

Dear Members of Congress:

The United States has made great strides by relying on science to inform our decision making. Science helped us travel to the moon; advance medicine and health; and understand the complex web of life on land and in rivers, lakes, and oceans. Science has also opened our eyes to the workings of forests and provided blueprints for federal plans to better protect the abundant natural resources of our public lands.

When we, as scientists, see policies being developed that run counter to the lessons of science, we feel compelled to speak up. Proposed post-disturbance legislation (specifically the Forest Emergency Recovery and Research Act [HR 4200] and the related Forests for Future Generations Act [S. 2079]), crafted as a response to recent fires and other disturbances, is misguided because it distorts or ignores recent scientific advances. Under the labels of “recovery” and “restoration,” these bills would speed logging and replanting after natural disturbances.

Although logging and replanting may seem like a reasonable way to clean up and restore forests after disturbances like wildland fires, such activity would actually slow the natural recovery of forests and of streams and creatures within them. Many scientist-reviewed studies and syntheses (please see the selected citations appended to this letter) have recently come to this conclusion. For example, no substantive evidence supports the idea that fire-adapted forests might be improved by logging after a fire. In fact, many carefully conducted studies have concluded just the opposite. Most plants and animals in these forests are adapted to periodic fires and other natural disturbances. They have a remarkable way of recovering—literally rising from the ashes—because they have evolved with and even depend upon fire.

We are concerned that HR 4200 and S. 2079 will bind us to land management practices that, perhaps logical in the past, are no longer tenable in the light of recent scientific understanding. Specifically, post-disturbance logging impedes regeneration of forest landscapes when it compacts soils, removes or destroys so-called biological legacies (such as soil organic material, seeds in the soil, large standing and downed trees), damages riparian corridors, introduces or spreads invasive species, causes erosion, delivers sediment to streams from logging roads and steep slopes, degrades water quality, and damages populations of many aquatic species. In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Resources (November 10, 2005), eminent forest ecologist and University of Washington Professor Jerry Franklin noted that logging dead trees often has greater negative impacts than logging of live trees. He concluded that “*timber salvage is most appropriately viewed as a ‘tax’ on ecological recovery.*”

Beyond those concerns, post-disturbance logging often intensifies the potential severity of future fires by concentrating the slash from logging at or near the ground. Rather than leaving plant material standing—and providing perching, nesting, and feeding sites for wildlife—such logging abruptly moves the material to the ground. Most of this material would naturally fall to the ground, adding important supplies of nutrients and energy to the forest floor and structure in the form of woody debris to stream channels. But this

naturally happens over decades, not in the relatively short time associated with a logging operation. Advocates of post-disturbance logging may argue that this slash can be disposed of with controlled burns and other treatments. Yet such treatments can severely damage underlying soils, imposing other taxes on natural recovery.

One additional tax concerns us. Postfire logging taxes the public treasury. Recent analysis of postfire logging operations after Oregon's Biscuit fire of 2002 shows that costs of the logging operations exceeded revenue by about \$14 million for logging that removed more than 53 million board feet of timber (DellaSala et al. 2006).

Science provides the best insight into the real consequences of our policies and actions. Ironically, this legislation is crafted to ignore the science by waiving environmental reviews, reviews that would make use of the scientific knowledge often available only because of expenditures of public funds. Failure to conduct full environmental reviews informed by that science will inevitably lead to ecological and economic harm from post-disturbance logging.

In short, neither ecological benefits nor economic efficiency result from post-disturbance logging. We therefore urge you to defeat these legislative efforts because they will set back forest recovery. We urge you to work with your fellow lawmakers to craft legislation that will rely on the most up-to-date scientific knowledge to protect the natural resources of the nation's public lands.

Sincerely*,
(affiliations listed for identification purposes only)

James R. Karr, Ph.D., Professor of Aquatics Sciences
University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Reed Noss, Ph.D., Professor of Conservation Biology
University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL

Jon Rhodes, Hydrologist
Portland, OR

Tania Schoennagel, Ph.D., Fire Scientist
University of Colorado, Boulder, CO

Dominick A. DellaSala, Ph.D., Forest Ecologist
World Wildlife Fund, Ashland, OR

Selected references:

Beschta R. L., J. J. Rhodes, J. B. Kauffman, R. E. Gresswell, G. W. Minshall, J. R. Karr, D. A. Perry, F. R. Hauer, and C. A. Frissell. 2004. Postfire management on forested public lands of the western United States. *Conservation Biology* 18:957–967.

DellaSala, D. A., G. Nagle, R. Fairbanks, D. Odion, J. Williams, J. R. Karr, C. Frissell, and T. Ingalsbee. 2006. The facts and myths of post-fire management: a case study of the Biscuit fire, southwest Oregon. Unpublished Report, World Wildlife Fund, Klamath-Siskiyou Program, 116 Lithia Way, Ashland, Oregon.

Dombeck, M., J. E. Williams, and C. A. Wood. 2004. Wildfire policy and public lands: integrating scientific understanding with social concerns across landscapes. *Conservation Biology* 18:883-889.

Donato, D. C., J. B. Fontaine, J. L. Campbell, W. D. Robinson, J. B. Kauffman, and B. E. Law. 2006. Post-wildfire logging hinders regeneration and increases fire risk. *Science* 311:352.

Franklin, J. F., and J. Agee. 2003. Scientific issues and national forest fire policy: forging a science-based national forest fire policy. *Issues in Science and Technology* 20:59-66.

Karr, J. R., J. J. Rhodes, G. W. Minshall, F. R. Hauer, R. L. Beschta, C. A. Frissell, and D. A. Perry. 2004. The effects of postfire salvage logging on aquatic ecosystems in the American West. *Bioscience* 54:1029-1033.

Lindenmayer, D. B., D. R. Foster, J. F. Franklin, M. L. Hunter, R. F. Noss, F. A. Schmeigelow, and D. Perry. 2004. Salvage harvesting policies after natural disturbance. *Science* 303:1303.

Turner, M. G., W. H. Romme, and D. B. Tinker. 2003. Surprises and lessons from the 1998 Yellowstone Fires. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 1:351-358.