Re: BLM Western Oregon Plan Revisions

Dear BLM staff and WOPR response reviewers,

Having read summaries of your plan revisions and the very limited management alternatives that you are offering for public review, I am very disappointed in this WOPR product. I urge you to withdraw WOPR and to provide the public with at least one more management strategy alternative that would:

1. Protect from logging all of the old growth within the 2.6 million acres in question.
2. Enlarge all of the riparian zones along creeks, rivers, lakes, ponds and wetlands to protect water quality and fish and wildlife habitat.
3. Severely limit the number of areas and the acreage to be open to or set aside for future off-road vehicle use.
4. Emphasize thinning of those areas of the forest open to timber management with protection of water quality, air quality and wildlife habitat being taken into account in planning of each and every timber sale.

It is extremely important that the BLM not adopt any of the alternatives currently being presented in the WOPR process. Even the alternative that calls for no change in current practices is not acceptable because the BLM’s current practices are out of step with how the public wants its public forestland to be managed. While many National Forests have changed their practices to reflect public sentiment and are harvesting smaller diameter timber and protecting old growth, the BLM continues to attempt to sell big tracts of old growth timber, a practice that invites environment lawsuits and ties up management in the courts for years unnecessarily.

I feel that the BLM (probably at the behest of the Bush Administration) failed to include such an alternative management plan as outlined above in WOPR because it wants to please the timber industry and conservative commissioners who run many western Oregon counties who are greedy for more timber receipts. I’m sure that the BLM received many, many comments during the scoping phase of the process urging it to include environmentally sound and viable alternatives. It’s a shame that this advice was ignored.

My advice now is revise WOPR by listening to folks affiliated with the Oregon Heritage Forests coalition and craft a new alternative management plan that is based on good scientific
principles, which would provide a steady supply of timber (not the boom and bust cycle that the preferred alternative would cause) without degrading the environment.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Allen Hallmark
13365 Duggan Rd
Central Point, OR 97502
(541) 855-2312

cc: Senator Ron Wyden
    Senator Gordon Smith
    Rep. Greg Walden