

Honorable Congressmen and Congresswomen of Oregon State,

May I preface this letter of concern with a short introduction. Montesano, Washington, home to America's First tree farm, was my hometown for 22 years . Our family's tree farm, Wynoochee Willies, provided our family with an endless source of work, (planting trees, shearing/harvesting Christmas trees, grading roads, cutting firewood) and recreation (horseback riding, cascara bark peeling, mushroom gathering, berry picking, swimming and fishing). In the 42 years since leaving Montesano I have witnessed (in three different states) the ever encroaching permitting and regulatory processes eroding away the forest owner's ability to manage his property.

About ten years ago I relinquished my 35 year ownership of 80 acres on the Olympic Peninsula. The red tape involved in harvest permitting both through the Quinault Indian Reservation Department Natural Resources, and the **Washington** State Department of Natural resources made it virtually impossible to manage in a sustainable way. Four months of attempting to overcome the many hurdles of braided stream beds, big bird nests, and high water tables proved too daunting a task for the sole purpose of conducting a commercial thinning and salvage harvest of bear peeled trees. The new owner, more adept at the permitting process, quickly and quietly completed a final harvest on property that I had only wanted to thin. At the time, the FPA paperwork from the state consisted of 19 pages and the tribe was 29 pages. Requirements for expensive surveys, marking riparian zones, and forester generated reports.....all added substantial costs to the project, even before harvest could begin.

Recent FPA's completed for property owned in Lewis County **Washington** have proven equally onerous given the new typing requirements of every single drainage, seep, marsh, seasonal stream that happens to cross not only within the cutting boundary and on one's ownership but also those in the close proximity. Slope grades, road/access areas, new road construction, culvert sizes/placements, logging system etc, all have to be accounted for and approved. What used to be a permit process manageable by a landowner, is becoming a make work job for a forester, civil engineer, and attorney (unfortunately.... none germane to a Veterinarian!)

**One unintended consequence of this additional regulatory expense is the necessity to harvest more timber in order to make up the difference. Keep in mind it is only the landowner and logger that are producing the resource.....** not the regulatory agencies, nor the foresters, nor the engineers, nor the attorneys. Yet they are all being paid out of the timber being harvested and milled.

About 26 years ago, our family purchased timberland in Mendocino, County, **California**. By the time the NITHP (Non-industrial timber harvest permit) was completed.....it came to just under \$60,000.

That paid for a lot of ornithologist's, botanist's, biologist's, forester's, and attorney's time.....but never increased the forest inventory by a single bird, flower, fish or tree. Consider the amount of trees

needing harvesting just to pay for this expense.... But then there are the owl circles, archeological sites, riparian zones and steeper slopes which take away additional land value.

**Where is the incentive to manage timberland for the sustainable, renewable natural resource it is?**

Approximately 8 years ago, I purchased forestland in Columbia County, **Oregon**. Juxtaposed to the intimidating forest regulatory nature of its neighbors, Washington and California, western Oregon proved

to be a most friendly climate for forest stewardship. Filing a notice of operation to conduct a commercial thinning proved to be a straightforward process. There was a mutual respect and understanding between

the state forester and landowner.....neither wanting to disappoint the other. But now, well meaning but misinformed individuals threaten to usurp a proven, cost effective silviculture reporting system with HB 3226.

What is it that the Oregon Small Woodland Owners have been doing so right for these many years? Why is it the Washington Farm Forestry Association and the California Forest landowners association

have been kowtowed into surrendering so much of their livelihoods? Will Oregon state legislator's trample the good works of the forest industry?

Watershed, biodiversity, wildlife habitat, clean air, and recreational opportunities are all historically well known and valued commodities of a forested setting. Forest landscapes of varying ages and

species employing various management styles provide the best opportunities for striking the optimum balance and resilience. **Planting, growing, thinning, harvesting and reforestation provide this balance. These practices should be encouraged not discouraged by legislation.**

Lastly, I would ask you to consider the important role of timberland as one of the planet's major carbon sponges. **By helping mitigate the present day environmental/climate crisis, our temperate forests**

**could be called into "double duty" by sequestering not just one crop of carbon, but multiple crops through intensive management and harvest strategies.** This would rejuvenate the timber industry from

the seedling nurseries to the lumber mills. As wood sky-scrapers, made of engineered cross-laminated timber (CLT), go from novelty to the norm in the greener cities of America, **the call for more carbon**

**sequestering timber will come. Oregon is positioned to meet that call with its present day, common sense timberland regulations.** Washington and California forestland owners will be hamstrung by regulations and will be hard pressed when that call comes.

Please don't harm our forests by adopting a well-intentioned, but sorely misguided HB 3226. Contrast Oregon's forest lands to either of the neighboring states. A nationally ranked college of forestry (OSU), large timber stocking, and eager to work citizenry, Oregon should pursue a vibrant timber industry through partnerships and co-operations, not heavy handed over-legislation and taxation.

**"*Primum non nocere*"..... First do no harm.** This is a universal precept of the healthcare profession. It is a fundamental principle when contemplating medical intervention. **HB 3226 is bad medicine for a healthy patient. I urge you not to prescribe it and not force the forest stewards of Oregon state to swallow it.**

Most respectfully,  
Father to the 4th generation of Stewart Tree Farmers,

Bob Stewart, DVM  
360 901 5777  
[Agrofor@msn.com](mailto:Agrofor@msn.com)