

March 31, 2021

Senate Committee On Natural Resources and Wildfire Recovery
Sen. Jeff Golden, Chair
Sen. Dallas Heard, Vice-chair
Sen. Bill Kennemer
Sen. Deb Patterson
Sen. Floyd Prozanski

Re: **CONTINUED Opposition to Senate Bill 335-8**

Dear Chair Golden and Members of the Committee:

As we understand it, this bill (its current -8 amendments) will drastically and detrimentally restructure aspects of the Oregon Department of Forestry, which would appear to be a “knee-jerk” reaction to recent negative publicity about certain forest practices.

First, a little background about us. We are retired and we own and manage about 84 acres of forestland in western Oregon near Estacada, which we have been doing for almost 30 years. We are proud of our forest stewardship, and we were honored for our work in 2020 as the Clackamas County Farm Forestry Association’s Woodland Farmer of the Year, were awarded the joint ODFW/ODF “Fish & Wildlife Steward Award for Forest Lands” in 2020 and are certified by the American Tree Farm System due to, among other things, implementing standards of sustainability in accordance with the American Forest Foundation.

We specifically are opposed to the following provisions of SB 335-8:

Section 1 of the amended bill reduces the number of forestry-related members on the Board of Forestry from three to two. While it is both appreciated and necessary that one of these two members be a small woodland owner (owning less than 5,000 acres), we are concerned that the reduction of members with first-hand knowledge of working forests will be a detriment to the overall committee. It is imperative to retain three members with firsthand knowledge of working forests: one representing west-side forests, one east-side forests, and one for small woodland interests. It would be detrimental to the public interest and to those of us who manage our own private forestlands to not have this necessary experience base, given the difference in forest types between eastern and western Oregon as well as the differences between small and large, industrial woodland owners.

Section 1 also continues to introduce an income limiting provision. In this latest rendition, the bill stipulates “Not more than two members of the board may have derived income of \$10,000 or more, in the preceding five years, ...” is simply not realistic. This is not even close to poverty level wages. What type of practical forest-related experience will you get with this limitation? What other, similar boards have such financial limitations?

In summary, we find that SB 335- in its current form should be withdrawn from further consideration, as such drastic and unrealistic action is counterproductive.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



David & Mary Ann Bugni
30265 SE Kowall Rd.
Estacada, OR 97023