

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

From: kYra Dear <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Kwan, Hilda -FS <hilda.kwan@usda.gov>; FS-objections-pacificsouthwest-regional-office <objections-pacificsouthwest-regional-office@usda.gov>
Subject: Plaskett-Keller Project - OPPOSITION

Creating “defensible space” around homes and cutting down some trees within a half-mile of forest communities is one of the best strategies to protect lives and property. Proponents of the timber industry suggest that thinning forests will help solve problems, but the type of logging they do is in the backcountry and far from communities. Logging in these more remote areas degrades water quality, recreation experiences and wildlife habitat and does not make people safer from wildfire.

A specific type of logging, “salvage logging,” is particularly damaging. Salvage logging refers to the removal of burned trees after a fire. While this may sound harmless, scientists say that burned trees left in the wake of fires serve an important role in western forests, spurring improved biodiversity and supporting life ranging from shrubs to bears. In fact, removing these trees could actually [exacerbate fire damage and increase future risk](#), not to mention soil compaction from big machinery, and sending excessive ash and sediment into area streams.

Evidence reveals that salvage logging increases the risk of future conflagrations and interferes with forest regeneration by killing most of the seedlings that reemerge on their own.

Researchers at Oregon State University examined the aftermath of a massive fire that

encompassed nearly 500,000 acres of southern Oregon in 2002, the so-called Biscuit fire. They reported last week that salvage logging there destroyed about 70 percent of seedlings that had sprouted from the forest floor and increased the risk of future fires.

"Not everything leaves on the log truck," says John Campbell, researcher in the university's department of forest science. "We found that the process of logging in this type of situation actually produces a large amount of fine fuels on the ground that, unless removed, could increase fire risk, not decrease it."

Salvage logging arguments are a classic case of short-term economic interests, only slightly reducing next year's fire risk while boosting local economies reliant on natural resource extraction and damaging the long term effects salvage logging causes to the forestland, genetic diversity and watershed health - versus the natural cycles of water, fire and weather whose time-proven legitimacy operates on a much longer time scale.

I wholeheartedly OPPOSE the Plaskett-Keller August Complex Phase 1 project as it is not for the benefit of the forest, rather a perfect example of disaster capitalism at its most ruthless.

Thank you,

Kyra Rice

