



Oppose HB 3327

Oregon needs objective and reliable scientific review - HB 3327 will not deliver on that promise.

- **With current budget constraints, this is not the right time to make this investment.** Oregon’s natural resource agencies have experienced substantial budget cuts over the last decade. We cannot ignore the lack of state investment into programs, universities, and agencies that are already charged with providing such “independent” scientific review. If this effort isn’t funded appropriately, it will fail to deliver unbiased information. The Legislature should focus funding on scientific research at our Universities not “think tank” reviews.
- **Even with proper funding, eliminating bias and achieving consensus will be extraordinarily difficult.** We are highly skeptical that this process will produce any kind of consensus around answers to politically charged “high impact” questions.
- **The “Independent Scientific Review” will likely fail to be truly independent.** Each board member serves at the pleasure of the Governor and therefore it’s impossible to ignore the possible influence the governor’s office may have on the outcome of “independent” review. Additionally, we are highly concerned that the board will not be comprised of subject matter experts who have been employed by agencies, industry or NGOs. While this may help achieve the goal of striking an “independent” review board, it may come at the expense of relevant expert analysis.
- **Oregon does not need another governor-appointed board.** The natural resource agencies already have voluntary boards and commissions appointed by the Governor that are designed to provide oversight and deliver balanced results from agencies. Those same boards and commissions should also be ensuring that the scientific review from the agencies is complete and unbiased. Adding another layer will be ineffective and likely not produce a different result.
- **HB 3327 does not provide checks and balances needed to ensure that scientific review is done in an unbiased way.** The bill language fails to provide the board with direct oversight, limits to discretion, performance standards, legal obligations or overall best practices for scientific review. All of which should be clearly defined if the legislature intends to pass this bill.
- **Oregon has been down this path before.** In 1997, the Legislature established the Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team (IMST). It eventually became irrelevant and expensive, and the Legislature eventually defunded and repealed the IMST in 2017.

Ultimately, this board risks becoming another place for special interest advocates to pursue changes to public policy by seeking the endorsement of a board appointed by a political office.