



Chair Imeson, State forester Daugherty, and members of the Board, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. For the record, my name is Seth Barnes, and I'm the Director of Forest Policy at the Oregon Forest & Industries Council.

I would like to start by thanking the department for allowing stakeholders an opportunity to review materials and give feedback at their State Forest Public meetings following the FTLAC meetings. These have been good engagements, with productive conversation. I would like to focus some attention for a moment on one piece of information from the ODF presentation at our last meeting- the volume projections.

According to the most recent data shared with the group, these forests contain approximately 17 billion board feet (BBF) of timber volume. Yet, under the current FMP more than 50% of that volume is unavailable for harvest. While these numbers are fascinating, we are still left wondering how these projections came to be. I would remind the board that in May of 2015, ODF reduced its standing timber inventory by over 1.5 BBF and its estimated annual growth by approximately 20% from levels reported in the 2014 annual SLI, and in public testimony from ODF staff. This reduction in volume reduced the 2014 inventory from 15.1 BBF to 13.6 BBF. Annual growth was also reduced from the 2014 SLI report of 414 million board feet to 328 million board feet per year. Notwithstanding specific direction from this board in May 2015 to explain these adjustments, we still have not been provided with that explanation. Fast forward to the numbers that were reported for 2018, and we are convinced that the 2015 reductions were done in error. For ODF's 2018 projections to be accurate, annual growth since the 2006 H&H effort through 2017 has averaged well over 400 million board feet per year. Not only has the agency been harvesting just slightly more than 50% of annual growth, but also the residual inventory on the forest continues to increase and advance in age. Unless policy is changed, our NW Oregon State Forests will become the "Elliott North" and that would be an unconscionable outcome.

As a board, and as stakeholders, it is difficult for all of us to engage with any sort of clarity if these numbers change without explanation. These numbers are fundamental in the process. For instance, what now appears to be clearly faulty information, was used in 2015 to completely halt the conversation around the 70/30 compromise. From my view, the entire reason that we are not sitting here today finalizing a new State FMP centered around the land allocation approach is because a decision was made to use severely deflated data to model the tenants of that plan. That data has now been updated, but no attempt has been made to reconcile the flawed information that was presented previously. We remain convinced that if the 70/30 compromise had been properly implemented, we would be well on our way of accomplishing both goals of increased financial viability and enhanced conservation outcomes.

In conclusion, from ODF's data, its undeniably clear the opportunity to sustainably increase harvest levels is not only a certainty, but also an essential action needed to keep the value of this incredible asset from going to zero. We request the BOF direct staff to expeditiously develop an alternative FMP

that addresses the reality of the need to increase harvest levels to properly manage this asset for both today's citizens and future generations.

Additionally, we once again request the BOF insist on complete transparency around all assumptions and calculations for sound policy debate and for the needs of stakeholders.

Seth Barnes