

Board of Forestry Testimony

W. Ray Jones, Representing Stimson Lumber Company

January 3, 2018

The Board of Forestry (BOF) and the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) have been given the responsibility to manage State Forestland assets for the benefit of Forest Trust Counties. With that responsibility comes timely and transparent decision making by the BOF. The result could be Forest Policy that all stakeholders can understand and that the BOF and ODF are accountable to.

Transparency and Comparability when weighing costs and benefits of FMP Alternatives

- There needs to be a credible method to compare the current FMP to other Plan Alternatives and to weigh the cost and benefits of Policy Choices made by the BOF and ODF.
- The starting point or Baseline Model to compare to should be a Timber Emphasis Model, utilizing the Forest Practices Act Standards and Take Avoidance Strategies. This plan yields a set of economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits for the Trust Counties and ODF.
- Other Plan Alternatives including the current FMP can be compared to this plan. The costs and benefits of Policy Choices can be weighed in a transparent, objective and credible manner utilizing this approach. The Trust Counties and all other Stakeholders would benefit from this approach as each would understand the costs and benefits of Policy Choices made by the BOF.

Opportunities and Threats

- Milling Infrastructure across this plan area employ thousands of people with family wage jobs. These jobs contribute materially to local economies and to the social fabric of these rural communities. ODF's Annual Harvest Plans are a major source of raw material for the infrastructure that exists. Improvement in harvest plans directly provides job opportunity.
- Some milling infrastructure is hanging on by a thread; Northwest Hardwoods in Garibaldi is at risk because of Alder shortages. A new plan recognizing the need to convert underproductive stands on ODF's coastal lands could be a large opportunity for ODF.
- Social Costs and Benefits within rural communities need to be weighed more heavily as ODF and the BOF consider new plan alternatives. The deteriorating conditions of roads, struggling school districts and other services in these rural communities is evident.
- ODF needs more revenue to resume fundamental land management activities (inventory maintenance and management and young growth management and silviculture).

Economic Value

- The market value of these forests collectively is in excess of \$5.0 billion dollars. What is an acceptable rate of return on this asset? Who sets the return criteria and target? Does the BOF require ODF to provide the rate of return regularly based upon revenues and forecasts? Does ODF inform the BOF of changes to asset value based upon changes in Forest Policy Decisions?
- The value of the Northern Six Districts is at risk as evidenced by the situation on the Elliot Forest. This forest is an example of multiple years of policy choices and decisions that resulted in greatly diminished value over time. The value of the Northern Districts is at risk (An Elliot North) without a major change in policy and direction. I believe this BOF can do better than that!