I am testifying in support of 2357 because I hope that half of the timber tax will be redirected from funding for the Oregon Forest Resources Institute to smarter forest management and policies and practices in line with accepted climate-science. I believe that the OFRI does not present sound or responsible scientific information to our schools and the general public, and that the OFRI should be barred from engaging in "generalized advertising for public education." We need climate smart forestry: to measure the forest carbon emitted by logging in Oregon to enhance our efforts to reduce emissions; to enhance reporting and monitoring the use of toxic chemicals in our forests which can impact our drinking water, shellfish, salmon, terrestrial and aquatic life; to enable ODF to help landowners address the fire risk from private industrial forest operations, and to focus more resources on protecting homes and communities.

I strongly favor: climate smart forestry, transparency in use of public funds, forest policy informed by the best forest science, academic freedom for scientists, funding for outdoor education that doesn't have to go through OFRI, independent, science-backed school curriculum without OFRI as middleman, and redirecting OFRI funds to benefit the state of Oregon.

And I strongly object to the current practices of the Oregon Forest Resources Institute and its use of taxpayer money to unduly influence students and Oregonians in general by skewing information on forest industry practices in school curricula and dishonest advertising to cast the industry as benign and underplay the impacts of clear cut logging, presenting timber industry messaging points as facts. I am disturbed by OFRI attempts to silence scientific research - in an attack on academic freedom, OFRI executives lobbied legislators and university officials to undermine groundbreaking forest-climate research conducted by a team of scientists at Oregon State University's College of Forestry. And the composition of OFRI's Board brings its impartiality into serious question, with nine of its thirteen total representatives strongly affiliated with the forest products industry, one member representing small woodland owners and one representative of forest industry employees.

Thank you for listening.