EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOREST EMERGENCY RECOVERY AND RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to improve the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to promptly implement recovery treatments in response to catastrophic events affecting Federal lands under their jurisdiction, including the removal of dead and damaged trees and the implementation of reforestation treatments, to support the recovery of non-Federal lands damaged by catastrophic events, to revitalize, Forest Service experimental forests, and for other purposes:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Chairman, I regret that I could not be present today because of a family medical emergency and I am in opposition to the Forest Emergency Recovery and Research Act (H.R. 4200).

This bill misses the point. In the face of the President's drastic budget cuts to State and local wildfire assistance programs, including a 30 percent cut in the State Fire Assistance program, which directly funds local community fire risk reduction planning and projects, this bill seems wholly inappropriate. Instead of providing the necessary tools to mitigate future fires to the 11,000 high risk communities around the country threatened by wildfires, this bill "expedites" or "streamlines" the timber salvage process for the logging industry following a catastrophic event. It is unnecessary and unwise to weaken existing laws meant to protect public participation and the environment, when the authority and ability to recover and restore forests after fires, floods, or other disasters is not being prevented. Our communities deserve better. I urge my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill.

FOREST EMERGENCY RECOVERY AND RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to improve the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to promptly implement recovery treatments in response to catastrophic events affecting Federal lands under their jurisdiction, including the removal of dead and damaged trees and the implementation of reforestation treatments, to support the recovery of non-Federal lands damaged by catastrophic events, to revitalize Forest Service experimental forests, and for other purposes:

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I cannot support this bill in its current form.

H.R. 4200 focuses on actions to be taken after a "catastrophic event," defined as any one of various natural disasters or events.

For Colorado, this misses the point—our most pressing issue is the increased likelihood of severe wildfires that endanger human life and property (and municipal water supplies) resulting from a combination of increased fuel stocks (itself the result of various causes, including past fire-suppression policies), drought, and widespread insect infestations.

So, what we need is accelerated action to reduce hazardous fuels in the "red zones" before the communities that adjoin or intermingle with the forests are confronted with severe wildfires—not legislation that aims at speeding salvage or restoration after the damage has been done.

The bill also has serious flaws. I will not attempt to list them all, because they have been discussed fat length in today's debate. But I think it is worth emphasizing that while it is doubtful that the legislation is necessary anywhere it seems clear that there are certain lands to which it should not apply, including (1) National Conservation Areas and National Recreation Areas; (2) lands that have been recommended for wilderness by the President; (3) wilderness study areas; (4) BLM-designated areas of critical environmental concern; (5) lands recommended for wilderness in a Forest Service or BLM land-management plan; (6) the Fossil Ridge Recreation Management Area in Colorado; (7) the Bowen Gulch Protection Area in Colorado; (8) the Piedra, Roubideau, and Tabeguache Areas in Colorado; (9) the James Peak Protection Area in Colorado; and (10) the Arapaho National Recreation Area in Colorado. Further, I think the bill should include language to make clear that it will not change the requirement of section 103(d) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, which requires that at least 50% of the fuel-reduction funds must be used for projects in the wildland-urban interface—the "red zone" lands.

In the Resources Committee, I offered an amendment to make those changes, and also supported amendments offered by other Members. Unfortunately, those amendments were not adopted.

Similarly, I voted for the Rahall, DeFazio, Inslee, and Udall of New Mexico amendments when the House considered the bill earlier today.

Regrettably, however, the House did not agree to revise the bill as proposed in those amendments. And because I think the bill should not be enacted without those changes, I must vote against it.

FOREST EMERGENCY RECOVERY AND RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to improve the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to promptly implement recovery treatments in response to catastrophic events affecting Federal lands under their jurisdiction, including the removal of dead and damaged trees and the implementation of reforestation treatments, to support the recovery of non-Federal lands damaged by catastrophic events, to revitalize Forest Service experimental forests, and for other purposes:

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, protecting our environment is one of the most important jobs I have as a Congressman. Unfortunately, the legislation before us today would hurt, rather than protect, our forests by speeding up destructive logging projects in national forests impacted by natural disturbances.

H.R. 4200 would limit critical environmental reviews and excludes the public from the decision making process. Basic protections for streams, critical wildlife habitat, old growth forests, roadless areas, fragile soils, and other essential natural resources would be removed under this legislation.

Science suggests logging harms damaged forests and impedes their recovery, and can actually increase the likelihood and severity of future forest fires. A study by researchers at Oregon State University has shown allowing forests to recover naturally after a fire increases forest regeneration and decreases the risk of future fires.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. Congress can and must do a better job protecting our environment. We simply will not have a world to live in if we continue our neglectful ways.

FOREST EMERGENCY RECOVERY AND RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to improve the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to promptly implement recovery treatments in response to catastrophic events affecting Federal lands under their jurisdiction, including the removal of the dead and damaged trees and the implementation of reforestation treatments, to support the recovery of non-