

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: David Gould <cbto1974@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:51 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL; Kevin Bogatin; mshorb@powersschools.com; WALKER Vicki * DSL; Dave and Barb Sullivan
Subject: State Land Board Dec 13 Meeting Testimony

I want to point out that your Habitat Conservation Plan ignores the historic wild fire history of the Elliott Forest. It needs to address the dead wood that accumulates after a wild fire so it can be removed quickly. Your plan as written puts the lives of our community at risk of a Holliday Fire Event. FOR THAT REASON I DO NOT APPROVE OF THE HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN AS WRITTEN.

I want to point out you are not using a FAIR MARKET VALUE TO DECOUPLE FROM THE COMMON SCHOOL FUND. CARBON CREDITS ARE VALUABLE TO THE CHILDREN.

David Gould
Advocates for School Trust Lands
North Bend School District #13
Powers School District



KALMIOPSIS AUDUBON SOCIETY

P.O. Box 1265 • Port Orford OR • 97465

Dec. 12, 2022

To: Oregon State Land Board

Re: Elliott State Forest

Greetings:

I am writing on behalf of the Kalmiopsis Audubon Society. Our group has more than 400 members in Curry County who support conservation of habitat for birds, fish, and wildlife in southwestern Oregon. We also support the critical role of mature forests in carbon sequestration and in conservation of clean water for fisheries and communities.

Given the important remaining forest habitat, clean water, and carbon sequestration values of the Elliott State Forest, we strongly support the ongoing effort to find a better path forward for this public land.

Ahead of your upcoming meeting, we are writing to express support for

- The final decoupling of the Elliott State Forest and East Hakki Ridge forestlands from the Common School Fund
- the proposed research forest boundary, including the East Hakki Ridge forestlands

Thank you for your efforts to establish a promising new path for the Elliott State Forest.

Sincerely,

Ann Vileisis
President, Kalmiopsis Audubon Society

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Andy Gallagher <avg@peak.org>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:48 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Elliot State forest

Dear DSL

I have been alerted to this issue of the makeup of the governing board of the Elliott Authority. This board should represent more forest stakeholders than only the timber industry. And to this end I support making a more balanced board of much broader interests than wood products.

This land belongs to the whole state and not simply the timber industry.

Thanks

Andy Gallagher

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: doc <doc@entropy2.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:47 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Representative Board for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

In this letter, I want to express my worries regarding the people you may soon pick to be on the governing board of the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The appendix of your meeting information does not include anyone with experience in forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change, which are all essential. Having two candidates from the same family, with their credentials in the Douglas Co. timber industry, does not reflect the diverse range of progressive forestry knowledge present in our state. Moreover, the majority of the candidates have already been engaged in the OSU-DSL Elliott process, creating a bias for the DSL, OSU, and their conservative, "working forest" research plan. I strongly suggest you choose impartial individuals who will exemplify all Oregonians by paying attention to forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat, and other ecological services.

Please, I urge you to consider the importance of including a diverse group of voices.

Sincerely,
Michael Tobin

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Becky Garrett <becky.g777@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:41 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better Board for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. **The list** in Appendix A of your meeting packet **fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change.** Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

More personally written comments will be sent later, but my understanding is that you planned make the decision this morning. I implore you to delay naming the board now, and allow for more public comment time. Making this important decision at this busy holiday time is unacceptable.

Very Sincerely, Becky Garrett



**SIERRA
CLUB**
FOUNDED 1892

OREGON CHAPTER SIERRA CLUB

1821 SE ANKENY ST • PORTLAND, OR 97214
PHONE (503) 238-0442 • FAX (503) 238-6281
OREGON.CHAPTER@SIERRACLUB.ORG
WWW.OREGON.SIERRACLUB.ORG

December 12, 2022

Governor Kate Brown, Secretary Shemia Fagan, Treasurer Tobias Read
% Department of State Lands
775 Summer Street NE, Suite 100
Salem, OR 97301-1279

Dear State Land Board Members,

On behalf of the Oregon Chapter Sierra Club's 73,000 members and supporters, we are writing to express our concerns about the proposed appointments to the board of directors for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority (ESRFA) (item 5 of your December 13th, 2022, meeting agenda).

When Senate Bill 1546 establishing the ESRFA was originally proposed, we were concerned about undemocratic provisions in the bill, which enshrined into law many of the same issues the Oregon Chapter Sierra Club raised concerns about in [our 2020 comments](#) during the planning process. Specifically, the bill was designed in a way that prevents you (our elected leaders) from choosing your own, independent candidates for the board of directors governing this public research forest. Instead, OSU, the DSL director, and the existing Elliott Advisory Committee (EAC) were given the sole authority to choose prospective candidates. Unfortunately, these parties have often demonstrated bias in favor of the timber industry during their work on the Elliott. This underlying bias is clearly reflected in the choice of candidates (shown in Appendix A of your meeting packet).

At least two of the candidates appear to have financial conflicts of interest that would reasonably influence their decisions on the board of directors. In addition, having two members of the same family with traditional timber credentials fails to reflect the broad spectrum of progressive forestry interests and expertise in our state. A majority of candidates for the board have strong ties to the regional Coos or Douglas County economy and/or local government—even though the ESRF belongs to *all* Oregonians. Its board of directors ought to reflect statewide representation and a diversity of interests. Finally, there are no experts in forest carbon or climate change among the candidates. This glaring oversight fails to align with values that Oregon's public and Oregon leaders prioritize. The three candidates with conservation backgrounds will have a clear minority of power on the board of directors. This is contrary to the public interest and the stated goals for this research forest.

SB 1546 also requires that all board candidates must have, "...*demonstrated interest in the success of the mission and management policies of the forest*". This provision seems intended to exclude anyone who might have dissenting or alternative views about the stewardship of this public forest. We see the impact of this insular approach is reflected in the proposed board appointments, with six of the nine candidates having been previously involved in the Elliott planning process. The bill also gives OSU sole discretion to accept changes to its research plan. With substantial timber industry funding and a long history of advocacy on behalf of their industry sponsors, College leaders are unlikely to modify their research plan to position the Elliott as a true "world-class research forest," one that is addressing the dual crises of climate change and biodiversity loss as its primary focus. The non-democratic governance provisions and the transfer of members from the EAC to the board of directors clearly fail to live up to the Elliott Advisory Committee's own stated key element of transparency and public participation¹, and fail to serve the public interest in this process.

While many have tried to frame SB 1546 as a "conservation victory," we remain deeply concerned about the substantial reliance on clearcutting (over 14,000 acres) and destruction (of more than 3,000 acres) of older stands in the name of marbled murrelet research. It is misleading to maintain that this kind of "research" will lead to ecologically sustainable stewardship of our forests. We urge you to guide the ESRFA away from this outdated approach of forested lands that are actively managed for timber production. These forests are already working, providing clean air and water, resistance to climate change and forest fires, and vital ecological habitat. A "world-class" research forest should prioritize ecological values, not the status quo of active forest management.

Respectfully,



Debra Higbee-Sudyka *she/her/hers*
Chair, Conservation Committee
Oregon Chapter Sierra Club
Cell: 541-554-6979
ConservationCommittee@oregon.sierraclub.org
SierraClub.org/Oregon

cc: Tina Kotek, Governor-Elect

¹https://www.oregon.gov/dsl/Land/Documents/DSL_Elliott%20State%20Research%20Forest_One%20Pager.pdf
"Legislation to Keep the Elliott Publicly Owned: SB 1546 Collaborative work with the Elliott State Research Forest Advisory Committee identified key elements that served as the basis for SB 1546: ;;; • Assurances that the forest is governed with transparency and public accountability, including third party right of enforcement and public access to the decision making process. • Codify commitments to conservation and other public values. ..."

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Dan Jaffee <dsjaffee@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:25 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Comment on board of directors for Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board members,

I am writing to express my grave concerns about the prospective candidates you are proposing to appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority.

The list in your meeting packet startlingly does not include any experts at all in the critical areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family with timber credentials creates a strong appearance of cronyism and corruption, and grievously fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state.

In addition, most of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and what I believe is a regressive, "working forest" research plan.

I urge you to instead select independent candidates for the ESRFA, who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Dan Jaffee
Portland, OR 97211

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: matt stevenson <msstev731@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:24 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,
Matt Stevenson

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: James Hagan <josejim55@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:14 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Elliot Forest

Hey Folks

How about taking the action needed to protect this forest in its entirety. If you travel the coastal forests of Oregon it is apparent that this one is a true value in its existence. Let's make it a coastal resource for real research to all Universities that might be interested in doing so. No logging. Thanks. Jim

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Ian Stephens <stephensbpe@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:00 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Ian Stephens

From: David Bean <davidchinookbean@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022, 10:59 PM

To: MASIBA Meliah M * DSL <Meliah.M.MASIBA@dsl.oregon.gov>

Subject: land board testimony for the Elliot Forest

I know little of your inner politics, but as a 75 year old Oregonian and retired carpenter I know something of wood forestry and common sense.

Responding to public sentiment can be harrowing, with so many opinions, and so many ungrounded folks.

I grew up with fire bosses and head foresters as family friends and have seen the quality of wood decrease and the size and quickness of fires increase in my span of years, Why is that? And will you change that trend?

Big trees hold water on location in stem, root and soil; baby trees are all branches and osmotic pump. Of course a stand of adolescent trees are dry! It is not the weather, although hot winds don't help. The dry is baked into the cake with clearcut ransack of soil culture, and the lack of elders to inoculate young trees, underground. Trees are not crops, and mature slower than humans; take a look at my great grandfather's pictures to get a sense of scale of the water tanks which trees represent. Augustus W Ericson. Google his pictures. He supplied pictures of NW giant trees for the Columbia Exposition in 1893.

Big trees keep water on location, and when there are enough of them the land can withstand fire, as it has for thousands of years. The practice of even aged stands of baby trees desiccate the soil, spark the incendiary the conditions already made dangerous by the hot winds of the greenhouse effect. The Indians knew this by honoring the salmon, which feed the trees, and they learned it by mistakes that they made. Can you recognize the policy mistakes that has resulted from land board decisions?

The Elliot as you know is a national treasure as well as an Oregon one. If you do not include new insights, it is not inconceivable that parts of Oregon can emulate the Gobi. It was once forest, and now is desert. That mature culture of ancient China screwed up too. Honor the old trees with extensive root systems and find people that can make long term health of our state a birthright for our children.

My father was an architect and my grand daughter is an architect. The wood I used in my twenties is not available of equal quality to my grand daughter's projects as they were to me. Can your land board remedy that sad trend?

David Bean
3100 SE Tenth Ave.
Portland, Oregon, 97202
503 230-9698 hm n msg
503 415 9202 smartphone
davidchinookbean@gmail.com

David Bean has worked long to see forests get healthy. I hope you can see his work accomplished after he is gone

**Cascade Policy Institute
4850 SW Scholls Ferry Road, #103
Portland, OR 97225**

December 12, 2022

State Land Board
775 Summer Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Land Board members:

Cascade Policy Institute is a nonprofit policy research organization, supported by people in all 36 Oregon counties. Most of those individuals pay Oregon income taxes, and some are parents of public school students. Thus, they are affected by the Land Board's management decisions regarding Common School Trust Lands.

I am writing to oppose the staff recommendation for decoupling the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund. My opposition is based on two concerns.

First, the appraised value of the Elliott is artificially low.

Second, the Board's method for compensating the Common School Fund for the loss of timber revenue associated with the ESF harms CSF beneficiaries.

Each of the two factors represent a breach of your fiduciary duty to CSF beneficiaries.

I. The appraisal of the ESF is artificially low.

The DSL staff report states on page 3:

A valid, current appraisal substantiates the value owed to the Common School Fund in place of these forestland assets, and payments exceeding that valuation have been deposited in the Fund.

The most recent appraisal from Mason, Bruce & Girard (MBG) does not substantiate the true value owed to the CSF. That is made clear in the cover letter from MBG dated August 22, 2022, in which Messrs. Lord and Dewees state:

In this appraisal, the type of value to be determined is "Investment Value" rather than "Market Value." This is due to the 2019 ruling by the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon in *Cascadia Wildlands v. Oregon Dept. of State Lands and Seneca*

Jones Timber Company, LLC. In the decision, the court upheld the constitutionality of ORS 530.450, which has the effect of eliminating the potential for a sale of the ESF, in part or in whole, to the private market. The definition of Market Value is premised on the basis that such a sale is possible. Market value, therefore, cannot be ascertained since the subject property cannot be sold to the private market.

The Land Board relies on the Supreme Court ruling as the reason why the value of the ESF is so low, but long before that court decision, the Land Board was suppressing the market value of the ESF by imposing unnecessary management restrictions.

For instance, the 2016 appraisal conducted by MGB stated that the ESF would be worth \$220.8 million on December 31st of that year. But the Board had place four major sideboards on any bid, which it referred to as required “public benefits.” The minimum level of benefits were:

- (1) At least 50 percent of the purchased timberland needed to remain open for public recreational use;
- (2) No-cut buffers of 120 feet on each side of fish-bearing streams had to be left permanently untouched;
- (3) At least 25% of the older stands of trees had to be left intact; and
- (4) At least 40 full-time jobs annually had to be provided over the first 10 years of new ownership.

The Board also stated that the \$220.8 valuation was the *maximum* amount it would accept. If a prospective buyer offered even \$1 over the stated valuation, the offer would be rejected as “non-responsive.”

Clearly this was not a “Market Value” protocol as described in the MBG letter of August 22, 2022. It was an attempt to create the illusion of competitive bidding, without allowing it.

We know that the appraisal submitted in August of this year – ranging from \$99.6 million to \$180 million - is artificially low, because all previous valuations have been much higher. In the DSL Proposed Asset Management Plan published in August 1995, the Department estimated that under the preferred alternative for the ESF developed by the Oregon Department of Forestry, the annual income from timber harvesting would be “\$16 million for the foreseeable future.” According to DSL, these cash flows implied a forest asset value of \$300-\$400 million.

However, the Department noted that this was not the same as market value. The Department stated (p. V-8):

The open-market value is likely to be at least twice that amount, however, *assuming no conditions or qualifications beyond those applicable to private forest lands in western Oregon* (emphasis added). The \$850 million value shown in Table V-1 should be considered a minimum expectation (a starting point) for the Forest would likely sell for on the open market.

What has changed since 1995? Certainly not the available supply of timber. Annual growth of timber has likely exceeded harvest in every year since then, with harvest levels at near-zero since 2017. If the CSF was worth an estimated \$850 in 1995, it should be worth ***more than \$1 billion today***.

The 2019 Supreme Court decision subsequently created a barrier to a market-based sale, but the SLB has made no effort to mitigate that problem. Mitigation was available by simply requesting the legislature to amend ORS 530.450 to allow a sale to private purchasers. Given that Oregon is effectively a one-party state, and each member of the Board is in the majority party, it would not have been difficult to introduce such legislation.

As fiduciaries of the Common School Trust Lands, this is the least you could have done for beneficiaries any time between 2019 and 2022. You didn't even try.

Instead, you ***rejected*** a cash offer of \$220.8 million from a private consortium in 2017 – after initially accepting it – and then conjured the fantasy that Oregon State University could be talked into accepting the ESF as a “research forest.”

Not surprisingly, after several years of due diligence, OSU declined to take ownership of the ESF, knowing that it would be a money-losing liability.

Obviously the SLB is capable of successful legislative advocacy. Over the past five years, the Board and/or the Governor's office have succeeded in persuading the legislature to take at least the following actions related to the ESF:

1. Authorize the sale of Certificates of Participation in the amount of \$100 million, as a down payment on compensating the Common School Fund for the loss of timber harvest revenue;
2. Enact SB 1546, to create the ESFRA; and
3. Appropriate \$121 million of general fund money to further compensate the CSF, up to a level of \$221 million, the assumed value of the ESF.

These legislative actions did not benefit CSTL beneficiaries; they actually ***made them worse off***. Amending ORS 530.450 to allow an open-market sale would have resulted in a much larger amount of money deposited in the CSF, and all of those funds would have flowed from a source other than taxpayers.

II. The proposed methods of compensating the CSF for the loss of timber harvesting revenue force CSTL beneficiaries to buy an asset they already own.

After receiving legislative authorization to sell \$100 million of Certificates of Participation, the State Treasury sold them in May 2019 at an interest rate of 3.83 percent. Debt service of roughly \$145.9 million will have to be paid by Oregon taxpayers over a period of 20 years.

A subset of those taxpayers will be public school parents, teachers, and school board members – the people who are supposed to be benefiting from timber revenues from the ESF. Instead, they must now pay \$145 million in debt service.

The legislature also appropriated \$121 million in general fund revenues for the same purpose, which results in the same problem. CSTL beneficiaries pay taxes into the state's General Fund. The Land Board has created the illusion of holding school beneficiaries harmless by depositing \$121 million of General Fund revenues into the CSF, but the money comes from beneficiaries themselves.

Even if investing \$221 million in new CSF deposits somehow exceeds the liability of debt service and annual income tax payments over the long term, the gains will be much smaller than if the SLB had simply sold the ESF at auction prior to 2019. This fact is an obvious breach of fiduciary duty by Board members.

Why markets matter to school finance

The foregoing is somewhat complicated, but there is a much simpler way to demonstrate why the Board's management of the ESF has harmed beneficiaries.

Last June, the annual charitable auction of a lunch with Warren Buffett resulted in a record bid on eBay of \$19 million. This was four times the winning bid from the previous year. Although most people would probably not value a lunch with Mr. Buffett at \$19 million, that's exactly what it was worth to one buyer. And Mr. Buffett only needed one buyer.

That's why a market process matters. No one needs to guess the value of the asset; it is revealed by competitive bidding. The State Land Board has gone to extraordinary lengths over the past decade to prevent such bidding from occurring with regard to the ESF.

Fiduciary Duty to Beneficiaries

As soon as the Elliott began to lose money in 2013, the SLB stated in public that the Board was at risk of being sued by CSF beneficiary groups for breach of fiduciary duty. All three members agreed with this assessment, including our current Governor. That was the reasoning behind the 2015 decision to sell the entire forest. The Board subsequently received a valid offer for \$220.8 million from the Lone Rock Timber consortium.

As recently as February 2017, two out of three SLB members continued to argue that the ESF needed to be sold as a matter of fiduciary duty. It was only when the State Treasurer reversed his position in May 2017 that fiduciary duty ceased to be a concern for the Board.

As it stands now, the Board is breaching its fiduciary duty in at least three ways:

- The Board is not seeking a legislative fix for the 2019 Supreme Court decision;
- The Board is backfilling the CSF with \$221 million that imposes ongoing tax liabilities for CSF beneficiaries; and
- The SLB is supporting the creation of a new research entity that will require at least \$25 million in start-up funds from taxpayers, plus ongoing taxpayer subsidies for operating losses that will likely continue to infinity.

This is your last chance to properly embrace your role as fiduciaries for the Common School Trust Lands. I encourage you to take it.

Sincerely,

John A. Charles, Jr.
President & CEO

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Brian Wake <brian.wake1957@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 8:33 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Brian Wake

Sent from my iPhone



The League of Women Voters of Oregon is a 102-year-old grassroots nonpartisan political organization that encourages informed and active participation in government. We envision informed Oregonians participating in a fully accessible, responsive, and transparent government to achieve the common good. LWVOR Legislative Action is based on advocacy positions formed through studies and member consensus. The League never supports or opposes any candidate or political party.

December 12, 2022

To: The Honorable Governor Kate Brown
The Honorable Secretary of State Shemia Fagan
The Honorable State Treasurer Tobias Read
landboard.testimony@dsl.oregon.gov

Re: **Elliott State Research Forest Celebration with more work to do**

The League of Women Voters of Oregon believes that natural resources such as forests, and the animals and plants living within them, should be managed as interrelated parts of life-supporting ecosystems. We have positions in support of Parks and Water Quality as well as positions on Forestry that apply to this issue. Additionally, we support a stable state system for financing public schools. **Our members have been actively involved in assuring that this very special Oregon treasure, the Elliott State Forest, is maintained in public hands.**

In 2015, we 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 supported the \$100 million in bonding to help “buy” assets not otherwise protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and any Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). **We support continuation of the HCP**—an HCP that can be upheld in court and that protects Oregon’s iconic salmon, northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet and others as they are recognized as attempting to survive—even thrive--in this forest.

In December of 2019, we expressed appreciation for the work of the Advisory Committee and the Draft Set of Principles developed by the Committee. Those Principles have been included in **SB 1546** (2022) as foundational to the formation of this new proposed public Authority.

In December of 2020, we shared with the State Land Board our opinion that the final issues to be resolved were Governance and Finance. We have followed the work of the Elliott State Research Forest (ESRF) Advisory Committee as they worked with Oregon State University (OSU) and the Dept. of State Lands (DSL) since the December 2020 decision of the State Land Board. We believe that the Governance issue was addressed in **SB 1546** and is also being addressed today.

In February of 2022, we supported **SB 1546 Enrolled** that established the Elliott State Research Forest and provided funds to decouple the Forest from the Common School Fund. The bill additionally established the Elliott State Research Forest Authority with sideboards with the expectation that OSU will take on the research and management of the Forest under contract with the Authority. While the bill requirements need to be completed and today is one of those

steps, the bill provides clear guidance for the new Authority. **We appreciate the volunteers who may be appointed to that Authority today.**

As for Finance, we continue to have concerns, although OSU believes they can manage the research on the forest while not over-harvesting beyond what is in the draft Forest Management Plan. OSU and the yet to be adopted FMP and HCP will clearly guide any harvest. It is critical that the new management (the Authority) keeps a close eye on the revenue and expenses. Balancing the harvest revenues and other grant funding with doing the proposed research, providing recreational and educational opportunities and on-going management of the Forest is a big charge.

We want to recognize the incredible work by the members of the Elliott Forest Advisory Committee and the staff at OSU and DSL who have provided numerous public outreach efforts and listened to that input these past years. Mostly, we want to thank **the Land Board members** for your tireless effort to find a public ownership solution for this iconic Forest. Governor Brown and Treasurer Read have been here since the inception of this journey. **Thank you.** We hope that Director Walker can someday soon take a walk in the Forest with her grandchildren and remember her teenage years when playing in the river and creeks was a summer pastime. And we look forward to other Oregonians joining her in that journey.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide support for your decisions.



Rebecca Gladstone
LWVOR President



Peggy Lynch
LWVOR Natural Resources Coordinator

Cc: Dept. of State Lands Director Vicki Walker (Vicki.Walker@dsl.oregon.gov)
Dean Tom DeLuca, Head of OSU Dept. of Forestry (tom.deluca@oregonstate.edu)
Jason Miner, Governor's Natural Resources Policy Director (Jason.Miner@oregon.gov)
Molly Woon, Secretary of State's Policy Advisor (Molly.WOON@oregon.gov)
Ryan Mann, State Treasurer's Policy Advisor (Ryan.Mann@ost.state.or.us)
Alice Carlson and Frances Smith, League of Women Voters of Coos County Co-Presidents (lwwcoos@gmail.com)
Robin Wisdom, League of Women Voters of Umpqua Valley President (info@lwwuv.org)

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Berthe Leodra Palmrose <isus66739@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 8:02 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board, I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services. Sincerely,
Berthe Leodra Palmrose
Corvallis Or

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Kat Hampton <khampton228@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 7:43 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent ALL Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

We have had enough with the good old boys clubs in this country and in this state. It is time for some real change, and some real challenge as the world slips over the edge of catastrophic climate change.

Sincerely,

Kat Hampton,
Oregonian

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: bennerp@peak.org
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 1:15 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Cc: SMITH Arin N * DSL; bennerp@peak.org
Subject: Testimony: to State Land Board re. Elliott State Research Forest Authority Board, 12-12-2022

Regarding: Testimony to the December 12, 2022 State Land Board meeting
Elliott State Research Forest Authority Board

Dear Oregon State Land Board,

I am a river ecologist/historian who has serious concerns with what appears to be the lack of diversity of forestry and landscape expertise found in the list of candidates for the governing body (Board of Directors) for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority.

For example, it appears that there are no forest carbon, ecological forestry, fishery, or climate change experts among the candidates. I just learned of this issue this evening and so I hope that I am mistaken, but I fear that there is significant merit to my concern.

It would then appear that there could be a limited ability of visioning "outside of the box" by using existing and future knowledge and expertise for managing landscapes.

Of course, this board must have the knowledge to pass forward the history of the forest. But, it appears that this potential Board could be much less likely to balance all that we currently understand about the complexity of systems such as these, and the inter-woven "sister" ecosystems and landscapes such as the streams, ground water, and the near-coastal ocean.

I urge you to postpone the decision of selecting this Board of Director's members, and instead choose a more diverse set of candidates who will make up a board that will competently consider topics such as forest carbon, climate change, fish and wildlife habitat and other ecological services. A key goal is to have *individuals who have the native talents and breadth of knowledge who can truly think contextually. This includes, but it not limited to the ability to understand the connections between smaller and larger systems.*

Hypothetical examples: By second nature the board should be knowledgeable enough to be able to think broadly to ask about the amount and value of large wood inputs into the Umpqua and possibly Coos estuaries, the central Oregon coast beaches, and the ocean from the Coast Range rivers from the Forest. Historically, there was a tremendous amount of wood that found its way from the Columbia and Oregon watersheds down to these coastal ecosystems. Or, the board should be aware of research that verified the connection between watersheds and the ocean as nutrients are brought up to the Forest watershed by spawning salmon.

So, thank you for your time, and please also think forwardly and contextually to create a board that has a true diverse knowledge, skills, and perspectives.

Patricia Benner
River Ecologist and Historian



Margaret Bird
Advocates for School Trust Lands
1251 Walden Lane, Draper, Utah 84020
margaretraybird@gmail.com
801-597-6701

December 11, 2022

Oregon State Land Board
care of landboard.testimony@dsl.oregon.gov

Dear Oregon State Land Board Trustees:

I am on the Board of Directors for Advocates for School Trust Lands (ASLT), a national non-profit educational organization founded in 1999 whose mission is "to ensure that States fulfill their fiduciary duty to the common school trust beneficiaries."

I am writing today because an action item on your December 13th Agenda says the State Land Board will consider "**decoupling**" the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund based on an "**investment value**." These two terms deserve further consideration:

1. "**Decoupling**" is a euphemism for "selling." If Oregon transfers the Elliott State Forest from the Common School Fund to the Elliott State Research Forest Authority, then from the perspective of Oregon's schools, the Forest will have been sold in a **self-dealing transaction**. Investopedia says, "Self-dealing is when a fiduciary acts in their own best interest in a transaction, rather than in the best interest of their clients. It represents a conflict of interest and an illegal act that can lead to litigation, penalties, and termination of employment for those who commit it."
2. "**Investment value**" does not have a common definition in ordinary business affairs. The Mason, Bruce & Girard appraisal commissioned by the Department of State Lands (DSL) says their **investment value**: "represents the value of the property to the State of Oregon as measured by a set of investment criteria that are specific to the State's continued ownership of the asset." To put this definition in an everyday context, suppose you agree to sell a Ford pickup truck on consignment with a used car dealership, and the truck's Kelly Blue Book value is \$70,000. Now assume the dealership sells your truck to the dealership owner's sister for an investment value of \$10,000. When you ask how the investment value was calculated, you are told, "The sister said she would only drive the truck on Sundays, so based on a set of investment

criteria that are specific to her ownership, your truck's investment value was only one-seventh of its market value.” In both this everyday example and the Elliott State Forest “decoupling” sale being considered by the State Land Board, the sale would be a **self-dealing transaction** based on a **low investment value**, so neither transaction would withstand a legal challenge.

If the State Land Board wants to sell the Elliott State Forest, the sale should be for **market value**; that is, for its highest-and-best use in an arm’s-length market-based transaction. In a recent public meeting about the Elliott State Forest's potential sale, Geoff Huntington, the DSL's Elliott State Forest Project Advisor, said DSL has not asked for or received a market-based appraisal for the Forest. The best evidence ASTL has seen suggests the Elliott State Forest’s market value is in the general range of 1 to 1.3 billion dollars (for example, see <http://www.keepthechildrensforest.org/market-value>). In contrast, the “investment value” calculated by Mason, Bruce & Girard was only \$99,600,000, or less than one-tenth the Forest’s market value.

ASTL prefers to work with state governments in a cooperative manner, and for over 20 years, we have been very successful with this approach. Please feel free to reach out to us. Occasionally, informal methods have failed, and in those cases, we ask courts to enforce Trust Law.

The ASTL Board of Directors has voted to sue the State Land Board for Breach of Trust if you continue to move forward in a self-dealing manner. As a practical matter, the lawsuit would likely be filed by our Oregon-based affiliate, Oregon Advocates for School Trust Lands (OASTL, available at <https://www.oregonadvocatesforschooltrustlands.org/>). ASTL and OASTL have Oregon school districts, schoolchildren, and parents as members, and under the Doctrine of Associational Standing, courts have consistently allowed us to file lawsuits on behalf of our members.

Sincerely,

Margaret Bird, co founder of ASTL
(signed electronically)

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Jeff Cohen <jeffscohen@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:19 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan.

I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services. We are nearly out of time to reverse this extinction course we are being forced to endure. Money, power and control mean nothing when there is no viable ecosystem in which to live.

Sincerely,

Jeff Cohen
Corvallis Resident

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Danuta Karpinska <danutakarpinska108@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 11:02 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,
Danuta Karpinska PhD genetics)

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: dena nickell <3stones55@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 10:12 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely, Shirley Nickell

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Celeste Colasurdo <celeste.colasurdo33@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 9:09 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

Please consider my concerns! I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,
Celeste Colasurdo

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Leela Devi <leeladevidancing@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 8:29 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Leela Devi

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Linda Mallinoff <lmallinoff@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 8:03 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board, I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services. Sincerely,

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Jessica Denney <j_van09@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 7:27 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board, I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services. Sincerely,

Jessica Denney

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Martha Truninger <martha.truninger@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:49 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Martha Truninger

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Carol VanStrum <cvstrum@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:38 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am appalled by the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan, continuing OSU's notorious reputation as a bought and paid for tool of the timber industry. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,
Carol Van Strum

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Kali Gough <kaligough@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:15 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services. Sincerely,

Kali Gough

--

Take care,
Kali Gough

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Krakauer-Stewart <tkmm@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 4:50 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,
Karin Krakauer
tkmm@comcast.net

Sent from my iPhone

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Judy Riggs <judyriggs@peak.org>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 4:49 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

PLEASE make sure that there are people familiar with climate change, ecological forestry, and those with an understanding of forest carbon. Look at what is happening to our planet...we can no longer afford to do "business as usual" and ignore the fact that there has been no broad representation of good scientific knowledge. A state forest belongs to us ALL, and not for a few like-minded people.

Sincerely,

Judy Riggs

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Carol McClelland Fields <carolmcclelland44@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 3:10 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Carol McClelland Fields

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Allen Todd <allenwtodd@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 2:54 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Allen W. Todd
Corvallis, Or.

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Lisa Siewert <lisa.siewert@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 2:37 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,
Lisa Siewert

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Delores Porch <verandafay@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:51 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Elliott State Forest Board of Directors

I wish to have the following statement admitted to the public record.

I am opposed to the candidates to govern the Elliott State Forest. There are **NO forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change experts among the candidates.** This is a ruse to harvest as many trees as possible and use the money to "manage" the forest, just like OSU does to their "Research Forests".

Delores Porch
1212 34th Ave SE, #63
Albany, OR 97322

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: msc@scott-carson.com
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:49 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process.

This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Scott Carson
Concerned citizen

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Mark Noah <marknoah00@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 11:26 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: State Land Board Dec 13 Meeting Testimony

Delegates from many of the over 160 local community Granges in Oregon met for the annual convention of the Oregon State Grange in June of 2022 and adopted the following resolution regarding the Elliott State Forest:

Whereas: The Grange is a strong supporter of investment in public education benefiting rural timber economies; and

Whereas: There is a severe workforce shortage in all segments of the forest economy, including a shortfall of 6,000 wildfire fighters in the last fire season; and

Whereas: Recent forest studies show Oregon's westside forests to be among the most dense natural carbon sinks on the planet; and

Whereas: New ecosystem-based forestry practices promise significant ecological, economic, and recreational benefits; and

Whereas: These new developments in forest science promise creation of a significant number of new, well-paying forestry careers for Oregon schoolchildren; and

Whereas: The Oregon Department of State Lands is in the process of creating our nation's largest forest research institute in the Elliott State Forest. Therefore be it

Resolved: That the Oregon State Grange urges Oregon's Legislature to create a forestry academy in the Elliott State Forest to provide forest-related educational and research opportunities for school-aged children.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide testimony to the State Land Board regarding the Elliott State Forest.

--

Mark Noah
Oregon State Grange
Legislative Director
(c) 541 953-4155

OSG Office: 503 316-0106

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: barbara shamet <bshamet@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 11:26 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Elliott Reserve

Thank you for your work regarding the Elliott State Forest. My comments are included at the bottom of the Cascadia Wildlands comment form, please read, thanks. I will simply clarify, cut nothing over age 65 years within the Elliott, no poisonous herbicide sprays and no ITP's, taking critical wildlife. I support separating the Elliott from the Common School fund as the kids got a mere 12% on the dollar anyway and clear cutting was the excuse to make timber barrons rich, so, that needs to happen. To avoid further exploitation of our precious natural resource aka the Elliott, we must stay vigilant, and you can bet we Oregonians will. NOAA could provide federal dollars to ensure the protection of the Elliott and the Carbon Reserve it must become, Thank you again for your time, your service and your work regarding this great asset to the people, the state and the nation, in peace always, Barb Shamet, banks of the west Fork millicoma, for the Elliott

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Richard Barker <rbarker@asu.edu>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 8:49 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Richard Barker
11103 SW Davies Road
Beaverton, OR 97007

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Dianne Douglas <ddouglas@mainex1.asu.edu>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 8:49 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Dianne Douglas
2723 East Valencia Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85042

To: Oregon policymakers
From: Doug Pollock, Founder - Friends of OSU Old Growth
Re: Amendments to SB 1546 - Establishing an Elliott State Research Forest (ESRF)

February 3rd, 2022

Dear Policymakers,

I'm sure we all share a common desire to resolve the long-standing Elliott issue for the greater public good. Despite the overwhelming chorus of support, I'm compelled to point out some *glaring* problems with this bill - and the foundational document it embraces (**OSU's Research Proposal for the ESRF**). I urge you to consider these changes so that this *research forest* might truly become "world-class".

But first, I ask you to consider what it means to establish a "**world-class research forest**". A leading proponent of this bill wrote me an email saying: "*The details [of the Elliott plan] include the strongest forest protections in any forest management plan (federal or state) in Oregon by a long shot.*" I ask why we should compare the creation of a "world-class research forest" to *managed federal and state forest lands*?! Why not compare it to other "world-class research forests"? After all, an exemplary research forest is located only a few hours' drive east of the Elliott.

When considering an Elliott State Research Forest, there's no better model than the **HJ Andrews Experimental Forest**, near Blue River. This ~16,000-acre research forest was established in 1948. Here, OSU researchers work in collaboration with the US Forest Service and the Willamette National Forest conducting ground-breaking, long-term research. The resulting partnerships advance science in unique and synergistic ways. In the Andrews, old-growth forests and a diverse array of ecologically-based research are the norm. Practically speaking, it is the *opposite* of what OSU's "working forest" concept for the Elliott entails. Large clear-cuts and industrial forestry practices were abandoned decades ago, as ecological forestry principles took root. The Andrews now supports a robust and productive research program without substantial logging. Wildlife habitat, forest ecology and carbon research are clearly prized and prioritized. Why not strive for the same high standards in the creation of an Elliott State Research Forest?

With this bill poised to release the Elliott from its financial obligations to the **Common School Fund** (CSF), we should ask why it fails to account for the potential value of the forest's enormous carbon reserves (estimated at roughly 10,000,000 tons). With the price of carbon on the European futures market trading at over \$100/ton, the Elliott's carbon could be worth over \$1 billion (far more than the timber). By severing the Elliott from the CSF, this bill would deprive the school fund of any future carbon revenue. We should also ask why OSU's renowned forest carbon experts were not part of the OSU Elliott team. We should ask why ecological forestry and carbon experts were also absent from DSL's Advisory Committee (while timber interests were well represented). We should ask why the Elliott must still be saddled with a substantial amount of clear-cutting (over 14,000 acres).

A big part of the answer was revealed in a comment made by the lead architect of OSU's Elliott plan. When asked why they used an unusually low estimate for log prices in their model, she replied, "*It's not about the price of logs, but supplying logs to the local mills*". Her answer reflects the deep bias of both the OSU approach and the Elliott Advisory Committee (a group with substantial ties to the timber industry and regional governments). Why were folks with financial conflicts of interest even allowed to serve on this important committee?! Further, the salary of the College of Forestry dean comes from a

\$5M fund established by the former CEO of a company that logged the Elliott and tried to buy it. Is it any wonder that the resulting Research Proposal would continue clear-cutting and extensive thinning on vast stretches of the Elliott? I ask, "*Is this really the model of a "world-class research forest" - or industrial forestry disguised as research?"*"

Sadly, OSU's proposal for the ESRF is neither relevant nor compelling. Their "working forest" concept mistakenly equates *intrinsic value* with *economic profit*. This approach says the land must be logged in perpetuity to support the research and forest management activities - and the local mills. While the mission described in Section 2 of this bill is largely positive, it is NOT reflected in OSU's timber-centric Research Proposal. The proposal is based on a ~30 year-old research concept (called "Triad") that has little scientific relevance and fails to meet the needs of both society and the timber industry. It prioritizes timber production over enormously important ecological services, like carbon sequestration, air and water filtration, wildlife habitat, and buffering against wildfire and climate change. It offers no visionary ideas for increasing carbon sequestration or monetizing the enormous carbon reserves. By continuing clear-cut forestry and extensive thinning on substantial areas of the forest, OSU's plan for the Elliott will only perpetuate the historic pattern of fragmentation. It also targets over 3,000 acres of older forest in the name of wildlife research. This is research focused on industrial forestry and supplying logs to local mills. It is anything but "world-class".

The scientific shortcomings of OSU's "research" plan for the Elliott were exposed in a scathing 5-page critique written by Dr's. Jerry Franklin and K. Norman Johnson in November of 2020 (and included at the end of this letter). These renowned experts on ecological forestry have strong ties to OSU. Dr. Franklin graduated from OSU, worked as a professor in the College of Forestry, and played an instrumental role in developing the HJ Andrews Experimental Forest. Dr. Johnson also graduated from OSU, is a Professor Emeritus and served on OSU's Elliott exploratory committee until 2019. In their letter to OSU, they wrote:

"The current document "puts the cart before the horse" by proposing a major experiment before conducting such an analysis and without developing on-the-ground familiarity with the property. In addition, the experiment OSU has proposed is badly flawed, compromises development of the long-term research potential of the forest, and lacks significant relevance to management of Oregon's forests. The proposed experiment violates basic principles essential to production of statistically valid and socially convincing outcomes. Furthermore, the focus on Triad, an academic concept related to land allocations at regional scales, has no relevance to pressing forestry issues facing Oregonians."

When the Land Board adopted OSU's Research Proposal at their December 8th, 2020 meeting, they acted contrary to good science, overwhelming public sentiment, and the opinion of these eminent experts. Where the proposal lacks integrity, fails to follow sound scientific principles, and does not meet the needs of Oregonians, it undermines the very concept of a *research forest* - and erodes public trust. If the Legislature adopts OSU's deeply-flawed Research Proposal, it will undermine the very foundation of the Elliott State Research Forest.

Privately, most conservation advocates (including those on the Elliott Advisory Committee) concede that "no one trusts OSU" - yet they ask us to embrace OSU's timber-centric Research Proposal! They recognize the long history of undue influence of the College's timber industry sponsors, yet are willing to allow OSU to manage this research forest and determine the governance structure! They concede this bill has some serious shortcomings, yet they've embraced it because they think it's the best deal they're

going to get. Publicly, they frame it as a conservation victory, while admitting privately it's all about compromise. I guess this is their standard approach. Unfortunately, compromise and a scientifically-flawed research plan are inconsistent with creating a "world-class research forest".

I've summarized specific sections of the bill that ought to be changed below. I urge you to either address these deficiencies - or reject SB 1546 entirely. When it comes to establishing a "world-class research forest", Oregonians deserve and expect much better than this!

Sincerely,

Doug Pollock, Friends of OSU Old Growth (www.friendsofosuoldgrowth.org)

Here are specific problems in Senate Bill 1546-1 that ought to be amended:

Limitations on Judicial Review are overly restrictive: Section 13. (4) (a) through (d) in the amended bill are designed to limit judicial review to "Approval of a forest management plan or amendments to a forest management plan that are materially inconsistent with..." the foundational documents controlling the ESRF. Among other things, this includes the mission and management policies, the Research Forest Proposal, and the Habitat Conservation Plan. The bill seems to say, "*You can only take us to court if we don't follow our own plans.*" The problem with this is that some of these plans (e.g. OSU's Research Forest Proposal) are fundamentally flawed and biased - as I've described above. If one contests the scientific validity and societal relevance of the Research Proposal (as Dr's. Franklin and Johnson - and the vast majority of the public did), then limiting judicial review to violations of the flawed proposal doesn't do much good!

Problematic Research Proposal will be very difficult to modify and update: Section 4 positions the Research Proposal that OSU submitted to the Land Board at their December 2020 meeting (and amended in April 2021) as the foundational document controlling all research in the ESRF. It is especially noteworthy that the part (2) (a) states:

"The university.. **May**, after receiving input and approval from the State Land Board and approval from the board of directors of the Elliott State Research Forest Authority, further amend the proposal..."

This gives OSU enormous and unreasonable control over their problematic proposal. OSU may (but is not *required to ever*) change their original Research Proposal. The Land Board can recommend changes, but the university can choose to ignore them. Also, any changes to the Research Proposal must be approved by the Land Board AND the board of directors of the ESRF. The language does not specify how many members of the Board must approve amendments to the proposal. Thus it is unclear whether a simple majority or all members' approval is needed. The same uncertainty applies to the Land Board's approval. Finally, one must assume "university" applies to the OSU Board of Trustees (BoT). Given the relatively conservative nature of the OSU BoT, one would expect them to have little interest in understanding or changing the Research Proposal. **The bottom line is these restrictions will likely make it very difficult to update and improve the Research Proposal over time.**

Monetization of Carbon will shortchange Common School Fund: The bill apparently fails to provide any mechanism to compensate the CSF for future carbon credits. A knowledgeable source told me that the European carbon market is currently trading at over \$100/ton. With the Elliott's carbon reserves estimated to be up to 10,000,000 tons, this equates to over \$1 billion! This far exceeds the assessed value of the timber and land. Even if this estimate is off by an order of magnitude, the carbon value is clearly substantial and will likely increase over time. **By severing the Elliott from the CSF, this bill would deprive the school fund of any future revenue derived from carbon credits.** This, in itself, may be valid grounds for a lawsuit.

Section 11 of the bill dictates how the money from forest carbon sales could be used. It lists a number of broadly-defined uses:

- Support financial obligations of the authority.
- Conduct research or undertake other program activities located in the forest.
- Create financial reserves to ensure the long-term financial integrity and stability of the authority as a self-supporting entity.
- Hold and ensure compliance with permits, certifications and permissions from federal, state and local entities, including a habitat conservation plan and related incidental take permit.
- Work and partner with federal, state, tribal, local or private owners of lands surrounding the forest concerning land management, research and consolidation.
- Raise funds and advance cross-sector partnerships that further the mission and management policies for the forest described in section 2 of this 2022 Act and support programs related to the forest.

One can imagine great potential for conflicts of interest and ethically questionable decisions related to the revenue from carbon credits (and timber sales). Who would decide how the funds would be allocated - the board of directors, OSU, or the Executive Director? **This bill fails to ensure that any of the oversight entities would be truly independent.** It has no safeguards to prevent the kind of blatant financial conflicts of interest that have plagued other state entities (such as the Oregon Forest Resources Institute). Would researchers, program activities and partnerships favored by special interests receive funding? If so, how would the board of directors, executive director and university leaders avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest? With carbon credits expected to grow over time, this could be a significant problem. The bill ought to provide much more clarity and direction on how funds will be allocated, so as to minimize the inevitable conflicts of interest. This is another reason why the oversight body needs to be completely independent of OSU, DSL, and the current Advisory Committee.

Selection of board candidates is exceptionally biased and exclusive: Sections 5 and 6 deal with the selection of the board of directors of the ESRF.

Section 5 (3) (c) says the Land Board shall:

"Consult with, and consider input from, the university and the existing board of directors when determining whom to appoint to the board of directors."

Section 6 (1) describes how the pool of potential board candidates would be selected:

"...the Director of the Department of State Lands, the Elliott State Research Forest Advisory Committee formed by the Department of State Lands and Oregon State University shall develop a list of candidates for appointment as the first voting members of the board of directors of the Elliott State Research Forest Authority".

Section 6 (2) states that the Land Board *shall* appoint the first board of directors from the candidates specified in 6 (1). **In short, the DSL Director, current Elliott Advisory Committee, and OSU are the *only* ones allowed to nominate candidates - and the Land Board *must* choose from this group!** The Land Board could not, for example, choose their own, independent candidates.

This provision is clearly designed to restrict who can serve on the board of directors. During the multi-year Elliott process, OSU, the Advisory Committee, and the DSL Director have often shown substantial bias in favor of the timber industry. Putting them in charge of selecting candidates for the primary oversight entity for the ESRF is akin to having the "foxes chose who can guard the henhouse". A "world-class research forest" must have a truly independent governance structure, free of any financial conflicts of interest.

Section 5 (3) (d) provides an additional mechanism to ensure allegiance to the mission, management policies, and operations of the forest. It allows the Land Board to filter out prospective candidates based on what they judge to be the candidates' willingness to comply with the relatively conservative Research Proposal and Forest Management Plan. This is yet another sign of autocratic control that has no business being in the bill. Conservative forestry professionals (who are disproportionately white males) are more likely to support OSU's antiquated approach to forest management. **This is likely to promote an insular governing body and lead to implicit discrimination.** The Land Board should be able to select candidates with a diverse set of perspectives and backgrounds (regardless of whether the candidates fit the agenda of OSU, DSL, and the Advisory Committee). This section of the bill is inconsistent with our basic governing principles.

Supporting rural economies through active forest management should NOT be an explicit management policy of a "world-class research forest": Section 2. (3) states,

"The management policies of the forest are to:...(e) **Support rural economies through active forest management, timber harvest, recreation and research...**"

The Dean of OSU's College of Forestry has repeatedly stated that research will NOT be used as a justification for cutting trees. Timber will be an outcome of many research activities, but it won't be the driver. It is therefore inconsistent to have "active forest management and timber harvest" as explicit management policies in what is desired to be a "world-class research forest". Rural economies will be supported by a broad spectrum of activities and ecological services associated with the ESRF, but listing these as "management policies" shows clear and unreasonable bias. This is not how scientific research works and is inconsistent with a "world-class research forest".

(Critique of OSU's draft Research Proposal for the Elliott State Research Forest)

November 28, 2020

Creating a Scientifically Credible and Socially Relevant Research Agenda for the Elliott State Research Forest

By Jerry F. Franklin with assistance of K. Norman Johnson

SUMMARY: The Oregon State University College of Forestry (OSU COF) has an extraordinary opportunity to serve the citizens and forest resources of Oregon at the Elliott State Research Forest (ESRF). It can do that by creating new knowledge about forest ecosystems and demonstrating the application of that science in managing forests for the multiple environmental, economic, and cultural benefits desired by Oregon's citizens. However, the current OSU COF proposal for management and research on the Elliott Forest needs significant revision if it is to succeed in achieving those benefits.

Activities on the ESRF should begin with development of a problem analysis to identify what research and experiments are needed to address problems of importance to Oregonians. The current document "puts the cart before the horse" by proposing a major experiment before conducting such an analysis and without developing on-the-ground familiarity with the property. In addition, the experiment OSU has proposed is badly flawed, compromises development of the long-term research potential of the forest, and lacks significant relevance to management of Oregon's forests. The proposed experiment violates basic principles essential to production of statistically valid and socially convincing outcomes. Furthermore, the focus on Triad, an academic concept related to land allocations at regional scales, has no relevance to pressing forestry issues facing Oregonians.

The citizens of Oregon are effectively giving OSU COF a \$121 million gift in creating the ESRF – arguably the largest single investment that the State of Oregon has ever made in forest research. The state deserves a research program that will contribute to creation of forest ecosystems that can better meet current challenges, such as wildfire, climate change, and recovery of threatened salmon populations. The program also needs to have great flexibility to meet the ever-changing needs and preferences of society.

The State Land Board should direct OSU COF to make a fresh start at designing a research program that includes scientifically rigorous experiments directed at sustaining the productivity and other functions of managed forest landscapes. This process of selecting the research foci and initial experiments for OSU's program should be undertaken systematically and transparently. It is important that stakeholders understand how the topics for research were selected and how they relate to proposed experiments. Independent outside peer review would be appropriate for both the problem analysis and for all major research projects and experiments.

The State Land Board should also insure that there is a process by which OSU COF's program of research and management at the ESRF will undergo periodic outside review by an independent panel of scientists and citizens, who will report to the State Land Board on its findings.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on Oregon State University College of Forestry's (OSU COF) proposal to undertake management of the Elliott State Forest for research and education. My credentials for commenting on this proposal include my involvement in forest research in the Pacific Northwest for over 60 years, much at Oregon State University and most recently as a professor in the University of Washington's School of Environmental and Forest Science. My entire career has been involved with development and management of experimental forests and long-term research projects. I helped lead the development of the globally recognized H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest and managed Andrews, Cascade Head Experimental Forest, and the Wind River Canopy Crane facility for significant periods. I also participated in conceptualization and implementation of the National Science Foundation's Long Term Ecological Research Program (LTER), successfully competed for one of the initial grants (at Andrews), and coordinated activities of the LTER network for the National Science Foundation. I was involved in obtaining congressional funding for and the design of the only statistically designed regeneration harvest experiment in the Douglas-fir region (DEMO). I am coauthor with Norm and Debora Johnson, of the foundational textbook for ecological forestry, "Ecological Forest Management".

OSU COF has made significant progress in developing a vision statement, but some further changes are required, most profoundly a problem analysis to identify priorities for research and experiments on the Elliott State Research Forest (ESRF). A critical missing element in the existing document is provision for independent oversight of OSU COF's research and management of the property. It is fair to say that OSU COF's record in management of its own lands and in support of long-term research is checkered. Providing independent oversight is necessary to establish and sustain the trust necessary if OSU COF is to manage this important property. This group should include both scientists and distinguished citizens that represent the spectrum of stakeholder interests. They would be charged with reporting regularly and publicly to the State Land Board. Funding to sustain and make credible their oversight activities would be needed. Conservation easements could also provide some additional legal teeth in the oversight function.

The problem analysis is critical to identify the important issues relevant to managing Oregon's forest that OSU COF can address on the Elliott Forest. Such a document would provide a systematic approach to identification, review, and prioritization of potential research topics for the OSU program. It would be the basis for identifying the research, including experiments, necessary to address those issues. Examples of the scientific issues that need consideration are development and demonstration of approaches to creating managed forests that are more resilient in the face of disturbances, such as wildfire, and climate change, and techniques to better integrate forest management with restoration of salmon populations.

Development of a problem analysis will have several important benefits. First, it can make the process of identifying OSU COF's research priorities a much more transparent process. It would put on record the various topics/issues that were considered and the processes used by OSU COF in making its selection. While some stakeholders have relatively little interest in what research is done on the Elliott, many stakeholders do want to know more about OSU COF's research plans as well as to have input into these plans. It could allow for much broader participation by individuals both within and outside of the institution. The problem analysis should also undergo a scientific peer review process before it is finalized.

The State Land Board needs to provide OSU COF with time to develop such a problem analysis and to familiarize themselves with the property, so that the proposed activities are based on on-the-ground familiarity and not simply on maps and remote imaging. Detailed information on stand ages and structural and compositional characteristics is necessary to identify comparable areas for research. Attention to the geomorphic and hydrologic features of drainages is also needed, so that credible experiments examining the interactions of forest management on aquatic systems and fish, can be developed. ***The development of specific studies and experiments needs to follow, not precede, development of such familiarity. Initiating activities on a property that is intended to be managed in perpetuity for research, demonstration, and education should never begin with by committing essentially all of it to a single experiment.*** OSU COF's current proposal for a major experiment is very much "putting the cart before the horse"!

The deficiencies in the massive experiment currently proposed by OSU COF further emphasizes the need for a systematic assessment of research priorities and the potential of the ESRF before activities are undertaken. The experiment lacks a relevant focus (a supposed test of TRIAD) and has multiple significant flaws in its design and proposed implementation. The potentials for statistically credible scientific or socially convincing outcomes from the current design are near zero. Some of my concerns with this specific proposal are as follows.

The purported purpose of the experiment is to test the TRIAD concept. TRIAD is a concept that envisions forests in a region being managed using three general approaches (Hunter and Calhoun 1996): (1) Areas for intensive commodity production, (2) Areas with little or no resource use by people; and (3) Areas in which resource use is integrated with protection of ecological values. Here in Oregon, such a partitioning

of forest lands has already occurred – an approximation of the Triad approach. The industrial forest lands are currently managed intensively for commodity production (Triad category 1); and the national parks, wilderness areas, and Late Successional Reserves represent Triad category 2. The remaining managed forestlands (e.g., federal, state, tribal, most non-industrial private lands, conservation trust lands, etc.) represent Triad category 3. All owners and managers of lands in this latter category (Triad category 3) seek to integrate economic and environmental goals in the management of their properties by choice and/or law. A further important aspect of Triad is the geographic scale to which the Triad model applies and at which it needs to be tested. This scale is where the “Issues of economic distribution and balance can usually be evaluated [and is] at the scale of an individual state or county” (Hunter and Calhoun 1996). ***Triad is not intended to be applied to nor can it be tested at the scale of a single property.***

Hence, Triad is inappropriate as either an intellectual or experimental focus for OSU COF’s research program on the ESRF. A Triad-like division has already occurred in Oregon by policy decisions made regarding management of the various forest ownerships. Practically speaking, the proposed experiment can provide no meaningful insights into the merit of the concept. Indeed, what Oregonians need most is research that will assist managers of the Triad category 3 lands in achieving their goals of managing forests simultaneously for economic, environmental and cultural values.

In addition to its focus, the failures of the proposed experiment are numerous. The whole idea of committing most of what is intended to become a long-term research property to one massive experiment at the outset, is an outstandingly bad idea, since it greatly limits the potential for future research projects, notwithstanding arguments by proponents that you could nest other experiments within its design. We know from experience that our current ideas about the most pressing research questions, scientifically and socially, are going to undergo dramatic change with time. If most of the unreserved portions of a property have already been compromised by an experiment, the opportunities will be limited for other major research programs to be undertaken as new knowledge emerges and societal goals change.

The proposed experiment would be immensely expensive and take many years to implement; hence, it would take decades before any useful knowledge could emerge. It bases its treatments on watersheds and yet has no credible plan or intellectual engagement in measuring impacts of management on hydrology and aquatic ecosystems. Such research must be an important part of the Elliott Forest research program. However, the cost and institutional commitment for such research generally allows for relatively few gaged watersheds and the calibration of such watersheds requires 10 to 20 years before any treatments can begin. So, why are whole watersheds being proposed as the treatment units in the proposed experiment?

The experiment lacks a rigorous statistical design. The first and most basic principle in designing field experiments is random assignment of treatments to the experimental units – the specific land areas that are going to be part of the experiment. Treatments are not randomly assigned to the experimental units in OSU COF’s proposed experiment – rather the characteristics of the experimental units (such as how much older forest is present) are the basis for assigning the treatment that they will receive! A second

principle is that the treatments must include controls, which would be experimental areas that do not receive any treatment. The experiment does not include control treatments. The presence of a large semi-reserved area elsewhere on the Elliott does not fulfill the requirement for experimental controls. A third principle is that, if you want clear tests of variables – for example, how ecological responses are affected by the number of trees retained or the spatial pattern of the retention or the effects of different retention patch sizes – you must avoid confounding your treatments. Treatments are confounded when you change more than one variable at a time. Confounding of treatment variables is implicit in the current design.

There are many potential research topics highly relevant to the management of Oregon's forestlands, which could be addressed in OSU COF's research program. This summer has made obvious the importance of developing management regimes that would reduce the vulnerability

of managed forests in western Oregon to wildfire and other large-scale disturbances. A related and critical research need is to conceive and test multiple approaches to adapting managed westside forests to climate change. Experiments of this type are underway in many forest regions of North America – but notably not in the Douglas-fir region! Silvicultural approaches to integrating ecological and economic goals is a major challenge in management of a broad array of forest ownerships in Oregon, from small, non-industrial private forest lands to tribal and federal forests. Extensive experimentation is needed to better quantify the tradeoffs between various forest values, such as the economic costs and ecological benefits associated with various levels of live tree and dead wood retention during harvests. Similarly, research, including experimentation, is needed to compare economic returns and ecological benefits of mixed-age forests compared with even-aged forests. Any and all of these could be the foci of rigorous, statistically credible experiments that would directly benefit the citizens and forest ecosystems of Oregon.

OSU COF's research at the Elliott Research Forest needs to include significant, credible attention to the relationships between forests and streams. The streams and rivers are the very best and most sensitive indicators of the health (or, I would substitute the word, functionality) of our forest landscapes. We need much better knowledge of the impacts of management on water quality and quantity and on health of the biota. The salmon are arguably the most significant of the endangered biota of the Elliott. There has been no meaningful consideration of streams and stream biota in the current research plan – for example, no consideration of how geophysical processes line up with the expected treatment units. There are multiple ways to configure riparian networks to achieve desired outcomes but this is not a part of the current experimental design. Credible experiments are needed but these will be expensive and significant time will elapse before treatments can begin. The potential for stream-based experiments should not be compromised as they will be by the current research design. These concerns with the research related to aquatic systems and salmon need to be dealt with "up front", not some time after other experimental manipulations have already been planned, let alone implemented.

In conclusion, the OSU COF should drop the current proposed experiment and undertake a comprehensive and transparent problem analysis to identify the research priorities and experiments that will provide the greatest benefit for Oregon citizens and forest ecosystems. Any research projects,

including experiments, should be developed after the COF has an opportunity to become more familiar with the property and reassess how research can benefit the citizens and forests of Oregon in the short- and long-term.

Hunter, Malcolm L., Jr. and Aram Calhoun. 1996. A triad approach to land-use allocation. Pages 477-491 in "*Biodiversity in Managed Landscapes*", edited by R. C. Szaro and D. W. Johnston. Oxford University Press: New York.

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: George Sexton <gs@kswild.org>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 12:00 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
George Sexton
PO Box 240
Talent, OR 97540

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: CRAIG M PATTERSON <craigmpatterson@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 9:50 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Public testimony on Elliot research forest

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Department of State Lands,

Please accept the following as public input to your process.

First, not all public testimony is equal. When I hear Dr. Jerry Franklin professor emeritus at the University of Washington state without reservation (DSL meeting Dec 2020) that the proposal that Dean Tom DeLuca and his staff has developed is NOT A RESEARCH PROPOSAL, but rather a management/logging proposal, I take notice.

However I have yet to see anyone at the table even discuss this. So how do you basically ignore one of the top forestry scientists in the Nation while the committee sits 'mum' and rubber stamps a very bad and unfair process?

Let me share some specifics why I share Dr. Franklin's perspective.

First, I live about 10 miles from the H.J. Andrews experimental forest along the McKenzie since 1974. I have engaged with the scientists and managers at the Andrews anytime I find an opportunity to do so. OSU and the forest service are joint partners at the Andrews for a very long time. It was established in 1948. However the amount of "socially relevant" science that informs, impacts and helps the rural contiguous communities is rare and largely ineffective. How can it be that I live in the heart of the most productive soft wood forest on the planet and today there are virtually NO JOBS. To add data to my statement, the enrollment at the McKenzie school district (K – 12) totals 175 today. Forty years ago it was over 1000. No jobs, no families, no school kids. So the track record of Oregon state research regarding jobs and rural communities, is dismal at best. They are not experts in how and where thriving forests and communities intersect.

Secondly, as I listened to past meeting on the Elliot, I heard concepts like exploring alternatives. This current plan isn't about alternatives, it's about maintaining the status quo – Industrial forestry with meaningless and minor tweaks. Just as Dr. Franklin has confirmed.

I find it particularly disingenuous that there is recognition of the indigenous people/tribes/cultures in name alone, but no real understanding of the opposite differences of World/Nature views, respect and reverence. The alternative research should include and adopt Indigenous culture wisdom and STOP all Industrial logging as being totally contrary to their views and values.

Furthermore, there is historical evidence regarding how clear cutting Industrial forestry is not sustainable after the third rotation, as the soil is spent. Dean DeLuca (a soil scientist) should know this. However the liabilities extent before and beyond just the soil.

Take the example of the Gilchrist forest (the newest sate forest since 2010). Oregon department of Forestry bought this for 15 million, essentially a cut over young plantation. While some of the forest is approaching 30 years old, the revenue stream tells the story no one wants to hear. Over the last 5 years the income on 72,000 acres has averaged about 52,000. While the expenses just for fire protection and road maintenance is over 300,000 a year. When I've asked what is the projected 'break even' point is, mum is the word. A negative economic death spiral which no one wants to acknowledge.

Will you make the same mistake with the Elliot? It seems so.

Habitat conservation areas are nothing more than a legal way to take from the forest and justify logging. When logging is the main cause of endangered species in the first place. When do you connect those dots?

While there are many 'alternatives' which need to be studied that actually learn from history and don't just repackage Industrial logging, which your plan does.

What if (as indigenous cultures embody) the focus was on the long term – 7th generation to come? What if the forest wasn't 'fragmentated' and was seen as a whole of inter-connected and symbiotic relationships between the soil, the climate, wildlife and the forest? What if we focused on very slow with full utilization of forest resources in labor-intensive, job creating ways where scale doesn't create restoration needs? Industrial logging is akin to the 1880's and killing the Buffalo for it's tongue and hide and extreme mass wasting that followed. What if we treated logging in the same way the Plains Indians co-existed with the Buffalo for millennium, without waste and total utilization?

I could talk for days about my own efforts to envision and articulate true alternative forestry, if given the chance. I sincerely hope you do not rubber stamp this HCP and forestry model based on extraction without a significant understanding of all alternatives.

I request you put this decision on the shelf and explore all options first. Your children and grand children deserve better.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts.

Be safe,
Craig Patterson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Vic Bostock <care4animals@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 9:17 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Vic Bostock
1612 Woodglen Ln
Altadena, CA 91001

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Nicolette Ludolphi <agwang@hotmail.de>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 3:40 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Nicolette Ludolphi
Am Fockenberg
Gröpelingen Bremen, AE 28239

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Kris N. <prin@phoenixfi.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:42 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Kris N.
633 NE 68th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Marietta O'Byrne <info@nwgnursery.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:53 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years. It is well past time to stop the cutting of mature, or old growth forests for ANY reason. They are more important as carbon sequestration than for any other purpose, our forests being the best in the world for that purpose.

Additionally, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Marietta O'Byrne
86813 Central Rd
Eugene, OR 97402

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: ERNEST O'BYRNE <eob@peak.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:51 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years. It is well past time to stop the cutting of mature, or old growth forests for ANY reason. They are more important as carbon sequestration than for any other purpose, our forests being the best in the world for that purpose.

Additionally, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
ERNEST O'BYRNE
86813 Central Rd
Eugene, OR 97402

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Jack West <jpwest@teleport.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:43 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jack West
3914 SE Licyntra Ln
Portland, OR 97222

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Susan Peirce <speirce@prodigy.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:24 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Susan Peirce
18 Paseo de Aguila
Santa Fe, NM 87506

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Ed Cooley <edcooley@cascadeaccess.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:15 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Ed Cooley
PO BOX 642
ELKTON, OR 97436

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: David Stone <dns@efn.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:59 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
David Stone
1975 16th St.
Springfield, OR 97477

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Jo-Ann Murphy <jo-ann@spicemail.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:48 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jo-Ann Murphy
1790 Fraley Road
Dayton, TN 37321

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Nancy Chismar <nanlc999@optonline.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:43 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Nancy Chismar
6 York Dr
Edison, NJ 08817

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Len Greenwood <nestwood@sonic.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:42 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Len Greenwood
8843 Deer Creek Rd
Selma, OR 97538

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Lorenz Steininger <schreibdemstein@posteo.de>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:27 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Support a Stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear State Land Board,

Dear State Land Board members:

I'm writing to encourage you to support a stronger Elliott State Research Forest proposal. Significant work over the past three years has gone into this effort, and it is critical Oregon leaders get this right as the final product will govern this outstanding public forest for the next 80 years.

Specifically, I encourage you to:

- 1) Ensure there is more balance on the proposed Elliott State Research Forest Board of Directors. There must be an expert in forest carbon on the board as the old-growth, temperate rainforests found on the Elliott store incredible amounts of carbon and will act as a laboratory for research around mitigating climate change. Currently, the proposed board is deficient in this area of interest.
- 2) Make sure any forest research that may occur in occupied marbled murrelet habitat is conducted by experts in the field and that the research can only continue if it is not causing harm to this critically imperiled species.
- 3) Ensure property owners who live on Loon Lake and immediately adjacent to the Elliott State Forest in the Salander and Little Salander watersheds are directly communicated with about how proposed forest research and management may impact their property values, viewsheds, drinking water, access, stream flows, and other critical values.
- 4) Make sure Oregon State University's College of Forestry's logging research in designated "extensive" management allocations is not heavy-handed, particularly in older forests that may harbor imperiled species.
- 5) Ensure Oregon State University circulates for public review an updated financial plan for the proposed Elliott State Research Forest in a timely fashion.

Thank you for your attention to these important requests as the proposal to create the Elliott State Research Forest continues to be considered.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Lorenz Steininger
13 main st
stafford, VA 22554

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Jenny Jones <jjpeppercat@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 1:27 PM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Decoupling Elliot from Common School Fund: yes, thank you!

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I hope that the SLB approves decoupling the Elliot from the Common School Fund.

Perhaps if part of the forest research is to cut in a volume parallel of some type of timber sale, the wood could be sold and be earmarked or added to the Common School Fund as a courtesy for when such activities happen, but I believe this is the right move for the state and citizens.

These comments are my own personal opinions.

Thank you,
Jenny Jones

--

"Imagination is more important than knowledge." --Albert Einstein
"Enthusiasm is more important than execution." --Obvious corollary

"Having a bad diet right now is a better predictor of future violence than past violent behavior."
--Stephen Schoenthaler, a criminal-justice professor at California State University



December 7, 2022

Governor Kate Brown, Chair
Oregon State Land Board

Re: Support for Agenda Items 3 and 4 regarding Elliott State Forest (December 13th Meeting)

Dear Governor Brown, Secretary Fagan, and Treasurer Read,

Trout Unlimited (“TU”) is a non-profit organization dedicated to the conservation of cold-water fish (such as trout, salmon, and steelhead) and their habitats. The organization has more than 350,000 members and supporters nationwide, including over 3,500 members in Oregon. TU members that live in Oregon are affiliated with the Oregon Council of Trout Unlimited (“OCTU”). Our members are committed to caring for Oregon rivers so future generations can experience the joy of wild trout and salmon.

TU and OCTU support the Department’s recommendations for Agenda Items 3 and 4 at the State Land Board’s regular meeting on December 13, 2022.

Our organizations supported Senate Bill 1546 during the 2022 Oregon legislative session, which provided the model for keeping the Elliott State Forest in public ownership, as well as a path towards managing the Elliott as a world-class public research forest.

The next step in the process is decoupling the Elliott State Forest (Agenda Item 3) and delineating certain forestlands to be managed by the Elliott State Research Forest Authority pursuant to Senate Bill 1546 (Agenda Item 4). TU and OCTU support the staff recommendations for each of these as provided in the board packet.

Numerous salmon, steelhead, and trout streams flow through the Elliott State Forest. We support the proposals before the Board in these Agenda Items because we expect the measures to provide significant conservation benefits and long-term public access to important public resources. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on these items, and please let us know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

James Fraser
Oregon Policy Advisor
Trout Unlimited
james.fraser@tu.org

Mark Rogers
Chair
Oregon Council TU
marwrog@gmail.com

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: CRAIG M PATTERSON <craigmpatterson@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:51 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Elliot State forest. Advisory considerations
Attachments: PerspectivesOnAmericasForests.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Greetings State Land Board,

I believe that there are some very important alternatives which I haven't seen represented or discussed in your process to date. Many alternatives have deep implications both for the forest and 'educational opportunities' for Oregon and those communities around the Elliot. What about a long term educational focus on sustainable forestry over time and generations, rather than the boom/busted patterns everywhere today?

Tom Bender in Rain Magazine once said, "Appropriate technology reminds us that before we choose our tools and techniques, we must first choose our dreams and our values, while some technologies enhance them, others make them unobtainable".

When we look over Oregon's landscape today, we find NO thriving rural forested communities, anywhere. Whereas 40-50 years ago jobs were everywhere. I worked in a re saw mill in Redding, CA in the summer of 1967. I know what it was like first hand.

Now, after living in a rural forested community (McKenzie Bridge) in the heart of the MOST productive soft wood forest in the world for 48 years and there are very few jobs. The local school (K-12) has under 200 students where before it was over 1000 when jobs were abundant. This is a direct consequence of Industrial forestry and construction on the dams

It's time to learn from the last 50 years and reverse the trends, as the consequences follow environmentally, economically and socially in very negative ways.

This transition requires three major changes:

- 1) From high volume to a focus on value added very slow harvest with full utilization
- 2) From capital intensive to labor intensive (Job creating focus)
- 3) From corporate/Industrial control to local control which state institutions can manifest.

While I know the process to date has been heavy on the Industrial perspective, I think it prudent to revisit some of the consequences/liabilities of Industrial management, so your decision's are fully informed.

Socially and economically speaking Industrial forestry represents a short boom followed by a protracted bust, every time, no exceptions. While the foundational resource, the soil is compromised by erosion, compaction, invasives and landslides often from road building and intensive logging. Wildfire changes as beneficial surface fires become extreme when separation between lower branches and ground disappears.

Environmentally this effort is about defining the 'taking' rather than seeing it's the management focus that causes all these liabilities. Privatized profits today creating socialized liabilities for future generations. Is this your legacy?

I can articulate a different vision. My over 50 years of 'hands on' and research experience gives me breath and depth in understanding the issues and trade-offs. I gave a paper for the National Roundtable on Sustainable Forests in D.C. (2005) The link about includes all 7 papers. "A perspective from the ground up" begins on page 53, if your interested.

What if the overriding focus was on the simentanoous integration of environmental health, economic vitality and social equality? Maybe our grand children would thank us as we leave them an inkling of hope..

Please consider including me in this advisory group for the Elliot state research forest.

Thank you.

Many regards,
Craig Patterson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Fergus Mclean <willamettedams@q.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 10:15 AM
Cc: SMITH Arin N * DSL; HANSEN Ali R * DSL
Subject: Fw: Elliott Forest

<-----Original Message----->

From:
Sent: 12/12/2022 9:44:48 AM
To:
Cc: Arin.n.smith@dsl.oregon.gov, Ali.r.hansen@dsl.oregon.gov
Subject:

Oregon State Land Board:

The highest sworn offices of our state- Governor, Secretary, Treasurer- are pledged to defend, serve and protect the interests of all Oregonians, particularly against the selfish interests of the powerful and wealthy, both in their individual high offices and in their joint trusteeship over the Common School Fund Trust, endowed at accession with millions of acres donated and dedicated to the new State of Oregon for the use and benefit of schools by the United States' government.

Oregon's first state Forest was conceived by Governor Oswald West, OSU's first Dean of Forestry George Peabody, and our first State Forester, Francis Elliott to consolidate the Common School Fund's lands remaining in 1912 after a high proportion of those lands had been fraudulently conveyed by corrupt local politicians in partnership with a corrupt, greedy and venal timber industry. This story played out in the first decade of the 20th Century in the notorious Oregon Land Fraud trials, when most of Oregon's Congressional delegation was indicted for federal timber theft.

It was from the firm intention of West, Peabody and Elliott that only a brand-new institution- Oregon's first state forest- could, by consolidation and statute, maintain the tiny remnant of federal school trust lands in the public interest against a corrupt and rapacious timber industry. Governor West made his political bones as a young attorney in the Secretary of State's office by recovering school trust lands stolen by corrupt local elected officials and their industry co-conspirators worth millions in 1910 dollars. Much of this stolen acreage recovered by West was subsequently traded for portions of what became the Elliott State Forest when, twenty years later, what remained of the millions of acres of ceded federal school lands were consolidated and exchanged with the US Forest Service for the rugged, inaccessible and burned-over southernmost 70,000 acres of the Siuslaw National Forest, and named for State Forester Elliott.

Oswald West is Oregon's most respected and accomplished elected leader, elected as a Democrat when 95% of the Oregon legislature was Republican. Though he declined to run for a second term, among other feats, he built the Columbia Gorge Highway and dedicated Oregon's beaches to the use of all Oregonians. It is this legacy of political courage and public service which the Land Board is charged to protect and continue in your deliberations today.

The notion that it is inappropriate that Oregon's schools should benefit from the management of the Elliott Forest emerged under the Kitzhaber administration, when federal endangered species protections caused Elliott timber harvest revenue to plummet. But the long-accepted narrative supporting arguments for "decoupling" the Forest from the school fund, a narrative which initiated and has driven the process which produced SB1546, collapses in the face of Oregon Supreme Court's 2019 ruling in DSL vs Cascadia, which found- contrary to common wisdom in Salem- there exists no

legal obligation for DSL to maximize revenue in the Elliott's management; that Elliott management is entirely up to the legislature to determine.

Ironically, prospects for Elliott revenues cited as a key reason for "decoupling," took an abrupt U-turn while the process unfolded, and today the forest's massive carbon stores exceed its timber value, though you have heard nothing of this from Director Walker. What was in 2017 a burden on the CSF has become, five years later, a massively valuable treasure of CSF-owned carbon offsets. Oregon's loudest environmental voices seem not yet to have realized how the situation has changed; how the Elliott Forest, rather than being a burden on the CSF, has become a tremendous asset of precious carbon stores whose value today exceeds that of the Elliott's marketable timber. Carbon offset values have doubled since 2020; hardly an investment a trustee might rush to unload.

OSU has not told you that the value of Elliott carbon exceeds the value of its timber. In fact OSU has told you nothing at all about the Elliott's carbon, not including that staggering value in the highly questionable drop in the forest's appraised value by 60% while harvest projections dropped only one third of that. SB1546 addresses the sale of carbon offsets in three different places but OSU is mum about their value, which is not even mentioned in the latest appraisal by Mason, Bruce & Girard, the industry old boys club which likewise failed to identify any carbon value in its 2017 Elliott appraisal.

The Elliott lies in planet earth's most productive biomass zone and very likely holds in excess of a quarter billion dollars worth of carbon offsets whose value rises by the month, yet you as trustees of the Common School Fund are being advised by Director Walker and OSU to steal that carbon value from Oregon's schoolchildren and award it to a new state "Authority" which is industry dominated and as if designed for corruption by exactly those who West, Peabody and Elliott sought to protect Oregonians against.

Please reconsider.

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Larry and Sylvia Mangan <manganlarryandsylvia@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 12:22 PM
To: SMITH Arin N * DSL
Subject: Management Elliot State Forest

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'd like to make a suggestion on management of the Elliot State Forest.

About 12 years ago, as part of the natural resource restoration after the *M/V New Carissa* oil spill on the Oregon coast, several thousand acres of marbled murrelet habitat in the Oregon Coast Range (just east of Depot Bay) was purchased from a private landowner by the New Carissa Natural Resource Damage Assessment Trustees (USDI, USDA, State of Oregon, Confederated Tribes of the Coos Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians) and transferred to the Siletz Tribe (also a Trustee) to manage in perpetuity as marbled murrelet habitat. The property was encumbered by a very specific permanently binding conservation easement that dictated generally how the property was to be managed.

The principles of the conservation agreement dictated basically that the existing marbled murrelet occupied habitat (about 1/3 the acreage) on the tract would be maintained as occupied murrelet habitat. Another approximately 1/3 of the acreage was slated to be managed, through forest thinning and other techniques to attain marbled murrelet nesting habitat conditions within about 80 years, and the final 1/3 would be managed as an "industrial forest" to generate income to support management and maintenance on the other 2/3's of the tracts.

There was also significant marbled murrelet and forest research specified in the conservation agreement.

The Siletz Tribe has been successfully managing this murrelet habitat for a number of years now, and I think it would be worthwhile that the Land Board have a conversation with the Siletz Tribe (contact is Forest Manager Mike Kennedy) who might be able to provide some information that might help the Land Board in their decision on how the Elliot Forest should be managed for the long term.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Larry Mangan
North Bend, OR. 97459

SMITH Arin N * DSL

From: Forest Web of Cottage Grove <forestweb.cg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 10:55 AM
To: DSL Landboard Testimony * DSL
Subject: Please Choose a Better BoD for the Elliott State Research Forest Authority

Dear Oregon Land Board,

I am writing to express my concerns about the prospective candidates you may soon appoint to the board of directors governing the Elliott State Research Forest Authority. The list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically-important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. I urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services.

Sincerely,

Cristina Hubbard, Executive Director
Forest Web



Forest Web

P.O. Box 1026, Cottage Grove, OR 97424

Email: forestweb.cg@gmail.com Website: forestweb-cg.org

To: State Land Board

Re: Draft HCP for the Elliott State Research Forest and draft EIS

December 12, 2022

As the Executive Director of Forest Web, I am writing to you on behalf of over 45,000 of our supporters. Over the past decade Forest Web has attended State Land Board meetings and submitted numerous comments in the hope of crafting a different future for the Elliott State Research Forest (ESRF). A future that places a priority on the importance of this forest regarding the impacts of Climate Change, and the critical role the ESRF can take in teaching us how to mitigate this global crisis.

In our comments to the State Land Board, submitted on December 10, 2019, we said the following: “In the face of Climate Change, the Elliott has greater value than as a site for logging and studying how to generate and extract even more commercial timber. Its true value to the environment is as a standing contiguous forest, sequestering carbon. If any logging is to be done in the Elliott it should only be in second growth areas that need to be rehabilitated, using this opportunity to study how a forest can be healed instead of harvested. Other departments that deal with the various aspects of climate change and ecology should be included in this study to put forth a collaborative effort. Given the level of planet-wide deforestation, this knowledge would be invaluable to the effort of repairing the incalculable damage done to our world’s forests. “

Today, we are also including text from a letter from over 200 scientists with backgrounds in climate and forest issues sent to urge Congress to protect forests and mitigate the climate crisis facing our planet. The opening of the letter states: “As forest and climate change scientists and experts, we are writing to urge you to oppose legislative proposals that would promote logging and wood consumption, ostensibly as a natural climate change solution, based on claims that these represent an effective carbon storage approach, or claims that biomass logging, and incinerating trees for energy, represents renewable, carbon-neutral energy.

We find no scientific evidence to support increased logging to store more carbon in wood products, such as dimensional lumber or cross-laminated timber (CLT) for tall buildings, as a natural climate solution. The growing consensus of scientific findings is that, to effectively mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, we must not only move beyond fossil fuel consumption but must also substantially increase protection of our native forests in order to absorb more CO₂ from the atmosphere and store more, not less, carbon in our forests...”

Furthermore, the scientific evidence does not support the burning of wood in place of fossil fuels as a climate solution. Current science finds that burning trees for energy produces even more CO₂ than burning coal, for equal electricity produced, and the considerable accumulated carbon debt from the delay in growing a replacement forest is not made up by planting trees or wood substitution. We need to increase growing forests to more rapidly close the gap between emissions and removal of CO₂ by forests, while we simultaneously lower emissions from our energy, industrial and agricultural sectors...”

Link: <https://sites.tufts.edu/gdae/files/2020/05/Forest-Letter-to-Congress.pdf>

Ecotrust’s Carbon Analysis of Proposed Forest Management Regimes on the Elliott State Forest states, “If no harvests were to occur in the Elliott Forest the total amount of carbon stored would be approximately 46.6 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent by 2050, approximately 68.5% of the annual emissions of greenhouse gas for the entire state in 2007...” The report also states: “...The significant impacts of climate change on our forests and their continued management requires that we evaluate the potential of our forests to store more carbon and include this in the potential outcomes of the state’s management plans...”

Link:

http://archive.ecotrust.org/forests/Carbon_Analysis_of_Elliott_State_Forest.pdf

We advocate for the following for the HCP:

- Complete transparency on all management issues
- A detailed oversight process
- Strong and permanent protections for all endangered species habitat
- Permanent protections for all native mature and old-growth forest habitat
- A multi-disciplined program of Climate Change study with a focus on forest health
- No clear-cut logging or aerial spraying of herbicides
- Only select-cut logging to rehabilitate second-growth areas and promote biodiversity
- Continued public access with improved trails and signage for recreational and educational activity
- Specify a net reduction in roads over the permit term (to improve watershed health/reduce sedimentation that degrades salmon habitat)
- Have more safeguards around the protection of legacy trees
- Not allow for habitat loss within core spotted owl habitat
- Specify more safeguards around the proposed marbled murrelet experiment (especially allowing the experiment only once it can be proven that the desired data can be collected, and limiting the experiment to only the first allowed 500 acres unless sound research shows explicit benefit to murrelets, as approved by USFWS)
- Be more specific on the types of research allowed on the covered species to prevent harming endangered species
- Provide more clarity about benefits for climate change.

In the face of Climate Change, the ESRF has greater value than being a source of commercial timber. The science shows it adds even more value to the environment as a standing contiguous forest, sequestering carbon. The HCP needs to establish bold, science-based policies that put Oregon at the forefront of Climate Research and the pivotal role the forests of the Pacific Northwest play in solving the problems caused by Climate Change.

Regarding the proposed 9-member Elliott Advisory Board, the list in Appendix A of your meeting packet fails to include any experts in the critically important areas of forest carbon, ecological forestry, or climate change. Having two candidates from the same family, with conservative, Douglas Co. timber credentials fails to represent the broad spectrum of progressive forestry expertise in our state. In addition, a majority of the candidates have previously been involved in the OSU-DSL Elliott process. This lends a strong bias in favor of DSL, OSU, and their regressive, "working forest" research plan. We urge you to choose independent candidates who will represent all Oregonians by prioritizing forest carbon, climate change, wildlife habitat and other ecological services. We do however, support tribal representation, and endorse the selection of Bob Sallinger, Teresa Bird, and Jack Williams for the natural resource knowledge and commitment to conservation that they bring to the table.

We recommend supporting the final decoupling of the CSF as proposed.

Sincerely,



Cristina Hubbard, Executive Director

Forest Web of Cottage Grove