

**BIRCH Kevin R**

---

**From:** CRAIG M PATTERSON [craigmpatterson@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2007 11:30 AM  
**To:** BIRCH Kevin R  
**Subject:** Re: FFAC Request for public input  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Green

To: Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee

From: Craig Patterson - Public input

Main Points:

1) What is the Vision, Target and Goal as they relate to the triple bottom line? What are the symbiotic interdependent relationships that affected by our single focused choices and priorities? What are the key 'value' drivers of society and how do they interface with the 'target'? Are there 'institutional barriers' that prevent us from meaningfully exploring the target or goal? What are they and how can we create a level playing field?

Unfortunately, there is little work on identifying an integrated model that attempts to understand what the triple bottom line (environmental, economic and social) is 'on the ground' with real people in real communities. Why not connect our research from the theories to the communities who call them home? Without a goal or target, any path will do. However when we pass 'externalities and unintended consequences' on to future generations, then we aren't acting in a sustainable manor. If neither the Forest Service nor ODOF have an integrated vision and approach to creating the context of 'sustainability' then I believe it's premature to assume one agency should take the lead over another.

2) Our inability to adequately understand the interdependent and symbiotic relationships while creating an holistic analysis that incorporates the triple bottom line seems to allow many 'myths' of forestry to continue. Any externality or unintended consequence that requires 'mitigation' needs to be incorporated in the front end 'cost analysis', once it is identified and understood and not just passed on to future generations. This fundamental oversight has become the key anti thesis of 'sustainability', in my opinion. Leaving a legacy of 30-60 year plantations is not being a good ancestor, from any leg of the stool.

3) That the vision statement is very nice but unfortunately not grounded in on the ground examples. I offer the following examples.

A) Economic - The 2002 state economic map of 'distressed cities and counties - which covers about 3/4 of the state. The historically strong and basic industry (Lumber and associated industries) has been reduced to a small fraction of its heyday. The Boom bust cycle has been more or less universal through out the Industrial forestry model and through out the country. It seems to me that the problem is one of values and whether we are going to allow 'just a few to benefit' or reverse the historical trends and provide the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time? That model could be based on job creation thru a value added emphasis

coupled with appropriate technology and attempts to level the playing field. Isn't it worth a serious look?

B) Heritage and honoring the past - How does one reconcile this with relatively recent logging infractions on sacred sites including ones on the historical registry, with little or no consequences? What message does this send? How does destroying a cultural site honor it?

C) Stewardship and responsibility - How do you reconcile this with those who lost their lives and homes to landslides which were influenced by logging practices above? How does the state forest practices act allow cat logging on a 70% slope on a blind corner on a major two lane highway? How can we spray approximately 800,000 acres with chemicals, given that many of these chemicals bio accumulate and or degrade into sometimes even more harmful chemicals? In a recent study all rivers in the Pacific Northwest were found to be contaminated with mercury, maybe, just maybe it's time to think in terms of the precautionary principle. We are all guinea pigs now. Look at [www.bodyburden.com](http://www.bodyburden.com) to better educate oneself how extensive chemicals are in the environment. It's an eye opener. Is ut any wonder why cancer rates are so high?

D) Managing for sustainability - Which communities would you point to which reflect a robust economy, social structure and environment, without externalities? I have been looking for 30 years and yet to find one.

E) Scientific understanding and credibility - Again, where is the research that attempts to target the triple bottom line in real communities with real people? Science often seems devoid of social relevance and seems to attempt to mitigate or justify a certain modality rather than following the traditional scientific method that includes testing laws and principals, measuring, heuristics and finally consilience where connections and values interface.

".reductionism is the primary and essential activity of science. But dissection and analysis are not all that scientists can do. Also critical are synthesis and integration, tempered by philosophical reflection on significance and value." (Consilience, E.O. Wilson, p 54)

F) Connecting people with the land. Exactly, where is the science and models of integration on the land???? Where is the integrative triple bottom line research?

G) Material and spiritual well being - Can this be found in a plantation? A clear cut? If not, why not?

H) Healthy fish and wildlife - With extinctions, listed and many very vulnerable species in dire situations, how can anyone not understand the implications of our many intrusions into habitats through out Oregon? Here on the McKenzie, once thought to be prime bull trout areas, the present count of fish is pitiful. I have followed the relicencing of EWEB's dams on the upper McKenzie and heard some of the presentations. The problems are widespread. Where are the examples of healthy fish and wildlife populations and what can we glean from past management?

I) Healthy communities - Where are they?????..... I have lived in the McKenzie Valley for over 30 years and I have been looking for sustainable forestry communities most of that time. Perhaps I'm looking in the wrong areas. Please advise where they exist, with documentation.

J) Future generations - If were concerned about future generations we must incorporate the triple bottom line in EVERY analysis, research thesis and project that gets funding. We must incorporate the concept of 'consilience', the unity of knowledge which Edward O. Wilson so eloquently wrote about in his book of a similar title, "Consilience".

And we must learn to count what really matters as Tom Bender so eloquently explains in his book, "**Learning to count what really counts, the economics of wholeness**".

There are a number of new, exciting and potentially fruitful frontiers which need to be explored in the context of sustainability and future generations. Attempting to repackage or perpetuate the old Industrial paradigm is NOT one of them. I am actively exploring selective harvesting, local processing and end-product forest management. I invite you to take a look.

Sincerely,

Craig Patterson