# MINNESOTA COUNTY FORESTS:

# POLICY OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPACTS FOR PROGRAM FUNDING, TIMBER SALES, AND LAND OWNERSHIP

by

Melvin J. Baughman[1]

January 1983

STAFF PAPER SERIES NUMBER 35

---

[1]Forest Resources Extension Specialist and Program Leader for Renewable Resources Extension. Department of Forest Resources, College of Forestry, University of Minnesota, St. Paul. Research supported by the Department of Forest Resources and the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Minnesota, St. Paul; and the North Central Forest Experiment Station, USDA-Forest Service, Duluth, MN. Published as Paper Number 1853 of the miscellaneous journal series of the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents
(continued)

# INTRODUCTION

Minnesota county governments manage approximately 2.8 million acres of forest land that provides revenue to local governments, employment for the region's economy, and public recreation opportunities for the entire state. Changes in county policies may have significant impacts on county government, the local economy, and recreation opportunities. Before land management policies are altered, it is important for county governments and their constituents to explore all reasonable alternatives and attempt to project their impacts. A study was conducted that focuses on three policy issues of concern to Minnesota counties,[2] namely:

1. Funding county land management programs.
2. Timber sale procedures, especially long-term timber sale agreements.
3. County land ownership policies.

The study's overall objectives were to identify current county policies for each issue, to develop new policy alternatives and to describe the likely impacts which new policies might have. The study measured impacts on county governments, on the timber industry, and on non-timber outputs. The principal report describing the study methods and results is available as a University of Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin.[3] This Staff Paper supplements the Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin by listing detailed impact statements for each policy analyzed by a Delphi panel.

---

[2]Baughman, M.J. Minnesota county forest land: alternative policies for program funding, timber sales, and land ownership. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1982.

[3]Baughman, M.J. and P.V. Ellefson. Minnesota's county forests: a Delphi study of options for program funding, sale of timber, and land ownership. 1983. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Minnesota. Station Bulletin 553. 50p.

Present state-wide policies guiding county operations with respect to the three policy issues in question were obtained from a review of state laws and state agency reports in effect as of January 1, 1981. Current policies and procedures followed by individual counties were obtained by interviewing land commissioners in 14 counties. Potential new policies were derived in two ways, namely:

1. Existing literature provided sufficient information to write several new policies for each issue. Designed to stimulate increased timber production on county land, new alternatives were drafted to represent extreme points of view.

2. A Delphi questionnaire yielded additional policy alternatives. The Delphi process was also used to determine possible impacts of alternative policies.

In its broadest sense, the Delphi process is a method of structuring communications so as to enable a group of individuals to analyze a complex problem and perhaps reach a consensus about its solution. The Delphi begins by soliciting information and opinions from a carefully chosen panel. The responses of other panel members are given as feedback to each participant. Each individual then has another opportunity to analyze the problem and provide another response. The process in this case was repeated for three rounds. Participants remained anonymous from one another.

Panel members were selected from 12 major occupational groups including land commissioners and auditors; state natural resource agency administrators and staff; national forest administrators; researchers in the areas of public finance, timber sale policy, and land ownership policy; economic development

promoters; timber processing industry managers; loggers; and environmental quality advocates.

County policies can be very complex. In the Delphi process, each policy had to be condensed to a brief outline of only the most significant points. Only then could panel members be expected to quickly grasp differences between policies. This resulted in less precise definitions of policy alternatives than would be required in statutes, but hopefully precise enough for panel members to grasp their meaning and express their opinions about what general impacts they might have. A study of these policies and their impacts provides decision makers with some of the information needed to develop policies that enable counties to achieve their land management objectives.

The remainder of this staff paper is devoted to descriptions of all the policies considered by the Delphi panel and the impact statements developed by the panel. Summary statistics show the percentage of panel members who either agreed or disagreed with each impact statement. This tabular information will be most useful when combined with the analysis presented in the Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin. It will be most valuable to persons who have a deep interest in funding of forest management on public lands, leasing of public forest land to the private sector, or public land ownership and disposal policies.

# FUNDING PROGRAMS

Table 1. Fund management from sale of land and its products.

Proceeds from SALE or RENTAL of county LAND and its PRODUCTS:
- County may annually appropriate up to 100% for land management activities such as:
  - timber, wildlife, recreation development
  - administration of land sales, leases, land classification
- Remainder, if any, distributed to county general fund (40%) and towns and schools (60%)

County GENERAL FUND (composed of many revenue sources):
- No revenue spent on county land

Proceeds from STATE:
- 37.5¢ per acre of tax-forfeited land paid to county annually for timber, wildlife, and recreation development

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. County land departments would have considerable flexibility in allocating funds among forestry-related activities. | 74 | 26 |
| 2. Strong lobbyists would influence the allocation of money to various county land management projects. | 63 | 37 |
| 3. There would be unpredictable fluctuations in annual county income which would make it difficult to carry out long-range plans. (Disagree: There would be fluctuations in income, but it is possible to overcome difficulties in carrying out long-range plans.) | 65 | 35 |
| 4. Counties would sometimes divert funds from long-term forest management programs to cover short-run expenses resulting in benefits to the present generation but higher costs to future generations. | 80 | 20 |
| 5. Counties would sometimes be forced to overcut timber or sell too much land in order to generate revenue to cover fixed costs of land management. (Agree: Not as likely a possibility as in past because most county boards are well aware of resource values, but it is a possibility.) | 65 | 35 |
| 6. County land management would be oriented toward production of market-valued outputs. (Disagree: Depends on makeup of county board.) | 80 | 20 |
| 7. County property tax base would increase when land is sold. (Agree: But that does not necessarily mean county financial position would improve. Tax base would not increase significantly. Demand for county services would also increase.) | 90 | 10 |
| 8. When lands are sold, the county general fund would have to be used for projects previously supported by land management revenue. (Agree: But would general funds be appropriated or would projects be cut back?) | 63 | 37 |
| 9. County land department staff size is limited by the amount of land income county boards are willing to reinvest in land management rather than distribute to the county, towns, and schools. | 95 | 5 |
| 10. School districts would benefit from obtaining land income for which they have no liability. (Disagree: There is not enough money left to distribute to schools.) | 72 | 28 |
| 11. Counties would benefit in the short run from land sale revenue, but in the long run, they lose land management receipts and in-lieu tax payments from the state. | 80 | 20 |

Table 1. Fund management from sale of land and its products (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | County land sales would benefit purchasers such as farmers, timber companies, and developers. (Agree: Some timber companies would benefit, but companies which did not buy would suffer.) | 95 | 5 |
| 13. | The timber industry would benefit from county timber management and sustained harvesting. | 85 | 15 |
| 14. | Some timber land sold to private individuals would no longer be available for harvest by the timber industry. | 90 | 10 |
| 15. | Recreationists, especially local people, benefit from low-cost-per-capita facilities subsidized by land and timber revenue and state in-lieu tax payments. | 90 | 10 |
| 16. | Hunters benefit from free access to forest land managed partially for wildlife. | 90 | 10 |
| 17. | The resort industry benefits from free access to county land for its customers. | 95 | 5 |
| 18. | Land which is sold would generally not be open for public recreational use. | 85 | 15 |
| 19. | Counties would spend proceeds from the state on timber management but would spend very little additional management revenue on timber management. | 42 | 58 |
| 20. | Land departments would have lots of money. (Disagree: What is lots? Some counties would have an adequate amount, but not a surplus.) | 17 | 83 |
| 21. | The county general fund, towns, and schools would be hurt when counties invest in land management rather than those other entities. | 35 | 65 |
| 22. | The county would be hurt by selling timber at prices below the cost of production. | 33 | 67 |
| 23. | The quality of timber and variety of timber species on county land would decrease. (Disagree: Depends on county timber sale policy.) | 40 | 60 |
| 24. | Multiple uses of county land would be well integrated. (Agree: Plan 1 utilizes timber receipts for multiple-use plus state subsidy, but Plans 2 and 3 call for general funds which are hard to get.) | 40 | 60 |
| 25. | Consultants would have opportunities to work on county land. (Agree: But they would not do much work. Disagree: This would be more a matter of organization management policy than funding. Most counties will continue to rely on their own staffs rather than on consultants.) | 40 | 60 |

Table 1. Fund management from sale of land and its products (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26. | The quality of wildlife habitat would decrease. (Agree: Only on land sold and developed.) | 21 | 79 |
| 27. | County land and timber sales would subsidize programs funded out of the county general fund. (Agree: May happen occasionally.) | 55 | 45 |
| 28. | Very little revenue would be made available to the county general fund, towns, and schools. (Agree: Sale receipts are not sufficient for sound forest management programs, so no money left over for other programs. Disagree: I fear that general fund, towns, and schools would get more than they should. Some counties now provide revenue to general fund and this would continue. There will be strong local pressures to return some money to general fund, towns, and schools.) | 50 | 50 |
| 29. | The timber industry would continue to benefit from relatively low-priced timber. (Disagree: Depends on the county's pricing policy. Industry needs higher prices to attract private capital.) | 50 | 50 |

Table 2. Separate timber from nontimber revenues.

Proceeds from SALE of TIMBER cut on county land:
- Revenue placed in timber development account and appropriated annually by county for timber production
- Unappropriated funds left in timber development account over 2 years may be transferred to county general fund

Proceeds from SALE or RENTAL of county LAND and NONTIMBER PRODUCTS from it:
- Revenue distributed to county general fund (40%) and towns and schools (60%)

County GENERAL FUND (composed of many revenue sources):
- Money for nontimber-related land management programs allocated annually by county for:
  - wildlife and recreation development
  - administration of land sales, leases, land classification, etc.

Proceeds from STATE:
- 37.5¢ per acre of tax-forfeited land paid to county annually for timber, wildlife, and recreation development

| Impact Statements | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[4] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: | 70 | 0 | 30 | 1 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: | 78 | 17 | 5 | 1 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 61 | 33 | 6 | 1 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: | 39 | 50 | 11 | 0 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. The quality of county timber management would increase. (Disagree: Doubt if this policy will be cause of natural improvement in county timber management. No Vote: Land base should be more stable.) | 60 | 40 |
| 6. Counties would develop better access to their timber stands. (Agree: But access would not be developed to very high standard of quality. No Vote: Not sure enough additional funding would be available to guarantee it.) | 65 | 35 |
| 7. Counties would offer relatively more stumpage for sale. (No Vote: Would depend on how much of timber management program is financed from land sale revenue now.) | 60 | 40 |

[4] Panel members evaluated the relative change they expected to occur in a variable by rating relative change on a scale of +5 (increase greatly) to -5 (decrease greatly).

Table 2. Separate timber from nontimber revenues (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | Stumpage prices for county timber would increase. | 74 | 26 |
| 9. | Counties would spend relatively less money to produce nontimber outputs. (Agree: Harder to get general funds than dedicated funds.) | 60 | 40 |
| 10. | The quantity and quality of habitat for deer, grouse, and moose would improve on county lands. (Agree: Harvesting would set back plant succession and increase number of animals, but size of cuts and rate of conversion to conifers would not change. Moose habitat will not improve. Increased harvesting and more stable land base improve habitat, not more money for habitat work. Disagree: Trend is most likely outside scope of policy's influence.) | 67 | 33 |
| 11. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would be more variable over time as county boards change membership and alter funding levels for these outputs. | 84 | 16 |
| 12. | County land departments would lose authority and flexibility over their county boards for allocating revenue among land management projects. (Agree: County boards would have to allocate funds for nontimber uses.) | 32 | 68 |
| 13. | The level of funding available for county land management would be more variable. (Agree: Nontimber programs would be dependent on county board allocations from general fund. Disagree: Suspect long-term trend toward declining real purchasing power. County would at least have general funds available.) | 41 | 59 |
| 14. | Counties would invest relatively more money in timber development. | 37 | 63 |
| 15. | Counties would invest relatively less money in timber development. | 21 | 79 |
| 16. | Counties would invest relatively more money in the county general fund, townships, and schools. (Agree: Only if counties sell relatively large amounts of land.) | 39 | 61 |
| 17. | Counties would continue to subsidize timber management with land sale revenue. (Disagree: Land sales have been decreasing.) | 29 | 71 |
| 18. | The quality of county timber management would decrease. | 5 | 95 |
| 19. | Counties would overcut their timber and deplete their growing stock. | 5 | 95 |
| 20. | Counties would sell relatively more land. (Agree: Counties would sell low timber-producing lands not generating income.) | 33 | 67 |
| 21. | Counties would sell relatively less land. | 39 | 61 |
| 22. | Stumpage prices for county timber would increase but at a slower rate. (Disagree: Prices will be based on bidding.) | 31 | 59 |
| 23. | Processing firms owning timber land would harvest timber from county land first and hold their own timber in reserve. (Disagree: This happens now, but this funding plan would have no affect on the practice.) | 39 | 61 |

Table 2. Separate timber from nontimber revenues (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24. | Firms owning timber land would invest relatively less money in developing timber resources on their land. | 21 | 79 |
| 25. | Counties would spend relatively more money to produce nontimber outputs. | 37 | 63 |
| 26. | Counties would spend relatively more money to improve wildlife habitat on their land. | 37 | 63 |
| 27. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally increase. (No Vote: Trend is outside scope of this funding policy's influence.) | 33 | 67 |
| 28. | Counties would invest relatively more money in recreational facilities on their land. | 37 | 63 |
| 29. | Recreational use of county land would increase. (No Vote: Trend is outside scope of this funding policy's influence.) | 17 | 83 |
| 30. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally decrease. (Agree: It would be harder to get funds for nontimber outputs.) | 40 | 60 |
| 31. | The quantity and quality of habitat for nongame animals would generally decrease on county land. | 21 | 79 |
| 32. | Water quality would decrease on county land. | 16 | 84 |
| 33. | The quantity and quality of unique vegetation on county land would generally decrease. (Disagree: Sale of land will do more to eliminate unique vegetation.) | 33 | 67 |
| 34. | The scenic quality of county land would generally decrease. | 11 | 89 |
| 35. | There would be no effect on the timber industry so long as county land department salaries and operating costs are appropriated from the general fund. (No Vote: Plan 2 does not provide for appropriations from general fund for land department timber management.) | 56 | 44 |
| 36. | The timber industry would feel more secure in developing long-range plans for investments in processing facilities. | 55 | 45 |
| 37. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally not change. (Disagree: Depends on county board's willingness to appropriate funds. No Vote: Trend is most likely outside scope of this policy's influence.) | 47 | 53 |

Table 3. Sell revenue bonds and separate timber from nontimber revenue.

Proceeds from REVENUE BONDS:
- Revenue bonds sold to pay for large, nonrecurring timber development projects (e.g., roads, reforestation backlog); bonds backed by revenue production capacity of county forest

Proceeds from SALE of TIMBER cut on county land:
- First, timber revenue bonds paid
- Second, remainder placed in timber development account and appropriated annually by the county for timber production
- Unappropriated funds left in timber development account over 2 years may be transferred to county general fund

Proceeds from SALE or RENTAL of county LAND and NONTIMBER PRODUCTS from it:
- Revenue distributed to county general fund (40%) and towns and schools (60%)

County GENERAL FUND (composed of many revenue sources):
- Money for nontimber-related land management programs allocated annually for:
  - wildlife and recreation development
  - administration of land sales, leases, land classification, etc.

Proceeds from STATE:
- 37.5¢ per acre of tax-forfeited land paid to county annually for timber, wildlife, and recreation development

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[5] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: | 76 | 0 | 24 | 2 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: | 94 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 88 | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: (Increase: Perhaps small industries will enter but expansion by existing firms will fully utilize resource.) | 82 | 18 | 0 | 1 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. County land management policies would generally be more stable. | 79 | 21 |
| 6. Counties would improve the quality of their land management planning. | 84 | 16 |
| 7. Counties would increase their orientation toward producing market-valued outputs on their land. (Agree: Counties would definitely have to produce revenue to repay bonds, but counties might also produce more nonmarket outputs. Producing market-valued outputs is not necessarily detrimental to nonmarket-valued outputs.) | 84 | 16 |

[5] See footnote 4, page 8.

Table 3. Sell revenue bonds and separate timber from nontimber revenue (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | Counties would invest relatively more money in timber development. | 94 | 6 |
| 9. | County governments would pay closer attention to the economic feasibility of forestry investments. | 100 | 0 |
| 10. | The quantity and quality of timber harvested from county land would increase. (Agree: Increase would not be very noticeable in first 20 years. Disagree: Harvest is market controlled.) | 79 | 21 |
| 11. | Counties would develop better road access to their timber stands. | 100 | 0 |
| 12. | The annual supply of timber harvested from county land would be more stable, less erratic. (Disagree: Timber markets, not the agency, are main determinants of how much is cut each year.) | 84 | 16 |
| 13. | Bonding would commit counties to a long-term timber production program. | 95 | 5 |
| 14. | Bond payments, given present interest rates, would interfere with proper timber management on county land. (No Vote: County might exceed allowable cut if bonding proposal is not carefully planned.) | 68 | 32 |
| 15. | Debt service on bonds may be higher than the return on forestry investments. (Disagree: Would hope counties would use bonded revenues for investments with best benefit/cost ratio. No Vote: Too many variables to judge whether this statement true or not.) | 71 | 29 |
| 16. | Counties would sell relatively less land. | 84 | 16 |
| 17. | Counties would sell relatively more land. | 16 | 84 |
| 18. | Counties would dispose of relatively more of their land not suited for commercial timber production. (Agree: Better benefit/cost ratio on managing commercial rather than noncommercial land.) | 45 | 55 |
| 19. | Counties would put relatively more money in the county general fund. | 32 | 68 |
| 20. | Firms owning timber land would invest relatively less money in developing timber resources on their land. (Agree: Counties would be in better position to supply timber. Disagree: Firms would maintain status quo and enjoy any benefits from public investment.) | 21 | 79 |
| 21. | Processing firms owning timber land would harvest timber from county land first and hold their own timber in reserve. (Disagree: This may occur but not because of the funding plan which might be in effect. Firms cannot do this indefinitely, but company-owned lands tend to insulate firms from market variations.) | 45 | 55 |
| 22. | Stumpage prices for county timber would increase. (Agree: More and better timber would be available so it would sell for higher price.) | 68 | 32 |

Table 3. Sell revenue bonds and separate timber from nontimber revenue (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | Stumpage prices for county timber would increase but at a slower rate. | 35 | 65 |
| 24. | Stumpage prices for county timber would be more stable, less erratic. (Disagree: Up-and-down flucutations might be less, but rate of price increase might be greater.) | 61 | 39 |
| 25. | Timber utilization on county land would improve. | 84 | 16 |
| 26. | The timber industry would feel more secure in developing long-range plans for investments in processing facilities. | 84 | 16 |
| 27. | Part-time loggers would tend to be displaced by full-time professional loggers. (Agree: Because size of sales would increase. Will occur regardless of funding policy employed. Disagree: Part-time loggers will be displaced with or without this funding policy.) | 63 | 37 |
| 28. | Counties would spend relatively more money to produce nontimber outputs. | 16 | 84 |
| 29. | Counties would spend relatively less money to produce nontimber outputs. | 75 | 25 |
| 30. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally increase. | 28 | 72 |
| 31. | Improved road access to county land would encourage more recreational use. (Disagree: Roads provide access but do not encourage more recreational use.) | 89 | 11 |
| 32. | Wildlife associated with timber harvesting and reforestation would increase. (Agree: Site disturbances would increase wildlife numbers but not to full potential because of limitations on size of cuts and design of harvest area.) | 89 | 11 |
| 33. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally not change. | 63 | 37 |
| 34. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs would generally decrease. | 24 | 76 |

Table 4. Time limit set on revenue bonds.

Use revenue bonds for roads and timber development on county land, but only to extent needed to bring county timber production up to a high level.

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (Percent) | |
| 1. | Presence of the option would encourage counties to develop a more analytical approach to management whether or not they used bonds. | 70 | 30 |
| 2. | It would show timber industry that counties are serious about timber management and would encourage development of a more permanently based wood industry. (Agree: To extent that counties actually used bonding. Some changes in attitude occur as county board members change.) | 84 | 16 |
| 3. | Would help ensure that county governments are committed to timber development projects and timber sales to pay off revenue bonds. (Agree: But timber sales could exceed sustained supply if planning not done properly.) | 90 | 10 |
| 4. | More timber would be available to timber industry. (Agree: Later in the 20-year period.) | 80 | 20 |
| 5. | Counties may periodically overcut timber to pay off bond debts. | 80 | 20 |
| 6. | There would be more public interest in how land management funds were spent. (Agree: But apathy and special interest groups would still prevail.) | 90 | 10 |
| 7. | There would be increased public input on proposed programs resulting in increases in nontimber outputs. | 50 | 50 |
| 8. | It would reduce direct commitments to nontimber outputs, but some indirect impacts resulting from timber management might be beneficial to wildlife and hunting. | 74 | 26 |
| 9. | New roads built by bond money would attract more recreationists and private homes (where county and private lands are intermixed). (Agree: Could really increase management and property protection costs. There would be less timber harvested from private land.) | 85 | 15 |
| 10. | It would still take decades to get county land up to a high level of timber production. (Disagree: It would take decades to increase allowable cuts but not to increase average growth per acre. Improved access would provide immediate increased productivity.) | 68 | 32 |
| 11. | It would promote greater intensification of timber production on nonindustrial private land. (Agree: To extent that county access roads also improved access to nonindustrial private forest land. If industry expands creating greater demand. Disagree: There would be more private timber in hands of summer homeowners and, therefore, less timber harvested.) | 50 | 50 |

Table 5. Sell revenue bonds for permanent roads.

Use revenue bonds to develop permanent system of roads for county land, but not for other timber development projects.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. Improved road access would increase supply of county timber available to timber industry. | 85 | 15 |
| 2. Improved road access would facilitate timber management, timber harvest, and recreational use of county land. | 95 | 5 |
| 3. Timber management backlog would not be addressed. (Disagree: It would to extent funds formerly used on roads would be used for reforestation. Improved road system would facilitate access thus lowering management costs and increasing the price of timber.) | 37 | 63 |
| 4. Better access not needed if counties did not also do timber development projects to increase productivity. | 28 | 72 |
| 5. More county timber would be available to small timber buyers. (No Vote: It would depend on other county policies.) | 76 | 24 |
| 6. Counties may have to overcut timber to pay debt service on bonds. (Agree: The possibility exists, but I presume good fiscal planning would accompany use of revenue bonds.) | 74 | 26 |

Table 6. Sell revenue bonds for contingency fund.

Place proceeds from revenue bonds in contingency fund and allocate for timber management to reduce lumpiness in annual timber sale income.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. Lumpiness is not much of a problem. | 31 | 69 |
| 2. It would give county land departments greater financial stability in carrying out long-range forest plans. (Disagree: It would also add an interest cost to the county budget for the convenience of having money available.) | 80 | 20 |
| 3. It would take some of the politics out of county timber sale program. | 50 | 50 |
| 4. It would not increase funding for timber development projects needed to increase productivity. (Agree: It would lower funding. Still have to pay off bonds plus incur costs of holding money.) | 53 | 47 |
| 5. It would help provide stable long-term timber supply for timber industry. (Agree: But at a greater than necessary cost.) | 68 | 32 |
| 6. Cost of bonds could reduce total net revenue from county land. (Disagree: I assumes use of bonds is optional.) | 90 | 10 |
| 7. Too easy to use this money for regular operating expenses and nontimber-producing purposes. | 74 | 26 |
| 8. Nontimber outputs would not be adversely affected. | 70 | 30 |

Table 7. Invest land sale proceeds.

| Invest land sale proceeds in interest-earning bonds, bank accounts, etc., and allocate interest earned to land management. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
| | (percent) | |
| 1. It would stabilize county land management funding. (Agree: But not enough money would be invested to make land management funding entirely stable. It would be similar to trust fund on state land.) | 65 | 35 |
| 2. It would increase funds available to manage county land. | 65 | 35 |
| 3. Long time period needed to generate revenue could hurt reforestation and access road development in short run. | 72 | 28 |
| 4. Counties would sell more land. (Agree: Counties would sell more nonproductive land. Disagree: Should have no effect on land sales. It just ties money from land sales back to land management.) | 40 | 60 |
| 5. Counties would sell less land. (Disagree: The plan would not affect the sale of land.) | 22 | 78 |
| 6. Counties could sell land better suited for another ownership without depleting their capital assets. (Agree: But other costs for roads, management, protection, etc., would increase. Definition of "better suited" changes over time.) | 74 | 26 |
| 7. Counties would spend more money on nontimber outputs. | 35 | 65 |
| 8. Counties would spend less money on nontimber outputs | 40 | 60 |
| 9. It would increase supply of timber available to timber industry. (Agree: After several years. Disagree: Would increase supply just nominally.) | 40 | 60 |
| 10. It would help ensure a stable long-term timber supply for industry. (Agree: By somewhat discouraging land sales. Only if counties not tempted to sell too much land.) | 55 | 45 |

Table 8. Fund projects throughout their lives.

Prepare long-range, comprehensive plans for county land and dedicate county and state funds to specific projects throughout their life. Annual changes in funding levels allowed to reflect changes in the economy.

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | |
| 1. | Since long-range projections are always somewhat wrong, funds may be dedicated to obsolete projects. | 65 | 35 |
| 2. | It does not have flexibility to handle abrupt biological changes in forest conditions. | 63 | 37 |
| 3. | Counties would have more stable land management revenues. | 65 | 35 |
| 4. | It would increase the quantity and quality of county timber available to timber industry. (Disagree: Plan may divert funds away from other needed projects.) | 53 | 47 |
| 5. | It may unduly defer start up of some new land management projects. | 45 | 55 |
| 6. | It would generally improve quantity and quality of nontimber outputs. | 60 | 40 |

Table 9. Charge recreational user fees.

Charge user fees which fully reflect the cost of providing improved recreational facilities and wildlife habitat on county land.

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | |
| 1. | Collecting user fees on county land is generally not practical or cost effective. (Agree: Except for campgrounds, beaches, and other concentrated-use areas.) | 85 | 15 |
| 2. | Higher fees would reduce demand for some nontimber uses. | 85 | 15 |
| 3. | It would free up additional funds for timber management. | 55 | 45 |

Table 10. Increase stumpage prices.

| Raise stumpage prices on county land to earn a reasonable profit for county and pay all land management costs from land management receipts. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
| | (percent) | |
| 1. It would reduce volume of timber purchased from counties. (Agree: But depends on magnitude of price increases over timber prices on other land ownerships.) | 80 | 20 |
| 2. Counties would reduce their total net revenue from timber sales. (Disagree: Depends on volume sold.) | 53 | 47 |
| 3. It would help make county timber programs cost effective. (Agree: If timber still sold at higher price.) | 63 | 37 |
| 4. It would motivate counties to make long-term investments in timber management. | 80 | 20 |
| 5. It would economically depress the timber industry. (Agree: But for how long? Stumpage prices are a small component of final output price for wood products. Disagree: Depends on price. Prices may have to rise substantially to make a "profit." Not fair for wood industry to foot entire management bill because many other benefits also result from good forest management.) | 32 | 68 |
| 6. Private nonindustrial forest owners would be able to sell more timber at higher prices. (Agree: But it depends on relative prices.) | 58 | 42 |
| 7. Major forest road construction cannot be financed from short-term timber sale receipts. (Agree: Receipts from different sales could be pooled, but that would leave little or none for reforestation. Disagree: It can if the sale is big enough.) | 58 | 42 |
| 8. It would generally hurt nontimber outputs. (Agree: County may want to keep costs--and thus timber prices--down.) | 30 | 70 |

Table 11. Establish emergency contingency fund.

Place part of excess county land management revenue in contingency fund, set at specified level, to handle emergencies and special projects.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. Most counties would not have any excess revenue. (No Vote: Some counties now put significant amounts of revenue into general fund.) | 79 | 21 |
| 2. Special projects and emergencies would always arise to consume the contingency fund. (Disagree: Would need guidelines or priorities.) | 95 | 5 |
| 3. It would encourage more careful planning by counties. (Agree: Only for special projects.) | 50 | 50 |
| 4. It would help stabilize funding and workload of county land management. | 35 | 65 |
| 5. It would help stabilize county timber supply available to timber industry. | 20 | 80 |
| 6. It would be a good source of money for nontimber outputs. (Agree: But doubt if it would be used for this.) | 60 | 40 |

Table 12. Allocate fixed minimum plus variable supplementary funds.

Set aside annually a fixed minimum amount of revenue from county land management for resource development. Supplementary resource development funds to be appropriated from county general fund.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. Land management would generally be funded at fixed minimum level with few supplementary funds appropriated. | 78 | 22 |
| 2. It would stabilize county forest management funding. (Agree: But stability would depend on amount of "fixed minimum" and adjustments for inflation.) | 58 | 42 |
| 3. County forestry plans and goals would be designed for minimum levels of funding. | 65 | 35 |

Table 13. Supplement land revenue with general funds.

Basically fund all county land management from revenue generated from sale of products and services from land, but also allocate money from county general fund to balance production of market- and nonmarket-valued outputs.

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | |
| 1. | County land departments would concentrate more on market-valued outputs to ensure continued financing. (Agree: But not a real big factor.) | 85 | 15 |
| 2. | Funding for nontimber outputs would be more dependent on wishes of county board. | 95 | 5 |
| 3. | Would result in more unstable timber supply from county land. (Disagree: But, may not be more stable either.) | 30 | 70 |
| 4. | It would result in more fluctuations in funding depending on the economy. (Agree: This common under many funding plans.) | 80 | 20 |

Table 14. Allocate from county general fund.

Place county land revenue into county general fund and allocate land management funds on basis of projected long-range need for outputs and demonstrated past performance.

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | |
| 1. | It would be more equitable for all interest groups. (Agree: But disastrous for timber management.) | 55 | 45 |
| 2. | There would be a lower level of land management funding. | 75 | 25 |
| 3. | Funding levels would be more unstable. | 75 | 25 |
| 4. | It would encourage increased sales of county land. | 53 | 47 |
| 5. | It would result in elimination of county land department in several counties. | 50 | 50 |
| 6. | It would create more unstable timber supply for timber industry. | 60 | 40 |
| 7. | Nontimber outputs would have lower priority for funding. | 55 | 45 |

Table 15. Increase in-lieu payments periodically.

Increase state payments to counties periodically to reflect current cost of producing outputs from county land which benefit the statewide public.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. It would be an administrative nightmare to measure benefits and costs to statewide public of watershed protection, recreation, and wildlife and then balance payments between rural and urban counties (since urban counties also produce statewide benefits.) (Agree: It would have to be done politically. Disagree: It need not be a nightmare, but with the propensity government has for red tape, it probably would be.) | 75 | 25 |
| 2. State in-lieu tax payments would then reflect property tax inflation. (Disagree: Property taxes not necessarily subject to inflation; they fluctuate throughout the state.) | 67 | 33 |
| 3. Counties would be able to increase their timber supply. (Agree: Timber supply would increase somewhat if funding continues.) | 50 | 50 |
| 4. Counties would be able to increase nontimber outputs. | 70 | 30 |
| 5. It would result in improved social equity at expense of economic efficiency. | 33 | 67 |
| 6. State would gain more influence over management of county lands. | 35 | 65 |

Table 16. Allocate state money for time period.

State allocates money to counties for timber production only until forest land reaches full production; thereafter, timber management funded entirely from timber sale revenue. State payments continued for wildlife, recreation, and other nontimber-oriented programs.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. It would be difficult to determine when full production is reached. | 90 | 10 |
| 2. Nontimber outputs would be neglected until forest land reaches full timber production. (Agree: Timber outputs would have priority. Neglect is not the right word, though.) | 70 | 30 |
| 3. State would require counties to balance nontimber outputs with timber production. (Agree: State would certainly mandate production. Disagree: Unless it was legislated that way. No Vote: Some interest group would push for this.) | 37 | 63 |
| 4. State would require that it exercise more control over county forest management plans. | 80 | 20 |
| 5. It would encourage counties toward more cost-effective timber management. (Agree: With a full production goal.) | 60 | 40 |
| 6. Timber industry would be more assured that state's #1 forest resource goal is timber production. | 70 | 30 |

Table 17. State makes grants for projects.

State makes grants to counties for specific timber development projects rather than providing annual flat rate payments of 37.5¢ per acre.

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | |
| 1. | Grants would be more costly to administer than flat rate payments per acre. | 95 | 5 |
| 2. | Funds would be used more efficiently since only counties which desired them would request funds. (Agree: All counties would desire them, but some may not qualify.) | 50 | 50 |
| 3. | There would be greater fluctuations in county land department funding. | 90 | 10 |
| 4. | It would encourage counties to plan more extensively than is required when income is guaranteed. (Disagree: It would encourage fly-by-night projects.) | 90 | 10 |
| 5. | County government would be giving up control over resource goals to the state. (Agree: But not to an inordinate extent.) | 80 | 20 |
| 6. | State would be in role of approving individual projects rather than more comprehensive management plans. (No Vote: Depends on how the approval process is set up.) | 95 | 5 |
| 7. | Counties would lose flexibility in using funds for various kinds of forest resource projects. (Agree: But, I doubt if much would change.) | 90 | 10 |
| 8. | State would require more consideration for nontimber outputs. (Disagree: Funding plan says "timber development projects.") | 42 | 58 |
| 9. | It would bias land management toward timber management and away from nontimber outputs. (Disagree: Timber plans would consider and include nontimber outputs if administered properly by state.) | 75 | 25 |
| 10. | Money would go to best promoters rather than to most worthwhile projects. (Agree: But maybe the best promoters have most worthwhile projects. No Vote: Depends on how laws written and how criteria developed to allocate funds.) | 78 | 22 |

# TIMBER SALES PROGRAMS

Table 18. Small-volume auction and negotiated sale.

Acres: 300 or less
Tenure: 3 years
Marketing: Competitive timber bids on sales over $750; negotiated price on smaller sales
Payment: Lump sum at time of sale
Harvest Control: County sets tree harvest and site conservation standards
Risk: Buyer reimbursed for timber destroyed by natural disaster prior to harvest
Timber Management: County performs and pays for all work
Roads: Buyer pays for temporary logging roads; county pays for other roads
Nontimber Land Uses: County controls
Noncounty Land Owned by Buyer: No special county control

| | Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (percent) | |
| 1. | County land managers benefit from the ease of maintaining the status quo. | 84 | 16 |
| 2. | County land managers have great flexibility to change management practices over time. | 74 | 26 |
| 3. | County governments are unable to make long-term policy because of short-term timber sale contracts and unknown future revenues. (Disagree: Long-term commitments may also have adverse effect on making policy.) | 47 | 53 |
| 4. | Medium- to large-size wood processing firms are unable to make long-term plans and increase operating efficiency because of short-term timber sale contracts. (Agree: New firms are affected but not old firms with established procurement systems.) | 68 | 32 |
| 5. | Counties get current stumpage values--a real benefit. | 67 | 33 |
| 6. | Counties are hurt when timber prices increase greatly during the contract period. (Disagree: Counties have option of increasing prices on existing contracts and exercise it.) | 25 | 75 |
| 7. | Counties benefit by getting full payment before logging begins. (Disagree: Front-end cost load reduces competition for stumpage.) | 79 | 21 |
| 8. | Timber buyers are hurt by making full payment before logging begins. (Disagree: Amounts of money are not that great.) | 67 | 33 |
| 9. | County timber sale administrators have a heavy burden deciding who gets a negotiated timber sale and what price should be paid. (Agree: Only if they do not have mechanisms in place to make decisions. Disagree: Counties are on thin ice to some extent, but there are few cries of outrage so far.) | 63 | 37 |
| 10. | Informal commitments made in connection with negotiated sales tie county timber sale administrators to promises they wish were never made. (Agree: Same holds true for larger and longer sales. Disagree; There should not be any informal commitments.) | 69 | 31 |
| 11. | Numerous small timber sales hamper the counties in applying good silviculture practices. (Disagree: Small timber sales benefit wildlife and allow timber management to be concentrated on small tracts.) | 74 | 26 |
| 12. | Counties lose money on negotiated timber sales because prices are generally higher on competitive sales. | 89 | 11 |
| 13. | Counties lose money on negotiated sales because they are inefficient to administer relative to larger, competitive sales. | 84 | 16 |

Table 18. Small-volume auction and negotiated sale (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Low stumpage prices asked by counties in negotiated sales also reduce stumpage prices on private nonindustrial land and discourage private timber management. | 65 | 35 |
| 15. | Small loggers benefit by buying timber without competition through negotiated sales. (Disagree: Processing companies know stumpage prices and set mill prices accordingly.) | 78 | 22 |
| 16. | Negotiated sales result in a timber price subsidy to processing firms since prices paid are less than in competitive sales. | 67 | 33 |
| 17. | Service firms (trucking, parts, fuel, equipment dealers) benefit by selling services and merchandise to a large clientele of small, independent loggers. | 67 | 33 |
| 18. | These sale procedures perpetuate a noncompetitive and inefficient logging industry. (Agree: Sale procedures help to do this, but stumpage cost is small part of production costs.) | 67 | 33 |
| 19. | Consumers are hurt by noncompetitive, inefficient logging industry. (Disagree: Inefficiency does increase price of wood at mills. Price of wood at mill is so low and small logger is so willing to absorb loss that consumer has it made.) | 80 | 20 |
| 20. | Competitive timber sales on large tracts result in better utilization of timber than occurs on small, negotiated sales. (Disagree: Small logger will monkey with fuelwood, but big logger will not.) | 69 | 31 |
| 21. | Large, competitive sales squeeze small loggers out of business. | 78 | 22 |
| 22. | Large, mechanized logging firms are hurt by short sale periods which hinder their financial planning and operating efficiency. (Disagree: Size of sale is more important than length of term for large, mechanized logging firms.) | 83 | 17 |
| 23. | Competitive sales allow timber processing firms to control the harvesting sector. (Disagree: Good competition between firms permits harvesting sector to control processing firms. Almost all loggers are independent operators.) | 50 | 50 |
| 24. | New timber industries can compete for purchases of county timber. (Disagree: What's small or large? There is not much difference in number of employees.) | 73 | 27 |
| 25. | New timber industries can compete for purchases of county timber. | 75 | 25 |
| 26. | Short-term, small-volume timber sales favor established processing firms over new entrants. (Agree: New firms have to have an ensured supply of timber before risking capital. They can't sink millions into a plant and then start looking for raw material. Existing firms with established procurement systems have the advantage. Why else is Boise so much in favor of informal sales? Disagree: Processing firms have a buyer's market 95% of the time. A new entrant willing to pay will be buried in wood.) | 47 | 53 |
| 27. | Wildlife is adversely affected by 300-acre harvest sites. (Agree: But careful planning can mitigate this effect. Disagree: Wildlife managers think so but I cannot believe it is that critical. Most sales would be smaller than 300 acres. Agreement 1 is best agreement for wildlife.) | 39 | 61 |
| 28. | Wildlife and environmental quality in general are enhanced by small, scattered site disturbances. | 78 | 22 |

Table 19. Long-term timber volume guarantee.

Acres: Approximately 10,000 acres; county guarantees 235,000 cu. ft. of wood fiber annually from generally designated area
Tenure: 10 years, renewed in 5-year increments
Marketing of Lease: Competitive timber bids among timber processing firms
Payment: Quarterly payments for volume cut; unit prices adjusted periodically; lessee reimbursed for approved reforestation expenses
Harvest Control: Lessee cuts at least 50% of allocated volume annually and within ±10% of allowable cut every 5 years; county sets tree harvest and site conservation standards
Risk: County supplies 235,000 cu. ft. of wood annually regardless of natural disasters
Timber Management: Lessee replants cutover areas and is reimbursed for approved expenses; county performs and pays for all other work
Roads: Lessee pays for the temporary logging roads; county pays for other roads
Nontimber Land Uses: County controls
Noncounty Land Owned by Lessee: No special county control

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[6] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: | 76 | 0 | 24 | 2 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: | 76 | 0 | 24 | 2 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 88 | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: | 65 | 15 | 20 | 1 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. County forest management plans would be more oriented toward timber production objectives of the lessee and not toward multiple-use of county land. | 81 | 19 |
| 6. Counties would do a better job of integrating nontimber outputs with timber production in their management plans. (Agree: County staff would have more time to work on nontimber outputs if released from timber management.) | 38 | 62 |
| 7. Counties would be better able to harvest their maximum allowable cut. (Disagree: Payment is made on wood cut. If company inventories are up, county timber won't be cut.) | 82 | 18 |
| 8. Counties would have a more stable flow of income from timber sales. | 94 | 6 |
| 9. Counties would sometimes have too little money available to reimburse the lessee for his reforestation work on county land. (Agree: Budgets and work plans would have to be closely coordinated.) | 68 | 32 |

[6] See footnote 4, page 8.

Table 19. Long-term timber volume guarantee (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | There would be better opportunities for bid price conspiracies among large timber processing firms. (Agree: This might be true. Smaller independents would not be able to handle this. Competition would be less. Disagree: I think (naive?) that companies are basically honest. At present, competition is too great and times are changing too fast for long-term conspiracies.) | 47 | 53 |
| 11. | Counties would have difficulty finding a buyer for timber not in a lease area. (Agree: Most favorable, high-volume sites would be locked up in a lease. Need Agreement 1 and small, independent loggers to harvest small stands. Disagree: Small loggers would buy timber.) | 19 | 81 |
| 12. | Counties would be hurt by a large natural disaster which reduced their ability to supply a guaranteed volume of wood. (Agree: Need to recognize this type of problem in the agreement.) | 94 | 6 |
| 13. | The process of allocating timber cutting rights to various loggers would pass from the county to the timber processing firms. | 80 | 20 |
| 14. | County land managers would spend less time on timber sales and more time on timber, wildlife, and recreation management. (Agree: Would have fewer sales. Disagree: Sales still need much administration.) | 42 | 58 |
| 15. | Counties would lose flexibility to adjust land use to meet new social demands and changing economic conditions. | 82 | 18 |
| 16. | Counties would be hindered in exchanging tracts of land. (Agree: Would require better planning.) | 79 | 21 |
| 17. | The more stable timber supply would result in higher financial risk to the timber industry during extended downturns in the general economy and competitive advantages through wood availability during upturns. | 87 | 13 |
| 18. | The timber harvesting and processing industry would have more difficulty with long-range planning. | 7 | 93 |
| 19. | Profits of the remaining firms in the timber industry would increase. | 73 | 27 |
| 20. | Profits of the timber processing industry would decline. | 0 | 100 |
| 21. | The timber industry would gain a tax advantage--depletion allowance. (Agree: But not many firms take advantage of it when it is available.) | 64 | 36 |
| 22. | The timber industry would gain a tax advantage--capital gains. | 85 | 15 |
| 23. | The number of both timber harvesting and processing firms would be reduced. (Agree: Small loggers and small mills and processors would have difficulty getting county wood.) | 45 | 55 |
| 24. | Local economies would be more subject to fluctuations in timber product markets. | 25 | 75 |
| 25. | County governments would have to increase welfare and unemployment payments to displaced small loggers. (Agree: There would be fewer workers and better equipment. Disagree: Other factors will put small loggers out of business if lack of stumpage doesn't.) | 31 | 69 |

Table 19. Long-term timber volume guarantee (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26. | The average size of individual timber harvesting areas would increase. (Agree: Although cutting blocks could be kept small through regulation and planning.) | 82 | 18 |
| 27. | Timber harvesting operations would become more mechanized. | 88 | 12 |
| 28. | There would be fewer worker's compensation claims filed by loggers. (Agree: Assuming more mechanization with fewer workers, it might be true.) | 63 | 37 |
| 29. | Innovations in utilizing waste would decrease. (Agree: Size of cuts would increase.) | 18 | 82 |
| 30. | Average wages for loggers would increase. | 69 | 31 |
| 31. | Forest road development would increase. (Disagree: Temporary roads are needed in both Agreements 1 and 2.) | 82 | 18 |
| 32. | The lessee would cut the best and leave the rest. (Agree: Certainly would cut best first, then economics may dictate leaving lower value timber. Disagree: Not if lease were drawn up correctly.) | 8 | 92 |
| 33. | Counties would have more money to spend on nontimber outputs, but any increased expenditures on them will depend on local politics. (Agree: Politics would influence expenditures on nontimber outputs, but there would not be much extra money for those outputs.) | 67 | 33 |
| 34. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally increase. (Agree: Due to better opportunity to achieve allowable cut level.) | 62 | 38 |
| 35. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally not change. | 29 | 71 |
| 36. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally be reduced. | 19 | 81 |
| 37. | Mineral exploration would be hindered on leased land. (Disagree: I assume contract would ensure access for mineral exploration.) | 35 | 65 |
| 38. | Recreational use of county land, except hunting, would be reduced. | 29 | 71 |
| 39. | There is a potential for loss of wildlife habitat and water quality, depending on regulatory controls used by counties. (Agree: Could be adverse impact on wildlife habitat but not water quality.) | 65 | 35 |
| 40. | The diversity in composition of forest vegetation on county land would decrease. (Agree: Larger tracts treated in same way.) | 60 | 40 |
| 41. | The quantity and quality of uniquely aesthetic timber stands would decrease. (Disagree: These stands could be saved.) | 35 | 65 |

Table 20. Cooperative sustained yield unit.

Acres: 10,000 county owned plus 10,000 lessee owned
Tenure: 20 years; one 20-year renewal guaranteed
Marketing of Lease: Competitive timber bids from processing firms owning 10,000 acres of timber land in Minnesota
Payment: Quarterly payments for volume cut; unit prices adjusted periodically; lessee reimbursed for approved timber management expenses on county land
Harvest Control: County sets allowable cut level on 20,000-acre unit; lessee cuts within ±10% of allowable cut every 5 years; county sets tree harvest and site conservation standards for entire unit
Risk: County and lessee share timber losses due to natural disaster by reducing allowable cut.
Timber Management: Lessee prepares management plan and performs all work for unit; lessee is reimbursed for approved projects on county land
Roads: Lessee builds all roads and is reimbursed for county-approved, permanent roads
Nontimber Land Uses: County controls use on its 10,000 acres in the unit
Noncounty Land Owned by Buyer: Harvest volume on 10,000 acres owned by lessee is controlled by county

| Impact Statements | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[7] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: | 81 | 6 | 13 | 2 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: | 63 | 6 | 31 | 1 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 88 | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: | 18 | 12 | 70 | -1.5 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. County forest management plans would be more oriented toward timber production objectives of the lessee and not toward multiple-use of county land. (Agree: County would tend to willingly concentrate on timber management.) | 88 | 12 |
| 6. Counties would do a better job of integrating nontimber outputs with timber production in their management plans. (Agree: Counties would have more time for it. Disagree: Lessee proposes management plan.) | 19 | 81 |
| 7. Counties would be better able to plan and harvest their allowable cut of timber. (Agree: Counties would have to plan better, but how the actual cut comes out is questionable.) | 88 | 12 |
| 8. Counties would lose flexibility to adjust land use to meet new social demands and changing economic conditions. | 88 | 12 |
| 9. Counties would have more stable land management policies. (Agree: Stable, but not flexible.) | 94 | 6 |

[7] See footnote 4, page 8.

Table 20. Cooperative sustained yield unit (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Counties would benefit from greater economies of scale in management practices. | 100 | 0 |
| 11. | Counties would need fewer personnel to supervise timber sales. (Disagree: Sales would be more efficiently administered, but counties don't have enough personnel now.) | 88 | 12 |
| 12. | Counties would need more personnel to handle increases in timber management activities and increases in negotiations with the lessee. (Agree: Would need more timber management staff and accounting staff, but no more for negotiations.) | 24 | 76 |
| 13. | Counties would decrease their management costs but increase regulatory costs. (Agree: Hopefully, savings would affect new regulatory costs. Disagree: Management costs still being reimbursed to lessee.) | 55 | 45 |
| 14. | Counties would have a more stable flow of income from timber sales. | 94 | 6 |
| 15. | County net revenue from timber sales would decrease if a processing firm gained a monopoly over county timber sales. (Agree: Sure, from lower bidding activity, but it should be possible to prevent monopoly.) | 85 | 15 |
| 16. | Counties would have long-term legal problems. | 38 | 62 |
| 17. | If a lessee went out of business, the county would be left with an incomplete timber management program and lack of personnel to complete it. (Agree: It would not take long to cope with the change, however.) | 62 | 38 |
| 18. | The process of allocating timber cutting rights to various loggers would pass from the county to the timber processing industry. | 88 | 12 |
| 19. | The value of private forest land would increase as processing firms compete to buy land for their half of the sustained yield unit. (Disagree: Most large firms that would be interested already have enough land to qualify. Industries would be nuts to give impression they had to buy other private land. Price would go up overnight if they did.) | 62 | 38 |
| 20. | The number of both timber harvesting and processing firms would be reduced. (Agree: Small operators could not compete.) | 45 | 55 |
| 21. | Timber processing firms would increase their staff size to deal with counties on lease matters. (Disagree: They could do it with present staff. If they did increase, it would only be a few people.) | 50 | 50 |
| 22. | Lessee would have adverse public relations. (Agree: It would take a real orator to convince body politic that there were no undercover maneuverings. Public wants their land "public.") | 45 | 55 |
| 23. | The timber industry would gain a tax advantage--depletion allowance. (Agree: But depletion allowance is not generally used by those who could use it now.) | 67 | 33 |
| 24. | The timber industry would gain a tax advantage--capital gains. | 71 | 29 |
| 25. | Timber harvesting operations would become more mechanized. | 88 | 12 |

Table 20. Cooperative sustained yield unit (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26. | Wages for loggers would increase. | 50 | 50 |
| 27. | The size of timber procurement areas for individual forest products processing firms would be reduced. (Disagree: Not if competition is strong, but companies could manipulate operation zones and reduce both procurement areas and competition for timber. Depends on location of leased tracts. Firms would tend to purchase private, state, and federal wood near their leased tracts.) | 65 | 35 |
| 28. | The average size of individual timber harvesting areas would increase. | 76 | 24 |
| 29. | The lessee would cut the best and leave the rest. (Agree: Would cut best first, but may not leave the rest. Disagree: Assuming the 10,000 acres would be good sites.) | 25 | 75 |
| 30. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally increase. | 38 | 62 |
| 31. | The quality and quantity of nontimber outputs from county land would be reduced unless counties require a good management plan and improve their regulatory activity. (Agree: It still may be difficult even with good management plan and increased regulatory activity.) | 75 | 25 |
| 32. | The diversity in composition of forest vegetation on county land would decrease. | 60 | 40 |
| 33. | Recreational use of county land, except hunting, would be reduced. (Agree: Leased tracts would not be as available to the public.) | 30 | 70 |

Table 21. Sale of all timber management rights.

Acres: 50,000
Tenure: 50 years; one renewal if lessee matches highest bid
Marketing of Lease: Competitive timber bids among timber processing firms
Payment: 10% down; balance in 10 equal payments with interest; annual "property tax" fee paid
Harvest Control: Timber productivity at end of lease must at least equal present productivity
Risk: Lessee absorbs all timber losses
Timber Management: Lessee performs and pays for all work
Roads: Lessee builds all roads
Nontimber Land Uses: County controls
Noncounty Land Owned by Lessee: No special county control

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[8] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: (Decrease: Competitive bids may be quite conservative considering such a long time span.) | 30 | 10 | 60 | -1 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: | 55 | 15 | 30 | 1 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 94 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: | 25 | 6 | 69 | -1 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. Counties would lose flexibility to adjust land use to meet new social demands and changing economic conditions. | 88 | 12 |
| 6. Counties would do a more thorough job of forest planning. (Agree: Sure, they would make plans, but a good plan is dynamic. If their first chance for adjustment is 50 years away, what good is a plan? Disagree: Not after contracts were let.) | 29 | 71 |
| 7. County land management would be accomplished more efficiently. (Agree: In terms of administrative costs. Disagree: Land management by county would hardly exist.) | 35 | 65 |

[8] See footnote 4, page 8.

Table 21. Sale of all timber management rights (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | County land management would be less efficient. (Disagree: Management would be more administratively efficient, but less silviculturally effective.) | 20 | 80 |
| 9. | Counties would need fewer forest management personnel. (Disagree: Not enough personnel now.) | 82 | 18 |
| 10. | Counties could better project their future income. | 94 | 6 |
| 11. | Counties would have a decrease in management costs but an increase in regulatory costs. (Agree: But, not a very big increase in regulatory costs. If land left in unproductive condition after lease, high reclamation costs would arise.) | 69 | 31 |
| 12. | Counties could not enforce the requirement that timber productivity at end of lease equal productivity at beginning of lease without a clearly defined, stiff penalty. (Disagree: Too long a term to lay this requirement on. Too many possible changes that would render it an anachronism.) | 71 | 29 |
| 13. | The timber processing industry would expand its output. | 82 | 18 |
| 14. | Firms which get leases would invest in new processing facilities. | 65 | 35 |
| 15. | The Minnesota timber industry would have lower wood supply costs and a better competitive edge in regional and national markets. (Disagree: Too many other variables for good answer.) | 81 | 19 |
| 16. | The timber industry would have more financial stability. (Agree: Their wood supply would be secured but their product market is a much bigger variable factor.) | 100 | 0 |
| 17. | The number of both timber harvesting and timber processing firms would be reduced. (Agree: Would be reduction in number of small processing firms.) | 76 | 24 |
| 18. | The process of allocating timber cutting rights to various loggers would pass from the county to the timber processing industry. | 94 | 6 |
| 19. | Local economic impacts of timber production would be more stable. | 76 | 24 |
| 20. | Timber harvesting would become more mechanized. | 88 | 12 |
| 21. | Technological innovation in utilizing low-value species would slow down. | 29 | 71 |
| 22. | Average size of individual timber harvesting areas would increase. (Agree: If there weren't too many pressure groups hounding the industry.) | 88 | 12 |
| 23. | Counties would have more stable funding for nontimber outputs. | 40 | 60 |
| 24. | Counties would increase their ability to plan for nontimber outputs. (Disagree: Counties would have no staff. Industry would have much influence.) | 70 | 30 |

Table 21. Sale of all timber management rights (continued)

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 25. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would generally increase. | 31 | 69 |
| 26. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land would be reduced unless counties require a good management plan and improve their regulatory activity. (Agree: Plans and regulations help, but are not entire solution.) | 80 | 20 |
| 27. | Major conflicts would develop over nontimber land uses, controlled by the county, and timber development, carried out by the lessee. (Disagree: Procedures for adjustments to the times would have to be included in the contract.) | 60 | 40 |
| 28. | Diversity in composition of forest vegetation on county land would decrease. | 44 | 56 |
| 29. | Wildlife associated with more intensive timber harvesting would increase. (Disagree: Small, scattered sales better for wildlife.) | 82 | 18 |
| 30. | Deer hunting on county land would improve. | 71 | 29 |
| 31. | Quality of recreational activities on county land would generally be reduced. | 35 | 65 |

Table 22. Timber sales: Acreage options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| 500 ACRES | (percent) | |
| 1. New timber processing industries will locate here without larger area leases. (Agree: If they have no other choice about where to locate. Volume of timber is critical factor. Tenure is the critical factor.) | 47 | 53 |
| 2. Land use and social issues are changing too fast to obligate larger areas of land to one company. (Agree: This is true of long-term agreements. Tenure is critical factor.) | 55 | 45 |
| 3. Counties will be better able to administer this size tract than larger ones. | 32 | 68 |
| 5,000 ACRES | | |
| 1. Timber industry could set up a more efficient harvest schedule. (Disagree: Efficient only from an economic standpoint.) | 85 | 15 |
| 2. Counties would still be able to distribute leases among several firms and maintain competition in industry. (Agree: Would depend on the county. Larger counties could do this.) | 75 | 25 |
| 3. Counties would generate a more stable flow of income. (Agree: Somewhat more stable, but fluctuations would still occur.) | 70 | 30 |
| 4. Counties would be better able to make long-range management plans. | 80 | 20 |
| 5. It would reduce county timber sale administrative costs. | 90 | 10 |
| 6. Impact on nontimber outputs could be positive or negative, depending on specific terms of lease. | 90 | 10 |
| 10,000 ACRES | | |
| 1. Timber sales would be more competitive, resulting in higher prices for stumpage. (Disagree: Only largest companies could bid.) | 30 | 70 |
| 2. These large leases would facilitate entry of more new processing firms by providing supply base. (Disagree: Not if lease was for only 3 years. There is still only a finite timber supply.) | 70 | 30 |

Table 23. Timber sales: Tenure options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| 3-YEAR TENURE | (percent) | |
| 1. County can project its income better than it could under a longer lease. | 47 | 53 |
| 2. Prevents industry from locking up more land than it can really harvest. | 84 | 16 |
| 3. County can plan its management efforts better than if it were under a longer lease. (Agree: In terms of scheduling reforestation agreements.) | 42 | 58 |
| 4. County can more quickly respond to changing conditions of resource and public demand than it could under a longer lease. | 89 | 11 |
| 5. Timber industry would be better able to weather changes in business cycle than it could under shorter lease. (Agree: Although 3 years is not very long.) | 89 | 11 |
| 6. County would have more difficulty scheduling forest regeneration activities than it would under shorter lease. (Disagree: Scheduling is no problem, but funding may be.) | 21 | 79 |
| 10-YEAR TENURE | | |
| 1. Timber industry would have a more stable timber supply. | 100 | 0 |
| 2. County government would have more stable source of revenue. | 70 | 30 |
| 3. Counties would reduce their timber sale administrative costs. | 65 | 35 |
| 4. Loggers could better plan their timber harvesting schedule. | 90 | 10 |
| 5. It is not too long to prevent industry from reacting to changing product demands. | 70 | 30 |
| 6. Counties would have more stable land management goals. (Disagree: Goals should remain stable. How they are carried out might be different.) | 80 | 20 |
| 20-YEAR TENURE | | |
| 1. It is sufficient time for industry to amortize investments in processing equipment. | 100 | 0 |
| 2. Counties would have more stability in land management plans. (Disagree: Cutting regulations would certainly become outdated.) | 70 | 30 |
| 3. Counties would have more stable timber sale revenue. (Agree: Assuming price is escalated with inflation. Disagree: Not if one payment is made at time of sale.) | 53 | 47 |
| 4. Timber industry would have a more stable supply of timber. | 100 | 0 |
| 5. There would be no significant impacts on nontimber outputs. (Disagree: County management limited on land under lease.) | 32 | 68 |

Table 24. Timber sales: Marketing options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| **NEGOTIATED SALE PRICE ON SMALL SALES, SALVAGE SALES, AND TIMBER NOT BID ON AT AUCTION** | | |
| 1. Permits counties to manage timber in stands which do not attract competitive bids. (Agree: But might also tend to discourage bidding.) | 95 | 5 |
| 2. Provides employment and income for buyers who cannot afford large sales. (Agree: Other costs and factors are killing these operators, though. Counties are treating the symptoms not the illness. Disagree: Negotiated sales become political rather than biological.) | 85 | 15 |
| **SEALED BID** | | |
| 1. Avoids overbidding which can occur at oral auction. (Disagree: Tends to moderate bidding, but overbidding still occurs. Avoids grudge bidding.) | 63 | 37 |
| 2. More uncertainty about what to bid since competitors are not known. (Agree: Many loggers feel this way, but they should be looking at costs not competitors.) | 85 | 15 |
| 3. Unsuccessful bidders lose right to harvest in their traditional cutting areas. (Agree: They should not have the "right" to a cutting area, however. Disagree: Depends on other sales in that area. There is no guarantee buyer will get other timber.) | 80 | 20 |
| 4. Increases stumpage prices above prices of negotiated sales. | 89 | 11 |
| 5. Winning firm may pay far more than necessary to outbid competitors. (Agree: But the firm must have figured it could afford to pay the price. In other words, a fair and reasonable price.) | 80 | 20 |
| **ORAL AUCTION** | | |
| 1. Avoids excessive overbidding common in sealed bids. | 45 | 55 |
| 2. Favors larger buyers than in negotiated sales. | 70 | 30 |

Table 25. Timber sales: Payment options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| 25% DOWN, REMAINDER PAID QUARTERLY IN PROPORTION TO VOLUME THAT WAS CUT | (percent) | |
| 1. Buyers avoid difficulty of getting a bond. | 89 | 11 |
| 2. Buyers do not accumulate too large a bill compared to an annual payment. | 90 | 10 |
| 3. County would have a more stable flow of timber sale revenue. (Agree: Would help if county has a cash flow problem. Disagree: Would not make much difference. Budgets are based on annual appropriations. Could put money in a fund, invest it, and come out ahead.) | 65 | 35 |
| QUARTERLY PAYMENT FOR VOLUME CUT WITH FIXED MINIMUM DUE EACH YEAR, PLUS ANNUAL RENT PAID | | |
| 1. County would have a more stable and predictable flow of timber sale revenue. (Disagree: True if county has a small number of sales. With large number of sales, however, flow of revenue should even out regardless of payment procedure.) | 75 | 25 |
| 2. Timber industry would have less flexibility in the timing of its timber payments. | 80 | 20 |

Table 26. Timber sales: Price indexing options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| ANNUALLY | (percent) | |
| 1. Protects timber industry from radical price hikes which could occur with less frequent indexing. (Agree: I don't think industry would mind lower prices for and extra year or two.) | 84 | 16 |
| 2. County gets fair, current market value for its timber. | 100 | 0 |
| ANNUALLY AFTER SECOND YEAR | | |
| 1. County would receive fair market value for wood throughout lease. | 75 | 25 |
| ANNUALLY AFTER THIRD YEAR | | |
| 1. Threat of a price hike would encourage logger to get harvesting over soon in contract period. (Agree: Depends on the amount of the increase.) | 95 | 5 |
| 2. County gets fair market value for its timber. (Agree: Tomorrow's prices may also be reflected in bids for timber. Disagree: Recently, price hikes have come more often.) | 35 | 65 |

Table 27. Timber sales: Harvest control options and impacts

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| COUNTY SETS TREE HARVEST AND SITE CONSERVATION STANDARDS | (percent) | |
| 1. County can protect nontimber values. | 89 | 11 |
| 2. Forces county to have professional expertise in designing timber sales. (Agree: Would hope they have professionals anyway. Disagree: It would be nice, but force isn't strong enough.) | 67 | 33 |
| 3. County can protect its investment in long-term forest management. | 100 | 0 |
| 4. County incurs regulatory costs. (Agree: But they would in any case.) | 83 | 17 |
| COUNTY AND LESSEE JOINTLY SET TREE HARVEST AND SITE CONSERVATION STANDARDS | | |
| 1. County gains input of lessee's technical expertise. (Agree: But also lessee's prejudices and profit motive.) | 85 | 15 |
| 2. County learns about lessee's harvest plans and can comment on them. (Agree: But county can require this where county alone sets the standards.) | 80 | 20 |
| 3. Gives lessee more freedom to respond to product demands of market. | 84 | 16 |

Table 28. Timber sales: Risk sharing options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| COUNTY AND LESSEE SHARE RISK BY REDUCING ALLOWABLE CUT | (percent) | |
| 1. County does not have to deplete resources in other locations to cover timber supply obligations of a lease. | 95 | 5 |
| 2. Industry has less secure timber supply than if county guaranteed supply. | 95 | 5 |
| COUNTY AND LESSEE SHARE LOSSES BASED ON TAX STRUCTURE ALLOWANCES AVAILABLE TO LESSEE FOR DESTROYED TIMBER | | |
| 1. County may lose substantial income after a major disaster. (No Vote: Don't understand the question. What type of tax allowances?) | 75 | 25 |
| LESSEE ABSORBS ALL LOSSES | | |
| 1. Creates incentive for lessee to harvest timber quickly. | 95 | 5 |
| 2. County reduces its financial losses. (No Vote: Yes and no. During good markets when competition is great, it is true, but bidders may also consider the added risk in the price they are willing to pay.) | 95 | 5 |
| 3. Timber buyer's financial risk is increased. | 90 | 10 |

Table 29. Timber sales: Timber management options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| COUNTY PERFORMS AND PAYS FOR ALL WORK | (Percent) | |
| 1. County has better control over quality of work than if lessee were doing it. | 75 | 25 |
| 2. There is less chance for industry to influence county plans when industry does not perform timber management work. | 89 | 11 |
| 3. County has better control over habitat manipulation for nontimber outputs than if lessee performed timber management. | 89 | 11 |
| 4. County could more efficiently accomplish work than could lessee. (Agree: Some large companies could do an efficient job but not small companies. Disagree: It is a toss up. A private firm isn't hampered by the red tape and administrative procedures as much. No Vote: Probably true in larger counties with smaller operators.) | 20 | 80 |
| LESSEE REPLANTS CUTOVER AREAS AND IS REIMBURSED FOR REASONABLE EXPENSES; COUNTY PERFORMS AND PAYS FOR ALL OTHER WORK | | |
| 1. Loggers would be more diversified and less dependent on logging for their livelihood. (Disagree: Replanting sounds like only a break-even deal for a logger.) | 78 | 22 |
| 2. It would encourage better job of logging to accommodate tree planting. (Disagree: Would pass costs on to county.) | 84 | 16 |
| 3. Paying lessee for tree planting (as opposed to not paying) frees county of future obligations to lessee. (Disagree: Obligation would not exist even if lessee did planting since it would be required by contract.) | 59 | 41 |
| LESSEE PERFORMS ALL WORK AND IS REIMBURSED BY COUNTY FOR ALL REASONABLE EXPENSES | | |
| 1. County reduces its administrative burden. | 75 | 25 |
| 2. Lessee has more responsibility for integrating timber harvest with overall land management plan of county. | 90 | 10 |

Table 30. Timber sales: Road construction options and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| LESSEE BUILDS AND PAYS FOR TEMPORARY LOGGING ROADS; COUNTY BUILDS AND PAYS FOR PERMANENT ROADS | (percent) | |
| 1. County better able than lessee to design and build roads. (Agree: Since county has long-term goals. In present situation.) | 59 | 41 |
| 2. Avoids attempted closing of roads by logger to other types of users. | 67 | 33 |
| 3. Roads would be built more quickly because lessee anxious to get wood harvested. | 65 | 35 |
| 4. Loggers would become more diversified and less dependent on logging for their livelihood. | 35 | 65 |
| 5. Timber buyer could recover costs not now being reimbursed. | 56 | 44 |

Table 31. Timber sales: Options for control of nontimber land uses and impacts.

| Impact Statements | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| COUNTY CONTROLS NONTIMBER LAND USES BUT SPECIFIES SUCH USES IN TIMBER SALE CONTRACT | (percent) | |
| 1. Timber buyer knows his responsibilities and possible conflicts in advance. | 100 | 0 |
| 2. Minimizes conflicts between timber and nontimber uses. | 70 | 30 |

Table 32. Timber sales: Options for control of noncounty land owned by lessee and impacts.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| NO SPECIAL COUNTY CONTROL OVER NONCOUNTY LAND OWNED BY LESSEE | (percent) | |
| 1. County avoids costly and difficult-to-enforce regulatory program. | 84 | 16 |
| 2. Lessees will give little consideration to nontimber outputs on their private land. (Agree: Unless there is a fair financial return. They will do some for good public relations.) | 69 | 31 |

# LANDOWNERSHIP PROGRAMS

Table 33. Retain most land.

Retain 2,000,000 acres:
- 1,880,000 acres for timber production (at least 30,000 acres per county)
- 320,000 acres for mining, peat, recreation, fish, wildlife, and access to water and public land

Dispose of 600,000 acres:
- 550,000 acres to fill in state and federal forests with scattered parcels less than 80 acres sold to private individuals and firms
- 50,000 acres to urban and agricultural uses

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 1. Counties benefit by disposing of parcels which are inefficent to manage. (Disagree: Not always. Depends on how well property lines are defined.) | 71 | 29 |
| 2. State and federal land management agencies are able to acquire land to block in their ownership and subsequently manage land more efficiently. (Disagree: Political pitfalls may prevent acquisition by state and federal agencies. Acquisition monies would not be available.) | 71 | 29 |
| 3. Blocking in public land minimizes conflicts between recreationists and private landowners. | 82 | 18 |
| 4. Retention of land by the county can bear the fruit of unexpected resources such as mineral deposits, peat for energy, and gravel. (Agree: It has worked that way often. County also bears fruit of increased sale value, e.g., in a 10-year period land rose from $5/acre to $150/acre.) | 100 | 0 |
| 5. Individuals benefit by having freedom to attempt to influence management of public land. | 88 | 12 |
| 6. By retaining small, scattered wild land, counties benefit from in-lieu tax payments from the state which are higher than property taxes would be on this land. (Agree: Counties benefit from in-lieu tax payments, but they are not higher than property taxes. Disagree: Depends on the county and surrounding land values.) | 38 | 62 |
| 7. Large areas of public land in a county increase property taxes on private land. (Disagree: There is no direct correlation--my taxes in Anoka County were higher than in a northern county. Not when state makes in-lieu tax payments to counties. Public land requires fewer government services than inhabited private property.) | 35 | 65 |
| 8. Value of existing resort and lakeshore properties is enhanced because large areas of public ownership will not be sold to increase the supply of similar private land. (Agree: But this could also be accomplished by zoning.) | 82 | 18 |
| 9. Retention of land by counties minimizes both development sprawl and associated costs of government services. | 94 | 6 |

Table 33. Retain most land (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Recreationists benefit from access to county land. | 100 | 0 |
| 11. | Timber harvesting industry benefits from access to timber on county land. | 100 | 0 |
| 12. | Farmers, land developers, and others who want to buy land benefit from county land sales. (Disagree: Developers may benefit but not farmers, unless they can buy adjacent land.) | 82 | 18 |
| 13. | When county land is sold, counties lose much control over future land uses on it. (Agree: Counties can zone, but even that is hard to enforce if someone defies it.) | 88 | 12 |
| 14. | Disposal of scattered tracts results in a loss of wildlife habitat available for public use. | 71 | 29 |
| 15. | Timber firms, farmers, and investors are hindered in acquiring land because large areas of public land are not for sale. (Agree: Because we want it, doesn't mean we have to have it. Disagree: Timber firms are not trying to buy land. Farmers and investors only want cheap land. Land ownership stability also a benefit to these groups.) | 71 | 29 |
| 16. | Counties lose revenue by selling land now rather than holding it for sale at a future date when prices will be higher. (Agree: However, counties should not hold land just for speculation. Disagree: They lose revenue as a farmer loses by selling his farm off a few acres at a time and blowing money on other needs that come up because he has dollars to spend.) | 71 | 29 |

Table 34. Retain hardwood sites, dispose of softwood sites.

Retain 1,900,000 acres:
- 1,580,000 acres for hardwood timber production (at least 30,000 acres per county)
- 320,000 acres for mining, peat, recreation, fish, wildlife, and access to water and public land

Dispose of 900,000 acres:
- 850,000 acres for softwood timber production to forest industry
- 50,000 acres to urban and agricultural uses

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[9] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: | 6 | 6 | 88 | -2 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: | 69 | 12 | 19 | 1 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 81 | 12 | 7 | 1 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: | 53 | 11 | 37 | 1 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. Intermixed character of hardwood and softwood land would cause a break-up of blocks of land and inefficiencies in management for both counties and the timber industry. (Disagree: Stand conversion would take place. The impractical breakdowns would be easy to anticipate and easy to avoid.) | 76 | 24 |
| 6. Pure stands of softwoods are mostly black spruce, cedar, and tamarack stands with poor growth potential and of little value to timber industry. | 31 | 69 |
| 7. Counties would have better quality management on their smaller land bases. (Agree: Counties would give more attention to land but have less money for investment in land management. Disagree: Counties would have relatively lower timber sale receipts since softwood prices are generally higher than hardwood prices.) | 24 | 76 |
| 8. Counties would get a one-time windfall of revenue from land sales with sharply decreased revenue after that. | 94 | 6 |

[9] See footnote 4, page 8.

Table 34. Retain hardwood sites, dispose of softwood sites (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Counties would lose control of land use on land they sold unless deed restrictions were enforced. (Agree: Except deed restrictions are not allowed in sale of tax-forfeited land.) | 88 | 12 |
| 10. | Some softwood land would later be sold for scattered development. (Agree: But only as it became practical to do so. Should be no problem.) | 71 | 29 |
| 11. | Land sales would cause relocation of timber processing plants which would disrupt present county economies. (Agree: Small firms would disappear. Disagree: Major plants are not likely to move.) | 12 | 88 |
| 12. | Counties would lose some of their ability to stimulate or stablize the local economy by regulating the timber supply. (Agree: But what do counties do now beyond giving local loggers preference for timber sales? Counties haven't consciously regulated supply and are basically responsive to needs of market. Counties would lose ability to regulate harvest among small loggers. No Vote: Counties do not regulate timber supply.) | 67 | 33 |
| 13. | Counties would generally be selling their most valuable land and retaining their low-value land. (Agree: Depends on county. Swamp conifers are on low-value land, but pine is generally on high-value land. Average productivity of remaining county land would be lower. What company wants to buy poor land?) | 82 | 18 |
| 14. | Decrease in timber sale revenue would be offset by returns on investment of land sale proceeds by counties. (Disagree: Counties would not invest land sale proceeds. Historically, land sale revenue used for current operating expenses, not investments.) | 25 | 75 |
| 15. | Counties would have more difficulty selling hardwood timber if they have none of the more desirable softwood timber to offer in a package deal. (Agree: Also, it would encourage only softwood-using industries, thereby reducing demand for hardwoods.) | 69 | 31 |
| 16. | Counties would decrease their personnel workload. | 76 | 24 |
| 17. | Counties would significantly reduce their land management costs. (Agree: Hardwoods generally cheaper to manage than softwoods. True for total costs but not on a per-acre basis.) | 35 | 65 |
| 18. | The number of small wood processing firms would be reduced. (Agree: Their timber supply would be cut off.) | 50 | 50 |
| 19. | The number of independent harvesters would decrease. (Agree: Marginal operators will be eliminated regardless of this factor.) | 71 | 29 |
| 20. | Timber industry would have greater control over timber prices. | 65 | 35 |

Table 34. Retain hardwood sites, dispose of softwood sites (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. | The value of softwood timber stumpage held by other owners (state, national forests, nonindustrial private) would decrease. | 20 | 80 |
| 22. | Industry would hold prime forest land that may become more valuable for nonforestry development. (Agree: Sure, even if industry did not use them, just as the railroads did with land granted to them.) | 65 | 35 |
| 23. | It would perpetuate softwood utilization which would price Minnesota industry out of national and international markets. (Disagree: Agree with first part; disagree with second part. Certainly would not encourage hardwood utilization unless new industries were introduced only for hardwood utilization.) | 27 | 73 |
| 24. | Counties would have fewer but more violent land use conflicts on their remaining public land. | 60 | 40 |
| 25. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land (both land retained and land disposed of) would generally increase. | 18 | 82 |
| 26. | The quality and quantity of nontimber outputs from county land (both land retained and land disposed of) would generally not change. | 35 | 65 |
| 27. | There would be no effect on wildlife. (Disagree: There is always an effect when ownership changes.) | 60 | 40 |
| 28. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land (both land retained and land disposed of) would generally decrease. | 40 | 60 |
| 29. | Water quality would decrease on land disposed of unless counties enforced water quality standards. (Disagree: Would not decrease significantly except possibly on land sold for urban and agricultural use,) | 65 | 35 |
| 30. | There would be a significant reduction in general recreation including hunting on softwood land. (Disagree: Recreational trails and campgrounds may be reduced in number, but not hunting.) | 35 | 65 |

Table 35. Retain productive timberland, dispose of unproductive timberland.

Retain 720,000 acres:
- 400,000 acres of best net revenue-producing timber land (30,000 acres per county)
- 320,000 acres for mining, peat, recreation, fish, wildlife, and access to water and public land

Dispose of 2,080,000 acres:
- 2,030,000 acres to forest industry
- 50,000 acres to urban and agricultural uses

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Median[10] (+5 to -5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | | | |
| 1. Average annual net revenue (money left after deducting timber management expenses) from timber sales on county land would: | 19 | 0 | 81 | -3 |
| 2. Average annual employment (full time, part time, and seasonal) in the Minnesota timber industry would: (Decrease: There would be more company crews, fewer independent loggers, and fewer small industries.) | 65 | 12 | 23 | 1 |
| 3. The size (average volume of output) of individual forest products processing firms in Minnesota would: | 94 | 6 | 0 | 1.5 |
| 4. The entry of new forest products processing firms into Minnesota would: | 28 | 33 | 39 | 0 |

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| 5. Counties would improve forest management on their remaining land. (No Vote: Only a few counties would have enough land to make management worthwhile.) | 87 | 13 |
| 6. A decrease in timber sale revenue from county land would be offset by returns on investments of land sale proceeds. (Disagree: Would love to invest proceeds, but it would not happen.) | 14 | 86 |
| 7. Counties would be selling a long-term source of revenue for a short-term cash gain which would soon be spent and could not be replaced. | 88 | 12 |
| 8. By selling land now in a period of high inflation, counties forego an even greater income which could be earned at a later date. (Agree: And counties forego a much more stable, continuous income.) | 80 | 20 |
| 9. The worst land would not be bought by timber industry. (Agree: Except as an adjunct to good land.) | 94 | 6 |

[10] See footnote 4, page 8.

Table 35. Retain productive timberland, dispose of unproductive timberland (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Counties would have improved economic efficiency in land management. (Agree: Perhaps, but retained land may be scattered. Disagree: Increases in fixed costs/acre managed may offset increases in revenue. 400,000 acres of timber land divided among several counties isn't much of a land base to support competent management agencies.) | 70 | 30 |
| 11. | Counties would have reduced land management costs. (Agree: Total costs would be reduced. Per-acre cost would be higher, though.) | 81 | 19 |
| 12. | Counties would have higher per-acre administrative costs. | 71 | 29 |
| 13. | 30,000 acres of land per county is hardly enough to cover the fixed costs of management. | 75 | 25 |
| 14. | Counties would lose control over the use of land disposed of unless other regulatory measures were instituted. | 94 | 6 |
| 15. | There are many other entities which would outbid the timber industry for the land if it were sold at public auction. (Agree: If market suddenly flooded with land. Industry would still get most of it. If units sold were small enough, bidding could be fierce. Investment firms might win bid even on large units.) | 65 | 35 |
| 16. | Timber industry would not buy land with low productivity. | 94 | 6 |
| 17. | Industry would resell some land for real estate development. | 81 | 19 |
| 18. | County government service costs would increase to handle new land developments which would arise. (Agree: Unless zoning regulations were instituted and enforced.) | 88 | 12 |
| 19. | Fire risk would increase as more land is developed. | 65 | 35 |
| 20. | Some of the low-productivity land would go tax delinquent again. (Agree: Would change hands a few times first.) | 38 | 62 |
| 21. | Counties would have fewer but more violent land use conflicts on their remaining public land. | 88 | 12 |
| 22. | County governments would have a major effort in land classification to decide which tracts to sell. | 88 | 12 |
| 23. | Trespass problems would increase on land which is sold. (Agree: That would be a company problem.) | 65 | 35 |
| 24. | Counties would lose payments-in-lieu from the state. (Agree: On those lands sold, not on those lands retained.) | 94 | 6 |
| 25. | The timber industry would have greater control over timber prices. (Agree: Including control over other government and private prices.) | 94 | 6 |
| 26. | Capital that would have been bid into stumpage prices would be diverted into land purchases. | 71 | 29 |
| 27. | Investment in timber processing facilities would increase. (Agree: By large industry, not small firms.) | 88 | 12 |

Table 35. Retain productive timberland, dispose of unproductive timberland (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 28. | No new investments would be made in the land after industry bought it. | 18 | 82 |
| 29. | A few, large, monopolistic firms would emerge in the timber harvesting and processing industry. (Agree: Good chance large firms would purchase land. They could be new firms, though.) | 50 | 50 |
| 30. | Local economies would be tied to timber market conditions of a few large processors. (Agree: Same as present situation. But with other public wood and diversity of economic activity the impact would not be great.) | 76 | 24 |
| 31. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land (both land retained and land disposed of) would generally increase. | 6 | 94 |
| 32. | There would be no change in the quantity or quality of nontimber outputs from county land (both land retained and land disposed of). | 35 | 65 |
| 33. | The quantity and quality of nontimber outputs from county land (both land retained and land disposed of) would generally decrease. | 62 | 38 |
| 34. | Counties would reduce their involvement in production of nonmarket-valued outputs on land retained. (Agree: Mainly in terms of recreational facilities.) | 24 | 76 |
| 35. | The quantity and quality of extensive recreation on land disposed of would decrease. (Agree: In terms of trails and campgrounds.) | 82 | 18 |
| 36. | Water quality would decrease on both land disposed of and land retained. (Disagree: No problem on land retained.) | 31 | 69 |
| 37. | The quantity and quality of wildlife habitat would decrease on both land retained and land disposed of. | 35 | 65 |

Table 36. Retention/disposal of land in federal or state parks and forests.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| DISPOSE OF MOST COUNTY LAND WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF STATE/FEDERAL FORESTS AND PARKS TO THOSE ADJOINING AGENCIES | | |
| 1. There would be more uniform land use in the area. (Agree: But the increase in uniformity would not be significant.) | 90 | 10 |
| 2. It would improve management efficiency on county land retained. (Disagree: Depends on ownership patterns before and after disposal. Would it change their management methods?) | 58 | 42 |
| 3. It would improve land management efficiency of state and federal agencies which acquired land. (Agree: Only to extent that these agencies would not have to worry as much about property lines.) | 89 | 11 |
| 4. Timber industry, including loggers, would deal with a single agency in an area rather than several agencies. (Agree: But is this good? Intermingled ownership helps prevent undue domination by one agency.) | 100 | 0 |
| 5. Timber industry would be less likely to influence land management decisions in an area dominated by one agency. | 50 | 50 |
| RETAIN MOST COUNTY LAND WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF STATE/FEDERAL FORESTS AND PARKS | | |
| 1. Mixed public ownership more likely to serve variety of different interest groups. | 80 | 20 |
| 2. Mixed public ownership provides timber industry, including loggers, with more flexibility in acquiring timber because of differing policies of various land managing agencies. | 90 | 10 |

Table 37. Retention/disposal based on timber production potential.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| RETAIN MOST COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND WITH HIGHER THAN AVERAGE TIMBER PRODUCTION POTENTIAL | | |
| 1. Timber industry can be reasonably assured these lands will remain in active timber production. (Agree: Although there will be many other demands for land use.) | 84 | 16 |
| 2. Counties can better project their future income potential. | 89 | 11 |
| 3. Helps ensure stability of timber industry and local economy. | 89 | 11 |
| 4. Provides continuing source of timber for small, independent timber buyers. (Agree: But poorer lands sometimes provide cheaper wood for small-scale timber buyers.) | 80 | 20 |
| 5. Disposing of land on basis of timber production potential would lead to fragmentation of holdings and higher per-acre administrative costs. | 90 | 10 |
| RETAIN MOST COMMERCIAL LAND WITH AVERAGE OR LOWER TIMBER PRODUCTION POTENTIAL | | |
| 1. Land remains available to public for nontimber uses. | 100 | 0 |
| 2. Small-scale loggers have better opportunity to buy timber. | 60 | 40 |
| 3. Net revenue from county land management is lower. | 79 | 21 |
| 4. Counties avoid future tax-forfeiture which would occur if land was disposed of. (Disagree: Doubt that tax-forfeiture would be significant. No Vote: Possibly true, but nowadays if you can stand on it, it's worth something to somebody.) | 63 | 37 |
| 5. Relative value of land and timber may increase over time and county can reap economic gains. | 90 | 10 |
| 6. Provides administrative advantage of blocking in county ownership around more productive land. (Agree: Definitely easier to manage larger blocks of land.) | 85 | 15 |
| DISPOSE OF MOST COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND WITH AVERAGE OR LOWER TIMBER PRODUCTION POTENTIAL | | |
| 1. It would reduce per-acre land management costs of county government. (Disagree: More investments would be made on better land.) | 65 | 35 |

Table 38. Retention/disposal of noncommercial forest land.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| RETAIN MOST NONCOMMERCIAL FOREST LAND | | |
| 1. Counties can better protect wildlife habitat. (Agree: With the state's guidance and financial help.) | 80 | 20 |
| 2. Land remains more available to public for nontimber uses. | 90 | 10 |
| 3. Relative value of land and timber may increase over time and county can reap economic gains. | 85 | 15 |
| 4. Prevents private development of land which would require additional government services. | 90 | 10 |
| DISPOSE OF MOST NONCOMMERCIAL FOREST LAND; RETAIN LAND WITH UNIQUE WILDLIFE/RECREATIONAL QUALITIES AND PARCELS WHICH HELP BLOCK IN COUNTY OWNERSHIP AROUND COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND | | |
| 1. Retaining wildlife and recreation lands prevents counties from maximizing their economic return. | 35 | 65 |
| 2. County can protect unique wildlife and recreation values. | 90 | 10 |
| 3. Land is available for public to use for nontimber outputs. | 79 | 21 |
| 4. Disposal results in more economic efficiency in management of remaining land. (Disagree: Not if land is retained to block ownership.) | 70 | 30 |

Table 39. Retention/disposal of different size tracts of multiple-use land.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| RETAIN MOST MULTIPLE-USE LAND IN PARCELS LESS THAN 320 ACRES | | |
| 1. Greater use by public for recreation, wildlife, and fuelwood occurs than if sold to private owners. | 95 | 5 |
| 2. County can earn some revenue from timber sales. | 90 | 10 |
| 3. County has relatively low economic return on this land. (Agree: Although fuelwood can bring high return per acre. No Vote: Scattered lands are often very productive.) | 74 | 26 |
| DISPOSE OF MOST MULTIPLE-USE LAND IN PARCELS LESS THAN 320 ACRES | | |
| 1. Private land development would increase government service costs. | 85 | 15 |
| 2. County would probably not be able to afford to repurchase land in future if wanted for a public use. | 85 | 15 |
| 3. It would increase county property tax base. (Agree: But how much? Increase would be offset by cost of services requested or by loss of state in-lieu tax payment.) | 85 | 15 |
| 4. Would reduce frequency of conflict between county and adjoining landowners over land use and management policy. (Agree: Would this serve overall public interest?) | 65 | 35 |

Table 39. Retention/disposal of different size tracts of multiple-use land (continued).

| | | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | RETAIN MOST MULTIPLE-USE CONSERVATION LAND IN SCATTERED PARCELS OF LESS THAN 20 ACRES | | |
| 1. | Land is available for public to use for nontimber outputs. | 90 | 10 |
| 2. | Promotes good public relations between county and residents to have small parcels of county land scattered throughout the county. (Disagree: Too small to hold in high-pressure area. Lose more friends than we gain.) | 25 | 75 |
| 3. | County preserves option of marketing land in future if a more valuable land use arises. | 90 | 10 |
| | DISPOSE OF MOST MULTIPLE-USE CONSERVATION LAND IN SCATTERED PARCELS LESS THAN 20 ACRES | | |
| 1. | County would probably not be able to afford to repurchase land in future if wanted for a public use. (Agree: If they could afford it, land would be quite high priced.) | 75 | 25 |
| 2. | Land may be put to uses undesirable to the public at large. (Disagree: Zoning should take care of this.) | 80 | 20 |
| 3. | Counties will reduce their per-acre management costs on land retained. | 75 | 25 |
| 4. | Quality of wildlife habitat on land disposed of will generally be reduced. (Agree: Land will be used mostly for residential purposes.) | 50 | 50 |

Table 40. Retain recreation, fish, and wildlife land.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| | RETAIN MOST PRIME RECREATION AND AESTHETIC LAND | (percent) | |
| 1. | They are a general economic asset to the region. | 30 | 70 |
| 2. | Counties receive relatively low monetary returns for funds expended on them. (Agree: Indirectly, counties gain from these lands.) | 95 | 5 |
| 3. | County would probably not be able to afford to repurchase land in future if sold and then wanted again for a public use. | 89 | 11 |
| 4. | County preserves option of marketing land in future if a more valuable land use arises. | 100 | 0 |
| 5. | Promotes good public relations for county to own this land. (Agree: With some interest groups.) | 80 | 20 |
| | RETAIN MOST PRIME FISH AND WILDLIFE LAND | | |
| 1. | Counties will preserve habitat better than private owners would do. | 78 | 22 |
| 2. | Counties receive relatively low monetary returns for funds expended on this land. | 80 | 20 |
| 3. | Land is available to public to use for recreation. | 100 | 0 |

Table 41. Retention/disposal of mineral and peat land.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| **RETAIN MOST MINERAL LAND WITH COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL** | | |
| 1. There is generally a greater value in mineral royalties than in land sale revenue. (Agree: State owns minerals; counties do not. Disagree: Depends on economic picture, extent of deposit, location, and type of minerals.) | 74 | 26 |
| 2. County and state can regulate rate of depletion of the minerals. (Agree: Assuming state holds mineral rights and surface rights. Disagree: Only state can regulate minerals.) | 84 | 16 |
| **DISPOSE OF MOST MINERAL LAND WITH COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL** | | |
| 1. It would better encourage economic development of minerals. (Disagree: This can be done without disposal by using a lease.) | 35 | 65 |
| 2. If counties sold surface rights but retained mineral rights, conflicts would arise between county and surface owner when mining is begun. (Disagree: County doesn't own mineral rights.) | 80 | 20 |
| 3. County would lose some control over environmental quality on land disposed of. | 90 | 10 |
| **RETAIN MOST GRAVEL DEPOSITS WITH COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL** | | |
| 1. Less expensive for county to mine gravel for its own use than to buy it from commercial supplier. | 84 | 16 |
| 2. Prevents private firm from acquiring monopoly over gravel supplies in an area. | 85 | 15 |
| 3. County more likely than private owner to protect environmental quality of area. | 84 | 16 |
| 4. County can regulate rate of depletion of gravel. | 95 | 5 |
| 5. Potential for county to get revenue by selling gravel. (Agree: But better to hold for future.) | 100 | 0 |
| 6. Public has continued access to land for uses other than gravel mining. | 100 | 0 |

Table 41. Retention/disposal of mineral and peat land (continued).

| | (percent) | |
|---|---|---|
| RETAIN MOST PEAT LAND WITH COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL FOR MINING PEAT | | |
| 1. County can better protect water quality than private owner. (Agree: Not "can" so much as "would.") | 89 | 11 |
| 2. County revenue from peat development would exceed land sale revenue. (Agree: Peat and lowlands are generally lower priced than uplands.) | 70 | 30 |
| 3. County better able to protect ecosystem of area than is private owner. (Agree: Because county wants to and has to.) | 84 | 16 |
| DISPOSE OF MOST PEAT LAND WITH COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL FOR MINING PEAT | | |
| 1. Would promote more rapid commercial development. (Agree: Unless all or most lands went to one company.) | 55 | 45 |
| 2. Would promote more rapid use of peat for energy production. (Agree: If energy production from peat proves practical. Disagree: Unless all or most lands went to one company.) | 55 | 45 |

Table 42. Retention/disposal of forest land suited for agricultural and urban uses.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| **DISPOSE OF MOST AGRICULTURAL LAND CLEARED FOR FARMING OR HAY** | | |
| 1. Would generally be used to enlarge existing farms and improve their efficiency. (Disagree: Residential buyers and speculators are willing to pay more.) | 85 | 15 |
| 2. Counties get immediate income from land sales which can be allocated to many uses. | 100 | 0 |
| 3. Counties enlarge their tax base. (Agree: But lose in-lieu tax base. What is net effect?) | 90 | 10 |
| 4. Counties eliminate a source of land use conflict between county and adjoining landowners. | 75 | 25 |
| 5. If sold at public auction, a farmer would probably not win the bid. (Disagree: He just has to want it badly enough.) | 58 | 42 |
| **RETAIN MOST LAND SUITED FOR AGRICULTURE BUT COVERED BY FOREST** | | |
| 1. County avoids cost of repurchasing land in future if needed for a public purpose. | 85 | 15 |
| 2. It will stabilize the forest resource base. (Agree: Also, good agricultural lands often grow good trees.) | 84 | 16 |
| **DISPOSE OF MOST LAND SUITED FOR AGRICULTURE BUT COVERED BY FOREST** | | |
| 1. Land cleared for agriculture will cause a reduction in wildlife habitat. (Agree: Unless "mixed" with woodlands. Disagree: The habitat will change, but that may be an improvement.) | 75 | 25 |
| 2. Private agricultural use will generally provide a higher economic return to county than county forest management. (Agree: But land would not have to be sold to gain this efficiency. It could be leased for farming.) | 68 | 32 |
| 3. Farmers can expand size of farm for greater production efficiency in use of their capital resources. (Agree: If they can successfully bid on land sold.) | 80 | 20 |
| **DISPOSE OF MOST URBAN LAND** | | |
| 1. Urban land use will generally provide higher economic return to county than forest management. | 95 | 5 |
| 2. Counties get immediate revenue from land sale for allocation to many uses. | 100 | 0 |
| 3. City lots and small urban parcels are an administrative burden to county. | 95 | 5 |
| 4. County helps control pattern of urban growth by selling land. (Disagree: May do so by retaining land.) | 50 | 50 |
| 5. County reduces its administrative costs. | 75 | 25 |
| 6. County eliminates a source of land use conflict between county and adjoining landowners. | 60 | 40 |

Table 43. Retention/disposal of access to water and public land.

| Impact Statements (Panel Comments in Parentheses) | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| | (percent) | |
| RETAIN MOST ACCESS TO LAKES OR RIVERS | | |
| 1. Maximizes public access for recreation. | 100 | 0 |
| 2. Minimizes private shoreland development. | 95 | 5 |
| 3. Counties incur land management costs with little monetary return. (Agree: Except county receives indirect returns. Disagree: Management costs are low. Attraction of people to these areas which contribute to quality of life enhances economics of area.) | 60 | 40 |
| 4. Prevents some conflicts between private shoreland owners and environmental/recreation interests which would arise if land were sold. | 90 | 10 |
| RETAIN MOST LAND PROVIDING ACCESS TO OTHER BLOCKS OF COUNTY LAND | | |
| 1. Public has access to county land for recreation. | 100 | 0 |
| 2. County has access needed for management purposes. | 100 | 0 |
| RETAIN MOST LAND WHICH PROVIDES ACCESS TO STATE AND FEDERAL LANDS | | |
| 1. Maximizes public access for recreation. (Agree: Also provides access for other agencies.) | 100 | 0 |
| DISPOSE OF MOST LAND WHICH PROVIDES ACCESS TO STATE AND FEDERAL LAND TO ADJOINING STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES | | |
| 1. Promotes cooperation between agencies in developing land potential. | 79 | 21 |
| 2. Forces state and federal agencies to pay cost of access to their own land. | 70 | 30 |