

I am an environmental educator and early education teacher with a degree in Biology. I learned about, and have experienced, the complexity and diversity of forest ecosystems. And how the soil, debris, nurse logs, standing dead trees, trees of variety of ages and sizes, a variety of plants, fungi, and animals, and, in the Pacific Northwest - wildfire, all play an important role in keeping the forest healthy and thriving. Our old growth forests, with their ancient trees, play an especially important role in mitigating climate change.

I am often taken aback by OFRI's description of forests and how they should be managed. They do not match up with an ecological view of the forest. I walk away from their teaching thinking that these foresters need to take a few biology and ecology classes.

I support HB 2357. OFRI needs to be eliminated. They are a lobbying group using taxpayers money. Their viewpoint skews science and the reality that old growth trees are needed for carbon sequestration.

OFRI has been writing to teachers to ask them not to support this HB 2357 because the funding OFRI uses to provide buses to places like The Oregon Garden and Arboretums, (where OFRI has exhibits that present their industrial forest view), sponsors teacher workshops, and funds 2/3rds of the budget of Talk About Trees would be gone if OFRI was eliminated.

Once again OFRI is using deceptive concepts. While these above mentioned programs are worthwhile, the funding for these programs comes from taxpayer moneys (OFRI doesn't mention that) and can be distributed through a different source.

I support The Sustainable Forest Practices because, unlike OFRI, it

- i. Promotes forest health
- ii. Incorporates regulation or monitoring of pesticide use in forests
- iii. Employs adaptive resource management
- iv. Advances climate science or climate policy as it relates to forest management.

I am also supporting the ask to make two small amendments:
For points ii. and iv., to change the OR to AND.

I agree with what a friend of mine said: "Regulation without monitoring is meaningless, even if the monitoring is done by another agency such as EPA. Similarly, climate science without policy is powerless. Please support this bill with these amendments."