Comment Summary: Oregon Consensus report on the Elliott State Forest

The Oregon Department of State Lands (Department) engaged Oregon Consensus, a program of the National Policy Consensus Center at Portland State University, as a neutral party to assist with outreach and overall work toward decoupling the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund.

In October 2018, Oregon Consensus completed stakeholder interviews regarding decoupling the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund and submitted their final report to the Department. The report summarized what was heard in the interviews and discussed key themes, issues, and considerations for successful decoupling.

The Department invited the public to read the final report and provide feedback on report findings. Feedback was accepted from October 9 to November 15, 2018. The Department received comments representing feedback from more than 50 individuals and organizations.

As the Oregon Consensus Report indicated, perspectives regarding the future of the Elliott State Forest vary widely. Comments received illustrated this range of perspective. Though specific comments often offered highly detailed and nuanced feedback, general themes within the comments include:

Decoupling the Forest from the Common School Fund. Comments reflected a variety of perspectives related to decoupling, compensating the school fund for the value of the Elliott, and ongoing contributions of the forest to education. Themes within the comments included:

- The school fund needs to be fully compensated for the forest. Multiple commenters noted concerns with the current appraisal undervaluing the forest, and with previous approaches or litigation devaluing the forest. Some commenters indicated that funding schools should be the primary driver for any solution.
- Potential for forest to continue to contribute to Oregon schools. Perspectives ranged from not supporting decoupling at all, to interest in developing some kind of ongoing monetary contribution to the school fund, to finding non-monetary ways the forest can benefit education.
- Support for decoupling. Most comments supported decoupling. Several indicated partial decoupling as desirable. Commenters that did not support decoupling indicated multiple reasons, including a process that does not adequately consider the non-monetary values of the forest, loss of potential ongoing revenue, a false sense of urgency for decoupling, and an undervalued appraisal.

Use of $100 million. Commenters indicated additional information, discussion, and ultimately resolution of how the $100 million in bond proceeds will be used is needed. Specific feedback mentioned use of the $100 million:

- To preserve non-economic benefits.
- To preserve assets not protected by the Habitat Conservation Plan or Endangered Species Act.
- To preserve critical habitats.
- To protect specific forest parcels.
• Needs to be prioritized to decouple land unavailable for logging under a Habitat Conservation Plan or Incidental Take Permit, and then applied to specific parcels.

The Forest’s Revenue Potential. Commenters offered specific ideas for revenue generation, related both to purchase of the forest as well as ongoing revenue generation. Included were a harvest tax on timber revenue, carbon credit sales, and timber harvest. Several commenters did not support any solution that required debt to be serviced from commercial logging, or noted that the level of logging they would support would not generate significant revenue.

Comments regarding timber harvest varied widely. Perspectives ranged from, no logging should be allowed, to commercial log sale only as a byproduct of thinning, to supporting harvest within specific parameters.

Potential Public Owners. Comments support continued public ownership, with many offering support or concern regarding specific public owners. Generally:

• Some commenters indicated that ongoing transparency, public accountability and involvement, and oversight by elected officials would not be possible with some public owners.
• Some commenters indicated concern with ownership that emphasized financial returns, experimental research, or that included ties to timber companies.
• Some commenters indicated an ownership/management partnership by multiple public entities as a possible solution, with different roles/oversight of different areas of the forest.

Need for additional information. Comments indicated the ongoing decoupling process should be informed by further examination of specific issues and topics, including:

• The forest’s carbon potential and carbon market value.
• The forest’s role in mitigating climate change.
• The non-monetary values of the forest, particularly to education institutions and communities and other benefits to future generations.
• Context regarding related education funding issues.

Use of data, facts, and science to support decision-making was mentioned multiple times, specifically on issues of climate change, carbon, recreational use, and timber production and employment.

Several commenters also noted the need for outstanding litigation to be settled in order for a permanent solution to be reached.

Development of Habitat Conservation Plan. Multiple comments indicated that a Habitat Conservation Plan needs to be developed prior to complete decoupling. Reasons varied, but included:

• HCP has impacts on multiple remaining decoupling issues.
• An incomplete HCP process opens any decoupling solution to litigation.
• A future public owner should play a role in development of a Habitat Conservation Plan.
Forest Management Approach. Many commenters offered specific ideas on future management of the forest, and indicated a desire to have further information and input regarding a potential public owner’s management approach. Themes within the comments included:

- The forest could be a model for emerging or alternative management approaches.
- Management could allow for multiple uses of the forest, including recreation, habitat, conservation, preservation of old growth, and harvest (though perspectives on harvest vary. See discussion in Revenue Potential).
- State agencies may have an ongoing role to play, either in an advisory capacity or economic development capacity.
- Climate change, carbon must be considered in management.
- Solutions must consider the realities around how the forest can be managed.
- Concern regarding private or for-profit business involvement.

Additional stakeholder and public engagement. Many respondents indicated a desire for increased engagement, specifically:

- Inclusion of additional perspectives. Specifically mentioned were tribes, environmental groups, scientists, labor, communities of color, state agencies such as health, labor & industry, and tourism, the global warming commission, carbon scientists and economists, recreation groups, and education groups.
- Ongoing opportunities to provide information regarding remaining issues and comment at decision points.

The approach taken to public engagement was also noted as important. Respondents mentioned:

- A transparent process.
- A process that allows the public a voice in any final decision.
- Use of engagement strategies that allow all voices an opportunity to be heard.
- Desire for the engagement process to include decoupling as well as Habitat Conservation Plan development. Creation of a multi-agency technical team to advise the Habitat Conservation Plan development process was mentioned.
- If an advisory committee is formed, the voice of the committee must be heard by the Land Board. The unlikelihood of advisory committee agreement on some issues was also mentioned.
- The process should reflect that the Land Board is the ultimate decisionmaker.

Finally, many respondents shared their vision for the future of the Elliott State Forest. These desired outcomes again emphasized that the forest is a special place to Oregonians for many reasons and that the ultimate solution should be carefully crafted to resonate with many. Desired outcomes mentioned included:

- An Elliott State Forest that is beautiful, wild, and preserved in its natural state.
• An Elliott State Forest that supports study and cultivation of natural forest practices, modern forest management, forest carbon, sustainable and environmentally appropriate timber harvest practices, endangered species management, and other topics.

• An Elliott State Forest that is managed to provide multiple benefits to people, species, and environments.

• An Elliott State Forest where habitat is provided and protected.

• An Elliott State Forest where recreational and educational opportunities abound.

• An Elliott State Forest that sets the standard for how to manage and maintain public forest land.

• An Elliott State Forest that is preserved for the wide-ranging legacies it provides to our children and our planet.

• An Elliott State Forest that benefits all Oregonians.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Affiliation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robert “Bob” Main</td>
<td>Chair, Coos County Board of Commissioners</td>
<td>Having the majority of the Elliott in Coos County I find it unacceptable to not interview myself. (board chair) and Coos County Commissioner Melissa Cribbins! Also, only one of the three county commissioners from Douglas County was interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kevin Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am hopeful that the State Land Board will fulfill its fiduciary duty to manage the Elliott State Forest to maximize revenue for Oregon’s schools. The Elliott State Forest, when managed well, can provide jobs, products, renewable energy, recreation, environmental benefits and revenue for Oregon schools for many generations to come. Please make Oregon schools a priority. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ramona Garrison</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Elliott State Forest should continue to contribute to the Common School Fund. Coos and Douglas Counties have provided more timber land to our state and nation than any other region nationwide. Promises were made that need to be kept regarding school funding. These regions (Douglas &amp; Coos) have gone from prosperous regions in Oregon to now generational poverty that will continue without strong schools. The Elliott State Forest should not become yet another unkept promise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>John Rexford</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Common School Fund must receive full appraised value in return for transfer of the Elliott Forest away from supporting schools. The current proposal cheats school children by under compensating the Common School Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scott Mills</td>
<td>OSBA, Columbia Conservation Association, IUPAT, VFW,</td>
<td>Do not allow the forest to be sold off ever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barb Shamet</td>
<td>West Fork Millicoma coalition</td>
<td>As per DSL request, my comment regarding the next steps in the Elliot forest school fund decoupling project is as follows: please do it. Also, regarding the 100 million Kate Brown secured from Oregon’s 2017 legislature earmarked specifically for and ONLY for the preservation of critical habitat which includes native stands 80 years and older. This is the critical aspect of the entire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
project, proposal and controversy. Revenues can be generated from the plantations already in operation. Approximately 50% of the Elliot is a natural native forest and must be left intact securing the survival of the salmon species, the carbon sequestration balancing our present climate crisis as well as the preservation of threatened and endangered species, and the prevention of major catastrophic flooding. It is imperative to conserve what remains in the Elliot’s native stands. With the $100 million intended for just this purpose, we shall accept no other option except to preserve what is left that has been untouched. To enter any other agreement is a breech of the 60 year contract agreed upon by the Dept of Forestry and State Land Division. Recent climate crisis litigation assures us of a rule in favor of conservation as opposed to extraction for profit. Whom ever assumes the responsibility of the Elliott must be made aware of these non negotiable terms, thank you. It’s a matter of simple preservation, Barb Shamet

Additional comment:
Since the US forest service is interested in rejoining the Siuslaw National forest with the Elliott State forest, as it originally once was, and its primary focus is CONSERVATION, the state would not even have to use the $100 mill to secure the old trees, the critical habitat for which it was intended. A lot of well informed, educated people I I have talked to think this is the way to go. A second option would be to split the forest in half, preserving and protecting the old growth in carbon credit storage and critical habitat protection for the salmon species which is all standing fir 80 years and older. Scientific research proves these old trees sequester more carbon than any new plantation growth. This half could be placed in state park status, national park status, monument status, whatever is the most viable means of protecting and preserving these old trees. The plantations which make up roughly the other 50% can be managed for revenues as it has been, and people suggest thinning this half. I don’t trust OSU or the tribes only because their bottom line is money or experimental research. But if the half we are trying to save is PROTECTED for all time in an effort to stop massive fires, sequester carbon, and save species facing extinction, then it does not matter who manages the plantations, but we hope it will be without massive clear cuts and poisonous chemical sprays. We have worked long and hard to find solutions, I call DeFazio, Wyden and Merkely and could work on them helping secure the USFS in the federal capacity if you choose. What ever you think is best, but know that if we don't save that half of the Elliott which has never been logged, but is a native biodiverse ecologically sensitive and supremely unique forest on the planet, well, there will be a lot of tree sitting in the woods, in peace always, I pray we find the right solution for everyone, thank you so very much for all your time, your work and your efforts regarding this irreplaceable piece of Oregon, on a global spectrum. sincerely, Barb Shamet, Allegany, 541-269-2147. Ps, there are really no salmon yet this year running by my house, I saw maybe four sore backs coming up to spawn, we have no rain, we have to have a forest to have a rain forest. I hope you understand.

Alan Bartl
I would like to see the Elliot forest preserved for future generations and not used as logging revenue.

Ron Wallace
Organization or affiliation: Many Rivers Group of the Sierra Club , Executive Committee Member
I support the decoupling of the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund.
I believe that this forest will become an asset in Oregon's Carbon Sequestering portfolio as well as a respite for salmon and other threatened wildlife.

I would also encourage OSU's involvement as a research forest, but stipulating that any harvest be limited to thinning with no clear cutting at all.

Thank you for your work thus far on this project.
Ron Wallace

9 Barbara Taylor
Organization or affiliation: Ms.

A partnership between OSU, SSNERR, and one or more of the five western Oregon tribes may be the best option for successful public ownership and management of the Elliott. I oppose county ownership, and I feel that ODF already had their turn.

10 Patricia Phillips

The Elliott Forest lands, being pretty contiguous, are very important ecologically for salmon, as well as some other important species. Earlier generations' timber harvest levels in the area were unsustainable. Hopefully the future timber harvests can be put under a 100+ year cycle and rather than clear cuts, have selective harvests.

The tribal history of the area is well known, it is just that tribal descendants are split between multiple confederations today. Much of the Elliott is part of Hanis (Coos) territory, with the northern bit Quuich (Lower Umpqua). Most Hanis Coos and Lower Umqqua descendants are part of the Conf. Tribes CLUS but some are in Conf. Tribes Siletz.

11 Alan Baas
Organization or affiliation: 1944

Frankly, I feel the issues around the Elliott Forest continue to be way more murky than need be. PLEASE protect that forest into perpetuity for its legacy value. I am disgusted, and am a retired educator and so that disgust is deep, by our state school board assn pushing to sell forests today to give a pittance of relative cash to kids today at the expense of tomorrow's kids. FAR Better I wld have that OSBA perhaps get its act together and encourage its membership to speak directly to the issue of what kind of planet are we leaving those kids we keep claiming us educators are here to serve and protect! Whatever your latest intents are, pls just keep the darn forest as it is and get on with developing a realistic, deep-systems-oriented conversation around how are we in our aging generation really looking to our children's future----way beyond all the political misinformations. Pls excuse the crankiness--I am aging and getting more weary and disenchanted with govt these days.....ab

12 Patt Komar
Organization or affiliation: David Douglas School District

This seems like quite a defeat for education. If I am reading correctly, your bonding is $120M less
than the appraised value? Someone is getting a deal at the expense of education. When we are discussing the continual need for funding for education and the inability to meet sustainability in times when revenues are good, how can we even consider something like this? Who actually is benefiting from this deal? It surely doesn't seem like schools will.

| 13 | David Petrie  
Organization or affiliation: Indigenous person - Coos |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am adamantly opposed to decoupling the Elliot State Forest from the Common School Fund. Observing the dominant cultures lack of understanding, as an indigenous person of Coos heritage, it's evident the current Governor, and other State Land Board officials, lack understanding of the unintended, or intended, consequences of this effort. The OR State Forestry Departments outdated management policies are what's driven special interest groups to lockup this land base, for no benefit to students educational needs. Institutions conducting future research projects within this land base will only benefit a few academics while producing data that isn't already available...threatened species will continue to be threatened...nothing has changed for the past 40-years to ensure specie survival...humans included. Until the dominant culture recognizes a holistic approach to timber management and harvest practices is implemented all species are at risk. Keep in mind the dominant culture arrived in our traditional territory September 1853, and since that arrival the environment is 90 + % compromised. Isn't it time to consider both Traditional Indigenous Knowledge and contemporary science when managing our landscapes. Taking this forestland out of production isn't a benefit to any specie...but adjusting stewardship practices will ensure future generations some hope of survival...instead of this continued nonsensical exercise of people educated beyond their intelligence thinking they can solve problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 14 | Pamela Driscoll  
Organization or affiliation: Cascadia Wildlands; OSU alumnus |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have been following the research and latest science on the carbon our forests in western Oregon sequester and hold and climate change across the globe for over 20 years. The Elliott State Forest is one of the MOST important forests in the world as it is much less likely to experience forest fires as we encounter hotter and dryer conditions due to climate change/global warming. As habitats become more and more stressed, the Elliott State Forest may hold some of the last and best habitats for many endangered and soon to be endangered species. Water filtration and holding water is also extremely important. I am hoping the logging industry takes a back seat on any final decisions on how we care for the Elliott. I say &quot;care for&quot; because this is a state/national/global treasure that should be protected. About 47% of the carbon stored in the forest is in the soil. So ANY disturbance/type of logging will release vast amounts of carbon. Please consider what the Elliott State Forest is doing for wildlife habitat, water filtration, carbon sequestration, hunters, fishers, etc. and keep the forest intact and restore it for all the important ecosystem services it provides as other forests will inevitable burn, be logged and will not grow back due to increases in drought and higher temperatures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 15 | Elizabeth A Lockwood  
Organization or affiliation: Cascadia Wildlands; OSU alumnus |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a former student at Oregon State, I can think of no better caretaker of the Elliott Forest than</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon State University. With their extensive programs in forestry, fish and wildlife, and natural resources, they would be much more acquainted with preserving forest health. In addition, OSU is not run by the political forces that seek to pit people against each other. Please strongly allowing OSU to acquire this beautiful and wild part of the Oregon landscape.

16 **Helgaleena Healingline**  
Organization or affiliation: White Rabbit Grove RDNA

Among the options being considered is a possible acquisition of the Elliott State Forest by Oregon State University. Cascadia Wildlands will be meeting with OSU officials in December to gain a better understanding of what an ownership under the school means for this treasured forest.

Please take heed of what Cascadia Wildlands proposes.

17 **William O’Brien**  
Organization or affiliation: Mazamas

The consensus of the voters in Oregon wanted to keep the Elliot State Forest in public hands not with logging interests. The Elliot State Forest should be managed in a sustainable best practices method allowing for recreational use and a refuge for old growth forest, wildlife, some on the endangered species list, and clean water for salmon and trout. The Elliot SF could become a model for how we manage the other state forests in Oregon.

18 **Benton Elliott**

I support conserving the Elliott State Forest in its natural state for future generations. It should be preserved and enjoyed by all Oregonians, not managed as a money tree for schools, government, and industry.

19 **Jen Velinty**

Thank you for taking comments on the decisions for the ELLIOTT Forest in Oregon.

**Essential steps.**

1. Keep the Elliott Forest intact. Minimal logging to preserve the natural habitat. Ownership of the Elliott Forest must be public with no areas owned outright by adjacent counties.

   No government agencies such as Fish and Wildlife or BLM should be involved.

   De-couple the tie between OR Schools and clear cut timber harvesting.

   Forests are perfect educational sites to teach children about preserving carbon sinks, clean air and water. Youth involvement of observing bird life and animals native to the area.

2. Make the buy down bonds available to the general public.
3. Include the Tribes for their historical views of preservation of what the earth provides. Tribal oversight could be considered.

4. Save the Marbled Murrelet from extinction. No fish hatchery activity permitted. No hunting permitted for safety of the general public and youth education. No businesses or concessions permitted.

5. Decommission as many roads as possible in the Elliott Forest. No motorized recreational vehicles permitted. Thank you for your efforts to preserve the Elliott Forest for public education.

---

20 Elizabeth Watts

It's horrible and undignified to pit school funding and the environment against each other.

---

21 Joseph Metzler

Organization or affiliation: OOHA, Cape Arago Audubon, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, Trout Unlimited

The Elliott State Forest and public lands like it should be first and foremost kept in public ownership. Conflicts about how to utilize our public lands should never compromise the priority of maintaining ownership of our public lands. Please do your best to find a solution that maintains Public ownership and access to all our beloved State Forests and Parks. User groups and extraction industries will change and come and go over time. But the Land shall remain in Public Hands, preserved and managed for future generations of Oregonians and all visitors.

I believe the Elliott State Forest could be used as a research forest for OSU to find best logging practices and endangered species management. With ODFW, ODF, helping to find best management practices using peer reviewed science. Wood products generated in the Elliott and other State Forest should be promoted and certified as Wildlife and Fish friendly and sustainability harvested. Then sold at a premium as Organic and Sustainable.

Recreational trails and Public use should be promoted. Sustainable logging should also be promoted. All watersheds should be protected and managed for native fish.

Thank you all for doing your best to find a solution to keeping Our Elliott State forest intact for all future generations. I am willing to help promote and establish trails and public use of the Elliott, and help in any way to keep Public Lands in Public Hands.

---

22 Kian Daniel

Oregon’s 82,500-acre Elliott State Forest was and always should be LEFT ALONE and not touched by businesses for profit (i.e. the effort by timber companies to make it private). This land is and always should be left as is - a wild and beautiful area not touched by human greed. Please keep this land as wild and beautiful as it is. If we lose this beautiful piece of wild, we will never be able to get it back.
Thank you,
Kian Daniel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michael Friedmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please do what is good, and kind, for the trees, animals, and environment. Thank You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Philip Ratcliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Oregon Consensus Report outlined a number of possible paths forward to sever the Elliott’s archaic tie to schoolchildren in Oregon. Once resolved, Oregonians will no longer have to pit school children against our environment. Among the options being considered is a possible acquisition of the Elliott State Forest by Oregon State University. That would be a positive solution. I'm hopeful that the forest will remain intact, won't be privatized, and serves as a good example for the maintenance of Oregon's public land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dear DSL, State Land Board Oct. 18 2018 meeting was not held? Did the Oct. 18 SLB meeting get rescheduled? We can possibly not comment to Oregon Consensus Report for Elliott State Forest Common School Fund Decoupling if we do not see resulting minutes from the cancelled Oct. 18, 2018 SLB meeting. Or, can you send a copy of minutes from OCT 18 SLB or from the date this meeting was rescheduled to. Arin is out until Nov 13, and Anne is not responding. Thanks, Rana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gary L. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization or affiliation: retired forester/independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Elliott State Forest has been undervalued by the appraisal of $220 million. It is worth at least $425 million. The value of standing timber and growth potential make it one of the most valuable chunks of land in the State. If sold, the Common School fund should get what it is worth, not a token amount. The only public entity in Oregon capable of managing the Elliott forest is the Oregon State Department of Forestry. No other State agency has the capacity to handle the job. I began my career as a forester on the Elliott State Forest, so I do have some knowledge to back up my statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Marguery Lee Zucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Elliot is a gem, a pleasure, a peaceful place, and rare for its degree of intactness. It is not acceptable to damage, reduce, or compromise its pristine nature in any way: It is a public treasure and must remain so at any cost. De-coupling it from any obligation to produce revenue for the State is vital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sue Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization or affiliation: Sierra Club, 350.org, InterFaith Earthkeepers Eugene/Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the Oregon State Lands Board,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for beginning the process of saving Elliot Forest for future generations. This was a very positive step forward for which I am grateful, along with my grandchildren!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I just finished reading the Oregon consensus report: Next Steps. I am rather taken aback by its rather shallow review and process to determine “Next Steps”.

There were many errors, not the least was concerning the vital idea that Elliot is indeed a huge carbon sequestering operation, without anyone having to do anything! This was not really even given a cursory thought. One of the statements in the report was on page 14, alluding to old trees not being able to sequester carbon at the level that younger growth does. This is not correct. Aged trees sequester much better then younger ones. So of course we need as many mature trees as we can get!

The second point that I wish to make is very simple.

I lived in Colorado for 26 years. I hiked with my young family mostly around the area of Estes Park. We also drove to many isolated areas in Colorado. The observation that I wish to share is this: Colorado is extremely dry. It has been dry for eons, tho now is experiencing a bit more moisture. When the trees burn, or are cut in Colorado, they take literally 100s of years to grow back. We would see forests that had been burned 70 or 80 years past, that were just burned over, dead debris. The trees had not even begun to grow back.

So please consider this. I live near Eugene. We have had so little rain, and none in sight. It will not take long for our trees (which are already stressed) to be blown over in a wind storm since the roots are very dry and very shallow. Once they are gone, it will be very hard to restore them. It take a lot of water, and since I am on a well, I do worry. Though my well is 90 feet, it produces only 9 gallons a minute;

One of my neighbors encouraged me to take with me, hiking, emergency supplies, just in case. In those supplies, he told me to take a candle and matches, because he explained “it takes a lot to start a campfire in Oregon, because everything is wet and damp”.

What I am feeling, is that it is no longer wet and damp. And when you clear-cut a forest, and scrape it clean, and spray it, I will bet that new seedlings will be hard pressed to grow at all!

Please take some time to consider how much we could benefit from using the Elliot old growth as a great carbon sink that we could have California, or even Oregon use as carbon credits with the money going to buy out the rest of the forest.

Thank you Sue Craig

---

29 James Nielsen
Organization or affiliation: I am a member of the Coos Chapter - Society of American Foresters
After reading the consensus report I have the following comments:

1) The background & context section should include a discussion of the critical need for funds that our public school systems have. I have read that Oregon schools as a group do not rate very high nationally. One of the reasons for this is that PERS is taking a large amount of funds that would otherwise go to improving education for our children. This need for funds must be a driver for any
2) I believe that a major reason the Land Board made a decision to decouple the Elliott from its obligation to provide funds to the school fund was to reduce "pressure" on the environmental preservationists (EP) from their efforts to reduce or stop timber harvest on the Elliott State Forest. This should be stated as background for this consensus report.

3) The value of the Elliott to the School Fund should be based on the average income from timber sales up until the latest shutdown due to lawsuits by the EP. I like others believe the 2016 assessed value is low.

4) I must have missed it, somewhere, but what is the CTCLUSI tribe??

---

Haley Lutz  
Organization or affiliation: Coos Watershed Association

November 13, 2018 Department of State Lands  
775 Summer St. NE, Ste. 100  
Salem, OR 97301


To our partners at the Oregon Department of State Lands,

The Coos Watershed Association (CoosWA) is a nonprofit organization established by diverse stakeholders in 1993 to help landowners and communities work together to improve watershed health - always with the goal to support environmental integrity and economic stability.

The Common School Fund (CSF) lands within the Elliott State Forest are ecologically critical to the health of the Coos Watershed and the species that depend on its function. The Coos basin contains 48% of the Elliott State Forest (44% CSF lands) and 95 miles of fish-bearing streams running through the Forest, making it the highest density basin of fish streams within the Elliott.

Our Association began implementing restoration projects on land within the Elliott State Forest in the mid-1990's. Since then, in collaboration with our partners, we have invested more than $3 million of on-the-ground restoration projects to improve watershed conditions within the Elliott. Additionally, the CoosWA professional staff have conducted extensive aquatic inventory and road surveys throughout the entire Elliott State Forest, as well as continuously monitored water quality and quantity of the West Fork Millicoma River, the main drainage basin within the Elliott.

The CoosWA has also worked with a wide variety of partners including Oregon Department of Forestry, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, Weyerhaeuser Timber Company, Oregon Department of State Lands, and Oregon State University to identify and prioritize approximately $10 million worth of potential restoration work to be completed in the future. Our Association is committed to continuing this critical work in the Elliott State Forest and looks forward to partnering with any new landowner.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
I have reviewed the report from Oregon Consensus (OC) entitled “Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund,” (OC Report) dated October 2018 and presented to the State Land Board (SLB). I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the next steps in fully decoupling the Elliott State Forest (ESF) from the Common School Fund (CSF).

Application of Decoupling: The term and concept of “decoupling” should apply to the entire Elliott State Forest under the ownership of the CSF.

Public Ownership: Public ownership should be limited to a state or federal agency. In this context, ownership by a federally recognized tribe directly or in trust by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs or county government is not public ownership. Otherwise, such ownership would lack public transparency, oversight, and accountability.

Habitat Conservation Plan: The SLB should consider the HCP/ITP process as a precursor to complete decoupling. After completion of the HCP, it will be known which CSF lands on the ESF are still jeopardized by the constitutional requirements of the CSF.

Revenue: The OC report makes several statements regarding revenue as factual without citing references or attribution. Of particular concern is the discussion on “carbon” which minimizes this potential ESF revenue stream. There is recent research indicating that large, old growth forests capture more carbon than younger forests. Obviously, forest dynamics are complex. The OC report should be revised to delete such perfunctory statements or least provide citations to support similar statements. Carbon offset markets are relatively new and verification process are evolving. However, the OC report should not minimize the possibility of using the ESF as a potential carbon offset revenue source. Carbon offsets in Oregon will increase in importance as the Legislature and local governments enact greenhouse gas reduction requirements.

Threatened and Endangered Species: In addition to the ESA-listed northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet and coho salmon, there are other species that inhabit the ESF that may eventually come under ESA protection. One is the red tree vole, which relies extensively on older forests. The ESF is also in the historical range of the fisher, an imperiled mammal.

Remaining Funding to Decouple ESF: I support the comments submitted by Mr. Andy Kerr, et. al.,
regarding the remaining approximately $121 million needed to fully decouple the ESF from the CSF. I urge the SLB to not accept a funding mechanism that requires debt to be serviced from commercial logging on the forestlands that remain unaffected by the final HCP/ITP. The volume of commercial logs from such management would not be enough to materially contribute to the debt service of the remaining $121 million.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,
Howard Saxion, Ph.D.

32 Peggy Lynch
Organization or affiliation: League of Women Voters of Oregon

Response to Oregon Consensus on Elliott State Forest Report
November 14, 2018
Amy, Peter and Brett:

Thank you for a comprehensive report on the challenges and decision points for the State Land Board (SLB). The report seems to clearly share multiple interests and possible steps forward. My comments will draw on past official League testimony. In 2015, our letter said: The best transition scenario, and the best management strategy, decouples old-growth clearcutting from school funding, protects the Elliott’s remaining native forests, wild salmon and imperiled wildlife, safeguards the Elliott drinking water, public recreational and educational opportunities, and promotes timber jobs by restoratively thinning the second-growth tree farms. We continue to believe that scenario.

We believe in the need that any process selected should continue to be transparent and allow the public a voice in any final decisions. If an advisory committee will help AND the final decisionmakers, the State Land Board, clearly hears these voices, then we would support. The key for us is transparency and access to comment on all the decisions along the way. We understand that there are multiple interests that often are at odds. That won’t change whether or not an advisory committee is chosen. They won’t go away. So selecting a method to allow all voices to be heard is a very important one for the SLB. If the SLB goes forward with an advisory committee, we support your recommendations on pages 32-33 of this report.

The League believes in the importance of preserving our public lands for future generations and keeping them in public hands. Oregonians recognize that, when the Elliott became a Common School Fund asset in 1930, it was a different time. With the ESA and at least three species finding the Elliott home, the Elliott as a funding asset has become more challenging. But it is still an asset for Oregonians of all ages. We supported the $100 million in bonding to help bridge those two issues. That money should “buy” assets not otherwise protected by the ESA and any HCP.

We support continuation of the HCP—an HCP that can be upheld in court. We believe strongly in the reality of climate change (and have filed a brief to support Our Children’s Trust so that governments actively address this issue). The SLB cannot ignore the current court decision rejecting the 2014 sale, so we can hope that any Supreme Court decision is quick! Until that decision is made, it will be perilous for continued SLB action around divestment.
Although no state agency has the money to “buy out” the rest of the current assessed value, we continue to believe that they might have a role to play, from Parks to Fish & Wildlife to Education (outdoor school potential) to OWEB grants among others. Those agencies might provide some of the important family wage jobs that were a part of the original discussions around the Elliott. We certainly support a multi-agency technical team to advise the HCP process. The 9,000 acres of Board of Forestry lands within the Elliott needs to be a part of any final decision. So discussions should occur with the BOF to find a reasonable solution.

Since the reason we are here is the lack of funding to the CSF and the amount of harvest that has been available due to the many circumstances that have changed how the Forest can be managed, that issue will continue no matter what public entity owns the Forest. That fact should not be lost in developing a final answer. The League is NOT supportive of connecting the South Slough with the Elliott discussion. As the first National Estuarine Research Reserve and its value for research with climate change, it seems unnecessary to try to link these two important properties.

These comments are mine and not official League of Women Voters of Oregon comments. But I believe you can be assured that LWVOR’s voice can be heard in these comments.

Thank you again for your work in listening to so many voices and for clearly framing the complicated issues surrounding this very special place.

Peggy Lynch, LWVOR Natural Resources Coordinator

Fergus Mclean  
Organization or affiliation: Many Rivers Sierra Club

At your May 2017 meeting the State Land Board directed the Division of State Lands to analyze various possible methods for decoupling management of the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund. To carry out this mission, DSL contracted with Oregon’s public policy conflict resolutions program, Oregon Consensus, which produced the October, 2018 report Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund. Though a good effort on the part of staff, the Decoupling report falls short in that it fails to address key and developing conditions or to bring us closer to a satisfactory outcome for the Elliott, and so responsibility for guiding the process of transitioning the Elliott away from the Common School Fund of necessity must come back to the Land Board.

The Consensus Report presents an interesting snapshot of the opinions of a somewhat limited study population. Researchers failed to interview DEQ, the Global Warming Commission and the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute. This could explain their trivialization of the topic of carbon sequestration and markets for forest carbon credits. Had the authors of the Global Warming Commission’s Forest Carbon Accounting Project Report to Oregon Department of Forestry been interviewed, the Consensus Report would have reached far different conclusions about forest carbon, and about the economic potential of the Elliott.

Tremendous developments in the science of forest carbon were taking place even while the Consensus Report was being prepared, developments which are summarized in the GWC’s Forest Carbon Accounting Project 2019 Report to ODF.
Prior to 2016 data was inadequate to permit quantifying the carbon contained in Oregon’s forests. Since then we have learned that our forests constitute one of planet earth’s greatest carbon storehouses, as shown in this image from the Accounting Project report:

Oregon’s south coast is very special; its forests capture more biomass than almost anywhere else on earth. It is pure folly to consider future management of the Elliott without taking this enormous resource into consideration, yet the Consensus Report trivializes and dismisses serious consideration of the Land Board’s responsibility for stewarding one of planet earth’s greatest storehouses of carbon.

All indications are that the 2019 legislature will pass a cap and trade system, with a goal of reducing the state’s carbon footprint by around a million and a half tons of carbon a year. New US Forest Service Forest Inventory Analysis data shows that our state’s total carbon reduction target through 2035 is only about 5% of the carbon stored in our forests, so that carbon management of our forests must play a crucial role in our global warming policies, and we must have a specialized institution to carry out the basic science and also lead the state in its development of the capacity for measuring and storing forest carbon.

As the Accounting Project’s report to ODF make clear, the study of forest carbon is a young science far beyond the institutional or educational capacity of ODF to explore. The Elliott Forest can be home to a new forest science institution consistent with our preeminent forest carbon resources and one which can also address the other key goals of the forests’ founders: sound scientific forestry as well as public education and recreation.

It would be appropriate to levy a harvest tax of $2/thousand board feet on timber harvested in Oregon to meet the payments on the $100 million Elliott bonds, and suggest a unique new combined forest research and management institution which could be called the Elliott Forest Carbon and Wildfire Institute to explore not only basic forest carbon science and wildfire mitigation strategies but also to address the entrenched arguments over forest management which have plagued and hampered forest resource management policy and taxation since the days of free-wheeling cutting of old growth timber petered out in the ‘70s. Here’s what the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute has to say about the need for research on forests and carbon:

Management principles to foster resilience to disturbance while conserving ecosystem services include: 1) managing dynamically and experimentally through a sustained commitment to adaptive management, 2) managing for ecological processes and functional characteristics instead of specific structures and species compositions, 3) considering trade-offs and conflicts that include ecological and socioeconomic sensitivities, 4) prioritizing choices that are likely to work within a range of possible futures and in crucial areas that are most exposed to changing disturbance regimes, 5) managing for realistic outcomes by focusing on a broader set of ecosystem services, and 6) treating disturbance as a management opportunity for applying adaptation strategies (Seidl et al., 2016).

The Global Warming Commission’s Forest Carbon Accounting Project draft report contains a host of complex scientific questions which are far beyond the capacity of ODF to address. OSU has the world’s leading forest carbon scientists. These are the researchers who should be given a hand in a new institution for the brand-new science of forest carbon they are already creating, along with the Global Warming Commission and the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute.
An intriguing industry-oriented experimental approach being suggested for management of the Elliott State Forest, called the Giesy Plan. This plan has been around for decades, and has served as a template for major forest management laws. Under the Giesy Plan, riparian areas are set aside and protected, and the remaining timberland is divided in two pieces, with half being managed for maximum industrial logging production and the other half set aside as a reserve. When modified to include the value of carbon offsets, the Giesy Plan can generate a self-funding strategy for a research institution based in the Elliott State Forest, and at the same time address with good science many of the fundamental disagreements about forest management which have polarized and paralyzed advances in forest policy and science.

A modified Giesy Plan for the Elliott, after setting aside enough of the land base to serve as riparian reserves to protect coho salmon, would divide the remaining forest into three rather than two pieces, with 25,000 acres used for maximum timber production on a 30-year rotation; a 25,000 acre block of older forest including key owl and murrelet habitat set aside as a carbon reserve; and 25,000 acres dedicated to experimental forestry on a 100-year rotation, to carry out the kinds of experimental, adaptive management called for but never carried through under the North West Forest Plan. Careful harvest design and meticulous monitoring of the economic and ecological impacts of various harvest practices will develop a scientifically sound basis for forest management, and make Oregon the global leader in forest carbon research.

I support the proposals of Wayne Giesy and Dr Bob Zybach for a needed research capacity on the Elliott, and also endorse the great work Dr Zybach has done with Southwestern Oregon Community College in developing an ambitious recreation plan for the Elliott. Even though we may have quite different philosophies about forestry, and different beliefs about the best way to go about forest management and even argue about what the best techniques for maximizing forest carbon are, we are fully agreed that forest policy should be based on sound science, and that the Elliott is the perfect place to create such an institution to carry out that exploration of scientific adaptive management, promised but never followed through under the NorthWest Forest Plan.

The economics of combining elements of high-intensity logging with long-term carbon offset sales is very powerful. Research of the carbon offset rules of the California Air Resources will show that states may register and sell state-owned forest carbon credits in the California offset market. In stands with a carbon density which exceeds that of a normal 60-year old stand that excess may be sold as carbon credits. Here’s how it could pencil out with Oregon selling Elliott Forest carbon credits:

Harvest on 15,000 acres of the 25,000 acre industrial block, 30-year rotation:

500 acres/year X 35,000 board feet/acre = 17.5 million board feet/year
17.5 mmbf X $265/thousand = $4.6 million net revenue/year

Create a 25,000 acre carbon reserve in the North/NorthWest portion of the forest. All carbon reserves above the level of those on a 60-year old stand are eligible for sale in the California carbon market. It we assume an average of 400 excess tons of CO2e/acre, that would provide 10 million tons of CO2e, worth $150 million today. (At the carbon price Canada has announced they will set by 2022, $50/ton CO2e, those Elliott carbon credits would be worth half a billion dollars, far more than the $120 million needed to finish purchasing the Elliott from the Common School Fund.)

Harvest in experimental block:
15,000 acres out of 25,000 harvested on 100-year rotation = 150 acres/year
150 acres X 35,000 board feet/acre = 5.2 million board feet
5.2 mmbf X $265 = $1.4 million/year

Ongoing annual Carbon Credit sales from 25,000 acres @ 5 tons/acre/year
125,000 tons carbon credits/year
@ $15/ton = $1.9 million/year
@ $50/ton = $6.2 million/year

So an Elliott Forest Carbon and Wildfire Institute could theoretically generate an initial $150 million (enough to finish paying off the Common School Fund and completing the decoupling process) and in addition generate between $8 and $12 million a year in revenue while making Oregon the global leader in carbon science and providing unique educational and recreational opportunities to Oregon’s citizens and our visitors.

The broad base of public sentiment which opposed privatizing the Elliott can be drawn upon to support the increase in the harvest tax to retire the initial Elliott bonds, an increase which would still leave Oregon’s timber taxed at a much lower rate than timber harvested in either California or Washington.

I support the Land Board in your duty and privilege of being in the position of leadership in preserving and enhancing Oregon’s crown jewel- the Elliott State Forest- for present and future generations of Oregonians and the world.

34 Amber Gayle Thalmayer

I appreciate the efforts made in this report to hear a variety of voices and to find consensus for this precious forest. I hope decision makers will keep in mind the long term benefits of protecting a place valued by so many, compared to the very small, and very short term gains to made by logging. Schools must be funded more sustainably in Oregon, whatever that takes. Schools are not a luxury, they are a necessity, and should never have been linked to timber funds. This mistake has to be rectified now.

Sincerely,
Dr. Amber Gayle Thalmayer

35 Greg Stone
Organization or affiliation: Several, but my comment are my own.

The State Land Board really screwed up years ago when you didn’t defend your own forest management plan on the Elliott against threats of litigation. You spent millions of dollars over the years to develop that plan that includes justification for conservative harvest levels and resources protection measures beyond requirements in the forest practice act. The notion that you ‘decouple’ school lands may be unconstitutional, but then you can have the spineless AG who wouldn’t defend your forest plan defend you. Shame on you!

36 Cathy Seitz
I am one of the people who submitted a letter of interest during the proposed sale of the Elliott. I applaud the land board for the decision to keep the Elliott in public hands. I have a suggestion, if no one comes forward with the remaining money to buy out the school fund obligation. That would be placing the uncut areas under roadless or Wilderness status, and keeping the remaining areas in the school fund, assigning each section to whatever state agency would oversee them.

The sections which have been logged could remain in the school fund, but without any obligation to produce revenue. If revenue results, beyond maintenance and reasonable costs, in the future the school fund would receive it. Instead of heavily leaning on the forest for timber, I am proposing an approach to logging which would be gentle on the forest, but would still produce revenue, although it might not get much to start. It is referred to as ecosystem-based forestry, ecoforestry or ecostery. The way the Cow Creek tribe talked in their proposal, I wonder if they might have something like this in mind. I apologize that time prevents me from contacting them and would be happy to discuss this with them in the future.

I have contacted the leading Eco-Forester on the west coast, Herb Hammond. Hammond has been designing ecosystem-based forest management for many years on large parcels, and is very interested in working with us. Ecoforestry focuses on maintaining and restoring ecological integrity in a forest. Timber is a byproduct of this management focus. Under ecoforestry, as the trees get older and larger, ecosystem services, like air purification, carbon sequestration and storage, water conservation, and biological diversity all increase. In addition, the value of the timber (and other forest products like mushrooms or game) also increases. Some timber may be removed throughout the process, the sale of which provides forestry and logging jobs for the local community, and furnishes wood products for local manufacturing. Areas in the Elliott that currently require thinning would constitute priority areas to apply ecoforestry.

Ecoforestry maintains a continuous forest cover by using single-tree and small group selection systems in cutting trees in the forest. Roads have small footprints and are carefully fit into stable portions of the terrain. Ecoforestry often includes the use of small mills, often portable sawmills. All of the approaches to ecoforestry are labour intensive, guaranteeing employment opportunities for the local community.

On the unlogged portions, I suggest leaving some or all of the existing roads in place, while adding hiking and horseback trails, which could connect to the parks near Lakeside and the Dunes reserves on the ocean, and the Siuslaw National forest just to the north. This would make a long trail which would attract backpackers. I understand that the Pacific Crest Trail (north to south borders backpacking) is now being heavily used, so a new trail would likely be welcome.

The Elliott might be too steep for bicycles, as their use may erode any trails, particularly in wet conditions. The Elliott is both remote and in competition with a nearby tourist destination--the ocean--so developing it as a campground etcetera would not be likely to pay off. Existing campgrounds near the beach are easier to get to and on flatter ground. Most of the Elliot is extremely steep and hard to reach.

I understand that OSU may make an offer to acquire the Elliott. If this happens, I would transfer the idea of ecoforestry to them. I assume they will be held to the standards which were imposed when the sale idea was proposed, including protection of the old growth forest. In fact, I propose that the old growth not be transferred to them unless it is also protected by wilderness or roadless area
level standards.

The Consensus Report said some people were concerned that environmental standards could be changed by the approach taken in the Elliott. I hope they are, and that they become more protective. This is in the interest of the greater good. In particular, I want to increase protection for standing trees on the entire forest. While some thinning may be appropriate for fire avoidance, that thinning must be guided by the priority of protecting, and where necessary, restoring ecological integrity. This will ensure the protection of vital ecosystem services.

One often ignored reason to protect intact forests is their value in holding water and cooling the surrounding areas. We face increasing summer temperatures, droughts, and fires. Many call for heavy thinning of forests because of fire, but a growing body of scientists caution against excessive reduction of forest cover along the world’s coasts. Even replanting needs assessment to be sure that any replanting focuses on re-establishing natural forest composition, structure, and function. Also, young trees need large amounts of water to get established.

On the coasts, water is taken into the clouds from the ocean and dropped as precipitation, primarily rain, on the forest, incorporated into trees and other plants through photosynthesis, and then released to the atmosphere where it is taken up again by clouds which move inland. Because very large trees pump thousands of gallons of water into the atmosphere, coastal forests are responsible for water supplies far inland. The high humidity in these old coastal forests, coupled with multi-layered canopies, canopy gaps, and the very thick bark of many old-growth trees make these forests very resistant to fire. Ecoforestry aims to maintain this type of forest structure, providing both fire resistant forests, and water supplies.

One of the issues I know you face is the likelihood of lawsuits. My suggestion would avoid two potential suits in the future...from environmentalists, and from the schools, some of whose representatives are not happy with the current arrangement. It is possible that a third lawsuit could be avoided by including Lone Rock Timber and the Cow Creek tribe in the harvest process, if they would be interested in ecoforestry. I note that Lone Rock claims to log sustainably, but Sustainably Harvested Certification does not represent adequate forest protection for forest integrity, in my view. The tribe, as I said above, may have ideas that are more in line with true sustainability for the forest.

Our Oregon forests will not continue producing timber indefinitely with current logging practices. With so much clear cutting or near clear cutting on short rotation cycles and so much spraying of pesticides, the soil will become exhausted. Soil is being degraded structurally from too few remaining old roots, internally from the loss of fungi and microorganisms which forests need to regenerate. Some of our forests already are not coming back as they should, due to overharvesting. Other areas in the world such as the Middle East which were once forested are now largely deserts. This could happen here as well. This is why we need to drastically improve our forestry practices (and start using less new wood, reusing and recycling old houses and lumber).

We have already suffered numerous years of drought on the West Coast, and do not know if that is over. In 1930, when the Elliot was pledged to fund the schools, Oregon, Washington, and California had many more large trees than they do today. Our two neighboring coast states both have more protected forests than Oregon. We can get smarter about this, and change our ways to maintain healthy forests in the face of climate change, which could include producing bigger, healthier trees.
I have written this paper with added input from Herb Hammond to be sure that what I am saying falls in line with the approach he could help us carry out.

Cathy Seitz

Relevant websites:

Herb Hammond’s Ecosystem Based Conservation Planning: http://www.silvafor.org/ Article from French biodiversity association Envol-Vert, entitled Forests and Rainfall: http://envol-vert.org/en/forests-services-2/role-forests/2015/06/forests-and-rainfall/ “The forest creates fresh water runoff for the streams and rivers, and helps pull rainfall in coastal areas inland. In India, deforestation has caused a 30% drop in rainfall...forests play the role of natural pumps, sending precipitation which gathers in coastal areas further inland.”

A report on a study on the Science Direct website, entitled Trees, Forests and Water: Cool insights for a Hot World: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378017300134 “Forests and trees must be recognized as prime regulators within the water, energy and carbon cycles. If these functions are ignored, planners will be unable to assess, adapt to or mitigate the impacts of changing land cover and climate. Our call to action targets a reversal of paradigms, from a carbon-centric model to one that treats the hydrologic and climate-cooling effects of trees and forests as the first order of priority.” (from abstract) and “Precipitation is recycled by forests and other forms of vegetation and transported across terrestrial surfaces to the other end of continents.”

Article from Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies entitled Rivers in the Sky: How Deforestation Is Affecting Global Water Cycles: https://e360.yale.edu/features/how-deforestation-affecting-global-water-cycles-climate-change “A growing body of research suggests that this hitherto neglected impact of deforestation could in many continental interiors dwarf the impacts of global climate change. It could dry up the Nile, hobble the Asian monsoon, and desiccate fields from Argentina to the Midwestern United States.”

World Wildlife Fund 200 most outstanding and representative areas of global biodiversity: https://www.worldwildlife.org/ecoregions/na0510 They specifically mention the Elliott as “among 31 proposed high priority reserves that together cover 5,065 km2, or over 23 percent of the Oregon Coast Range Bioregion...The high priority areas must be linked and insulated by reserves under slightly less strict protection and by multiple-use buffer zones. Together, these three classes of reserves would form a continuous network through the Coast Range.”

37 Cristina Hubbard
Organization or affiliation: Forest Web of Cottage Grove

November 15, 2018
To: Oregon Department of State Lands
Elliott State Forest Project, 775 Summer St. NE, Ste. 100, Salem OR 97301
RE: The Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund Report

Writing on behalf of over 2,100 supporters, Forest Web of Cottage Grove is submitting the
following comments on The Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund report released in October 2018.

Our main requirement for the Elliott State Forest is that well established guidelines are in place for protection of all old-growth and late successional habitat as well as riparian areas with significant buffers established for these ecosystems. There should also be connectivity maintained between these habitats with no large gaps created by logging. Also, we strongly recommend that logging should be restricted to thinning and restoration projects in mature second-growth stands.

We agree a federal Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) needs to be developed as soon as possible to achieve these goals. However, we have concerns with the associated Incidental Take Permit as this gives leeway to timber companies regarding the death of any individual members of an ESA-listed species that occur during logging operations.

The legislation specifically directed the $100 million be used to preserve non-economic benefits of Elliott State Forest. This report leaves us with concerns as to how that will be accomplished as it also states the funds will be used as a “buy-down” of the School Fund. While we support the funds going to the School Fund, it needs to be clear that the preservation of the non-economic values of the Elliott State Forest be at the forefront of all planning decisions. Under Cap-and-Harvest (Section 2, Subsection 2.2) it also states: the $100 million is meant to define the state’s contribution to achieving conservation, recreation, and non-revenue values on Elliott State Forest. Whether retained by DSL and managed as a School Fund asset, or owned and managed by another entity through decoupling, the $100 million would be applied towards achieving these values.

However, this subsection also states: The remainder of Elliott State Forest would be placed under timber management. This would seem to be taking us back to how the issue of saving the Elliott State Forest began, treating it as a commercial enterprise rather than valuing it for its critical environmental benefits. Yes, logging should be a component of management and restoration, which will generate income, but the focus of these projects should be the rehabilitation of the second-growth stands. Logging should not continue to be the driving force in managing the Elliott State Forest.

As for future ownership of the Elliott State Forest, the report cites both the ability to manage the forest as well as to raise the remaining cash reserves for the School Fund to be the primary criteria. Of all the options listed in the report, only the United States Forest Service (USFS) currently meets those requirements. The report states: As an adjacent landowner and manager, the United States Forest Service (USFS) indicated interest in seeing the Elliott State Forest consolidated into and managed as part of the Siuslaw National Forest. The similar forest type and proximity were seen as advantages, as well as the historic connection between acreage on the Elliott State Forest and National Forest lands. It was also noted that the USFS would likely need a congressional appropriation to pay the School Fund. It should be noted that with the results of the recent election, the new Congress might well be willing to approve this.

Under Carbon (Section 4, Subsection 4.5) the report states: Among the constraints cited were the relatively large and older class of trees already on Elliott State Forest, which reduces their potential carbon uplift and, therefore, value on the carbon market. This is statement is not accurate nor based on current science. Recent studies show old-growth trees are rich and valuable carbon sinks, continuing to sequester carbon throughout their life-cycles. We have included an excerpt from one
study as well as the full text of the abstract for another study below:

"The Role of Old-Growth Forests in Carbon Sequestration"
26 JULY 2016 Geoffrey Craggs, JP, Research Analyst, Northern Australia and Land Care "...Until recently it was believed only young forests sequestered atmospheric carbon in early growth and that old-growth forests were only sinks in which the carbon was stored. Recent studies, however, have identified that intact old-growth forests continue to take up carbon from the atmosphere even past the point at which they reach maturity. By measuring growth rates, researchers have identified that carbon sequestration in trees increases continuously because the overall leaf area increases as they grow, enabling bigger trees to absorb more carbon from the atmosphere. Older, larger deciduous trees reproduce more new leaves, thus capturing the most carbon from the atmosphere..." [http://www.futuredirections.org.au/publication/role-old-growth-forests-carbon-sequestration/]

"Old-growth forests as global carbon sinks"
Sebastiaan Luyssaert, E. -Detlef Schulze, Annett Börner, Alexander Knöhl, Dominik Hessenmöller, Beverly E. Law, Philippe Ciais & John Grace
Abstract
"Old-growth forests remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere at rates that vary with climate and nitrogen deposition. The sequestered carbon dioxide is stored in live woody tissues and slowly decomposing organic matter in litter and soil. Old-growth forests therefore serve as a global carbon dioxide sink, but they are not protected by international treaties, because it is generally thought that ageing forests cease to accumulate carbon. Here we report a search of literature and databases for forest carbon-flux estimates. We find that in forests between 15 and 800 years of age, net ecosystem productivity (the net carbon balance of the forest including soils) is usually positive. Our results demonstrate that old-growth forests can continue to accumulate carbon, contrary to the long-standing view that they are carbon neutral. Over 30 per cent of the global forest area is unmanaged primary forest, and this area contains the remaining old-growth forests. Half of the primary forests (6 x 108 hectares) are located in the boreal and temperate regions of the Northern Hemisphere. On the basis of our analysis, these forests alone sequester about 1.3 ± 0.5 gigatonnes of carbon per year. Thus, our findings suggest that 15 per cent of the global forest area, which is currently not considered when offsetting increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations, provides at least 10 per cent of the global net ecosystem productivity. Old-growth forests accumulate carbon for centuries and contain large quantities of it. We expect, however, that much of this carbon, even soil carbon, will move back to the atmosphere if these forests are disturbed." [https://www.nature.com/articles/nature07276]

Missing from the report was any mention of Climate Change or the role the Elliott State Forest could play in mitigating this global crisis. With our federal government taking little or no action on this critical issue it is imperative Oregon, with its vast forestlands, lead the way in providing solutions. According to the most current scientific studies and reports, forests are the key to saving our planet.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recently released their latest report on Climate Change in September 2018. The report, drafted in response to a request by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), evaluates the differences between a 1.5°C and a 2°C future and whether different emissions trajectories can achieve a future with less
warming. It makes clear that we need a global commitment to move away from fossil fuels and focus on the removal of carbon dioxide already in the atmosphere (not just reduction of future emissions) to prevent irreversible effects that would have devastating consequences across the globe. Such an approach is especially vital to the ocean, where achieving a 2°C future (the official goal of the Paris Accord) would still result in destructive changes to the ocean and coastal areas around the world.

The IPCC report is comprised of three years of work by more than 130 authors, synthesizing over 6,000 scientific references and fielding over 42,000 comments during the extensive peer review process. The IPCC report confirms the vital role of forests as an essential climate change solution. Link to IPCC Summary: http://report.ipcc.ch/sr15/pdf/sr15_spm_final.pdf Link to all IPCC documents: http://www.ipcc.ch/report/sr15/

Global Forest Watch, which monitors deforestation in real time, estimates that between 2001 and 2017, 800 million acres of tree cover was lost. Much of that was driven by agriculture, logging, and cattle ranching. Oregon must reprioritize how it manages our public forests, making conservation the primary focus. To emphasis this point, we also submit the following information on how forests, including the Elliott State Forest, are critical to combatting Climate Change.

The following is from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: "Roles of forests in climate change" "As more scientific information about global warming accumulates, climate change is emerging as perhaps the greatest environmental challenge of the twenty-first century. What is more, a virtual Pandora's box of major global threats, such as hunger, poverty, population growth, armed conflict, displacement, air pollution, soil degradation, desertification and deforestation are intricately intertwined with and all contribute to climate change, necessitating a comprehensive approach to a solution. Rising to this challenge will entail unprecedented cooperation among the world's nations and strong support from international organizations concerned. FAO is particularly implicated, as its domain encompasses major sources of greenhouse gases, major potential victims of climate change, and major mitigation potentials though carbon pools and "sinks".

Forests have four major roles in climate change: they currently contribute about one-sixth of global carbon emissions when cleared, overused or degraded; they react sensitively to a changing climate; when managed sustainably, they produce woodfuels as a benign alternative to fossil fuels; and finally, they have the potential to absorb about one-tenth of global carbon emissions projected for the first half of this century into their biomass, soils and products and store them - in principle in perpetuity." http://www.fao.org/forestry/climatechange/53459/en/

"The Great American Stand: US Forests & The Climate Emergency" "Standing forests are the only proven system that can remove and store vast amounts of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere at the scale necessary to keep global temperature rise below 1.5 degrees Celsius this century. It is therefore essential to not only prevent further emissions from fossil fuels, deforestation, forest degradation, and bioenergy, but also to expand our forests’ capacity to remove carbon from the atmosphere and store it long-term. If we halted deforestation, protected existing forests, and expanded and restored degraded forests, we could reduce annual emissions by 75 percent in the next half a century.

If fossil fuels were rapidly phased out during this same time period, we could reduce the amount of
carbon in the atmosphere, meet the goals of the Paris Agreement and avoid catastrophic climate change. But, we cannot solve the climate crisis without a major scale-up in forest protection and restoration across the planet. We must not only protect remnant primary, intact forests, but also conserve and restore less pristine landscapes." [https://www.dogwoodalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/The-Great-American-Stand-Report.pdf](https://www.dogwoodalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/The-Great-American-Stand-Report.pdf)

Since 2011, Forest Web of Cottage Grove has campaigned on behalf of the Elliott State Forest, organizing hikes and providing educational information to the public on its diverse habitat and the value of its ecological resources. We have attended and testified at numerous State Land Board meetings and provided written comments on its management, working in cooperation with other environmental organizations to promote its protection.

We acknowledge the issues included in this report regarding the Elliott State Forest report: how to decouple the forest from the School Fund; how to provide the remainder of the funds to the School Fund; and who will manage the forest in the future. But what we manage this forest for is the most critical issue to be addressed, and Climate Change must be included in this discussion when making any management decisions for the Elliott State Forest.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Cristina M. Hubbard, Executive Director
Forest Web of Cottage Grove

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38</th>
<th>Jennifer Haynes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I support the environmental group’s letter (Cascadia Wildlands, Oregon Wild, Portland Audubon), with this added concern:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want the Elliott to be sold to OSU because the public needs oversight into what happens. The Administrative Procedures Act (APA) allows for that oversight, but only if an agency is in charge of management. I am also concerned that because OSU gets so much money from timber companies, they may have an incentive to misuse the Elliott and/or skew their research to support timber priorities (this makes me very sad because I attended OSU). I think the problem really is the &quot;old school&quot; leadership in the Department of Forestry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you so much for considering my comments, Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39</th>
<th>John Charles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization or affiliation: Cascade Policy Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fundamental problem with the report is that it treats the 2016 ESF valuation of $220.8 million as a meaningful number. The fact is, the moment Gov. Brown brought down the gavel last year to void the 2015 ESF Sale Protocol, the appraisal connected with that protocol also disappeared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appraisal process was governed by the four limitations embedded in the protocol, all of which acted to diminish the market value to the forest. Those constraints are no longer in effect; therefore appraisal of $220.8 million is null and void.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous appraisals had estimated the ESF to be worth far more than $220.8 million - possibly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% more, depending on various factors. This means that the $100 million loan will "buy down" much less of the forest than assumed by many legislators when they approved it.

Moreover, there is no obvious way to determine how to best spend the loan funds, since the majority of the forest would remain in SLB ownership even after spending $100 million. This is especially the case given the parallel process of adopting an HCP. Previous efforts took 10 years of negotiation, and in the end the state walked away with nothing. Why will things be different now? How will that affect the "de-coupling" process?

Finally, the SLB has a fiduciary responsibility to manage the Trust Lands for the benefit of public schools and students of those schools. Borrowing $100 million and then paying $199 million in debt service to bond holders for the next 25 years by diverting income tax revenues from other purposes harms the very families the Board is mandated to help. The only morally or legally defensible way to dispose of Trust Lands is to sell them to private parties, something the Land Board voted to do in 2015 and then reversed in 2017. The Board has now boxed itself in; the ESF is no longer a productive asset, it's a liability, and the Board is at risk of being sued for breach of fiduciary trust by adversely affected beneficiary groups.

The Board should indefinitely delay the February bond sale and re-consider selling the ESF and other under-performing Trust assets to private parties, in order to meet its fiduciary obligations.

---

**Lon Otterby**

Organization or affiliation: Many Rivers Group Sierra Club

Attention: Oregon State Lands Board
Regarding: Oregon Consensus Report: Next Steps
From: Lon Otterby
Chair Many Rivers Group Sierra Club

The Many Rivers Group of the Oregon Sierra Club (MRG) represents a little over 3000 members in Coos, Douglas and Lane Counties. We have been actively participating in exploring the Elliott State Forest (ESF) with our membership and our allies for the last several years. We have also been participants in the SLB’s efforts to find solutions to the management challenges of the ESF. The onsite field trips sponsored by the DSL and the SLB have been most helpful in understanding the landscape of the forest, the local economic challenges, and local indigenous people’s historical relationship with the Elliott State Forest.

I am very disappointed in the lack of hard information and the limited scope of interviewees in this report. It may be this is what the Department of State Lands (DSL) and the State Lands Board (SLB) had asked for, but there is very little here to be helpful moving ahead with the ownership and management of the Elliott State Forest (ESF) and possibly other state forests. The majority of the those interviewed are the usual suspects primarily paid but also some volunteer lobbyists that show up and testify at the SLB hearings on the dilemmas facing the Common School Fund (CSF) and the DSL. The interview list is populated primarily with lobbyists from groups and businesses in the Portland-Salem area. There was almost no representation from the scientific community or from labor. The communities of color were only represented by the Tribes in the ESF area and the former member of the Coalition of Communities of Color in Portland.
I am very unhappy with this report because the Oregon Consensus staff only attempted to interview two labor groups while interviewing several management groups in education and timber business folks. We were pleased to see Laurie Wimmer, the Oregon Education Association, interviewed. It would have been good to know what her responses to the questions were. Jeff McGillivray, Secretary Treasurer of the Building Trades Council in Curry, Coos, Douglas and Lane Counties, would have been a good addition since he represents much of the labor force that benefits from keeping the ESF in public ownership.

Oregon Consensus interviewed several state agencies especially those connected to timber harvest. We would have liked to read what Curt Melcher and the rest of the folks from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife had to say about the status of wildlife in the ESF with different management plans. Oregon Consensus did not interview the folks at the Global Warming Commission, the Department of Health, Oregon Department of Labor and Industry, or Travel Oregon. That is a large group of agencies to ignore. It is no wonder that there is very limited information about the huge carbon sequestration and recreational benefit of the ESF.

There was a lack of independent scientists and economists interviewed. The experts from OSU like Beverly Law, Mark Harmon, and Kim Nelson were not included. The scientists at the Hatfield Marine Science Center at Newport and Oregon Institute of Marine Biology at Charleston were left out of the interview process. So, we do not have information for the very important Land Sea Connection in the Coos Bay region of Oregon. 30% of Oregon’s Coho Salmon spawn in the ESF. We do not hear about this valuable economic and natural asset for Oregon. The Lamprey Eels that migrate from and back to the ESF are left out. The multi-decadal weather and ocean cycles that influence upwelling and forest fire patterns are not here. The local and migratory marine mammals and birds are dependent on the nutrients from the ESF. This is why you cannot move forward without an adequate HCP.

The Oregon Consensus Assessment Report had several vague references to numbers of respondents and a lack of inclusion of several key stakeholders in our opinion. The common references to who said what are described with terms such as many, some, a few, etc. The level of mistrust of the SLB and DSL is not spelled out, and we think exaggerated. There is a huge difference between mistrust and unhappiness with different outcomes of the process.

Also, the Oregon Consensus group plowed forward without a Habitat Conservation Plan in place. We are not sure who you can do a plan for how to use the $100 Million Bonding or how you can plan to decouple the Common School Fund from the ESF.

The outdated assumption that timber was the driving economic force for paying off the Common School Fund. Timber has for several years been a declining economic driver in Oregon. In Lane County for instance Timber has to be combined with Mining and together they still do not represent 1% of the employment opportunities in Lane Count. Meanwhile recreation use of our forests is booming. The three recreational groups, Oregon Hunters, Rocky Mountain Elk, and Trout Unlimited were very good interviewees. We were not told what they had to say. There are many non-extractive forms of recreation in the ESF that the Oregon Consensus other than the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department did not investigated in their interview process. Hiking, mountain biking, off highway vehicle, and camping groups especially local to the ESL area were not interviewed, nor were the questions asked pertaining to these groups’ use of the ESF.
We were happy to see that Forest Economist, Brent Davies from Eco-Trust, was included in the process, we were greatly disappointed that knowledgeable economists like Wayne Giesy and Ernie Niemi were not included in the interview process.

There is scant information about the possible management of the forest by Oregon State University. The educational value of the ESF driven by the Tribes, the K-12 School systems, the Community Colleges, and Oregon’s universities was missing. The CSF has never taken responsibility for the educational value of the Elliott. The Fund and the school board groups have just stood there with their hands out looking for dollars. The CSF did not join with the teacher associations, universities and labor groups in lobbying for programs like outdoor education, forestry skills classes, building a carbon credit policy and program, and understanding the forestry science with climate change. The fact that the ESF was undervalued is the Common School Boards responsibility for being absentee landlords.

Finally, the carbon value of the Elliott is huge not only monetarily but for the health of the land, the wildlife, and the people. The scientific community of Oregon State and other scientific experts were not included in the process. Those would be Beverly Law & Mark Harmon at OSU School of Forestry, land use expert Paul Engelmeyer, manager of the Ten Mile Creek Conservancy for Portland Audubon, James Johnston, history and future of forest fire expert from OSU,

This Oregon Consensus Report is of little to no use. Please call on the scientific community to inform the DS L and the SLB, please listen to the Global Warming Commission and please finish the HCP so that we have something to work with to manage this impressive forest.

Thankyou,
Lon Otterby
Chair Many Rivers Group Sierra Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41</th>
<th>Samuel Schwarz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization or affiliation : Stakeholder in the Elliott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nov 15, 2018

Oregon Department of State Lands,

I believe the consensus report to offer very helpful and valid information that will assist us, as stakeholders in the Elliott, to ensure that this forest continue to be a vital asset to the entire State of Oregon.

I look forward to hearing what OSU might present in December. The Elliott is so diverse in its forest ecology and it has so much to offer for study and cultivation of more natural forest practices. Opportunity for field research and facilities in the Elliott are phenomenal. Native salmon population should be a key factor in this conversation. Tribal interests are extremely important and are key to restoring this lost connection to the natural world. Watching log barge after barge from Tribal Lands, being loaded and exported from Coos Bay to markets overseas is difficult to witness. With strong leadership, I believe that Tribal influence in the Elliott should shift from resource extraction and focus on native tradition and culturally enriching opportunities. Survival skills training, hunting, fishing and medicinal knowledge be revitalized for the youth and prosperity of
Native Heritage.

There are a great deal many potential directions still ahead (many undiscovered) and decisions that need to be made concerning one of Oregon's most valuable assets. I don't believe we are there yet. The future health of this region depends on strong leadership, not just business as usual. These opportunities lend to more creative avenues yet to be explored.

As a lifelong resident of Allegany and having been fully engaged throughout the process that has lead to the decoupling of the CSF from the ESF, I am pleased to continue shaping the future of our unique and diverse emerald forest. Far long have we removed precious resource from this land, striving to maintain a sustainable harvest, pressured by the timber industries desire to increase yield in order to maximize monetary gain. I state here, in my comment, that as a local inhabitant of this coastal region, that I will forever act as steward of the Elliott State Forest and ensure just and intelligent decisions be made by any said owner or manager of this land. I am of this land and I stand for this land. I stand as a voice for the natural world, that is all too often ignored.

Sincerely,

Samuel J Schwarz
Ford Family Fellow
Bachelor of Arts, U of O
SAMIO Lighting, Patented Lighting Device
F/V Nor' Gale LLC, Commercial Fishery

42 Kaola Swanson
Organization or affiliation: Pacific Forest Trust

November 9, 2018

To the Oregon State Land Board regarding the Elliott State Forest Project,

The Pacific Forest Trust (PFT) is grateful for the opportunity to support the process and conclusions outlined by the Oregon Consensus Center's Assessment Report “Elliot State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund.” Expediency in decoupling should be balanced with the proper time and consideration needed to meet multiple objectives. As outlined by the report, these multiple objectives include meeting fiduciary responsibilities to the School Fund, managing the forest for revenue production as well as conservation, cultural, and public values; local community benefit; and tribal engagement. Further, public ownership and access as well as complete decoupling are identified as goals of this project.

PFT would like to remain engaged as a stakeholder, though we do not intend to submit either a letter of interest or a formal proposal for ownership. However, we would like to encourage the State Land Board to consider the potential of a Working Forest Conservation Easement (WFCE) to meet the many goals outlined for the Elliott State Forest. In particular, this tool could help a public landowner to partner with conservation entities to lower the costs associated with complete decoupling, and if carefully structured, meet the goals of an HCP on a shorter timeline.

Working Forest Conservation Easements are legally binding agreements that permanently protect forests as forests for all their values, including habitat, climate, and cultural values, in addition and complementary to forest management for economic return. While conservation easements are
often focused on preventing development or avoiding subdivision of a parcel of land, working
forest easements add another layer of responsibility by guiding future management to achieve
desired outcomes. Annual monitoring and reporting by a third party is required for compliance
with the terms of the easement and the associated management plan, granting the public regular
insight into the management of their asset and its appreciation over time.

A WFCE would benefit the Elliott State Forest in several ways:

• Creates public trust in the permanent protection of the land for its multiple values,
• allows for ongoing forest management which includes economic returns and local jobs,
• an easement would maximize the investment from the $100 million bond, as it would buy the
  public trust values, reducing the market value of the land while keeping it in desired productive
  use.
• Finally, easements are a flexible tool that can work in conjunction with any potential future public
  owner and can be used as the foundation for an ongoing adaptive management plan.

PFT currently holds WFCEs on approximately 10,000 acres of working, productive forest land in
Oregon and more than 100,000 acres in California. These properties are managed for timber
production and profit as well as benefits to climate, wildlife, and water. Forest managers, loggers,
truck drivers, as well as monitoring and conservation staff are all employed as part of meeting the
terms of the easement and each landowner’s objectives. We’d welcome the opportunity to discuss
this tool further with the Land Board, potential public owners, and interested stakeholders. Please
feel free to contact me by phone or email at your convenience.

Sincerely,
Kaola Swanson
November 14, 2018

Governor Kate Brown
Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
State Treasurer Tobias Read
State Capitol Building
Salem, OR 97310

Honorable members of the State Land Board.

The undersigned organizations have reviewed the report from Oregon Consensus (OC) entitled “Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund,” (OC Report) dated October 2018 and presented to the State Land Board (SLB). Several of our organizations engaged with Oregon Consensus during their process and found it helpful. We are taking this public comment opportunity to share with you our views as to the next steps in fully decoupling the Elliott State Forest (ESF) from the Common School Fund (CSF).

We are including our views on the habitat conservation plan (HCP) and incidental take permit (ITP) under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) process in which the Oregon Department of State Lands (ODSL) is beginning to engage with NOAA Fisheries and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

1. **Application of Decoupling.** The term and concept of “decoupling” should apply to the entire Elliott State Forest under the ownership of the CSF.

2. **Public Ownership.** The ESF should be placed in the hands of a public state or federal agency where there is direct public accountability through oversight by elected officials.

3. **Use of the $100 Million.** The $100 million of bonds to be issued in February 2019 to buydown the revenue-producing requirements for the CSF ESF lands should be linked to specific parcels (“Parcelization” as described in the OC Report) of lands, not just a general relief of that obligation. This is consistent with the language adopted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly (Sec. 124, H.B. 5006 enrolled). We recommend that the State Land Board (SLB) temporarily treat the $100 million as a buydown, giving time for the HCP process to be completed. Upon such completion, the $100 million should be specifically spent to decouple specific high-value conservation parcels (e.g. older forest, streamside areas, etc.) that are otherwise excluded from being logged due to the requirements of the finalized and accepted HCP/ITP. In the interim, interest on the $100 million should go to the CSF.

4. **Prioritizing Use of the $100 Million.** We strongly recommend that the SLB not treat the $100 million as a “cap-and-harvest” (again in the parlance of the OC Report). We do not anticipate the HCP and ITP to fully embrace all of the older (mature and old-growth) forest and streamside areas of the CSF’s ESF lands. The social license to log—via clearcutting or otherwise—previously unlogged native forest with large trees on the ESF, as well as along stream sides of fish-bearing waterways with ESA-listed species, has expired. In addition, allocation of the $100 million should be prioritized to first decouple the underlying “bare land” value of those lands made unavailable for logging under an HCP/ITP. The 2016 appraisal
estimated 42,255 acres of CSF ESF would be unavailable for logging under an HCP and valued the underlying non-timber value of those lands to be ~$6 million. The remaining ~$94 million should be used to decouple specific parcels of the remaining older forest stands (beginning with the oldest) and along streams (beginning with those that are fish-bearing).

5. **The Habitat Conservation Plan Process.** The SLB should consider the HCP/ITP process as a precursor to complete decoupling. After completion of the HCP, it will be known which CSF lands on the ESF are still jeopardized by the constitutional requirements of the CSF. The $100 million should then be applied per (4) above.

6. **Advisory Group.** While we are happy to sincerely and constructively engage in an advisory group to make recommendations to the SLB as how to proceed, in the end the decision is that of the SLB, not an advisory group. We feel obligated to warn you that the chances of the environmental community and the timber industry coming to agreement on how to manage the ESF are very low.

7. **Continued Litigation.** The OC Report addresses concerns about continued litigation that could include the ESF. Such is certainly a possibly. Some of our organizations have been successful in blocking a sale of a portion of the ESF to a private interest (the state has requested the Oregon Supreme Court to review). The more conservative ("conservation-oriented") the HCP and ITP, the less it is vulnerable to litigation.

8. **Imperiled Species.** In addition to the ESA-listed northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet and coho salmon, there are imperiled species that inhabit the ESF that may eventually come under ESA protection. One is the red tree vole (RTV), which relies extensively on older forests. The North Oregon Coast Range (NOCR) Distinct Population Segment (DPS) has already been found warranted for ESA listing, but precluded by higher priorities. While the ESF is located south of the NOCR DPS for the RTV, it is otherwise in the heart of the range of the RTV and, because of its generally older forest condition, excellent habitat for the species. The RTV is limited to older forests in western Oregon and northwestern California. The ESF is also in the historical range of the fisher and coastal marten, both being imperiled mammals.

9. **South Slough National Estuarine Research Sanctuary.** The OC Report mentions the possibility of involving the South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve (SSNERR). Though managed by ODSL, the SSNERR is not CSF land and we don’t view it as necessary or desirable to resolving the ESF issue or that of other CSF forestlands in western Oregon.

10. **Other Common School Fund Forestlands.** Our interest in CSF forest and range lands being decoupled and the assets managed in the public interest for conservation values is not limited to the ESF. While these CSF lands provide little return to the CSF, much of the lands have high public conservation value or are lands that should be exchanged for lands with high conservation values—all while making the CSF whole. We- and other conservation organizations- stand ready to work with the SLB and other stakeholders to develop a rational and timely strategy for decoupling these lands (or replacement lands) from the CSF while maintaining public ownership.
11. **The Remaining $120.8 Million.** We are strongly committed to helping the SLB obtain the remaining ~$120.8 million to fully decouple the ESF from the CSF. In regard to this, we urge the SLB to not accept a funding mechanism that requires debt to be serviced from commercial logging on the forestlands that remain unaffected by the final HCP/ITP. Such forests are in two categories: (1) natural forest stands of any age that have not been logged; and (2) monoculture plantations established after clear-cutting natural forest. As the public will not accept logging of the former, these stands are best dedicated to conservation. The latter stands should not be allocated to timber production neither via traditional production (industrial) forestry nor ecological forest management. Rather the plantations should be put on a course to again be naturally diverse and older forest stands. Such a course is best achieved by the application of scientifically sound ecological restoration thinning that also results in a very significant byproduct of commercial logs for several decades. The net operating revenues from the sale of such logs likely could cover the annual management costs for two or three decades, until no additional plantation treatment is needed. Depending upon market prices for logs and management costs, it may also be possible that a portion of these revenues could be placed in an endowment to aid future management costs. The volume of commercial logs from such management would not be enough to materially contribute to the debt service of ~$120.8 million.

12. **Carbon Credits.** After completion of the HCP, it may be that the value of not logging natural forest that is allowed by the HCP could be sold into the carbon market. Our initial review suggests this might be a one-time payment of ~$10 million. While far from the $120.8 million, it is nonetheless worth doing.

13. **Research Forest.** It has been suggested that ESF could become a research forest with revenues from the sale of timber from experimental logging being used for debt service. As we understand it, the kind of research being suggested centers along the notion of extending timber rotations and/or logging in ways that are less than a clearcut that would also result in the minimal persistence of ESA-listed species. It is further suggested that such research could serve as a model for private timberlands or public forestlands. In the case of the former, the alternative management scheme would conflict with profit maximization especially by disregarding the time-value of money, so would not be of interest to almost all private timberland owners. In the case of the latter, most public forestlands in the Oregon Coast Range are administered as no-logging reserves.

14. **Reappraisal.** Depending how the *Cascadia Wildlands v. Oregon Department of State Lands* litigation turns out, the results of the HCP process and the passage of time, it may be necessary and/or desirable to reappraise the residual values.

Thank you very much for your consideration and continued interest in ensuring that the Elliott State Forest is managed in the best interest of this and future generations.

For the Elliott State Forest,

Andy Kerr, Director, The Larch Company  
Bob Sallinger, Conservation Director, Audubon Society of Portland  
Cameron La Follette, Executive Director, Oregon Coast Alliance
Rhett Lawrence, Conservation Director, Oregon Sierra Club
Steve Pedery, Conservation Director, Oregon Wild
Noah Greenwald, M.S., Endangered Species Director, Center for Biological Diversity
Josh Laughlin, Executive Director, Cascadia Wildlands

Cc  Oregon Department of State Lands (Vicki Walker)
    Oregon Consensus (Peter Harkema, Brett Brownscombe, & Amy Delahanty)

    Oregon State University School of Forestry (Anthony Davis and Geoff Huntington)
    Ecotrust (Brent Davies, Ken Margolis & Lisa Watt)
November 15, 2018

To:
Oregon Department of State Lands
Governor Kate Brown
Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
State Treasurer Tobias Read
State Capitol Building
Salem, OR 97310

Regarding the Oregon Consensus report: Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund.

Dear members of the State Land Board,

We have received the report by Oregon Consensus, and appreciate the thorough summary of the issues we all face in moving forward to a solution for the Elliott State Forest. We believe that it will be critical to learn from the Elliott’s history if we are to attain a sustainable solution for the forest that can be accepted by a diverse group of stakeholders.

As the local group that lead the Save the Elliott Campaign in the Coos Bay area, we continue to support public ownership options for the Elliott State Forest and the protection of its native forest and endangered species habitat. Having conducted marbled murrelet surveys in old growth stands throughout the Elliott since 2013, we would be happy to share any of our data or knowledge of the forest where it applies. We would like to remain engaged in the Habitat Conservation Plan and decoupling processes, and are continuing to update our supporters at each new juncture.

Sincerely,

Teresa Bird
Co-director, Coast Range Forest Watch
To: Oregon State Land Board  
From: Bob Zybach, Secretary, ORWW  
RE: Current PSU Oregon Consensus Elliott Decoupling Report  
Date: November 15, 2018  

To the Members of Oregon State Land Board:  

Oregon Websites and Watersheds Project, Inc. (ORWW), is a nonprofit 501 c(3) corporation based in Philomath that has continuously created and maintained a series of online educational websites for more than 20 years – likely making us the longest continuously operating educational website ever. Since beginning in December 1996, our Mission Statement has been:

*Oregon Websites and Watersheds Project, Inc. shows students how to use Internet communications and scientific methodology to help manage Oregon’s natural and cultural resources. Students are encouraged to use computer technology, historical documentation, scientific reasoning, community outreach, environmental enhancement projects, and effective long-term monitoring strategies to help make decisions which affect Oregon’s quality of life.*

On behalf of myself and the other ORWW Board Members, Russ Sapp (President) and Wayne Giesy (Treasurer), we would like to make the following four statements regarding the October 2018 Portland State University (PSU) *Community Consensus Assessment Report*, “Elliott State Forest: Next Step Considerations for Decoupling from Oregon’s Common School Fund.”

[First, please note that we think this report was very well written and considered and, despite our continued opposition to the decoupling process, believe there is strong value in completing the third phase “advisory committee” of this agreement for informational purposes; whether a decision is ultimately made to decouple or not.]

1. ORWW does not support the proposed decoupling of the Elliott State Forest (“the Elliott”) from the statutory obligation and responsibility of the State Land Board to manage the Elliott for the advantage of Oregon schoolchildren and the Common School Fund. We believe there is a false and unnecessary urgency to adopt this “solution” to effectively and legally manage the Elliott; that the 2016 appraisal of the Elliott for $220 million grossly underestimates its true timber and land value, and doesn’t adequately consider potential research, education, and recreational values; and that this process – for those two reasons alone – is greatly unfair to Oregon school children, to the Common School Fund, to Oregon taxpayers, and to residents and businesses of Coos and Douglas counties.
2. “Elliott State Educational Forest.” Instead of “decoupling” the State Land Board from its fiscal and legal responsibilities we continue to support adoption of the proposed self-funding, 20-year “Giesy Plan Alternative” for the management of the Elliott at this time. This proposal was first formally presented to the Land Board at the February 14, 2017 meeting and provided with greater detail at the May 9, 2017 meeting. This proposal has also been discussed in detail in a series of public meetings, magazine articles, radio interviews, and newspaper editorials:

http://www.orww.org/Elliott_Forest/Research/Giesy_Plan

The basic design of the Giesy Plan proposal is to first divide the Elliott State Forest into 18 to 24 subbasins, at an average size approaching 5,000 acres. Subbasins would be further separated into contiguous riparian areas containing fish bearing streams, floodplains, roadways, and bridges; which would be managed separately from the upland forest, perhaps in collaboration with local Indian Tribes. One-half of the subbasins, about 40,000 acres, would be managed entirely for “old-growth habitat,” while the other subbasins would be systematically clearcut and reforested at the historical rate of 50 million board feet per year for 20 years. During this time careful records would be kept of nesting and foraging activities of local wildlife populations, carbon sequestration changes, and economic benefits to the Common School Fund and to local communities; and all resulting information would be made publicly available online.

Old-growth Habitat. Would be actively managed to maintain current access roads and viability of older trees. Salvage logging, prescribed fires on culturally significant meadows and berry patches, and considered reforestation would be allowed.

Active Management. These lands would be systematically clearcut on a subbasin basis to provide a direct contrast to the old-growth habitat subbasins, and then carefully reforested. These would be the principal source of the 50 million feet of harvest, supplementing any salvage logging, thinnings, or other prescribed harvest on old-growth and riparian reserves. Reforestation planning, plan implementation, and maintenance would be performed by Oregon students and local Tribes and businesses, based on historical survey patterns, comprehensive cultural resource inventories, and development of native, non-timber resources as meadows, prairies, trails, myrtle groves, cedar stands, etc.

Riparian Zones. These would be defined as a contiguous polygon including all fish bearing streams in the Elliott, and the streamside roads, trails, bridges, and culverts that adjoin them. Management would be in cooperation with local Indian Tribes and public schools.

In this way the Giesy Plan Alternative for managing the Elliott for 20 years would:

1) Provide a scientific demonstration as to how to help end the “forest wars” of the past 30 years in order to better manage our federal forest lands for local and wildlife benefits;

2) Produce more than 430 full-time local jobs in Coos and Douglas Counties;

3) Produce an estimated $460+ million for the Oregon School Fund over 20 years;
4) Retain (and actively study) more than 40,000 acres of “old-growth habitat” for native animal species;

5) Provide an excellent scientific basis for researching nesting and foraging habitat for marbled murrelets and spotted owls; carbon sequestration measures for differing forest management approaches; and effects of active management on native coho and lamprey populations.

These results would be of direct benefit to Oregon schools, teachers, and students; to western US forest and wildlife managers; to local timber producing communities; and to native wildlife.

3. “Jerry Phillips Heritage Grove.” Jerry Phillips successfully managed the Elliott State Forest for most of his career and was responsible for many of the land transactions that helped build it to its current dimensions. He was also personally responsible for the creation of the Silver Creek Heritage Grove, which has never been formally recognized. David Gould has championed permanent boundaries for the reserve and a name change to honor Phillips’ work and we strongly support this proposal.

http://www.orww.org/Elliott_Forest/History/Phillips

ORWW recommends using the 1000 Line as the northern boundary to the proposed reserve for all of the State land in Section 12, Township 24 S., Range 11 W. (see attached map: 1000 Line is fairly close to historical Indian Trail). This area, about 100 acres in size, should be devoted to actively managing the largest and oldest trees in the Elliott in perpetuity and as an educational demonstration of reforestation, thinning, and salvage logging to achieve those objectives. This land base could be extended further westward to a private ownership interested in promoting recreational use of the Forest and include the North Marlow Ridge clearcut for related educational and recreational purposes.

4. During the past 2½ years ORWW has spent a significant amount of donated time and private funding to produce a comprehensive Elliott Forest educational website for the benefit of Oregon students, teachers, researchers, and taxpayers. This process has involved students and instructors from Southwestern Oregon Community College (SWOCC) and the website is currently comprised of multiple local history books, government reports, news articles and editorials, radio interviews, and hundreds of historical maps and photographs -- in addition to documenting six educational field trips and a student written draft plan with recommendations for expanding Elliott Forest recreational opportunities (see attachments):

http://www.orww.org/Elliott_Forest/Recreation

Our interest is to continue building the Elliott website for the direct benefit to Oregon high schools, community colleges, and universities. Other ORWW content and resources can likewise be used and developed into accredited online courses and school-related reports that can be used to correct, supplement, challenge, or further illuminate existing content. Proposed research projects regarding wildlife habitat, economics, and carbon sequestration can likewise be transparently shared and considered by all Oregonians with an interest in these topics.
Thank you for considering these proposals for the future ownership and management of the Elliott State Forest.

Sincerely,

<signature>

Bob Zybach (ORWW Secretary)

<signature>

Russ Sapp (ORWW President)

<signature>

Wayne Giesy (ORWW Treasurer)
Jerry Phillips’ June 23, 2018 historical map of Silver Creek Heritage Grove as 40-acre land exchange from Weyerhaeuser following salvage logging operation. Tsp. 24 S., Rng. 11 W., Sec. 12.
October 28, 2017 Eugene Register-Guard editorial by Fergus McLean supporting the Giesy Plan proposal for its potential research value for carbon sequestration income scientifically compared to active management income.
This page shows how the 2018 SWOCC Draft Elliott Forest Recreation Plan appears online, including HTML hyper-text “Recommendation” links to individual online chapters authored by student teams. The following page shows how the students’ Recommendations appear in their complete form, as page 47 in the printable PDF format of the Draft Plan.

2018 SWOCC Elliott State Forest Draft Recreation Plan

RECOMMENDATIONS

*2018 SWOCC Elliott State Forest Draft Recreation Plan* Authors, Instructor, and Field Guides, West Fork Millcoma River, Elliott State Forest, April 17, 2018. Photograph by Anne Farrel-Mathews, Southwestern Oregon Community College (SWOCC) staff photographer.

Students were asked to develop topical recommendations for maintaining or improving recreational opportunities on the Elliott State Forest for the advantage of the landowner, the Oregon School Trust. These opportunities would focus on legal requirements of net income and/or educational value for Oregon students and interested public.

Consensus Elliott Recommendations: Investment and Income

1) Signage. The Elliott does not have road signs and only one historical marker. Signage is needed for safety, educational, and recreational purposes. (Chapters 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12)

2) Maps. Good road and/or trail maps do not exist for the Elliott or for its potential recreational and educational attractions. These could be made and sold for income. (Chapters 1, 2, 5, 7, 9)

3) Improve Roads and Trails. At the time of the field trips the roads were in very poor condition, needing rock, grading, and clearing; trails were overgrown. (Chapters 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

4) Install Campgrounds. Commercial campgrounds could be developed for seasonal recreational and educational uses, including hunting, fishing, sightseeing, harvesting. (Chapters 3, 6, 10, 12)

Potential Elliott Forest Recreational Income
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5) User Fees. Recreational users of the Elliott could pay access and parking fees for activities such as hunting, fishing, camping, sightseeing, and harvesting. (Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12)

6) Strategic Logging. Commercial logging could create and maintain scenic vistas, game foraging areas, berry fields, roads, trails, campgrounds, etc. (Chapters 5, 7, 10, 11, 12)

7) Grant Applications. A number of existing sources for installing signage, increasing fish runs, developing wildlife habitat, etc., already exist and can be used. (Chapters 1, 2, 6, 9)

8) Local Business Networks. Existing recreational businesses on the perimeter of the Elliott could benefit by increased forest recreations, map and supply sales, etc. (Chapters 2, 7, 9)

9) Donations. Another potential source of income could be voluntary donations by people or organizations directly using the Elliott or supporting its uses. (Chapters 2, 4, 7, 9, 12)

Other Recommendations

Chapter 2: 1) Forest “zipline” attraction(s).
Chapter 7: 1) Increase hatchery fish runs; 2) improve hatchery visits; 3) conduct fish research.
Chapter 8: 1) Improve fish habitat.
Chapter 9: 1) Limit access to birds during nesting season; 2) conduct bird research.
Chapter 10: 1) Use of herbicides for vegetation management.
Chapter 12: 1) Install commercial communication towers.