

Forestry Review Committee Speaker List March 29, 2006

Speaker	Comments
Tom Waltz - Forester with Sierra Pacific Industries	- There are a couple of concerns to us, we are glad to see that staff recommended that implementation be postponed - please re-word the recommended motion to make this clear. For my reading of it, the merger ordinance was written to comply with state law and Humboldt County was not required to do this. This Merger Ordinance will affect Sierra Pacific - there are financial encumbrances by banks that cover different parcels and this may affect financing. These implications are not well thought out (unintended consequences). Staff should present what the impacts of this ordinance would be - how may parcels would be merged, etc, the FRC needs this information to make a decision.
Bill Blackwell - Sierra Pacific	- This Ordinance will affect land exchanges and how they do business. It would be difficult to acquire individual parcels that would be merged under this Ordinance.
Dan Opelack - Investment Manager for Green Diamond Industry	- This merger concept is new to me. We don't really understand how this ordinance works and the implications on land exchanges. We believe it will have a big impact on our company - we need more information. Comments from FRC members: Launi - you didn't have any consideration that this ordinance was going to be implemented? - no - we just don't understand it. Jim Able - don't you just cut your timber and then subdivide and run? - We like to grow trees here, they grow well here, and we would like to be a cornerstone for this County - we would like the County to give us incentives to keep growing timber.
Bob Morris	- I have reviewed the literature the planning staff has put out - this ordinance is elective; the Subdivision Map Act doesn't require it. In 1986 the BOS took only 20 minutes to address this Ordinance; however, there have been major changes in timber industry since then. Very difficult to make the same findings today to pass this ordinance. What should also be on the table is the equity and fairness to the landowner as a result of this ordinance. This would be the largest assets devaluation action the county could do. There are other mechanisms for protecting large timber lands. This is the "stick" approach. Conservation easements would be a positive incentive to help keep in resource production.

<p>Joe Russ</p>	<p>– we have about 15,000 acres of TPZ lands in the county. I was on the Planning Commission during the discussion on the merger ordinance. I didn't support them then nor do I support it now – it affects land values. (gave an example of valuation of 160 vs 600 acres). Impacts are far reaching. Financing is also a problem because of valuation of assets. We should get into this issue now, because they are talking about 600 acre parcel sizes as a protection for resource lands as a part of the GPU. This would be a big impact – urge you to move carefully on this and the message to the Board should be not to implement – look at the impacts. We put our ranches together originally by acquiring patents here and there and we don't want to lose that!</p> <p>Comments from FRC members:</p> <p>Jim Able – why don't you sell off your 40 and 80 acres now – you'd make more money?</p> <p>- We have been more in the buying mode not selling mode, but I believe that smaller owners should have the ability to sell smaller patents</p> <p>Gary Rynearson – smaller patents are managed as a whole now? You could afford to put together these ranches with smaller parcels at a time.</p> <p>- Yes we did acquire these smaller units one at a time – patent parcel issues should be decided early on before we decide on a 600 acre parcel size on the GPU. The County should chose not to implement – maybe we need to get determination from the BOS on if it should stay on the books.</p> <p>Steve Launi – can you manage a 40 acre stand alone TPZ parcel?</p> <p>- It would take more intense management, you see a lot more hobby managers of smaller acreage. It's more difficult to manage a 40 acre by itself.</p>
<p>Steve Horner – General Manager for Barnum Timber Co</p>	<p>- We are very concerned about the implementation of this ordinance on the devaluation of our property and also takes away flexibility for us. This is not a way to help forest products industries or help larger ownerships. Recommended more research into this ordinance – what are the issues now that makes it seem like this ordinance is valuable, new findings on why you would need this. To wait until the GPU – it may get lost in the larger discussion. Should be brought back to the FRC with more research for review and discussion. I don't see emergency on why this needs to be implemented right away – I believe there is more board feet now then when this ordinance was passed. Barnum Timber right now is letting our trees grow longer, we need to make some money so we sell off our smaller parcels in order to protect the larger resources. People did live on these parcels originally – we won't create something that wasn't already there. Suggest that we don't put it off until later.</p>
<p>Tina Christiansen – Realtor, HAR President</p>	<p>– Devaluation of property, taking away property rights. I don't think the County has this right. I want to know the cost to the County for the implementation of this ordinance. Where are we going to get the money to implement? There are way more important issues out there.</p>

Jim Redd, Realtor	<p>– Tina covered the point that I wanted to cover. My understanding that the reason that this ordinance was never implemented was the tremendous cost to implement (noticing etc.).</p>
Chuck Ciancio – forester	<p>I had a real hard time trying to figure out what you are supposed to do. I sent a list earlier that I wanted to discuss. The County has not been forthright in getting this information out.</p> <p>I have been dealing with private landowners for 40 years – why do people keep property in open space – use it, sell it off, keep for personal satisfaction. The restrictions put on open space by government agencies results in a loss of satisfaction and people want to sell – does not protect the resource. This is not a problem – haven’t seen any data...</p> <p>The County is dealing in issues I believe need an RPF license. How will the county sign off on it w/o and RPF?</p> <p>Some terms I would like to know if you have...</p> <p>Assessor parcel – SMA parcel – LLA Fusing of parcel Legally separate parcel</p> <p><i>Note: Mr. Ciancio submitted several documents that are attached as a pdf file to the email distributing this agenda and staff reports.</i></p>
Ray Flynn –	<p>I would like to give some background information on TPZ – I was the Assessor when TPZ when into effect. List A and List B – List A was put on the tax rolls as TPZ, List B was left up to the Assessor to decide if it qualified for TPZ. Mixed grazing lands with timber zoned 160 acres with AE (B-5)160 and TPZ.</p> <p>Assessor parcel numbers- discussed implications. Ease on how the parcels were set up and located on the assessor maps – does not represent legal parcels. Patent parcels never came up.</p> <p>Comments from FRC members Jim Able – wasn’t there a list C?</p> <p>Yes – timberlands that you could “opt in” not too many – smaller didn’t qualify under A and B.</p> <p>Gary Rynearson – Did you need 40 acres site III or better to come into TPZ? - No</p>