# Supply

## TTC Work Group Call, February 17, 2023 - Summary

### Participants

- Bob Christensen
- Steve Connelly
- Mike Cooney
- Mike Douville
- Michael Kampnich

### Goals

1. Develop a much clearer picture than currently exists of the amount of young growth supply that could be available for harvest under different management scenarios, during the next ten years and beyond.

2. Clarify the interests and factors that are important to people with different perspectives about what should be the appropriate size of the timber industry in SE Alaska in the future – in hopes of defining an agreed upon vision about the nature and scale of industry.

### Challenges

**It is very difficult to try to define the future of the timber industry in SE Alaska without a more refined estimate of what potential supply really looks like.** Operators cannot make investments or try to expand markets without some information/assurances (e.g., long term contracts) about supply.

**The agreement that was achieved by the TAC to pair bridge timber from old growth with "co-intent" has been strained on both sides** – by reinstatement of the roadless rule and the decision to back away from transitional old growth on the one hand and the lack of progress towards achieving the range of benefits assumed under co-intent on the other – bringing into focus the distinction between those who support industry and those who favor a "restoration economy".

**New bug infestations have become another factor** complicating supply analysis.

### Suggestions

Please note that these suggestions **do not represent agreement or consensus among call participants**. They are a compilation of ideas that were discussed – from differing perspectives.

1. **Build on the basin analysis work that is currently underway** (and on work that is also happening at the State level) by getting to a more granular level of analysis, defining maximum yield under a range of scenarios (e.g., different rotation lengths), and incorporating community input – with the intent of getting to actionable solutions that can be implemented.

   See the attached proposal that Bob Christensen and Mike Cooney agreed to draft as an outgrowth of the work group's conversations. Forest leadership and staff have agreed to move forward with the analysis.

2. **Examine what can be accomplished by having planning teams comprised of both timber and restoration professionals working together to examine what can be accomplished by taking a holistic approach** - using realistic assessment of stand productivity, road infrastructure, community interests (including their future vision for the forest and industry's needs), etc. into account - to integrate multiple objectives within a watershed (e.g., producing both timber and deer from a singular watershed). The approach used on the Staney Creek sale offers a possible example, although its focus on old growth bridge timber may make it less relevant to current circumstance.

   Alternatively, designate some acreage within timber LUDs for harvest and designate other acreage on which to concentrate restoration.

3. **Take advantage of roads systems that are already built out** (e.g., on POW) – thereby providing more ability to balance values across the landscape in a cost-effective manner.

4. When considering economic factors:
   - **Keep round log exports on the table for analysis** purposes to see how exports "pencil out" under various scenarios.
   - **Look at operability costs associated with different management scenarios** and evaluate the economics associated with opening size, adjacent units.
   - **Incorporate the interests of small mill owners**, e.g., by taking advantage of the work that is being done to understand the needs of manufacturers on POW.
   - **Take a long view and learn from and avoid past mistakes**.

**Attachment: Proposal**

**From the TTC Supply Work Group - Our ask**

A summary of projected suitable YG acres and total volumes, by year (or by decade), on POW.

1. A timelapse map (a snapshot every ten years going forward) of suitable and economically feasible YG stands for two basins (Thorne Bay and Thomas Bay).

Our goal with the timelapse maps is to provide our group with concrete examples of how harvest could be planned and scheduled over time to meet multiple uses, interests of local communities, forest health, and industry needs. To help inform our discussion we are hoping that the maps will include OG and YG polygons so we can see what is not suitable because of S&Gs, what is suitable but not economically feasible, and what is suitable and feasible for each decade. It would also be helpful to see an overlay of planned harvest units by logging system (ground vs cable) as well as expected road use including road reconstruction, proposed in the current project plans for each basin.

**Looking ahead** - The approach we would like to take in answering the vision question noted above is to as a group assess a few different scenarios for each basin using a set of indicators to give us a better sense of the potential outcomes of each scenario. For example, scenarios could be set using:

1. different rates of harvest (e.g., economic feasibility vs a 100- or 200-year rotation lengths),
2. different prescriptions (clearcut vs selective) and
3. different levels of processing (e.g., round log export vs local manufacturing or a combination of the two).

For indicators, we might use something like this set for each basin:

1. deer habitat carrying capacity,
2. miles of accessible road maintained,
3. number of local jobs provided,
4. estimated revenue generated, and
5. cost of forest management, etc.