

2009

Alan Hoffmeister
Bureau of Land Management
Western Oregon Planning Revision Public
Outreach Coordinator
P.O. Box 2965
Portland, Oregon
97208

January 11, 2008

I am interested in reviewing and commenting to any changes the BLM has made to the DEIS prior to the Jan 11, 08 comment period as referenced by Alan Hoffmeister to the Corvallis Gazette Times Nov. 26 2007. Changes where noted as underway to the DEIS as a on going process during the 180 day comment period was also cited by Trish Wilson Marys Peak Field Manager Portland USDI-BLM during her meeting/work session Oct 30, 2007 with Benton County Board of Commissioners and then entire board of Benton County Environmental Issues Advisory Committee(EIAC) in Corvallis, Oregon.

The public should be apprized of all changes to the DEIS as they are then able to most completely comment legally and factually to what they have before them as a DEIS-WOPR. The BLM may have failed/been remiss in providing the public with these updates to the DEIS during the 180 comment period.

Public meeting noticefication that BLM hosted ended 11/9/07 so beyond this date the BLM staff may not have extended meetings/hosted further community meetings to do more community outreach due to extending comment period from November 9, 2007 to January 11, 2008.

The public should be apprized of all changes made to the preferred alternative #2 and the DEIS-WOPR document in full 1599 page hard copy 1610(OR-930) Portland BLM August 2007 before the 180 day NEPA comment period expires.

ACEC:

ACEC discussion/findings and support reasoning for elimination and geographic changes presented in all alternatives in the DEIS, have not been developed fully in discussion in DEIS and there are errors/transposition error

1 DEISWOPR/11/2008 R. Foster

in presentation spread sheets in August 2007 DEIS paper copy, in the Marys Peak DEIS to which the correction should be shared with the public before Jan 11, 2008.

ACEC boundary changes are not clearly define for reason why they are reoriented on the landscape and to what use/reasons for historic ACEC area will be put when they are reconfigured or eliminated. Timber management area violates ESA, CWA, FLPMA, State of Oregon regulations which pertain to Forest practices act, threatened and endangered species, cultural resource protections and natural hazards protections from landslides and damages sustained from extraction use within a watershed which is linked to rural and urban water supplies.

What resource use will former ACEC's be providing for other the to support ESA, FLPMA 302(b) easements, permits, ect., for utilization through habitation, cultivation, and development of small trade or manufacturing concerns; applicable statutory requirements "...Nothing in this Act shall modify or change any provision of Federal law relating to migratory birds or endangered or threatened species."

I argue that reconfiguring ACEC without clearly spelling out the full reason both environmentally as historically defined or as part of the revenue base for TMA, the DEIS fails to provide the public reasonable explanations for removing ACEC's completely or reconfiguring historic ACEC's in the 6 BLM Districts. Valuation of the current ACEC's in dollars may not be included in the DEIS formulas for timber total board feet or mineral extraction, utility leases, road building costs to reach these ACEC's to extract resources identified or not identified in the DEIS as targeted areas for land use under Alternative #2. Ecologically loss of historic ACEC's may be priceless to place dollar value to this loss, and it this is not done in the DEIS-WOPR. Replacing these species loss may be impossible, fail or add to extinction of many endemic species only found in these single ACEC areas. Take and ESA apply here to ACECs.

High elevation habitat is where species are force to move due to rapidly upward moving climatic temperatures. DEIS fails to confirm this is occurring and to show that all ACEC'S are significant habitat for species which are forced to move higher in elevation due to climate change.

High and mid elevation ACEC's will or already are housing species who may be pushed completely out of their range due to climate change and

associated ecologic needs of these high and mid elevation species. Removing ACEC's to TMA could warrant more endemic species in these specific areas to be placed on State and Federal ESA.s

Additionally mid and high elevation ACEC's and indeed all ACEC's are/may be fully documented at State and Federal cultural offices, as culturally significant areas which are protected under various State Of Oregon Historic Preservation laws and Federal Acts such as: Antiquities Act 1906, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Archeological Resource Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470)8 amends PL 96-95(October 31, 1979), Historic Sites Act 49 U.S.C 303, Public Law 100-17, 1987, National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C 470) and amended in 1980 Public Law 96-515 (December 12, 1980) and National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1992, Title XL of Public Law 102-575 (October 30. 1992)

How does the DEIS address the above laws and statutes in relation to moving and eliminating ACEC's in all six districts?

Survey and Manage species in the TMA

I note an example TMA with significant 80-150 and 150+ year old native forest fragments on Oregon and California publically owned land in the Salem District has not been surveyed for Survey and Manage species. We are unable to see any T and E survey data in this Salem TMA area to be clearcut for Federally ESA listed Marbled Murrelet *Brachyramphus marmoratus*, Northern Spotted Owl *Strix occidentalis*, Red Tree Vole *Clethrionomys* and *Phenacomys* spp within the range of the Coastal Forest mg area for DEIS all Alternatives.

So, perhaps indeed no TMA have been surveyed for any State or Federally listed Species and or species listed as Survey and Manage under the NWFP due to discussed removal of NWFP from DEIS all Alternatives. Red Tree vole have been found in several areas to be clearcut in TMA in Alsea Falls area of the Salem BLM. Do the LSA area's support this much T and E species and Survey and Manage species as may be currently archived/living/residing/reproducing in the TMA for Salem District?

Will the LSA protect T and E species or will lack of NWFP guidelines be applied in LSA with passage of DEIS-all alternatives? State ESA/Forest practice law is violated when species which are listed as State of Oregon –

Threatened and Endangered or are fully Federally listed as Threatened and Endangered are forced/Taken across all 6 Districts are taken or removed from native 80-150 and 150+ yr old native forests in TMA areas.

Reductions in riparian protection buffers does not comply with State Oregon Forestry Practices as the Federal requirements are greater and so should be over achingly applied, not eliminated as in DEIS Alternative #2.

Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act are in jeopardy with water supplies of an undisclosed number of Oregonian communities to see failing water quality standards as landscape wide mass mg. practice as monocultural forest harvest practice with few established state or federal over site environmental laws and constraints apply in all action alternatives and perhaps monoculture non native seed source are uniformly installed a the wrong elevations under the Alternative #2. Countless landowners use spring boxes which are unidentified in the DEIS and so 1000's of Oregonian's will file for state or federal emergency FEMA assistance due to curtailment of their properties drinking water supply directly related to land use above and around these private properties in all six districts. Insurance rates of all types will sky rocket.

Title 42 The Public Health And Welfare Safety of Public Water Systems Public Health Service Act (Title XIV) PHSA all sections (42 U.S.C.A sections 300f-26] Chapter 6A-Public Health Service apply.

Loss of water supply as predicted historically determined volume, to communities may damage sewage system function so pollution to the waters of the State of Oregon may be projected due to DEIS all alternatives except the No action alternative. Water flow will decrease over time with massive harvest areas of native 80-150-150yr old native forests on O and C land in coastal rain forest rain shadow.

Solid Waste Disposal (42 U.S.C.A sections 6901 to 6992k) and State DEQ water quality acts and, FWPCA section 502 is violated in DEIS alt#2 and all alternatives except the no action alternative as landslide across all six blm districts in the geologically unstable coast range erode normally. DEIS fails to consider the long term impacts of increases in erosion from clearcuts and from landslides both small and large scale in nature. All landslides should not be considered equal or contributive of woody debris to all classifications of drainages, seasonal or perennial class 1, 2 or 3 under Oregon Forest Practices Act. Total number and surface area of all slides is not discussed as a leading environmental factor in loss of water quality and quantity to rivers, streams, water supply and to health and longevity of

estuary and long shore/nearshore and offshore oceanic ecology. Aquatic Inventory Strategy applies to LSA and TMA in all Action alternatives in DEIS-WOPR.

How will the State of Oregon protect private property rights should private and public water quality and quantity be physically degraded or be cut off or unduly damaged over the life of DEIS alternative #2?

Will the State DEQ sue Federal government-USDI, applying 1364 FWPCA section 504? Long term property values of private and state land may decline due to implementation of DEIS-WOPR action alternatives and not including the no action alternative in all six coast range districts.

How does the Portland office of the USDI propose to limit or reduce pending property damage or condemnation of entire communities water supplies/sewage treatment facility, water storage infrastructure due to watershed wide land management decisions defined in DEIS alternatives and not including no action alternative?

The August 2007 DEIS fails outright to clearly show how timber receipts will be calculated and shared within the six districts. Douglas County has the most board feet in TMA and LSA to be cut, but will share revenue with other districts. This is not clearly defined in DEIS WOPR all alternatives.

O and C land in second growth may support counties through management of these lands as timber and wood fiber resource areas, managed to increase long term, long range 100s of years later, movement towards 80-150Year old age class and beyond to 150+ age class in all six districts.

Does the DEIS WOPR show how the USDI will manage cut/established plantations within O and C landscape in the six districts? How will the DEIS-WOPR establish future 80-150 to 150+ year native stands, if the LSA are managed will the LSA be the only place native 80-150 to 150+ yr native publicly owned coast range forests exist? How can we confirm that mg. of the LSA will be correctly managed? Where are the controls for these LSA in all six districts?

Historic harvested and replanted plantation O and C acres could support just as many revue dollars as would cut of native forests which remain at 80-150 and 150+ years. How are the DEIS analysis considering management of already cut over plantation O and C land to supply revenue for Counties in O and C group, support habitat qualities increase habitat diversity in

plantations that are managed or thinned, and support investments in long term provision of clear water and clean air supply to the State of Oregon?

I see or find no discussion in DEIS-WOPR which shows dollar value of a single native tree in age class 80-150 to 150+ years. I argue that each nature tree in these remaining O and C landscapes as forest fragments of the aforementioned age class do completely and freely without management by man, house and contain life forms and surface areas as habitat for life forms to be totally incalculable and irreplaceable in the cut over Oregon Coast Range.

With increase to x percent logging by clearcut on private land in the Coastal Oregon forests what remains or is retained as island ecology and habitat, for the most part is found on USDA and uncut O and C USDI land. Not much is known about the cut plantation O and C land as to how it is functioning as forest ecosystems.

How are the historic O and C plantations functioning currently to support forest health and sequester carbon, support species once widespread in all Six districts and or are supporting endemic species? DEIS-WOPR does not analyze this and from visiting O and C plantations in the Salem District and adjacent 150+ year old native stands, there is a lot of forest diversity still contained in 150+ yr old stands where as the cut over plantation area adjoining these 150+ yr old stands are thickets of small diameter trees, perhaps mono culturally planed at the time of installation, and are or have shaded out almost all botanic understory species and show an almost complete lack of standing old relic snags or downed woody debris as ancient 150+ year old woody debris as is found abundantly in 150+ year old parcels.

I argue that these cut over plantation O and C checkerboard acres in all Six districts are slowly developing forest structure and slowly healing from forest management decisions as applied to the landscape and the adjoining native forest parcels support and supply diversity in the form of storehouse of plant and animal genetics/biorichness/flow of life/richness of species diversity exchanges to these O and C cut over plantations of less then 80 years, which are at this time unmanaged and not considered in DEIS-WOPR all action alternatives.

Removal of native 80-150 and 150+ year old forests will jeopardize the future of currently established O and C plantations under 80 years to achieve full environmental diversity as a function forest that supports all the species currently found or undiscovered in native 80-150 and 150+ year old

forests. Further fragmentation in all watersheds due to removal of remaining native forests lacks prospective to support future resource needs of the ecosystem that is the entire physically and environmentally dynamic Oregon Coast range. This is a rare/or rarified due to management by man, habitat remaining on the globe.

Federal O and C forests currently anchor the Coast Range ecologic stability and foundation of the entire coast range ecosystem. By applying all action alternatives to these six districts the USDI will have undermined the entire Oregon Coast range to degraded environmental conditions. All coastal nearshore fisheries and offshore fishers will perhaps show massive declines due to lack of headwater riparian corridors and removal of large surface areas of native 80-150 and 150 yr. old native forests. Buffer standards change globally so that movement will ripple into all aspects of the ecology of the coast range and Cascade Mountains as these wide Federal standardized buffers are critical to support forest and oceanic health.

How is the DEIS-WOPR all action alternatives projecting the loss of Special Forest Products receipts, jobs, industries in Oregon with reductions in forest cover in all six districts? Special Forest Products revenue may be lost in all six districts on USDI land and it is projected there will be collateral loss of quality and quantity of special forest products on adjoining State and private land due to large acreages of: forest removal, soil quality/fertility degradation over ten years and for 100s of years into the future, all sorts of erosion and mass movement of slopes after harvest/clearcut, drying of adjacent ownership forest canopy, and forest floor habitats, wind throw damage to private and State land, hydrologic changes due to elimination of native forests of 80-150 and 150+ years old.

Will timber sales be final if the price of raw logs increases and timber is sold? Will counties be paid the value of what is to be cut as board feet will gain value for raw logs sold to Asia on the global timber market? What mills in Oregon will take 80-150 to 150+ year old trees?

What is the value of native timber over 150+ years, as this is not clearly discussed in DEIS-WOPR. Will 150+ year old trees in TMA be ground up in situ? Will 150+ year old trees inside 80-150 yr old TMA be dropped or retained?

Perhaps a reason these older trees (150+ years) are found within 80-150 yr old areas/polygon are environmental or due to some forester in the past acknowledging the biologic and ecologic importance of these trees to be retained in these managed areas if they had been managed in the past on O and C land.

We see cutting/stumps in native stands of 80-150 and 150+ years and this cut relic record may be from before O and C land was designated. So, someone has considered how the forests should be currently back before O and C land was defined. The DEIS-WOPR may in all the action alternatives not look to the future forest sustainability as native unmanaged forests but does consider short term only managed landscapes, without ancient tree retention qualities in clearcut areas defined arbitrarily or randomly related to extraction ease in all Six districts as TMA and LSA locations.

What supports the location of TMA and LSA in the DEIS-WOPR? We note across the Six Districts unusual patterns in location of TMA and LSA which do not make much environmental sense.

Salem District TMA is south of Alsea, Oregon and reports that all O and C native 80-150 and 150 year old forests will be clearcut. This is a huge drain of all forest ecology from this entire region. This makes little if any environmental sense and is outright poor environmental practice. The headwaters of the SF Alsea River are the entire TMA area in the Salem District. Fish passage is blocked to much of this drainage basin by Green and Alsea falls and other drops on mainstem SW Alsea river, but that these fish passage barriers may be the only reason the DEIS-WOPR Salem District TMA is where it is currently.

I disagree with the location of TMA for the Salem District as the most native 80-150 and 150+ year old native forests in all Six districts will be clearcut from this one location. TMA may support T and E species and an unsubstantiated or undefined amount of survey and manage species. With global climate change, these areas are priceless pools of cold soil and airshed areas/banks/storage areas for both animal and humans to enjoy and sustain themselves within.

Removal of this much native 80-150 and 150+ yr old forest in TMA Salem District in all action alternatives in DEIS-WOPR violated ESA, NEPA, CWA, CAP Chapter 7 Section 701-706, State DEQ, State of Oregon FPA, ect.

I concur with specific remarks and comments on the WOPR Draft EIS submitted by the Coast Range Association and twenty-three other groups. The full coalition comments document (172 pages) is available as a Flashpaper document on the Coast Range Association's web site at:

<http://www.coastrange.org/WOPRDEISComments.html>.

Submitted by: Daniel Kruse, Legal Director
Cascadia Wildlands Project

P.O. Box 10455
Eugene, Oregon 97440
(541) 434-1463

Doug Heiken, Conservation and Restoration Coordinator
Oregon Wild (formerly Oregon Natural Resources Council)

P.O. Box 11648
Eugene, OR 97440
(541) 344-0675

Joseph Vaile, Campaign Director
Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center

P.O. Box 102
Ashland OR 97520
(541) 488-5789

Chuck Willer, Director
Coast Range Association

P.O. Box 2250
Corvallis, Oregon 97339

And 20 other groups.

Thank you,
Rana Foster



1415 SW Brooklane Drive
Corvallis, Oregon 97333