

**From:** CRAIG M PATTERSON [mailto:craigmpatterson@msn.com]

**Sent:** Friday, July 31, 2009 7:16 AM

**To:** mike@michaelschneeconsulting.com; ACHTERMAN Gail; jbarbour01@fs.fed.us; BARNUM Paul; jcease8@comcast.net; rick.fletcher@oregonstate.edu; HATCH Audrey C; glarsen@fs.fed.us; gllarsen@comcast.net; jlinares@fs.fed.us; kmagis@aol.com; mcljanet1@comcast.net; george@jeffnet.org; susan.morre@oregonstate.edu; dnearhood@gmail.com; john@lazyrb.com; kreynolds@fs.fed.us; springer@starkerforests.com; svickerman@defenders.org

**Cc:** CHASE Jeri; CLEM Cathy M; MORMAN David A

**Subject:** RE: Oregon Roundtable Subcommittee - Draft Proposal Review

Hello Mike, David and all,

Here are my comments on this Roundtable Draft;

In the first line of this you refer to 'great progress' has been made in the field of sustainable forest management. Where? What? How does this 'great progress' manifest in real forests with real people? I need to know as I have been looking for a long time.

When we use terms like 'great progress' without defining what we mean in terms of the environmental, economic and social implications and analysis we do little to expand our knowledge/wisdom base. ?

On the other hand, if we all understand and agree on what constitutes 'great progress' and the target of sustainable forest management we could better assess our past and present choices against that criteria. Unfortunately I see little analysis that does that or attempts to integrate 'cause and effects' regarding past management choices. This vacuum significantly contributes to the gridlock we seem to experience. There is a path out, if we care to use it.

Perhaps one of the reasons why we seem to be so polarized and why the public is disinterested in 'sustainable discussions' is that we aren't talking and integrating these 'sustainable theories' with on the ground reality in forest dependent communities. Theories that aren't tested in real time in real communities are essentially worthless. It's time to define terms and come to some agreement about what constitutes basic science and how we understanding consequences (externalities and unintended consequences) when we connect causes with effects.

The second part of the first paragraph is particularly important to me. Understanding the employment trends as capital intensive and automation seem to decrease employment while 'value added quality finish products' enhance it. Which trend is reflected in which management strategy? Can we connect the dots?

Secondly, biodiversity is the foundation of sustainability and anything that undermines biodiversity undermines sustainability. We need to talk about this elephant in the forest and attempt to reach some form of consensus.

You mention that Oregon is a shining light nationally in regard to sustainable forest management. How is this reflected in the fact the State economic department

classifies 3/4 of the state as economically distressed since 2002? Where are we simultaneously integrating the triple bottom line? In fact, isn't the opposite happening? Environmental costs for restoration increase while our ability to pay for these costs decreases as the 'profit' made on these old trees has long since been 'privatized' and taken.

Regarding the Project List.

The key is to integrate simultaneously the triple bottom line in every projects we undertake. What are the environmental, economic and social impacts, legacies and externalities?

Secondly, every project must have an 'on the ground' component, testing a hypothesis that is credible, relevant and cost effective. If we want the public to get excited, then they need to be able to see it.

Well I have exceeded my two cents worth. I hope my thoughts stimulate more dialogue.

Sincerely,

Craig Patterson