

Submitter: Angela Epley  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Agriculture, Land Use, Natural  
Resources, and Water  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4105  
Re: Opposition to HB 4105

I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 4105.

I relocated to Oregon specifically because of what this state still offers: forests that remember centuries, rivers that run clear, ecosystems that function as living communities rather than degraded fragments. This bill threatens to accelerate the conversion of these irreplaceable systems into short-term revenue at extraordinary long-term cost.

HB 4105 is Fiscally Irresponsible: The bill's fiscal impact is staggering. Implementation requires \$1.1 million in initial funding, with litigation costs potentially exceeding \$10 million per biennium in ODF and DOJ resources. This is public money spent to defend increased extraction, not to protect public value. Meanwhile, ODF already exceeds its harvest objectives and projects increasing revenues over the next decade under current management. We would be spending millions to solve a problem that does not exist.

The Bill Undermines Flexible, Responsive Management: By mandating 10-year harvest levels through rulemaking, HB 4105 locks the state into extraction targets regardless of changing conditions: climate disruption, fire pressure, species collapse, and hydrological shifts. It prioritizes timber industry predictability over the adaptive capacity our forests desperately need. The state forester would be required to "consider" but not comply with the Habitat Conservation Plan and climate commitments. This is governance through loophole.

Oregon's Forests Are Economic Engines as Intact Systems: The 600,000+ acres of state forests drive a \$550 million outdoor recreation economy and support over 10,500 jobs. They provide drinking water for half a million people. They harbor six salmon stronghold rivers and 17 at-risk species. Industrial clearcut logging does not enhance these values: it degrades them. As temperatures rise and drought intensifies, intact forest systems become more valuable, not less. They regulate temperature, maintain water flow, store carbon, and provide resilience buffers that fragmented, logged landscapes cannot.

Oregonians Have Already Spoken: Polling by the Oregon Forest Resources Council and Oregon Values and Beliefs Center consistently shows that Oregonians prioritize

clean air, clean water, and wildlife habitat over increased logging. HB 4105 disregards this public mandate in favor of industry pressure.

This is a Question of What We Value: I moved here because Oregon still holds something increasingly rare: forests that function as forests, rivers that support salmon, landscapes where ecological relationships remain legible. These are not abstractions. They are why people choose to live here, why tourists visit, why the outdoor economy thrives, why property values remain strong.

HB 4105 treats these forests as if their highest function is extraction. But a forest that supports salmon runs, stores carbon, filters drinking water, and offers refuge to endangered species is already working—and generating value that no harvest plan can replace once it's lost.

The state forester already manages for "Greatest Permanent Value." HB 4105 would redefine that value narrowly, prioritizing timber volume over everything that makes Oregon forests worth protecting.

This is not sound policy. It is short-sighted, expensive, and unnecessary.

I urge you to oppose HB 4105.