

Chair Nathanson, committee members,

Timber industry claims that private timber should be taxed (or not taxed) like an agricultural crop imply that private forestland is unconnected with larger ecological effects impacting the state's responsibility to protect the public's water quality and wildlife as well as regulate CO2 emissions.

While we know these other impacts of forest management are integrally connected to logging practices we lack specific, qualitative and quantitative measurement of the different economic and ecological outcomes from the brand-new science of ecological forest management from traditional industry practices.

Undoing over a century of established industrial forest practices is a task which is not likely to happen overnight. We can't wait for reform of forest management protocols before exploring the new ecological forestry paradigm in contrast to established practices. We need to get started with century-long, widescale testing and comparison of outcomes from ecological forestry practices (including carbon management) with present practices mandated under the Forest Practices Act.

Legislators ready to investigate new forest science models of management should consider stepping completely outside the existing timber industrial complex which includes OFRI, ODF and OSU, who have demonstrated their hostility to forest science which challenges their hegemony over forest management practices by allocating a portion of any severance tax equivalent to present OFRI funding- on the order of \$1/thousand board feet- to a completely new and independent forestry research institute in the Elliott Forest managed by DSL which includes a comprehensive forestry training program for preparing Oregon schoolchildren with a passion for forestry for Green Economy careers based on world-leading ecological forestry research conducted in the Elliott.