



A Plan must reduce and then eliminate the use of herbicides on recovering tracts of land after harvest. We are poisoning our public lands habitat when we spray, and in some cases, our citizens as well. We can be better stewards of forest habitat than this, and we can treat those that live in and near our forests in a healthier manner. Or is this too expensive? How do you assess the value of effective stewardship? Of being a good neighbor? Of not making people sick? A meaningful conservation Plan could address this issue in a more constructive context.

Another important aspect of a conservation Plan is to diversify funding for ODF. An analysis has already shown that a Plan is financially viable. Asset diversification is a sound strategy. We need to get beyond timber revenues to fund our State forests. It's another part of the balancing that needs to occur.

Finally, we should adopt and implement a conservation Plan because we want to, for reasons beyond money. Not because we have to keep timber revenue at record highs, but because it makes our State a better place to live and raise families, because right action has value beyond money, and because it's time. It's a start anyway. Thank you for taking this on.