

3438 NE Davis St.
Portland, OR, 97232-3404
Nov. 8, 2007

969.1

United States Dept. of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Oregon State Offices
333 SW First Avenue
Portland, OR, 97204

RECEIVED
NOV 14 2007

Dear Staff of the BLM:

I am impressed with the opus you produced to explain your new management alternatives for your lands in Oregon. Thank you for inviting my comments.

I realize that historically BLM has been expected to consider that its primary responsibility ^{was} to provide salable resources for homesteaders and their descendents. Perhaps that is why BLM has two alternatives which treat its domain's goal ^{is} as a source of commodity extraction. In spite of this, BLM has managed to finally restore areas polluted by cattle grazing, trampling and dirtying our clean wilderness waters. BLM also has made trails for hikers, and maintained other recreation areas.

My choice of alternatives is the No Action one. I am for no plan that would leave no green trees after any cut. I am against clearcuts and cuts too close to all streams. I am against any accommodation of off road vehicles in forests and desert whose beauty is first class (i.e.) has old growth and the full ground cover and complement of downed logs and snags with at least 8 large ancient trees per acre. I am against more roads on BLM land.

Your concern for the prospect of fire is justified. The solution to this problem is to advise all builders of homes or barns close to forests that could be fire-prone, that BLM and its Government agencies cannot assume responsibility for damage by fire if people build too close to woods which might catch fire. *Also to thin the brush understory of tree farms.*

We all know that Douglas Firs of great size and age have bark which helps save them from dying from forest fires. It behooves us to be grateful for this quality, and from now on ^{to} be smart enough not to harvest Douglas firs which are indeed alive after surviving a fire, and not to harvest them at any time from now on.

If the BLM feels that it must produce trees quickly to help communities build schools and libraries, then I think that those communities should be encouraged to absorb some industries or businesses which would give its citizens jobs. The other solution is for the citizens, many of whom have developed a dependence on cutting forests for their quality of life, those citizens should be willing to take training in lines of work which would ensure their employment. Certainly the beautiful lands of forests and streams which attract so many visitors fo Oregon, should not be clearcut and destroyed for the sake of unsustainable lifestyles and because of the lopsided management in the nation's tax system, and the foolish resort to expensive wars against countries which did not attack us. Everything on earth is related to everything else.

Even the EPA has complained that some of these BLM proposals are a threat to the fish and wildlife they are expected to protect.

I think off-road vehicles charging up trails in forests, grinding the dirt under their tires, creating noise ^{which} /disturbs living entities, wildlife and human, is an insult to all other life forms who respect the forests and wildlands. Such vehicles have no business in our treasured beautiful places and should not be allowed in BLM's wild true forests or special places.

It disturbs me that so many of your plans mention that there is no intention of leaving any green trees after cutting down the forests. Nor is there a plan to increase the habitat, or at least leave such habitats intact. (Spotted owls & Marbled Murrelets) ^{for}

Why this haste to cut our heritage of trees, when the market for trees is now at a low price? The Sierra Club says it best. *I attach their words.* Peace to Trees!

Alberta Gerould

Alberta Gerould, Sierra Club Life member

Enclosure