769 mbf a year is good for the timber industry and bad for public land owners and NEPA laws. Save our tax payer dollars, stay out of court and keep the NW Clinton Forest Plan in tact.
4. LSR's in the WOPR are to be reduced by 47% from approximately 936,000 acres to 494 acres. This wipes out old growth forest and critical wildlife habitat for endangered and threatened wildlife species. These proposed actions are illegal and unacceptable.
5. Riparian Zones will be reduced by 57% from 364,000 acres to 156,000 acres if WOPR alternative is chosen. This will dry up seasonal creeks and major streams and rivers, by destroying forest canopy. This will contribute to loss of fish habitat, this is unacceptable.
6. I support our clean water, a variety of fish species and especially protected salmon. WOPR wants to decrease stream buffers up to 25' that shade streams and keep soil sediment from the water. Our clean water cannot be threatened.
7. Sustainable economics makes sense to me. Healthy, protected forest are one of Oregon's most important natural assets. Clear-cutting is a short-term economic fix. The timber industry lawsuit is based on a 1937 O&C law, which is 70 years old. By clear-cutting and increasing the logging of our public forest, this is a short term quick economic fix. It's time for the timber mills to direct their work to thin for fuels management and hazard trees. Economical sustainability is showing our fishermen healthy fish, showing tourist the wildlife in a healthy protected native old growth forest. By bringing in tourist to our public forest lands to recreate, this creates money in the service industry and local merchants.

8. Global warming and fire. With wopr's proposal to increase clear-cutting on a large scale, this would increase global warming. How? When the trees are cut, we lose carbon into the atmosphere, which contribute to warming our climate. BLM responds to wopr in their proposal as: There is no change to the climate. This is ridiculous, and extremely stupid. Our scientist can testify clear-cutting contributes to global warming. BLM's wopr is to clear-cut and replace native forest with one tree species plantations. One species tree plantations are vulnerable to fires, due to the density of rows and rows of trees. A native old growth forest has a diversity of trees and has more moisture in it to fend off fire. Let's move forward, not back ward. We oppose your proposal to clear cut our forest, let's select cut trees under 80 years old and protect our forest.
9. Wildlife and plant habitat. How can wopr reduce the protected wildlife habitat areas by 50%? How can wopr and BLM issue take permits on endangered species like the spotted owl, the marbled Murrelet when by law they are legally protected? Wildlife need at least 60% of forest canopy close for winter thermal cover to survive, doesn't BLM recognize their own guidelines for deer, bear, elk and other animal species needs for winter survival? Wopr does not make sense to me, nor will it make sense in our courts of law. The wopr would reduce protection for wildlife and destroy valuable native plants. By clear-cutting, more noxious invasive weeds will grow and spread.
10. Peace and quiet. Yes, I can live with gun shots near my home during hunting season, because I choose to live next to BLM public lands. These lands offer a spiritual peaceful satisfaction to me and my family. No, I won't accept the increase of chain saws, logging trucks, and hearing the loud noise of "off highway vehicles". OHV's do not fit in with my choice of living in a rural peaceful quite environment. I oppose wopr's proposal to increase OHV areas, let's keep the existing OHV area's out of our peaceful spiritual forest.
11. To conclude, we recommend NO CLEAR-CUTTING. Thin only small diameter trees, approximately 4" to 18" inch DBH. Preserve our irreplaceable old growth (old growth trees) public lands for all ESA creatures to survive in. We oppose and future "take permits" for threatened, endangered or survey and managed wildlife.
- 12.

We would like to hear your response, concerning the above WOPR comments.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. Daniel and Claudia Beausoleil

