

House Agriculture & Natural Resources Committee (for **3/30/2107 hearing HB3226**)

Chair Clem and Members of the Committee, especially Representative Power (in part of my Clackamas County):

I am Gilbert Shibley of 24750 S Wallens Rd, Estacada, Oregon, My wife and I live on forest and farmland which I manage for a family in the natural resources business for 153 years. Our business is stewardship of the land with responsibility to three generations before me and at least three to follow. Sustainability has necessarily been our practice and goal since before the word became fashionable. You may know forest owners in your district or county who also see it this way. Public and private forests have the cleanest water in Oregon, along with good wood, wildlife and recreation. I proudly help make it so, having even been on Boards directly serving all but the last.

You should stop this misguided bill here and now. HB3226 is a solution in search of a problem. Our Forest Practices Act, regularly updated, has been helping our forest management to benefit us all-- me, you and all other citizens of "Oregon, My Oregon" for over half my life. It need not and should not be revised beyond recognition the way this bill would do. Under Sec. 7, my family could not afford to make a costly logging management "plan" every time we harvest. Our trees grow for 70 years and we only cut as much timber volume as we have grown since a few years earlier. We would be forced out of business by such unnecessary costs and so lose a legacy worth much more than dollars can represent.

Take Section 9, for another example. It would more than double the riparian management area and triple the no-harvest width on the streams that run through our land. My reference point here is the new rules now being made by the Board of Forestry. I spoke to them as I am to you, in defense of the forest, the water, the fish and the wildlife --not just my own interests. The science may say that water quality and fish populations increase with larger buffers, but you and I must balance that with the following question: Is the small incremental gain enough to balance the large extra cost? This is not simply a science question. Also, remember that those public benefits would be paid for with my private costs. It needs to balance somehow.

Think of it this way: the more we pay for an electronics product the more audio or video quality we want to get. Is it worth it? Science can measure this only so far, then it becomes a subjective judgment. We all know that it usually takes more than our budget will accommodate to keep reaching for the best. It is the same with water quality and fish habitat. The State cannot fairly keep reaching for "the best" on private forestland if it gets a barely measurable gain, one which would require a two or three hundred percent increase in costs for my family.

Thank you for considering this input and for attending to those in your district with similar interests. We value your dedication to good policy for a good state.

(signed) ---Gilbert A. Shibley, March 29, 2017