Claims vs. Facts of Revised Framework

Forest Service Claim: The revised plan will reduce the risk of fire by cutting large trees.
Fact: Logging large trees is not necessary to reduce fire risk. The focus must be on reducing the most flammable fuels in the forest, known as surface and ladder fuels. Moreover, logging can increase fire severity by leaving behind highly combustible twigs and needles, while loss of tree canopy encourages the growth of flammable brush, increases wind speed and air temperature and decreases humidity in the forest, exacerbating fire conditions.

Forest Service Claim: The revised plan will better protect homes and communities.
Fact: The logging of large, fire-resistant trees in the backcountry does nothing to protect homes and communities, and fails to adequately address surface and ladder fuels.

Forest Service Claim: The revised plan protects old growth and large trees.
Fact: The new plan fails to recognize old growth as a unique resource and manages it under the same standards as the rest of the forest. The new plan triples the amount of logging in the Sierra and allows old, fire-resistant trees to be cut across the entire landscape.

Forest Service Claim: The new plan allows more flexibility to develop land use practices that protect meadows and streams.
Fact: The revisions significantly weaken grazing limitations and water quality protections, and increase the risk of stream bank and meadow erosion.

Forest Service Claim: The revised plan reduces threats to at-risk wildlife and habitat by allowing fuel treatments in Protected Activity Centers (PACs).
Fact: Increased logging of large ancient trees, combined with clear cutting allowed under the reactivated Quincy Logging plan, will likely cause some species to be listed under the Endangered Species Act.

Forest Service Claim: Logging and selling large trees can offset the cost of removing brush and smaller trees.
Fact: Timber sales may generate some short-term revenue, but carry a great cost in the long-term. Loss of scenic values negatively impacts tourism and recreation, the main economic engines in most Sierra counties.

Forest Service Claim: The 2004 Record of Decision was based on public input and sound scientific analysis.
Fact: No public meetings have been held on the Framework since fall of 2002, and according to scientists who reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement it contains no new information that would warrant such a radical overhaul of the original 2001 Framework Plan.