

Submitter: Deidre Krupp

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Agriculture, Land Use, Natural
Resources, and Water

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3103

First: Setting a fixed rate of supply by fiat is a market distortion. Furthermore, should supply exceed demand, the provisions of this bill will create a glut of timber by carrying over the surplus into the next year. That will drive prices down and fail to bring in the revenue this bill supposedly seeks. Mandating that sales happen is not proper economics. Second: Clearcut logging INCREASES fire danger, as the exposed debris left behind is just so much tinder. Dense same-age tree plantations INCREASE fire risk relative to clumpy mixed-age forest. Ham-handedly promoting these practices is NOT to the state's benefit. And by putting timber harvest firmly above all other uses of our public forestland, by positioning "insufficient sales" as a deficit "to be addressed", this bill does exactly that. Third: The conifers our timber industry majorly depends on, in plantations or not, are being decimated by climate change. I have watched our local forests abruptly go from green to red in the last five years, and the next five, ten, fifteen years are only going to compound that. Investing heavily in forest "business as usual" now is likely to see a lot of that investment dashed on the rocks of mass tree death, be it from drought, insects, wildfire, or all of the above. It would be one thing if this bill aimed to harvest at-risk timber in the near term and promote transitions to foster future sustainability, cultivating future resilience. But it does not. Indeed, despite peppering the word "sustainable" throughout the text, this bill promotes the very opposite of resilience. This is not the bill Oregon needs at this time.