RECEIVED
DEC 12 2007

PO Box 689
Ashland, OR
97520

1358

Dec 8, 07

BLM-
Draft EIS - Response
Resource Management Plan W. & Regon
To BLM, (sorry about handwriting - no computer).

I would prefer the "no action" or alternative 1 "action. I have a background in wild life science and botany. (I have worked for BLM and USFS in these areas). I also served as chair of the Medford Citizen's Advisory Committee in 1980. (was kicked off by then Interior Sctry Watt for being an environmentalist and a democrat!). I am only too aware of political pressure from the current administration to pursue certain policies! The focus on O&C act in an attempt to extract more timber obviously comes from the top!

You make it clear that alternatives 2 and 3 will not meet certain wildlife objectives. I have also in the past come to question the methods used to estimate available timber harvest. Do you remember what was called the "allowable cut effect"? It used what was projected improvements in planting, thinning, spraying, etc - to boost the cut NOW. This is like getting interest now on capital - and projected future interest! Too many unknown variables! You say that you know more now than you did in the 1990's, but we still have only one full rotation under our belts to go on (unlike the "crop of corn" so often used as analogy). You implied this lack of knowledge in your wild life survey information. We still don't really know what is out there - new species of bugs, lichens, etc are discovered, even in our area. Surveys are still sketchy and incomplete.

Legally, it could be argued that because the O&C act predates many newer laws and rules, that the newer rules should dominate, or at least be equally considered. (Ideally, new legislation should clarify). I always have felt that the local BLM on-the-ground staff do their best to balance all of the resources, and protect them! Support them!

Sincerely,
Diane N. Meyer