

Once again an amendment has been attached to a bill that does not resemble the original text. As originally posted, Senate Bill 335 had a perfectly legitimate premise. Now a sleight of hand mirror trick has SB 335 being presented in a completely different light. The deliberate addition of a completely different contextual bill is disheartening to say the least, but to do so at the last moment when the people of Oregon do not have sufficient time to weigh in on this is completely reprehensible.

As per the text of SB 335-3, it is written:

“(3) Appointments made by the Governor under subsection (1) of this section shall include appointment of at least one member from each of the forest regions established under ORS 527.640 and the rules adopted there under by January 1, 1987.”

My first question is: If seven members are on the board and three of those members are from forest regions, what is the makeup of the other four members; and, what is the purpose for reducing the number of members from three to two as per the -3 amendment (4) where it is being amended to read “not more than two may have derived an average of \$1,000 or more, in the preceding five years, directly or indirectly from forestry or timber product-related enterprises. If the board includes two members described in this subsection, at least one of the two members must have derived the forestry or timber product-related moneys exclusively from enterprises on woodlands of not more than 5,000 acres.”?

To try and put the latter part of my question into context, let us say that my family's farm of 148 acres has two acres of forested land and Mr. Smith's logging company comes in and logs off the quality trees and the farm receives \$1,200. I am now ineligible to hold a position on the committee for five years? That seems somewhat excessive, doesn't it?

My second question is: Why, if it isn't broke, does it need to be fixed? Is micro-managing the State Forestry Board really another needless task by the governor? Or is the perception that the scope of the wildfires back in September something that could have been avoided if the governor had been more involved? The governor is ALWAYS involved regardless of who is at the helm; however, there was no way of knowing what was going to happen until it happened. Forestry mismanagement from the word “go” on ALL of government's part. Changing who is in charge of hiring and firing isn't going to change the overall outcome of an inevitable fact.

Is the vendetta against the current state of the private timber industry so strongly intense, that any means to strike back is brought to the House and Senate floors? The State Board of Forestry was created for a purpose. Let that board do what they were created to do in the manner in which they were supposed to do it. No changes need to be made at this time.

I am requesting that the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Wildfire Recovery vote AGAINST Senate Bill 335 as amended with the -3 amendment.