L1568

Dear Bureau of Land Management,

RECEIVED
JAN 04 2008

I'm not an expert. But I am concerned about the Western Oregon Plan Revision's 3 Alternatives (WOPR), none of which may adequately preserve water sheds if trees would be removed too close to existing water sources like at Wassen Lake, Wassen Creek - a rather remote spot off 36? near Scottsburg, Oregon on way to Reedsport. I know there is a stand of old growth trees that might be slated for removal if any of the 3 WOPR plans are approved. I would ask that you preserve these remote old growth sections whatever you do decide on.

Maybe certain trees can be blue ribboned to be kept - once logged no longer possible to be considered old growth, but plantation forest.

I would like to hear in your decision that adequate habitat for threatened birds like marbled murrelet, spotted owl are kept - definitely spotted owl is threatened by clearcut, and barred owl. Stream purity for salmon or trout is at issue too, adequate corridor to prevent erosion into streams must be addressed not compromised by future logging.

More + more as I drive to the coast west of Walton I see massive hillside (barren) that use to be forest not just clearcut sections - but whole vast sections. Whether on private lands not clear. Would hope BLM will not allow such wholesale removal of trees (with rainfall likely to badly erode into Siuslaw River.

I'm not necessarily a rabid environmentalist - but I feel we are stewards of this Earth - would hope we do what is right not out of a hasty decision to

temporarily ~~help~~ a few people have a job - If must be logged ~~be~~ use the lumber in U.S. not just sell to Japan, or elsewhere. Only log national BLM if private timber lands are exhausted... if so log conservatively + carefully not clearcut - even if costs more, logging selectively would be better than wholescale sections - What is logged must be profitable, not at a loss to taxpayer (roads, bridges included) - U.S. forest service has failed to break even on most of their timber sales in past.

One thing that wasn't addressed in the past - the issue of global warming and the need to keep or expand forests beyond current level to catch carbon wastes in atmosphere + create oxygen for us to breathe - can you do that by cutting more trees than at present?

Elsewhere in world be it Brazil or Indonesia, or Tongass in Alaska huge sections of forests are vanishing yearly. Are we going to do the same in U.S. or give a value to forests to help preserve our planet - or allow hotter temperatures.

A rush to log may forget the need to preserve our forests as much as is possible.

Yes the BLM + Forest Service own large sections of Oregon - would hope something can be worked out so County yearly payments can be continued without threat of no such payments - as is now yearly a headache.

Whether it is $20, 30, 40, 50 million to help Lane County or what

Lane County is now forced to charge citizens just to recreate in the county parks, wayside, boat landings.

BLM like Forest Service must be adequately funded directly from Federal govt. not dependent on timber sales. We pay the govt. the govt. should pay you 100%, not 50% of what you need.

Good luck on WOPR - I personally think something less than alternatives 1, 2, or 3 is the answer... and that other criteria must be looked at and weighed... EPA + Fish + wildlife aren't just talking, they have valid objections to what you propose in all 3 plans.

Respond when you decide to me → Bob Foster / 369 West Dst #1 Springfield, OR 97477