

by Al Schuler

Take a few minutes to compare U.S. lumber manufacturing costs with those of competitors around the world. s discussed in the March issue, U.S. wood product manufacturers are being impacted by global events much more than a decade ago. In this article, we'll compare U.S. lumber manufacturing costs with competitors around the world. Today almost 40 percent of our softwood lumber consumption is imported, up from 25 percent since 1990. Although Canada supplies most of the imports, there are increasing volumes of framing lumber from Europe and industrial grades from the southern hemisphere. U.S. exports have fallen by almost 50 percent in the past five years. Both the U.S. and Canadian lumber industry are consolidating to address competitive issues, and this is altering lumber markets—changes in distribution, selling and other aspects of doing business.

Global Comparison

Figure 1 provides a comparison of global manufacturing costs. The U.S. was the high cost producer of lumber while Brazil, Chile, New Zealand and Central Europe were vying for low cost status. Although we are comparing apples to oranges with different grades, dimensions and species in each region, similarities exist: SYP in the U.S. South and South America, Spruce/Pine in Central Europe, Russia and Canada. The data in Figure 1 represent industry averages for various geographic regions—averages across all grades, species and dimensions.¹ For the most part, lumber producers all over the world are not making inordinate amounts of money (EBITDA—earnings before interest, taxes, and depreciation). That is, lumber is often a low margin business. Higher wood costs are the main reason for the high cost position of U.S. mills. If you are a high cost producer, a sound business strategy may be to reduce your exposure to commodity products while putting more emphasis on value added products. Competition wasn't as much a problem before globalization; mills in the U.S. South competed with mills all over the world.

North American Comparison

Again, we are comparing apples and oranges. Product mix can differ from one producing region to another. Here are some examples:

- Due to size of the timber, there are larger production volumes of higher margin products like wide dimension (2x8 2x12) and long lengths (22' and 24') in the U.S. West and B.C. Interior compared to eastern Canada and the South.
- SYP has inherent physical properties that provide favorable treating economics, consequently, about 40 percent is treated compared with much lower volumes for other softwood species.
- Due to the inherent strength of SYP, a higher proportion of the production meets "stress grades" standards.
- Transportation costs to consuming destinations provide advantages and disadvantages to various producing regions.

at a glance

- The U.S. lumber producers are in general the high cost producers when compared to their foreign counterparts.
- The softwood lumber tariff creates a twotiered lumber market that allows Canadian component manufacturers to buy lumber cheaper than their U.S. counterparts, creating a competitive advantage when shipping to the U.S.

¹ These cost comparisons are for 2002 data. Since then, the USD has fallen against each of the currencies of the competing regions thereby improving U.S. competitiveness. Unfortunately, I don't have 2004 fiber and mill costs to complete an analysis based on 2004 data. That data will become available by mid 2005 when WMM, Price Waterhouse Coopers and Beck Consulting complete their global lumber benchmarking study.



Figure 1. Global Sawmilling Costs (2002 basis). The U.S. was the high cost producer. **Note:** Net wood costs are wood costs afer accounting for residue income (i.e., net of residue income). Mill costs include labor, energy, etc. (all variable costs except wood). Mill cost rankings (low to high): 1) S. Hemisphere, 2) C. Europe/Russia, 3) Canada, 4) W. Europe, 5) U.S.

For a more relevant comparison that deals with some of these issues, RISI (Resource Information Systems, Inc., part of the Paperloop Group) developed Product Variable Costs, which compares the variable costs of manufacturing 2x4s on FOB Mill basis in different geographic regions (see Table 1). This comparison demonstrates that on a pre-duty basis, Canadian producing regions have some cost advantages.

DF Green (del. Portland)	\$291	U.S. West
Inland HF	\$301	U.S. West
SYP	\$295	U.S. South
WSPF	\$245	Canadian West
ESPF (del. Grt. LK)	\$310	Canadian East

Table 1. Product Variable Costs (US\$/M, FOB, Mill, 2X4) - 2004 basis. [Source: RISI (North American Lumber Forecast, December 2004)]

In Figure 2 (on page 23), we compare industry-wide costs delivered to Chicago, and can see clearly the impact of the duty on the Canadian cost position. Of course, not everyone ships to Chicago. For example, Eastern Canadian mills often ship to closer U.S. east coast and southeast destinations. The Canadian dollar (CAD) appreciated about 20 percent between 2002 and 2004, and we show the added impact of a further strengthening in 2005, (about eight percent)—in essence, the stronger CAD translates to less revenue (or higher costs if you prefer) on shipments to the U.S. The CAD Continued on page 24



For reader service, go to www.sbcmag.info/anuprospect.htm



For reader service, go to www.sbcmag.info/wtca.htm

Economic Environment

Continued from page 23

is expected to remain strong through 2005 as the U.S. current account deficit puts downward pressure on the USD (U.S. Dollar) while robust world commodity prices support the CAD (see Jan/Feb **SBC**). The comparisons shown in Figure 2 help explain why Canadian mills are having serious margin problems, and any slip in U.S. prices (from a slower housing market for example), could result in reduced production from higher cost mills.

Conclusions

U.S. sawmills are facing increasing competition from offshore sources, but the duty and the stronger CAD are keeping many U.S. mills competitive with their Canadian counterparts. This should be only a temporary advantage; the duty issue will be resolved eventually, and the consensus is that the new duty, if any, will be lower than 27 percent. In

addition, the CAD is expected to peak this year, and the consensus opinion is that it will weaken in the future for a variety of reasons. U.S. mills need to consider adding more value to their product mix (move up the value chain), consolidate to capture scale economies, invest more to reduce costs, and



Figure 2. North American Industry cost comparisons for various geographic regions - 2004 basis, delivered Chicago.

be aware of new competitive threats from offshore.

CMs should stay current on the duty issue and CAD fluctuations because they impact Canadian sawmill costs, U.S. lumber prices indirectly, and even the competitive position of Canadian manufacturers. For example, the strong CAD and



For reader service, go to www.sbcmag.info/turb-o-web.htm



For reader service, go to www.sbcmag.info/wtca.htm



Figure 3. Two-tiered market showing price spread (USD) between the U.S. price, delivered U.S. destination, and Canadian price (USD), delivered Toronto, for ESPF, 2x4.

duty is forcing Canadian mills to divert some shipments from U.S. destinations to Canadian destinations simply because margins are being squeezed (a pullback in U.S. housing would exacerbate this situation). The Canadian market then becomes oversupplied or saturated, resulting in lower lumber prices in Canada. This is called a "two-tiered market" as Canadian SPF prices in Canada (USD basis) can be significantly lower than SPF prices in the U.S. (Figure 3). During 2004, after converting to USD, the spread for Canadian Eastern SPF, KD, 2x4, delivered Toronto versus delivered, Great Lakes (a U.S. destination), ranged from \$87/M to \$20/M. During 2004, Canadian component manufacturers paid about ten percent less for SPF (USD basis) than their U.S. counterparts, lowering their manufacturer's costs and making them more competitive when shipping to U.S. customers. This puts the unintended consequence of no duty on Canadian manufactured components/trusses shipped to the U.S. in front and center view and explains why it is difficult for component manufacturers to create long-term business plans. The uncertainty from day-to-day, month-to-month and year-to-year is illustrated in Figure 3. SBC

Al Schuler works for Forestry Sciences Lab in Princeton, WV. Please note that the economic information/opinions contained in this article are not necessarily those of the USDA Forest Service. Dr. Schuler can be reached at 304/431-2727 or aschuler@fs.fed.us. His economic information can also be found at www.sbcmaq.info.

TRACTOR MOUNT CRANE FOR THE TRUSS INDUSTRY TM-1882 OUTSTANDING DESIGN FEATURES Shortest Overall Length Minimal boom overhang Pentagonal boom shape (self centering) Superior function speed (82 ft. in less than a minute) Exceptional full power reach (no dangerous JIB to swing) . Beam & Jack (out & down) outriggers (187* max span) Strong capacities (1,200 lbs @ 75') Removable Hoist (serviceability) Shear Plate Mount (more positive than clamp on mount) Superior Winch Vertical jack rear stabilizer (true leveling capability) Adjustable height front stabilizer (increased approach angle). Unequalled strength to weight ratio Large diarre te r turntable bearing Clean boom (electric cable is inside the boom) Compact, Fast, Strong, Smooth & Smart The finest cranes on the planet TM-1882 TADANO AMERICA CORPORATION 333 NORTHPARK CENTRAL DR., SUITE Z HOUSTON, TX 77073-6088 T 281 869 0030 F 281 869 0040 TADANDAMERICA.COM For reader service, go to www.sbcmag.info/tadano.htm



www.sbcmag.info

Dear Reader:

Copyright © 2005 by Truss Publications, Inc. All rights reserved. For permission to reprint materials from SBC Magazine, call 608/310-6706 or email editor@sbcmag.info.

The mission of Structural Building Components Magazine (SBC) is to increase the knowledge of and to promote the common interests of those engaged in manufacturing and distributing of structural building components to ensure growth and continuity, and to be the information conduit by staying abreast of leading-edge issues. SBC will take a leadership role on behalf of the component industry in disseminating technical and marketplace information, and will maintain advisory committees consisting of the most knowledgeable professionals in the industry. The opinions expressed in SBC are those of the authors and those quoted solely, and are not necessarily the opinions of any of the affiliated associations (SBCC, WTCA, SCDA & STCA).

