

Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry & Fire Protection
Southeast Area Office
Request for Proposal
Odyssey Timber Sale (SSE-1391)
Addendum One
Date of Issue: May 1, 2025

Addendum One provides answers to questions received from interested parties.
This Addendum One is hereby made part of the Request for Proposal and is a total of ten pages.

Focus of Questions Relative to Original RFP Contents

Request for Proposal Letter	2
Sale Description	2
Outline of Agreement Terms and Conditions	2
EXHIBIT F	5
General Process	5
Field Layout, Forest Surveying, and Information Standards	7
General Comments	9

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
	Request for Proposal Letter	
	Sale Description	
Page 2, P2	<p>“a merchantable sawlog is a #3 sawlog or better w/ the minimum length being 12 feet plus trim. At a minimum length of 12 feet it takes a 12 inch top to make the necessary volume for a #3 sawlog. The 12 inch top actual makes the log a #2 sawlog unless knot size is excessive. In addition a 12 foot log is not a preferred log length and does not fit any market that the industry in SE sells wood to. Is there really a need to specify a minimum log length? Doesn't stating a #3 sawlog is the minimum standard for a merchantable sawlog enough?”</p>	<p>The DOF has observed 12 FT logs being utilized by industry on current timber sales in several species. The DOF has observed the industry's need to maintain preferred lengths. The DOF has been flexible with respect to adapting utilization to the market's potential when requested.</p> <p>The minimum log length description was chosen to manage issues voiced by the industry in the past with marketing small diameter logs. Given the higher likelihood of recovering redcedar in this timber sale, the DOF description on utilization reflects the intent to use to the fullest extent that species.</p>
	Outline of Agreement Terms and Conditions	
Page 4, Section 3	<p>“The purchaser shall conduct sale layout tasks in Exhibit F. The DOF shall produce a draft FLUP that to the extent it is in its best interest represents the purchaser's layout. The parties will make reasonable efforts to resolve and develop solutions to issues through the sale design process. Either party may terminate the agreement prior to the completion of the sale layout.”</p> <p>Why does DOF get to determine if the purchaser's layout is in its best interest? The BIF states that it is in the States best interest that purchaser layout is used for this timber sale. As long as the purchaser's layout meets the requirements of the AFRPA, the Southeast Forest Plan if</p>	<p>The DOF is delegated by the DNR Commissioner to manage the best interest of the State with respect to the various natural resources associated with the management of forest resources on State land.</p> <p>The DOF often must weigh the many interests of the State to determine its “best interest”. As resources are defined by the purchaser or the State there is a possibility that new information may become relevant in the decision process to harvest specific timber. The statement referenced reflects the State's prerogative under the constitution to manage the resource.</p>

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
	<p>within the State Forest or the Area Plan if outside the State Forest why does the DOF have the ability to adjust the timber sales layout. What issues will there be if again the requirements of the AFRPA, the Southeast Forest Plan if within the State Forest or the Area Plan if outside the State are meet? If the DOF decides to “terminate the agreement” shouldn’t the purchaser be compensated for the layout done again the requirements of the AFRPA, the Southeast Forest Plan if within the State Forest or the Area Plan if outside the State are meet? The idea of if DOF doesn’t like it then it’s not going to happen is grossly inappropriate.</p>	
Page 3	<p>On page 3, AS 38.05.123(j)91), AS 38.05.123(j)(2) and 11AAC 71.096 are mentioned regarding value added and high value added wood products. AS38.05.123 no longer exist in statute. 11AAC 71.096 refers back to AS 38.05.123 and mentions some additional wood products. This section needs to be corrected, is there anywhere in Statute that defines value-added or high value-added wood products?</p>	<p>You are correct that this statute has been vacated, the reference is historical and may not be relevant to cite.</p> <p>On Page 3 of the RFP, replace the third paragraph with: “For the purpose of this RFP, value added wood products are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round house logs • Chips • green lumber • flitches, cants or rough planks • Radius edged decking or siding” <p>On Page 3 of the RFP, replace the fourth paragraph with: “For the purpose of this RFP, high value added wood products are: Interior finish paneling, trim molding, flooring, doors, windows, cabinet stock, furniture, musical instruments or parts of instruments, toys, tools and implements, ready-to-assemble building kits, veneer, plywood, finger-jointed lumber, faced house logs, dissolving pulp, engineered wood products, paneled wood products, kiln-dried lumber, laminated veneer lumber, shakes, shingles and other similar finished wood products as determined by the commissioner to have received processing beyond sawing and planning that adds high value to the wood product.”</p>

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
		On the Page 2 of the Exhibit C, replace the last paragraph with: “By submitting this proposal, the proposer agrees it intends to process most of the harvested timber by volume from this proposed sale in a sawmill facility in the State of Alaska in the form of products defined in in this RFP to be value-added or high value-added wood products.”
Page4	Either party may terminate the agreement prior to the completion of the sale layout. The state can just decide they don’t want to bother anymore and end the contract? This is opposite the surety the timber industry needs with timber under contract. You get a different administration in that doesn’t like logging and it ends the timber sale.	Comment noted, no change made.
Page 5	The term of the contract is five years. The sale should be 10 years in length to give the purchaser the span to fit it into the mix of timber sales that maximizes market opportunities. Why just 5 years?	The DOF chose the length of time based on the market and the intent to have the timber utilized to support the creation of commerce as soon as feasible.
Page 5	Road at a minimum will be constructed to DOF Road Standards The road standards have several issues. What are the standards DOF is expecting with each road in the Sale? Can they all be to Spur road standards? There is a large cost difference in each road standard. These roads are all going to be closed out and put to bed which is contrary to the what the Commissioner of DNR has stated on record. Valuable road infrastructure will be eliminated for no reason. This is a significant benefit and value to the State of Alaska more so than the stumpage received from the sale.	Road Standards. Item 8a. of the RFP states: “(site specific variances may be considered if authorized by the DOF in the FLUP)”. This wording was chosen to illustrate that dialogue would occur between the DOF and the proposer on the appropriate road classification, variances or style of road constructed. The final decision on these matters with the concurrence of the land manager is the DOF’s. Road closure will occur when maintenance is not part of the management plan or capacity of the land manager. If there is not a clear program mechanism to maintain the road it will be closed under 11 AAC 95 at the conclusion of timber harvest activity. The RFP statement 8 c.on Page 5 is changed to read “The closure at the end of the contract or other mutually agreed to timeframe may be required of new State forest roads within the timber sale area to 11 AAC 95.320 when road maintenance is not part of the management plan.” Hog fuel roads are subject to the land manager’s approval and will be considered by the DNR based on the resources present and the long-term management intent of the parcel. Exchange

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
	<p>Can these roads that will be closed out be constructed of hog fuel?</p> <p>Trees shall be felled, bucked, limbed is not consistent with modern logging techniques that significantly reduce cost with whole tree log processing. Whole tree log processing is the game changer in a low volume timber stand. Virtually no one hand limbs and bucks on a commercial scale in North America. Why are you requiring this in the construction of the roads?</p> <p>Culverts must extend 36” beyond the toe of both sides of the road.</p> <p>This is a waste of culvert and results in extensive disturbance and cost on the inlet side in particular with significantly more excavation of the catch basin and in rock subgrade this can be very expensive drilling and shooting oversized catch basins to accommodate this spec. This is all for a road that will be put to bed and culverts removed at the end of the sale. This makes no sense.</p>	<p>Cove and the Whale Pass Addition lands are managed by the DMLW. The El Capitan lands in this RFP are managed by the DOF.</p> <p>The log deck requirements of the road specifications are performance expectations on DOF managed roads. The specification is designed to mitigate waste of the timber during construction, operational safety and other resource concerns related to soil integrity and surface water. There is no requirement that the timber be “hand” limbed and bucked.</p> <p>Culvert length is specified in the road standard as a product of the road configuration and the project engineer’s (forester’s) approval. The purpose of the specification is to achieve a culvert length that will stay clear of road fill and function over its lifespan. For this RFP and contract the statement is changed to read “A culvert must be of sufficient length to prevent road overlay materials from blocking an end of the culvert”.</p>
	EXHIBIT F	
	General Process	
Page 1	<p>The structure and composition of the data required by the DOF will vary based on the site and resources that are present. Input from other agencies will also influence the scope and material needs of the process. That is as clear as mud. Purchaser layout is very straightforward and simple. Why the ambiguous garbage that would allow</p>	<p>While the FLUP process has similarities to the DPO it has a broader responsibility on state land as outlined in the administrative standards of AS41.17.060(c). The adopted FLUP is required to address these requirements as applicable. The existence, extent and significance of the different resources is not always known in the Best Interest Finding and may require resolution in the FLUP. The process of resolution may take time. For this reason, the DOF has described the uncertainty as a risk that the purchaser should be aware of prior to considering and entering an agreement with the State for this sale.</p>

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
	<p>DOF and other agencies to require a whole bunch more work and information that may not be of any relevance or importance. Is it really that much of threat that you cant give simple specs, guidance, process and a timeline that is straightforward and definable?</p> <p>The DOF will make reasonable efforts to adapt the purchaser's timber sale plan into a mutually acceptable FLUP but it is not obligated to adopt a FLUP and authorize a timber harvest operating plan that is not in it best interest.</p> <p>Does it comply with the BID?</p> <p>Does it comply with the FRPA and through a DPO process reviewed by the three agencies?</p> <p>If it does what would be the issue that DOF would have?</p>	
Page 1	<p>The DOF will produce and publicly notify a draft FLUP that it determines to be potentially in its best interest. Reviewing, producing, and adopting a FLUP that is contingent on the States best interest and is not constrained with respect to a predetermined outcome or decision date. With the complete lack of straightforward specs and all of this language that enables DOF to have no accountably with timeliness in review and completing the FLUP it leaves the purchase in state of having no idea when timber would be available to operate. Again the complete opposite of what is needed to build confidence in a supply of timber under</p>	<p>The FLUP is subject to multiagency and public input, the decision of the DOF may be appealed or a reconsideration requested of the Commissioner's decision. The timing and resolution of these factors may be influenced by factors beyond the control of the DOF.</p>

Refer- ence	Comment	DOF Response
	contract and the ability to operate in a quickly changing world market. It could take DOF a year to review and approve a FLUP!!	
Page 1	<p>the concept of DOF having the final say over purchaser layout is again mention as “The DOF will make reasonable efforts to adapt the purchaser’s timber sale plan into a mutually acceptable FLUP but is not obligated to adopt a FLUP and authorize a timber harvest operating plan that is not in its best interest.” Please explain this concept of modified purchaser layout?</p> <p>The idea if “in its best interest” is mentioned again in the final paragraph of the General Process section of Exhibit F.</p>	The harvest of timber is subject to authorization by the DOF through the FLUP process and the contract. If the purchaser’s submitted layout does not represent the adopted FLUP, the layout will need to be modified, this cost has been allocated to the purchaser in the RFP structure. It is expected that the DOF and the purchaser will make reasonable efforts to resolve and develop solutions to issues through the sale design process.
Page 1	<p>The Purchaser is responsible for procuring the road use authorization and paying all associated cost of use. Why is DOF shoving this on the purchaser? DOF should be getting these road use authorizations now before it even sales. This has delayed other timber sale operations and was specifically identified as an issue in our December meeting and write up that DOF needed to resolve and eliminate for delay of timber sales.</p>	The road use authorization may vary with the means and methods (routing, etc.) proposed by the purchaser. The cost and land manager’s terms of use were thus allocated to the purchaser.
	Field Layout, Forest Surveying, and Information Standards	
Page 2	All the language on surveying and traversing road and units.	GPS records (location documentation) of the proposed roads and units is an acceptable method to describe the proposed road centerlines and the timber locations within the parameters of the

Refer- ence	Comment	DOF Response
	<p>This is all on roads that are again going to be removed at the end of the sale!! No one in industry surveys and traverses roads and units in 2025. This is from the manual 30 years ago. This would be appropriate if it was for a mainline road on a road that was going to be left in place and expanded upon going forward. Its not necessarily, not efficient and a waste of time and effort. A flag line that is GPS with locations of culverts identified is all that is needed unless it becomes difficult and technical. Most spur roads are not difficult with technically specific requirements. It would be really easy to distinguish between these. This is the essence of why industry wants to do purchaser layout and is so much better and efficient at the layout. You are not building a piano. DOF wants the purchaser to use the same bureaucratic approach they have entrenched themselves for the last 30 years.</p>	<p>Exhibit F. The intent of the requirement is to enable the DOF to spatially understand the operations proposed by the purchaser.</p> <p>On Page 2 of Exhibit F in the General Field Layout and Information Acquisition section replace the last sentence of the third paragraph with the following: “If a tree or bush is not available, a stick or other item that can affix the flagging shall be used if needed. The actual point of measure were different than the flagging and relevant to future use shall be identified by a piece of ribbon tied to a stick placed in the ground plumb with the measured position.”</p>
Page 2	<p>Are the requirements under Exhibit F, Field Layout, Forest Surveying, and Information Standards statewide standards or have they been developed just southern southeast? I find many of the requirements to be no more than historical process that are no longer currently used by industry. As an example; “Stationing flags tied on a tree or bush along road centerlines or on harvest unit boundaries will be labeled with consecutive numbers, date, and the initials of the person performing the survey. The actual point of the measure should also be identified by a piece of</p>	<p>While GPS has revolutionized how the industry works, it has not eliminated the need for marking in the field. Survey flagging on a bush or a tree is specified to aid the review of the layout by the DOF and to define the activity during the timber harvest. The use of a “flagged stick” in the ground augments this intent and has been used by foresters historically where specific information is gathered or a bush is not available. Depending on the site and what is being documented, leaving flagging on the ground on a stick may not be needed.</p>

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
	ribbon tied to a stick placed in the ground plumb with the measured point.” With the use of GPS receivers with the accuracy required in Exhibit F, why are ribbons and sticks in the ground needed?	
	Over the last 10 years, I have laid out more than 150 MMBE of timber on multiple landowner’s properties using Avenza mapping software. Every DPO that I have submitted or developed that others have submitted have been approved by the DOF. Of the 150 MMBF approximately 120 MMBF of the timber has been harvested w/o any issues. I have not surveyed, traversed or left station flagging or sticks in the ground. Why is DOF requiring more process on their sales when DOF is excepting “substandard” work on non-State land under AFRPA? Even the USFS has adjusted their standards regarding timber sale layout with the recent memo from Acting Associate Chief Chris French stating that; “virtual boundaries should be used in lieu of marked boundaries whenever possible.”	The DOF uses Avenza and ESRI GIS digital platforms in the process of managing data associated with timber sale preparation and operations. The data type requested is a common format. Data attributes are important for conveying information intent and the ease of the information access affects the length of time needed to create maps and exchange information. The DOF will work with the purchaser on this topic.
	General Comments	
	The layout work that I have done over the last decade has been on a per mbf cost basis. Industry likes that cost basis because they know what their actual cost for timber sale layout will be. My initial estimate of what my rate on a per mbf basis would be to layout timber per the requirements of Exhibit F is 3 times the rates I have been charging. The same outcome, timber units	Comment noted, no change made.

Reference	Comment	DOF Response
	ready to be harvested and roads ready for construction, at 3 times the cost.	

End of Addendum One