

## **Board of Forestry Subcommittee on ODF Alternative Management Plan Concepts**

### **Testimony of W. Ray Jones**

#### **Vice President of Resources-Stimson Lumber Company**

**April 8, 2015**

#### **(Comments on ODF's Land Allocation Alternative)**

As the process continues in development of a New Land Allocation Concept for management of the six ODF Districts, several thoughts continue to resonate with me. Some of the thoughts are prompted as I look back to the original Stakeholder Process and some are a continuation of thought most recently prompted by the newest Stakeholder Input summarized by ODF last week. All of these thoughts are in the vein of reaching the dual goals as laid out by Governor Kitzhaber when the Stakeholder process began nearly two years ago. I respectfully submit the following comments to the Subcommittee.

#### **Increasing Financial Viability:**

- The new plan must generate at least an incremental harvest of 100,000 MBF per year to generate viability for ODF and to meet expectations for the beneficiary counties. Specifically, a 100,000 MBF increase in harvest per year at a \$350/MBF stumpage value will create a total annual revenue increase of \$35.0 million dollars. ODF's share would be \$12.6 million and the counties share would be \$22.4 million. The harvest alternative must bring forward a minimum total annual harvest of 320,000 MBF per year versus the current harvest of 220,000 MBF per year.
- The Timber Harvest Optimization Model developed during the Stakeholder process, with current FMP buffers, developed a harvest of 366 MM per year with a total annual revenue increase of \$51.0 million; ODF's share would be \$18.3 million and the counties share at \$32.7 million. This revenue generation is possible and should be a benchmark for comparison to any new plan.
- The BOF and Subcommittee need to give ODF direction around planning fundamentals in order to build models that develop the New Allocation Plan:
  - Identify and deduct roads, stream buffers, non-forest, inoperable, known owl and murrelet nesting sites, and high land slide risk areas from the gross acreage on each of the six districts. This gives a baseline land base to work from and provides a comparison to any other incremental policy directed changes.
  - Any further set-asides are policy choices that need to be sanctioned by the Subcommittee and full BOF before beginning any modeling exercises.
  - Riparian set asides and resultant modeling runs should include FPA and current FMP Buffers. These two runs coupled with the baseline land base demonstrates how those two policy choices impact financial viability. This also shows the opportunity cost and benefit to riparian species that benefit from that decision.

#### **Increasing Conservation Outcomes:**

- Conservation increases will be demonstrated in both the production and conservation zones as ODF implements a new plan. A new plan with increased harvest does not detract from

- conservation increases but is additive. Species with early and mid-seral dependency seem to be overlooked many times as an example. Both areas within the Land Allocation Plan work in concert to provide conservation increases. Too many times we forget “function” versus a “place based” measure. Zeroing in on only “how many acres are set aside” versus the function of both emphasis areas could be a trap in the context of a new plan. I would encourage ODF to talk about function of the new plan in full context of what the conservation priorities are over the whole landscape.
- The Conservation Fund idea that Dave Ivanoff and I had in mind was to **incrementally** increase conservation benefits through increased funding availability. This idea was never an idea of mitigation. The limiting factor in completing more restoration, monitoring and habitat improvement projects is money. There are no shortage of project ideas within watersheds according to Watershed Councils, ODF, ODFW, citizens and companies. The idea was to tax harvest to fund more projects. Further, these conservation projects, monitoring and science needs could be directed on ODF land or other ownerships where the money is needed most to accomplish the greatest benefit.
  - A landscape/watershed level assessment of needs should be part of the New Land Allocation Plan. To this point, whether the topic is road inventory, riparian habitat/ improvement or terrestrial considerations, ODF needs the money as part of their normal budget to address these areas. Operating at current levels will not derive the conservation outcomes that we all want.

**Closing:**

I would ask the Subcommittee to use the FPA as a baseline for riparian buffers in the modeling efforts. This is a very important comparative when looking at modeling runs both from a financial and conservation point of view. It is a way for the Subcommittee and the BOF to quantify and measure policy decisions and resultant modeling runs that are developed for the new Land Allocation Model. The second model run would employ the current FMP Buffers; creating another way of comparing and quantifying financial and conservation outputs.

In order for the new Land Allocation Plan to succeed it must meet both the Financial and Conservation Goals. I believe it is possible to do both. I hope this testimony today is helpful as you give ODF direction to begin the task of modeling the new plan, and a way of measuring the cost and benefits of policy decisions.