



Chair Imeson, State Forester Daugherty, and members of the Board, for the record my name is Seth Barnes, and I am a Forester with the Oregon Forest & Industries Council. Since this is the first time I am appearing before several of you, I thought I would offer a brief introduction.

OFIC is the trade association that represents the forest industry in Oregon. We represent the vast majority of large forest landowners and wood manufacturing facilities in Oregon. I serve as OFIC's Director of Forest Policy. I'm a product of Oregon, born in Astoria while my father was working as a forester managing State Lands in Clatsop County. I was raised in the industry on our small family tree farm in Yamhill county. I have strong family ties to the coastal region as both of my sets of grandparents lived out their lives in the Florence area and had ties to the fishing and forest industries for many years. I received my degree in Forest Management from OSU and went to work in Washington State managing state lands and working on forest practices issues. I was there for 12 years before returning home to work on similar issues here in Oregon in 2015.

I am here today to testify regarding the proposed Goals, Strategies and Measurable Outcomes document that you have before you. There are 2 primary issues I wish to spend a few moments discussing, and both of these are issues this board has heard me and others touch on in the past; first- the need for alternatives and a clear baseline for comparison, and second- metrics and tangible outcomes.

A linear process vs comparing alternatives

The path being proposed to you here is a single alternative proposal to be developed line upon line in a layered fashion. A typical planning process involves the development of alternatives, each with a different set of variables associated with them. Of course, the purpose for bringing forward alternatives is to allow stakeholders and decision makers the opportunity to consider varying tradeoffs- it provides opportunities for discussing common ground while also considering different methods at accomplishing goals. Considering alternatives would not only provide better understanding of the relative costs associated with choices, but it would also provide agency staff with a variety of potential outcomes that could then aid discussions within the context of HCP negotiations.

As one alternative, I strongly recommend measuring to the standards required under the Oregon Forest Practices Act as an appropriate benchmark for comparison. As staff prepares additional alternative choices you would then be equipped to weigh the options and have informed discussions regarding tradeoffs and the future of these resources and the communities that depend on them.

Metrics and tangible outcomes

The second issue I bring up is the need for actual metrics. What you have before you is so generic in nature that it doesn't allow for a conversation where both parties understand one another. For example, the document uses words like "revenue to contribute towards financial viability" and "appropriate blend of ...outcomes"- at some point we are going to need to be more specific in terms of metrics so folks have an understanding of what is being discussed and voted on. Without this level of

specificity I fear that Board members may feel compelled to approve certain provisions with a fundamental lack of understanding as to what those decisions may

In closing I would remind you that these forests have real value, and no one understands this more than folks who live in the rural communities surrounded by state forests. As a Forester that has spent many years working on these issues I am proud of this industry and our ability to manage forests for multiple values. This is not an either-or scenario, we can have clean water, abundant habitat, strong fish runs, and robust timber harvest from our State Forests. And as a Board of Forestry you should expect those outcomes.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comment,

Seth Barnes