

**AFW-10 Comments**  
**Recommendation 47**  
**Expanded use of wood products for building materials**

WE HAVE KILLED THE LUMBER INDUSTRY IN MT with your heavy regulations like what you are proposing in all of this.

What about bamboo? And, if there is an increase in wood products they should come from bio-engineered tree farms where they grow quickly.

This will create a conflict with the ban on harvesting wood products. We do not need to go there. Besides the new plastic reduce the need for pest and mold control products.

First, the government should figure out how to stop the enviros from opposing timber sales.

Provide balance between the harvest of wood for products and the need to leave wood standing for carbon capture. Consider timber activities for damaged (beatles, etc.) stands.

Government mismanagement and over regulated the timber industry out of MT and the US

Could support only if using MONTANA WOOD

This depends on how the wood products are harvested and processed. Too vague to receive a vote.

Should be to expand usage of wood products by 50% (at least) over 2007 levels by 2010

As long as the policy doesn't encourage de-forestation and a net overall decline in carbon dioxide reduction.

Local products

seems like economic development for the timber industry

Allow thinning of fire killed and beetle killed trees.

Amazing-the same types of clowns who won't let professionals effectively manage forests recommend using more forest products!

Provided wood is harvested in a manner which results in lowest possible GHG emissions.

Start recycling building materials. Its a real shame to be throwing away wood, metal, etc like it has NO value, like there is NO tomorrow. We need to take to heart the real value of resources and quit being so wasteful.

We are very impressed with the R value of premier panels that we used for an addition to one of our rental properties. These panels use non-dimensional lumber that would otherwise be discarded.

Why? What is the basis behind this recommendation? The wood products industry? A renewable resource recommendation? If I were to build for long-term benefit, it would be with less wood on the exterior - none. Better fire protection and no maintenance costs or use of chemical based restore materials.

While I support the expanded use of wood products, this is out-of-scope. Besides, does anyone really believe the same folks that populated the CCAC would ever allow timber harvesting on the scale necessary to support this proposal?

Information already exists. Remove the subsidies that support harmful behavior, and the market will demand smart decisions.

Only if this reduces the total ecological footprint.

again, FSC in Montana

This has to be integrated with the need for more energy efficient buildings. Stone, concrete, brick, etc. are often more energy efficient (especially for passive solar).

Good for Montana jobs.

Individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

Use new materials available that are not wood.

Most wood products come from Canada. Maybe consider using local products for building, possible hay bales (which could boost local economy) or rastra.

I think to mandate the use of specific products is philosophically wrong.

Use steel and concrete. Save forests.

Look to the UN-intended consequences. Let the market do its job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive.

Absolutely not! It should already be illegal to use wood in construction. There is not 2% of our original old growth left in America. Stop treating it as if it would never end.

How does this support climate change initiative?

What does this solve we need to get away from wood and start using other materials

Why is this anything more than a handout to timber companies? Wood products should only be used in state buildings where architectural designs call for it. Don't mix incentives with usage requirements. I can support one, but not the other.

Do not support the creation of more commercial incentives to log public forests!

How's this supposed to help? Recycled wood products, maybe. Other recycled building materials, definitely.

Are you kidding me?!?!? This has very little if anything to do with GHG and everything to do with giving public money to the timber industry. Increasing the use to wood products in building materials will be at the expense of more energy efficient building materials, the end result being more GHG emissions over the life of these buildings trying to heat them.

Any such requirement should mandate locally harvested and milled wood products, and encourage small-diameter useage.

How about recycled plastic for building materials? Brick, renewable, recycled materials. We are so wasteful that we will throw away this country leaving nothing but devastation.

Wonderful!

Wood products should only be required if they are the most efficient product for the job. Straw, wheatboard and many other alternative materials that are able to be produced in this state are also viable materials to be included in this program.

Shouldn't there be something included to require replanting of maybe 5 trees for every tree felled?

Encourage wood building materials as a carbon sequestration technology? Sounds stupid. Not an expert in construction technology but seems there must be better construction alternatives to wood (e.g. hay and straw, recycled plastic/rubber/concrete/metal, etc.)

It is difficult to support greater use of wood products, since the stand rotation in arid Montana is so much longer than those states/communities closer to the coastal areas. Such requirements could prompt greater importation of wood from other areas, boosting transportation costs and pollution.

Why? What are the alternative materials? Where will this wood be coming from, and who will have economically benefitted from its harvest, processing, etc.? Keep it in the state, if at all possible! ONLY if it's based on sustainable growth and harvesting procedures!

On the one hand you are promoting the increase of forestation and on the other hand you are cutting down the trees.

Only if it is proven that the net result reduces overall CO2 emissions.  
how does this prevent global warming?

Calls for a mandate that tips markets. Let the market drive. Mandates add costs and reduce options.  
Must include programs to increase availability of wood products.

You finally found one that will help the workers of the state. Hooray

Increase forests (AFW 10)? Increase wood usage? Kinda mixed messages here. Big change would be to get on building code better foundations--less concrete. Now THAT is a big GHG saver!! Examples include rubble trench and shallow, insulated foundations (used in Sweden,etc.) which utilize much less concrete.

not informed about this action  
should use recycled wood products,,tear down a building, use the structural wood for another building

Seems controverdial. Don't know enough to vote.

Best to find a way to use less wood products.

Wood is our only truly renewable resource-we should use wood whenever possible.

Without conservation measures and best management practices, this is throwing good money after bad. Forest products are mined in this state. There is no evidence to prove there is any sustainability in forestry as it is practiced in Montana. Stick count is common, however, that is a joke. 1000 trees planted doesn't match one tree cut is we continue to replace mezsic stands with xeric stands. Especially with the issue of climate change staring us in the face.

We just don't want to give the logging industry so much incentive that they cut down ALL the trees storing our carbon...

Economic development.

No requirement. Incentive only.

First they oppose every timber sale and the cost of timber has skyrocketed. Now they want to build with wood? I am confused.

**ESPECIALLY IF WOOD PRODUCTS COME FROM MONTANA**

Why would this reduce carbon emissions?

Again, not enough effort on reducing demand.

Use what the market and common sense says - do a cost/benefit - wood is a great material, but we do not need to be locked into it. Information and outreach are OK

use salvage wood as much as possible

I support this if by wood products you mean wafer board, and the like, recycled or re-claimed wood products

There are other methods of building that may be more energy efficient and not using up more of our forests.

Encourage green products! Recycle wood for construction.

These percentages should be increased to 12% by 2020. That is only a 1 % increase per year.

NO increase in Gov't spending and this is a good idea.

We need to keep more of our forests. For example in Kauia, Hawaii recently a development will remove 10 huge trees to create a new shopping center. This goes against everything sensible in this day and age however that doesn't prove to be enough of an argument to stop the removal of those trees. I can see it, remove the trees, more O2 is lost forever, then to add insult to injury pave the area, using fossil fuel produced asphalt, truck it to the site using fossil fuel, pave it using fossil fuel burning equipment, then fill the shops with polyester (fossil fuel) clothing, so people that fly in fuel burning airplanes can buy the stuff, wear it for a couple months and throw it in the trash, compounding the garbage problem. Like I said this goes against everything logical but by golly that shopping mall will go in. This is the kind of problem that is the root, it is cumulative which makes it more problematic. We all need to kind of just STOP, stop developing, stop "improving property" (mother nature didn'

State buildings should be constructed of the most economical and energy efficient materials.

I am very much in favor of using wood products in buildings, but not in favor of mandating this.

With the prices rapidly increasing, conserving natural resources is a matter the free market can handle without government mandates.

NO! New wood is not energy efficient nor sustainable. Insist that wood be certified, is the most appropriate material, or is from previously used sources.

If we aren't going to harvest our forests for this wood then where will it come from?

it called logging and jobs for our men

how about 30 percent and 10 percent, a little economic development for the economy to pay for all those government subsidies

i don't understand this one

How about just relaxing the current unacceptable restrictions on the industry.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states.

commercial building codes are going the opposite way

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.aspx>

Great idea. Where exactly do you expect us to get these forest products when more and more of our forests are taken out of "production" by litigation initiated by environmentalists?

Natural resource use and development here in Montana benefits Montana.

How are you going to do that with "Environmentalists" hanging on to the trees. This will also add to the CO2 levels, with the cutting, transporting, sawing, drying, and manufacture of wood products. Not to mention the increase in CO2 because you cut the tree. I am all for increasing the use of wood products but not for the reasons you state.

Good Idea

Very good. Please include low THC, farmed hemp products as a valuable and low-cost alternative to wood products.

Why mandate this? Let a builder build as he or she sees fit. What a waste of time and tax dollars trying to control so much.

This appears to be in direct conflict with wilderness preservation, habitat conservation, fish habitat preservation, etc.

The numbers are so low as to be insulting.

Let us by all means rebuild the wood industry that gov. and environmentalists destroyed.

If this wood is locally harvested, then this measure would do far more for the environment and possibly garner more support from Montanans.

Before this makes sense we need to come to terms with the environmentalists so that we can continue to use the timber in Montana. If we have to import it this makes no sense at all.

Should encourage use of Montana's renewable resource timber

How can you do this?

Should encourage use of Montana's renewable resource timber.

if the products come from Montana

I think incentives and encouragement are OK, I don't think requiring this will do anything by increase costs.

Support the Healthy Forest Initiative

More use of recycled plastic for building materials

Why use wood? What is the benefit of this from a climate perspective? Seems like a bone thrown to wood products industries. How about encouraging use of straw bale buildings? That creates more of a market for a waste product, and creates extremely efficient and durable buildings.

How will you control this new promotion. If we use all our dead wood and need more?

What's the trade off?

I am all in favor of this if it is encouraging the use of "wood". "Wood products" imply wood composites, which require the use of chemicals. It is these types of "wood products" that have significantly contributed to my chemical sensitivities, affecting not only the quality of my life, but likely the length of it.

I'm unsure on this .....how energy intense is the greater use of brick from Montana clay? There is a lot of clay in this state.

WHY? 50% of the world's forest have already been forested. Only 2% of old growth forest left in the US. Is wood the most sustainable use of resources? Most of the trees replanted on our logged lands never reach the sustainable original height of the trees removed in the old growth. What's the reasoning behind these policies?

In a previous point (AWF-5), you want to reduce the amount of land used for wood harvesting, yet now you want to use more of it.

High potential that this will be counterproductive

Thought we were trying to ease up on the trees.  
raise taxes

Kelf crops for increased economic base and decrease of stupid wood use. Wood managed and used only when replaced first and age determines better use or beetle kill wood use first. Pay attention. We are part of nature and should use only when we help.

I would need more information about this.

Are you trying to support the logging industry?

Should be based on use of Montana grown wood

Restoration logging only? Make our buildings last longer and keep their energy better. Building materials don't really matter so long as the building functions well.

Make sure this wood comes from Montana.

Why? Isn't steel a better product for building structure? I don't know what is behind this? AFW-10

More logging and logging jobs. This doesn't need taxpayer money. Just open up the land to log it.

why? what is the wood replacing? what is the benefit?

This seems contrary to the forest recommendations. Besides, I'd estimate that close to 100% of buildings use wood already. This seems redundant.

How are you going to do this against the wishes of the tree huggers, who sue to stop the harvest of DEAD, BURNT, trees now?

More from Montana!

Alternative solution: Expand the use of straw and other agriculture byproduct for building materials. Policy would require annually renewable products in the design and maintenance of state buildings when feasible. Tax incentives....Information and outreach...Subsidize research and development of annually renewable grain byproduct-based building materials. Forestry jobs CAN be transferred to the cultivation, processing and manufacturing of more sustainable building materials being offered to the building industry. Continued use of our already abused forestry resources should be thought of as a LAST resort.

Montana needs to push US Forest Service to better manage forest resource, including beneficial harvest.

There are better choices available. It is the 21st century people.... leave the trees alone!

You need to keep whatever lumber mills are still in existence in the state in business for this to make any sense. We're not too crazy about importing all of our lumber from Canada.

This is clearly a bone being thrown to the timber industry that will lead to degradation of the natural forest ecosystems and result in a net increase in carbon loading.

As I write this I can think of all the wood pallets and wooden electrical and telephone spools are being tossed into a dump or worse yet burned. I can think of all the homes being demolished where virtually none of the wood beams or dimension wood is being salvaged and saved. So, make it mandatory that we recycle wood products more effectively.

Tax incentives again! Allow logging in our Forests to get these products.

How would this be beneficial? The use of recycled wood products like parallel strand lumber/composite wood would be a better fit for this plan.

Emphasis should be on recycled wood & techniques that use less wood

All of the state business furniture used to be wood from the prisons, what happened?

Good idea to keep moving our wood products utilization forward - but it is a small part of the overall problem we face.

Sounds good, but could have other adverse impacts.

We don't need government programs to do this, just put the fires out and thin the woods. Let people back into the woods to cut their own firewood.

Good idea. So, let the burned trees be cut right away after fires and used. They can build many buildings with that wood, instead of leaving in the forests to create more fire fuel for the next fire. Forget the darn tax incentives. Again too costly. Just cut the trees that burn and thin our forests to make them healthy again. Trees do not live forever.

Here, we hear the word policy again. This is the same as demand, law, mandate, etc. Government control at its best.

This reminds me of the 70's when Hydro electric was the answer for everything, and Carter wanted us to burn more firewood - which was banned in Missoula a few years later. Could you tell us which forests that will be logged without lawsuits? This sounds like a boon for environmental lawyers who will get rich off suing the FS.

With our laws prohibiting the cutting of trees on National Forests, where are we to get the lumber? These laws are what caused the decline in the use of wood products. The State should leave it alone, the Feds need to repeal some regulations.

instead of lumber? Maybe if chipping slash and thinned trees instead of burning is the source of the products.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls\*\*t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate.

Use local/regional wood whenever possible.

Why would wood products be required when no one can cut any trees and the lumber mills have gone bankrupt

Evaluation of forest management practices should be evaluated in the context of ecosystems management and principles of disturbance ecology.

But these wood products should be farmed organically to complete the cycle of environmental stewardship.

Don't require it. Let common sense reign in building construction. WONDERFUL. gREAT IDEA FOR LOANS (FORGET GRANTS)

Mandate this, mandate that. Do you have any idea what happened at the Boston Tea Party?

Use fly-ash concrete. Leave the forests standing. Let them go to old growth.

LETS USE OUR WOOD INSTEAD BURNNING UO OUR FOREST

The market makes this decision.

Two percent and five percent seem very minimal. Use of wood for building materials is a great way to sequester carbon.

Wood is a renewable source (slowly renewable!). I think any state buildings should be "green". After all, our state buildings set a guideline for other government owned buildings (county, city) as well as private. The state needs to not only "talk the talk" but "walk the walk".



Wood products for construction should be cropped, not cut from forests.

Why? We need to use more recycled materials, not necessarily more wood products.

Same comment as above The Forest Service needs to make the timber stands and management of the same available.

Steel products could be more energy efficient in some situations. Wood and forests have more uses than providing building materials.

Sure, but cutting trees takes out a way to sequester carbon. Perhaps cut trees at the urban interface only and prohibit construction in areas of high forest or grass fire risk

Make sure wood only comes from places that practice good replanting policies.

I don't know

Focus on re-using building materials instead of sending them to the dump and cutting more trees. Focus on logging that is sustainable.

Austria provides ALL of its needs for wood products...in two ways. They use wood very sparingly in the construction of buildings, especially homes and chalets (Tourism is their No. One industry. They also have intensive forest management.

Increase the usage by 2% by 2010 is much better than the first statement.

These percentage benchmarks are stupid. If lumber is the best available material to build with, then use lumber. Decisions need to be a balance of many factors in order to be truly sustainable in the long term. They can not just be made on the basis of environmental effect.

The more trees you cut down the less carbon they will take up

open the woods to loggers and stop wasting ny tax money telling people what they already know!

Keep the existing lumber mills in business and cut down on importing lumber from Canada.

Bad idea to mandate use of wood or any other product. Need to harvest more wood from federal lands so more wood products available.

This is the private sector's job. Stay out of it.

Only if these are wood products not produced from old trees or old growth forests. Emphasize use of waste wood in composites, finger-jointing, etc., not use of more wood cut in and from large dimension.

Increase percentages and reduce time frames.

No Position

Make it possible for the forest service to harvest timber without frivolous lawsuits.

If wood is appropriate, then use. If steel or concrete is better, use that. Stay out of the mandates.

I am a logger.

The timber industry is dead...how would this happen? The environmental lunatics appeal every decision on timber sales on national forests...how do you propose providing a steady source of wood products to be used in biomass power generation???

University system can be key here.

I do not understand how using more wood products benefits the environment

Expansion of the wood products industry, formerly one of our bigger industries, should be expanded and developed. It takes logging to do this, so the extremists are going to have to allow it without jumping to court for injunctions against it.

This will require more logging. The environmentalists will fight it every step of the way.

The timber industry is in danger of being lost in Montana. No mills to support diverse economies or treat fuel laden forests. The Beaverhead Deerlodge National Forest had over 600,000 acres of DEAD beetle killed trees in 2006. I imagine that number has grown to close to a million acres by this year.

Environmental groups think nothing of polluting our air and destroying Montana watersheds by filing lawsuits on every single timber cut that the Forest Service proposes. On the 26th of February, 2008, the Alliance for the Wild Rockies filed a lawsuit to stop a 140 acres beetle killed tree harvest in Big Timber Creek North of Big Timber Montana. The harvest was designed to remove the dead trees to stop the further infestation. These senseless acts of obstruction must be somehow reined in by our legislators before it is too late and the industry is lost. Colorado last year wanted to do restoration logging after a major fire and found no mills remained in the state to bid on the project. A mill in Texas was

Engineered wood products are superior to the natural products in many cases leading to superior building systems. Advancement in this field will produce more efficient utilization of our natural resources.

Use the best and most economical construction products.

There are reasons why building codes have discouraged wood in public buildings. Wood burns! Wood eventually rots, or shrinks, or becomes brittle.

let the logging industry cut an replant making a holistic circle of removal of choked unhealthy forest to economic stimulus to production materials for this suggestion to planting new trees that will grow faster and more healthy to capturing carbon again in greater abundance.

Should count in LEED certification

Let the customer make the choice.

Why not steel? It's recycleable and cheaper.

Assuming that the idea here is to use wood products in place of other materials with higher GHG footprints.

I'd rather see incentives and research on using post-consumer recycled products in construction. Smaller houses. Smaller buildings for the state offices. Research and implementation of more efficient use of space so we don't have to continue to consume more and more forest/wood products and/or products such as foam and plastics made from fossil fuels.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY HAS BEEN DOING THIS FOR YEARS---GOV SHOULD CHECK WITH THEIR LOCAL LUMBER YARD/HOME CTR---"BUT" YOU CANT LOCK OFF MORE FOREST LANDS BY DE-FACTO WILDERNESS LEGISLATION AND DEVELOP MORE NEW WOOD PROD AT THE SANE TIME---"DUH"

Pretty small. We could do much more, and should.

"Is wood the best building product?" needs to be answered first rather than mandating its use.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

I'm not sure what this has to do with climate change?

no.

We need to support our timber industry

The government does not need to tell us what building materials to use.

I am concerned that this provision could lead to increased road building and landscape/soil impacts and increase in habitat fragmentation.

This wouldn't reduce atmospheric carbon it would increase it by reducing available trees.

as stated before, consider local earth(dirt) options in building. The ecological/energy footprint is very low. Much less than harvesting, manufacturing, and shipping of forest products.

environmental challenges have killed the lumber industry... Government needs to stay out

Keep our mills alive and use some local lumber while at it.

Holcim supports the expanded use of those building materials found to be most sustainable and durable within the context of the local environment. The State should consider the use of Life Cycle Assessment methodologies to determine the most appropriate building materials, and subsequently expand incentives to facilitate the use of those materials found to be appropriate substitutes.

Is this counter-productive to the energy efficiency goals sought?

Why not use alternative products.

If the lumber is produced sustainably, yes. If not, no.

if planting trees, why increase wood products

and where is this wood going to come from, since this report says nothing about needing more logging?

I support this in opposition to the wide use of synthetic materials.  
Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.

Plum Creek believes that wood products are the most environmentally friendly, and support their use whenever possible.

???

I'd like to see wood/plastic composites being emphasized, with incentives to MT mfg to produce. Then I would be more in favor of this measure.

How does this help lower GHG emissions?

I don't understand this one; I think efforts should be in place to reduce the taking of trees, and thereby improve our CO2 "sink." Smaller homes, buildings, should be mandated