

April 13, 2014

From: Jack and Lilja "Tobie" Finzel

To: sabrina.perez@state.or.us

Dear Ms Perez,

We own two relatively small parcels (39 & 34 acres) of forest land in Columbia County and are members of Columbia County Small Woodlands Assn. as well as Oregon Small Woodlands Assn. We've been following the proposed increases in riparian setback with concern.

Both of our parcels have less than a quarter mile total of small to medium fish bearing streams. We of course maintain the current standards set by the Forest Practices Act. On both parcels, our forested land consists primarily of alders and maples nearest the water and conifers beyond that, all on the north side of the streams. As a result, the trees provide little or no shading of the streams.

When we selectively thinned one parcel in 1994 prior to the increased setbacks called for in the soon-to-be-adopted changes in the Forest Practices Act, we realized that had we waited until they were in effect, nearly all of the marketable timber in the proposed thinning area would have been excluded. This would have constituted a severe financial penalty for saving trees that had no effect on stream temperatures. As it was then, the existing setback on the north side of the stream cost us \$40,000 in timber that we could not harvest.

Further setbacks will just increase this penalty for small landowners with negligible benefit for the fish based on multiple studies. We consider ourselves good stewards of our forest lands. Taking away more of our property rights without compensation for a questionable improvement in stream temperature is not justified.

Sincerely,

Jack & Tobie

Jack and Lilja "Tobie" Finzel