

Dear Mrs. Diehl,

Due to my obligation to appear for jury duty tomorrow (4/9/15) I will be unable to give testimony on the subject of licensing foresters here in Vermont.

Firstly I would like to say that I am licensed in NH. and went to College in Maine where both states require foresters to be licensed by law. I have done almost all of my forestry work in Vermont, and can say that I have seen some of the best forestry work in this state as compared to the other two mentioned above. Please understand that I have seen excellent work in Maine and New Hampshire as well. The point being; the licensing of foresters doesn't seem to improve the practice of silviculture one bit.

I also don't see the point of licensing if my plans still have to be approved by a County Forester. I believe that if licensing is to hold us to a "higher standard" than when I put my stamp on it, it should be approved.

Some of the wording is a little unsettling as well; it states that a person may work under a licensed individual ONLY if the person with the license is in direct supervision of the unlicensed person. This to me makes it very cost ineffective. What about interns? College graduates? Someone just starting? Some supervision is expected with true "greenhorns", but at some point, that person is likely going to be competent enough to do simple tasks without a licensed person on site. They should be able to work under the license of the supervisor. The SUPERVISOR should be responsible for any issues that arise.

I also feel that the wording in the bill leads one to believe that if your logging job is subject to an AMP complaint that you can have your license taken. Please understand that I think the AMP's are important and should be enforced, but the way this is worded opens it up to too many interpretation possibilities by the enforcing personnel.

Thank you for your time. Ben Vicere