

To: Chair Golden and Helm, Members of the Senate Natural Resources Committee

Oregon Senate Hearing on SB 85: Relating to confined animal feeding operations.

My name is Edie Knight, I live in Stayton. I support the passage of SB 85.

I am a Senior Forester managing the 12,000 acre, Avery Family Forest with Mason, Bruce and Girard, a forestry and Natural Resources Consulting firm. This forest is in the Thomas Creek Watershed of the South Santiam River, just upstream from one of the proposed mega broiler chicken CAFOs. As a manager of the headwaters of the Santiam River, and member of the board of the South Santiam Watershed Council, my main technical concerns about these facilities are impact on water quality specifically, nitrification, bacteria including multi-drug resistant bacteria, and hormones. The Avery Family practices ecologically based forest management growing forests twice the length of industry standard, meaning that more ground is standing in mature forest, capturing and slowly releasing more water than young forests. Long before the passage of the private forest accord, my client left larger buffers on streams to protect water quality. We produce the cold, clean water on which fish and downstream residents and farmers depend. If these CAFO's are built in their ill sited locations next to critical habitat streams, the water stewardship my client has been doing for decades, along with the increased PFA-stream protections that will be employed by other forest managers, will be for naught when concentrated animal waste inevitably releases into the water.

Driving between the property and my office, I pass right by the Evergreen ranch site, next to the Lourdes charter school and the Broken Damn swimming hole in Jordan. Last summer, I recorded the number of cars utilizing the swimming hole. On days over 90°F there were up to 52 cars, which represents at least 100 people coming from Albany, Scio, Stayton and Salem. Humans will continue to need cool clean water and natural spaces as climate change bears down on us all. If this facility were built only 1,500' above the swimming hole, where would these water users go? Would the log placement stream restoration project we are building upstream this summer have any value to trout, salmon and lamprey if they have to swim through polluted water to get to the improved habitat?

Sincerely,

Forester, Arborist, Mother, Local Resident