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Introduction

Many private non-industrial forest landowners (NIPFLs) that own pine plantations have to make thinning decision at some point. An obvious objective with any timber sale is to realize as much income as possible. But should this be the overriding objective in a first thinning? In almost every case the answer should be no. The first thinning primary objectives should be: (1) remove trees that have (a) some visible defect, as discussed below, that will always keep them in the lowest price category; pulpwood or (b) those stems in lower crown positions and small diameters that will not respond to the thinning with large growth gains like the larger diameter, best crown position trees would. (2) Allow the best trees that have no defects and are the most dominant in the stand to grow at an accelerated pace into more valuable solid wood products after the thinning.

From an NIPFL’s perspective, there are at least three ways to grow value from timber, across time. These are, in order of increasing importance; (1) real product price appreciation, (2) wood volume growth, and (3) individual tree stems moving to higher value product classes through growth and management; i.e., pulpwood to-chip-n-saw to sawtimber to peeler logs and poles. The NIPFL’s expectation would be that these three value changes should occur at rates of return (ROR) above the individual’s discount rate (next best investment ROR of similar risk, in percent). Remember, tree stems moving to higher value product classes have the potential to give the highest ROR of the three factors mentioned above.

If we look at trees in a pine stand as inventory, we are generally best to harvest the portion of inventory that will not grow significantly in value as soon as possible. The portion of inventory that does not grow appreciably in value is trees with defects. Trees targeted for removal (harvest) during the first thinning generally have one or more defects such as crook, sweep, many/large branches, a fork below 17 feet, and/or a disease (fusiform and pitch cankers on the stem). Trees that should be included in a first thinning with the defective trees are those that occupy the lower portions of the overall canopy (suppressed or intermediate trees) that commonly do not respond positively to a thinning as the larger dominant and co-dominant trees
would. Good quality, defect-free crop trees that are generally larger stems, respond to a thinning as more of the site’s resources become available to them (water, nutrients, and sunlight). These crop trees grow at a faster rate after a thinning due to less competition for the site’s resources.

Trees are sold by product classes (Table 1). Wood product classes are based on two major factors: defects and diameter classes (to a given length which is highly correlated to diameter). Defects generally determine whether a tree is pulpwood, historically the lowest valued wood. If a tree has no visible defects, then the diameter dictates what wood product the tree falls into.

From an economic standpoint, a forest landowner wants to grow as much of the highest valued wood as possible (i.e. hold the portion of inventory that will grow into the highest valued products). In the example we use here, that class is sawtimber (ST) with a diameter at 4 ½ feet above groundline (also called diameter at breast height; dbh) of 13 inches or greater with no defects and is relatively straight (some sawmills may take smaller diameter trees). Demand for end wood products is the driving force in creating demand for timber and largely affects stumpage prices of various timber products. Pine sawtimber trees are used to cut dimension lumber (2” x 4” x 8’s, 2” x 4” x 10’s, 2” x 6” x 10’s, 2” x 8” x 12’s, 4” x 4” x 10’s and larger lumber). Pine chip-n-saw (CNS) trees have no visual defects, are relatively straight, and have dbh of 9 to 13 inches. Pine chip-n-saw is worth 43 percent (2016 price differences) to over 3.5 times (2005 price differences) the value of pine pulpwood (Table 1). Trees that qualify as CNS trees are used to make small dimension lumber; 2” x 4”x 8’s, 2” x 4” x 10’s, and some 4” x 4” x 8’s primarily (chip-n-saw mills will vary what dimension lumber they manufacture and the diameter size limit as well). Depending on demand for final products and other market factors, pine sawtimber has been worth 2-times (2016 price differences) to over 6-times (2005 price differences) what pine pulpwood is worth (TM-S 2016 and 2005, Table 1).

How does a landowner make the most of his/her pine stand (inventory) from a financial standpoint? Should the landowner (a) sell some of their best and large trees (inventory with potential for high valued products in the future) in the first thinning and make more money in the thinning or (b) are they better off with cutting primarily the trees with defects (inventory that is of low current and low future value) and smaller sized trees, leaving the best trees to grow at a faster rate to the higher valued product classes? Will the answer still be the same when the price premium of sawtimber over pulpwood has shrank significantly in recent years? This paper addresses these questions using three common pine product classes.

**Scenarios and Assumptions**

A forest landowner has 100 acres of 16-year-old loblolly pine and is considering two thinning options. The options are as follows:

**Financial Assumptions:**

Product prices were held constant across time using two price set scenarios, one from 2005 with large pulpwood, chip-n-saw and sawtimber price differences ($7, $25 and $43/ton for pulpwood, chip-n-saw, and sawtimber) and the other price set from 2016 where pulpwood, chip-n-saw and sawtimber prices were small ($14, $20 and $28/ton, respectively). The discount rate used was six percent to represent the NIPFL’s next best investment opportunity. Results are reported before taxes. Financial results reported include: net present value (NPV) of timber
product sales, i.e., present value of revenues minus costs in year zero discounted by the discount rate (6%), annual equivalent value (AEV) calculated at the discount rate (6%) as an annual annuity, and the whole scenario internal rate of return (ROR) calculated assuming that intermediate cash-flows are reinvested in the scenario at the ROR instead of the discount rate.

**Scenario #1**: Thin to allow the best crop trees (inventory with the potential for high value with time) to grow into more valuable product classes making more $/ton later in the life of the stand but with reduced profits from the 1st thinning. The landowner thinks that removing trees with poor form, a fork below 17', small, suppressed, and a stem canker in the first thinning will allow his best crop trees to grow at a better rate.

**Scenario #2**: Thin to achieve a higher per acre price by selling some of the better crop trees along with trees that are defective (stem canker, fork below 17 feet, large/many branches, and crooked trees).

**Stand information**:
(1) Loblolly pine, 1st thinning is to occur @ age 16-years when basal area is 137 ft²/acre and approximately 440 trees per acre (TPA).
(2) Thin back to 65 ft²/acre: Scenario #1-157 trees per acre (TPA) for 5th row + low thin¹; Scenario #2-195 TPA for the 5th row + even thinning².
(3) Stand mean annual increment (MAI) is 4.65 tons/acre/year through age 27-years.
(4) We assumed in both scenarios: $250/acre for site prep, seedlings, and planting cost in 1989, an annual management and property tax cost of $9/acre (1989 through 2016), and a 10% harvest cost at age 16- and 27-years (2005 and 2016). The land was assumed to be already owned. All costs and returns are in real (today’s) dollars.

**Two thinning types**:
**Scenario 1**: A row removal + low thinning in the leave rows removing over 90% pulpwood trees (diseased, deformed, forked below 17 ft, and stem cankered trees) and 20% of the good crop trees (in the thinned rows). A total of 283 TPA are removed in this thinning operation (72 ft² basal area/acre and 36.0 tons/acre removed) while leaving 157 TPA (65 ft² basal area/acre and 35.6 tons/acre).

**Scenario 2**: A row removal + even thinning in the leave rows resulting in removal of 75% of the relatively smaller-diameter and poorer quality pulpwood or suppressed trees and 40% of the larger good crop trees from the stand. A total of 245 TPA are removed in this thinning operation (72 ft² basal area/acre and 36.6 tons/acre) while leaving 195 TPA (65 ft² basal area/acre and 34.4 tons/acre).

¹ row + low thinning: removing every 3rd, 4th or 5th row and thinning from below: removing 100% of smaller diameter (4 through 7 inch classes), 90% of the poorer quality trees, and 25% to 30% of the 8 to 12 inch dbh class trees to achieve desired stand conditions after thinning.
² row + even thinning: removing every 3rd, 4th or 5th row and thinning 100% of 3, 4 and 5 inch dbh classes and 50% of 6 to 12 inch dbh classes in this case.
Table 1. Pine stumpage prices (TM-S Georgia statewide 1st Quarter 2005 and 1st Quarter 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product class (abbreviation: dbh, form specs)</th>
<th>2005 per ton price</th>
<th>2016 per cord price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pulpwood (PW: 4.6 to 9.5” dbh) to a 3” top</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip-N-Saw (CNS: 9.6 to 12.5” dbh, good form) to an 6” top</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawtimber (ST: &gt;12.5” dbh, good form) to an 8” top</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winyield (version 1.11, Hepp 2001) is the model used for this paper to estimate trees per acre by diameter class and product class distributions pre-thin (Figure 1), tons per acre (Figure 2), and value per acre (Figure 3; in 2005 $s) for trees harvested and trees per acre remaining (Figure 4) by thinning type. Winyield then grew out the stand and generated trees per acre by diameter class and thinning type (Figure 5), merchantable CNS and ST wood (tons per acre, Figure 6), value by CNS and ST product classes (Figure 7; in 2005 $s), and CNS and ST tons/acre by thinning type from the clear-cut at age 27-years (Figure 8).

Thinning diameter distributions, wood production and value per acre (age 16-years)

A total of 59 trees per acre in the 8 through 11 inch diameter classes that were harvested in the thinning at age 16-years with the row + low thinning scenario #1 (Figure 1). Comparatively, there were a total of 108 trees per acre in the 8 through 11 inch diameter classes that were harvested in the thinning at age 16-years with the row + even thinning scenario #2 (Figure 1).

A total of 36.0 (34.4 as PW and 1.6 as CNS) and 36.6 (33.4 as PW and 3.2 as CNS) tons per acre were harvested from the row + low thin and row + even thin, respectively at age 16-years. There were 22.0 and 11.6 tons of 5 through 7 inch dbh class trees harvested by the row + low and row + even thin, respectively (Figure 2). Conversely, 14.0 and 25.0 tons of 8 through 11 inch dbh class trees were harvested with the row + low and row + even thinning (Figure 2).

1st Thin economic estimates with Scenario #1:
Using 2005 prices → Landowner makes = $281/acre for 1st thinning ($241 as PW and $40 as CNS)
Using 2016 prices → Landowner makes = $514/acre for 1st thinning ($482 as PW and $32 as CNS)

1st Thin economic estimates with Scenario #2:
Using 2005 prices → Landowner makes = $314/acre for 1st thinning ($234 as PW and $80 as CNS)
Using 2016 prices → Landowner makes = $532/acre for 1st thinning ($468 as PW and $64 as CNS)
The economic gain in selling approximately 50 extra good crop trees (inventory with potential for the highest valued products with time) per acre did result in slightly more revenue ($40 per acre using 2005 prices or $32 per acre using 2016 prices) from the 8 through 11 inch diameter classes but less revenue in the 6 and 7 inch diameter classes for an overall per acre slight gain of $18 or $33 per acre (using 2016 or 2005 prices, respectively). The question is “is it worth a landowner selling more good crop trees (high valued inventory with time) in a 1st thinning than is needed to achieve a residual basal area (RBA) of 65 sq. ft. per acre?” The residual crop tree diameter distribution (Figure 4) shows 157 trees per acre in the 8 through 11 inch diameter classes for the row + low thin stand and 108 trees per acre in the 8 through 11 inch diameter classes for the row + even thin stand.

Scenario #1 (row + low thin) vs Scenario #2 (row + even thin) – Wood Revenues:

► Total revenue generated by thinning type:

Using 2005 prices $2878 per acre ($281 + $2597) for the row + low thinning and $2356 per acre ($314 + $2042) for the row + even thinning.

Using 2016 prices $2477 ($514 + $1963) for the row + low thinning and $2277 ($1745 + $532) for the row + even thinning.

► Landowner gains $18 or $33/acre in revenues due to selling some of his/her best trees as chip-n-saw in 1st thinning at age 16-years with the row + even thinning using 2016 or 2005 prices, respectively

► BUT loses $218/acre ($1963/acre - $1745/acre) or $555/acre ($2597/acre - $2042/acre) in final harvest value at age 27-years with the row + even thinning using 2016 or 2005 prices, respectively.

Clearcut diameter distributions, wood production, and value per acre (age 27-years)

By age 27-years (11 years post-thinning) the loblolly pine diameter distribution favors the row + low stand (Figure 5) with 51 trees per acre in the sawtimber class (13” dbh class and larger, highest valued inventory) versus 33 trees per acre from the row + even thin scenario. Total CNS and ST wood production for the row + low was 69.7 tons per acre compared to 51.9 tons per acre for the row + even thin (Figure 6), a difference of 17.8 tons per acre of CNS and ST wood.

The row + low thin and row + even thin produced similar amounts of wood, 55.3 (from 35.6 tons/acre at age 16-years to 90.9 tons/acre at age 27-years) and 55.0 (from 34.4 tons/acre at age 16-years to 89.5 tons/acre at age 27-years) tons per acre, respectively in the 11 years post thinning. The row + low thin produced 35.7 tons per acre of CNS and 34.0 tons per acre of ST, 6.6 and 11.2 tons per acre more of CNS and ST respectively, than the row + even thin (29.1 CNS and 22.8 ST tons per acre, Figure 6). The row + even thin produced more PW tonnage (the low valued inventory; 37.5 tons per acre) than the row + low thin (21.2 tons per acre, Figure 5).

The clearcut revenue generated from the row + low thin is $2597 per acre at age 27-years using 2005 prices and $1963 per acre using 2016 prices. The clearcut revenue generated from the
row + even thin is $2042 per acre at age 27-years using 2005 prices and $1745 per acre using 2016 prices. The differences of $555 per acre less than the row + low thinning using 2005 prices and $218 per acre using 2016 prices. The majority of revenue in both thinning scenarios came from the CNS and ST sized trees by age 27-years.

Rate of return (ROR) in scenario #1 compared to #2 thinnings

The rate of return (ROR = ((return/cost)^1/years – 1) x 100) for scenario 1 versus scenario 2 is ((555/33)^1/11 – 1) x 100 or 28.9% using 2005 prices and ((218/18)^1/11 – 1) x 100=25.2% using 2016 prices. A forest landowner may look at the thinning alternatives as giving up $33/acre at age 16-years to realize an extra $555/acre eleven years later using 2005 prices or $18/acre at age 16-years to realize an extra $218/acre gain eleven years later using 2016 prices.

Let’s assume that a landowner had the stand marked (painted trees for either “leave” or “take” depending on the timber sale contract) by a professional forester for $40/acre. The total cost per acre at age 16-years is now $33 + $40 or $73. Solving for ROR (((555/73)^1/11 – 1) x 100) we get 20.0 % using 2005 prices. Using 2016 prices a total cost per acre of $58 per acre ($18 in wood value loss + $40 per acre to mark the stand). Solving for ROR ((218/58)^1/11 – 1) x 100 we get 12.7%. These RORs are still attractive rates of return. In this case, it was worth the loss of $18 or $33 per acre in wood sales and a cost of $40 per acre to mark the stand to get more of the best crop trees to grow an extra $218 or $555 per acre in wood value eleven years later.

Scenario financial results for NPV, BLV, AEV and ROR using a 6% discount rate:

Financial results reported here include: net present value (NPV) of timber product sales, i.e., present value of revenues minus costs in year zero, discounted by the discount rate; bare land value (BLV); like NPV but for an infinite number of rotations, annual equivalent value (AEV) calculated at the discount rate as an annual annuity; and, the rate of return (ROR) calculated assuming that intermediate cash-flows are reinvested in the scenario at the ROR instead of the discount rate. The relative differences between the financial measures to achieve correct rankings of alternatives are more valuable than the absolute values themselves because absolute values are based on a set of conservative assumptions that keeps scenarios on the same playing field. The higher the NPV, BLV, AEV and ROR, the more attractive the scenario.

We assumed in both scenarios: $250/acre for site prep and planting cost in 1989, an annual management and property tax costs of $9/acre/year (1990 through 2016), and a 10% harvest cost at age 16- and 27-years (2005 and 2016). All costs and returns are in real dollars before State and Federal taxes.

The results in Table 2 (using 2005 pine stumpage prices) and Table 3 (using 2016 pine stumpage prices) indicate that the row + low thinning (scenario #1), leaving many of the larger, better trees to grow out from age 16-years to age 27-years when they are harvested, had higher NPV, BLV, AEV and ROR values than the row + even thinning (scenario #2) which harvested some of the larger diameter, good quality trees for more money at age 16-years in the thinning and not allowing these larger, good quality trees to grow out to higher valued products. The NPV, BLV, AEV and ROR differences between scenarios was reduced going from using 2005 prices (Table 2) to 2016 prices (Table 3). This difference lessening of these financial values is
due to smaller price differences between PW, CNS and ST when going from 2005 prices ($7, $25 and $43/ton, respectively) to 2016 prices ($14, $20, and $28/ton, respectively).

SUMMARY

In addressing the question of how a landowner makes the most of his/her pine stand from a financial standpoint. Does the landowner (a) sell some of their best and largest trees in the first thinning (potentially high valued inventory) and make more money in the thinning or (b) are they better off with cutting primarily the trees with defects and smaller sized trees (low valued inventory with low appreciation internal rates), leaving the best trees to grow at a faster rate to the higher valued product classes? In this case, the landowner is best off in total financial return by harvesting primarily the defective trees (low value inventory), removing very little of the good quality large trees and growing the good crop trees (inventory that with time will be high valued products) out to final harvest. Selling some of the largest trees in the first thinning improves cash flow in the early years but reduces total financial return of timberland management.

Table 2. Scenario financial results for NPV, BLV, AEV (solved at a 6 percent discount rate), and ROR using three product classes over one rotation (27-year period; i.e., 1989-2016) with a thinning at age 16-years (2005) and a clear-cut harvest at age 27-year (2016) using TM-S 1st Quarter Georgia 2005 prices (price per ton: $7 PW, $25 CNS and $43 ST).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario #, thin type</th>
<th>NPV ($/ac)</th>
<th>BLV ($/ac)</th>
<th>AEV ($/ac/yr)</th>
<th>ROR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, row + low thin</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, row + even thin</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Scenario financial results for NPV, BLV, AEV (solved at a 6 percent discount rate), and ROR using three product classes over one rotation (27-year period; i.e., 1989-2016) with a thinning at age 16-years (2005) and a clear-cut harvest at age 27-year (2016) using TM-S 1st Quarter Georgia 2016 prices (price per ton: $14 PW, $20 CNS and $28 ST).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario #, thin type</th>
<th>NPV ($/ac)</th>
<th>BLV ($/ac)</th>
<th>AEV ($/ac/yr)</th>
<th>ROR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, row + low thin</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, row + even thin</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

► It is very important that the first thinning be done at the right time and the right way.

► The major objectives of the first thinning should be (1) to harvest those trees are and always will be in the lowest valued product class (pulpwood, low valued inventory) and (2) leave as much of the larger trees that are defect free (future high value inventory) in the stand in good condition. Selling some of the largest trees in the first thinning can improve cash flow in the early years but it reduces total financial return of timberland management. This is valid in both scenarios of this study (2005 TM-S price and 2016 TM-S price). However, the spread in financial benefit of keeping good stem quality trees to grow compared to harvesting them in the first
thinning becomes narrower as the price difference in sawtimber and pulpwood decreases.

Forest management decisions that landowners make, including the type of first thinning, are decisions that must be carefully planned and executed. In this case, the first thinning decision that is made has large financial consequences and has to be lived with for a relatively long period of time.

If the goal of a forest landowner is to have a row + low thinning performed in their pine stand then they have two major options: (1) have a professional forester mark the “leave” (or “take” trees, whichever is the lesser of the trees to mark) with paint (usually blue) or (2) have a competent logger select those defective and smaller trees for removal during the thinning operation. If option #1 (professional forester mark “leave” or “take” trees) is the only way to achieve a row + low thinning, then that is what a landowner should do. There are some loggers that can perform a reasonably good “low” thinning (removing the defective trees and the lower canopy position trees). The bottom-line is to do the thinning operation that will give you the best results: leaving the potentially high valued inventory to grow and harvesting the low valued inventory in the thinning.

The “row + low” and “row + even” thinning options used in this paper could be accomplished using common 3rd, 4th or 5th row + selection thinning practices. Each of these thinning types has their advantages and disadvantages. Where good stem quality tree numbers are low, then a 5th (even 6th or 7th row can be performed and is being done in 2016), row thin with a local, reputable professional forester marking may be the best option to minimize the number of good trees being removed.

Other important factors that effect the financial outcomes of first thinning options include: (1) rotation age (shorter rotation ages may reduce the thinning method differences due to less product class differentiation, while longer rotation ages than the one used here may increase the thinning method differences), (2) first thinning residual basal area (higher residual basal area can decrease thinning type/quality financial differences and a lower residual basal area can increase thinning type/quality financial differences), (3) percent defect in the stand, (4) current and future stumpage prices, and (5) first thinning timing.
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Figure 1. Harvested loblolly pine trees per acre at age 16-years based on thinning type and trees per acre (TPA) just prior to thinning.

Figure 2. Harvested loblolly pine merchantable wood at age 16-years based on thinning type.
Figure 3. Harvested loblolly pine wood value at age 16-years based on thinning type (using TM-S Georgia 1st Quarter 2005 pine stumpage prices).

Figure 4. Residual loblolly pine trees per acre after the thinning at age 16-years by dbh class and thinning type and trees per acre prior to the thinning.
Figure 5. Loblolly pine diameter distribution at age 27-years by dbh class and thinning type (11 years after 1st thinning).

Figure 6. Loblolly pine chip-n-saw and sawtimber production at age 27-years by dbh class and thinning type (11 years after 1st thinning).
Figure 7. Loblolly pine chip-n-saw and sawtimber value by dbh class and thinning type at age 27-years (11 years after 1st thinning) using TM-S Georgia 1st Quarter 2005 pine stumpage prices.

Figure 8. Loblolly pine three product class distribution by thinning type at age 27-years (11 years after 1st thinning). PW=pulpwood, CNS=chip-n-saw, ST=sawtimber.
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