

FORM LETTER #3

(See comment  
letters 19 or 22)



"Pat Egan"  
<pegan@alltel.net>  
02/02/02 04:21 PM

To: "Arkansas Public Policy Panel" <app@igc.org>, <jgreis@fs.fed.us>,  
<dwear@fs.fed.us>, <scot@dogwoodalliance.org>  
cc: <arkdruglawreform@mindspring.com>  
Subject: RE: southern forests

It is important for all parties interested in sustaining forests to be aware of industrial hemp as an extremely attractive alternate pulp source with much higher yield and lower environmental impact than using trees for pulp.

[http://www.pdxnorml.org/USDA\\_Bulletin\\_404.html](http://www.pdxnorml.org/USDA_Bulletin_404.html)

-----Original Message-----

From: Arkansas Public Policy Panel [mailto:app@igc.org]  
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2002 1:14 PM  
To: Recipient list suppressed  
Subject: southern forests

>Please feel free to post this to other listserves and friends. Sorry for  
>cross postings and the time crunch. Thank you for your help. Katie Auman,  
>Ozark Regional Organizer, Dogwood Alliance  
>p.s. AR, MS, AL are all states included in the study, but Missouri was  
>left out. Trends in the South will effect forests elsewhere so the  
>information and your comments are relivent regardless of where you live.  
>thanks...

>

>URGENT ACTION ALERT!

>

>HELP PROTECT SOUTHERN FORESTS!!!

>COMMENTS TO THE US FOREST SERVICE NEEDED ON THE DRAFT OF THE SOUTHERN

>FOREST RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

>

>DEADLINE JANUARY 31st!

>

>In response to growing public concern about the impacts of an expanding  
>paper industry in the South, The US Forest Service initiated a 2-year  
>study called the Southern Forest Resource Assessment (SFRA). A draft of  
>the SFRA was released in November and the USFS is currently taking public  
>comments until January 31st.

>

>The USFS has concluded that the overharvesting of Southern forests and the  
>intensive management of pine plantations (including chemical spraying of  
>herbicides and fertilizers and the use of genetically modified trees) is  
>"sustainable" and the real threat is sprawl. Yet the SFRA documents  
>clearly that Southern forests are under tremendous pressure from the wood  
>products industry to produce products such as paper. However, the  
>SFRA fails to adequately address the impacts of these trends on the  
>ecological sustainability of the South's forests. (More detailed "Key  
>Findings" are attached.)

>

>WHAT YOU CAN DO: Please submit your comments immediately!

>EMAIL THE USFS TODAY!

>US Forest Service

>John Greis/David Wear

><jgreis@fs.fed.us> and <dwear@fs.fed.us> AND cc <scot@dogwoodalliance.org>

>

>FIVE POINTS TO INCLUDE IN YOUR COMMENTS:

>

>1- THE IMPACTS OF THE TIMBER INDUSTRY AND INDUSTRIAL FORESTRY PRACTICES

>ARE GROSSLY UNDERSTATED IN THE SUMMARY

>The SFRA documents that while 30 million acres of forest will be lost to  
>sprawl through 2040, at least 250 million acres of forests will be heavily  
>logged by big timber companies to produce products such as paper. Removals  
>of the South's hardwood forests will exceed growth by 2025. In addition,  
>approximately one in every four acres of the South's "forest" will be a  
>single-species pine plantation by 2040. The use of chemicals in pine  
>plantations will more than double. Despite these alarming trends, the  
>primary conclusion drawn in the SFRA is that sprawl poses the single  
>biggest threat to Southern forests-- a finding that is grossly misleading.  
>The impacts of big timber companies are exacerbated, not diminished, by  
>increased urbanization, as remaining natural forests become even more  
>important to sustaining wildlife  
>populations, water quality, scenic beauty, recreation, tourism and  
>value-added, quality wood products businesses.

>

>2- THE ECOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF INTENSIVE PLANTATION MANAGEMENT AND  
>INCREASED LOGGING ARE NOT ADDRESSED

>The SFRA documents that by 2040 one in every four acres of Southern  
>forests will be an intensively managed plantation, representing a 63%  
>increase and covering an area equivalent in size to the states of North  
>Carolina and South Carolina combined. The SFRA suggests that more  
>intensive management of pine plantations that result in greater production  
>per acre will relieve pressure on natural forests. Yet, there is no  
>detailed analysis of the ecological tradeoffs (long-term soil  
>productivity, pine beetle infestation, water quality, biodiversity)  
>involved with increased use of chemicals, genetically modified trees and  
>such wide-scale monoculture plantation management. Nor is there any  
>analysis of the impact of this type of forest management on quality of  
>life for local communities.

>

>In fact, the SFRA repeatedly includes intensively managed plantations in  
>its discussion of southern "forests". This has the overall effect of  
>minimizing the actual loss of southern forests.

>

>Similarly, the report does not adequately address the wide-scale increase  
>in logging (clearcutting and other forms of even-aged management) on birds  
>and other key species. Finally, the SFRA fails to acknowledge the role  
>that forestry has played in the loss of wetlands (including wetland  
>forests) due to logging, ditching, draining and conversion to plantations  
>across the South and the impacts of these practices on wetlands.

>

>3- THE CONCLUSION THAT MOST OF THE GAIN IN PINE PLANTATIONS WILL COME FROM  
>ABANDONED AGRICULTURAL FIELDS IS NOT STRONGLY SUPPORTED

>Data in the report document that 75% of the increases in plantations  
>across the South have come at the expense of natural forests. However, the  
>USFS assumes that through 2040 most of the plantations will occur on  
>abandoned agricultural fields.

>

>4- THE REPORT FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE ECONOMIC TRADEOFFS OF A CONTINUED  
>EXPANSION IN THE WOOD PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

>The SFRA acknowledges that communities where the paper industry is  
>concentrated are economically worse off than other communities and that  
>communities where value-added wood products industries are concentrated  
>are better off than those where the paper industry is concentrated. The  
>report also points out that communities where outdoor recreation is  
>concentrated are much better off economically. Yet, the conclusion drawn  
>is that the wood products industry provides stability to the region's  
>economy, in effect, failing to acknowledge the ecological tradeoffs  
>involved.

>

>5- THE CONCLUSION THAT SOUTHERN FORESTS ARE "SUSTAINABLE" IS NOT HELPFUL  
>First, the USFS definition of "sustainability" seems to be focused on a  
>sustainable wood fiber supply, rather than ecological sustainability (as  
>set forth above). Second, a broad statement about the southern region does  
>little to address key areas under intense pressure from the timber  
>industry and/or urbanization. the report alludes to the fact that trends  
>in certain subregional areas are cause for alarm, but fails to identify  
>these areas or the trends that affect them in the executive summary. The  
>USFS should break their analysis of "sustainability" into sub-regional  
>areas to provide a better sense of areas of concern.

>  
>To view a copy of the full study go to:

>-- <http://www.srs.fs.fed.us/sustain/>.

>

>

>

>For more information: Call or e-mail Scot at the Dogwood Alliance

>(828)251-2525 x18 [scot@dogwoodalliance.org](mailto:scot@dogwoodalliance.org) OR

>Katie at (870)439-2516 [katie@dogwoodalliance.org](mailto:katie@dogwoodalliance.org)

>

>

>Katie Auman

>Ozark Regional Organizer

>Dogwood Alliance

>870.439.2516

>[katie@dogwoodalliance.org](mailto:katie@dogwoodalliance.org)

>[www.dogwoodalliance.org](http://www.dogwoodalliance.org)

>

>

>

>

>Visit the Fair Trade Federation <http://www.fairtradefederation.org>

>Support fair trade with every email.

>Sign up for your free email account [you@gofairtrade.net](mailto:you@gofairtrade.net)-->

><http://www.gofairtrade.net>

---

Arkansas Public Policy Panel

1308 West Second Street

Little Rock, AR 72201

(501) 376-7913