

I oppose House Bill 4105. It is problematic for several reasons. First, by prioritizing the establishment and maintenance of sustainable timber harvest levels, the bill could potentially place economic interests above environmental considerations, possibly leading to increased logging on state forestlands.

Additionally, the bill allows for court intervention if the State Forester fails to comply, which could result in costly and time-consuming litigation, diverting resources away from effective forest management. Some may also be concerned that the bill's definition of "sustainable" may not align with broader conservation goals or climate change mitigation efforts, potentially undermining long-term ecological health.

Furthermore, the bill's focus on timber harvest and revenue may not adequately address other important forest values, such as biodiversity, recreation, and cultural resources. The ability for certain individuals or entities to seek court orders could create unpredictability in forest management and policy implementation, making it challenging for the State Forester to balance competing interests and adapt to changing environmental conditions. Overall, Oregonians may see the bill as too narrowly focused on timber production at the expense of holistic forest stewardship.