

Testimony Against S 3182 Forest Parity Act

My name is Jessie Kingston, retired. I live in Providence. I am testifying in opposition to S 3182

In its opening statement, this bill makes two opposing statements, one right after the other

That forests are more likely to be maintained if they provide economic value

And

That maintaining forests is vital to maintain both biodiversity, and ecosystem services, including carbon sequestration

Here is part of the “economic value” to loggers more kindly known as arborists. Forest products include:

Arboriculture and logging; and 14 (ii) Kiln drying, operations of firewood, saw milling, lumber, pallets, biochar, mulch, 15 compost, biomass, wood chips, saw dust, timbers, posts, beams, shingles, and artisan tree carvings, 16 seasonal greens and berries. 17

Another part of the economic value —not to the State but to loggers/arborists —is that forest product operations machinery is exempt from taxation

Page 24 lines 26-34 “forestry product operations” don’t sound like conservation to me:

: chainsaws, tree chippers, mulch grinders, 29 chip screeners, sawdust blowers, conveyors, power generators , firewood processors, log skidders, 30 wood splitters, disc cleaners, tumblers, shaving mills, loaders, forklifts, firewood kilns, pallet kilns, 31 lumber kilns, sawdust dryers, forwarders, sawmills, resaws, edgers, planers, debarkers, live log 32 decks, green chains, tractors, winches, tree harvesters, feller bunchers, log loaders, slashers, 33 delimiters, grapples, bucket trucks, tree cranes, and stump grinders.

In conclusion, such operations are permitted within all zoning districts of a municipality.

Except where prohibited for (...) protection of wildlife habitat

All forests contain “wildlife habitat” and as stated in the first lines of this bill.

are vital to maintain both biodiversity, and ecosystem services, including carbon sequestration

I attended the hearing in the House Committee on this same bill recently during which more opponents testified than proponents. The few proponents appeared not to have read the bill but instead simply wanted to showcase their knowledge of forestry in general without addressing the specifics or purpose of the bill.

Therefore I respectfully request that you do not pass this bill.