
Minutes
Board of Natural Resources Meeting
January 4, 2022
Webinar, Olympia, Washington

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

The Honorable Hilary Franz, Washington State Commissioner of Public Lands

The Honorable Bill Peach, Commissioner, Clallam County

The Honorable Chris Reykdal, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Jim Cahill, Designee for the Honorable Jay Inslee, Washington State Governor

Dan Brown, Director, School of Environmental and Forest Sciences, University of Washington

Dr. Richard Koenig, Interim Dean, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences,
Washington State University

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Peach called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Board members present provided self-introduction. A meeting quorum was attained.

WEBINAR FORMAT BRIEFING

Ms. Tami Kellogg, Board Coordinator, provided an overview for viewing and participating in a webinar meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chair Peach called for approval of the minutes for the December 7, 2021 Regular Board of Natural Resources meeting.

MOTION: Superintendent Reykdal moved to approve the minutes.

SECOND: Dr. Brown seconded the motion.

ACTION: The motion carried unanimously.

LIGHTNING TALK

State Land Survey Unit

Patrick Beehler, Assistant Division Manager, Engineering Division.

Mr. Beehler briefed the Board on the State Land Survey Unit (SLSU) section within Surveys and Maps Programs. As a professional land surveyor and a certified federal surveyor, he oversees the Surveys and Maps Program, Photogrammetry, and the Public Lands Survey Office (a statewide database of survey records). Program staffing is located throughout the state with

1 offices in each region and at the Department Natural Resources Headquarters Building.
2 Cadastral survey crews are responsible for mapping for tracking parcel location and size. Crews
3 are located in regional offices. The Tumwater and Chehalis crews typically handle work in
4 Ellensburg, Washington. The SLSU is one of the oldest within the former State Division of
5 Lands prior to the formation of the Department of Resources.

6
7 Program activities include retracement and section subdivision by cadastral crews to produce
8 accurate boundary surveys. Boundary surveys followed by posting for maximum resource value
9 for timber sales are important to ensure property lines are clearly defined and marked so the
10 Department does not offer timber sales inadvertently extending to an abutting property owner. It
11 is also important for property owners to be aware of boundary lines when harvesting timber to
12 avoid trespassing onto state land. The section is also involved in conservation areas by installing
13 Carsinte posts with information for the public. The SLSU works with the Forest Regulation
14 Division on riparian easements, as well as many other miscellaneous projects providing land
15 survey support for other DNR programs. Legal descriptions in transactions are prepared by a
16 legal description expert within the section responsible for ensuring descriptions are complete and
17 error free. A purchase transacted completed approximately eight years ago included a title report
18 and closing documents omitting a full section of land that was part of the transaction. At the
19 time, the employee for the review discovered the error and corrected the documentation to ensure
20 the legal description was accurate and complete. The section also has two aquatic land survey
21 specialists overseeing millions of acres of state aquatic lands.

22
23 The statewide GIS cadastre layer for State Uplands identifies all state land parcels. That section
24 conducts outreach and training. The Department's surveyors are recognized throughout the state
25 as some of the best in the industry who engage frequently at local land surveyor chapter
26 meetings.

27
28 The surveys of Washington began in 1851 at the Willamette Stone State Park located in the
29 southwest area of Portland, Oregon. The surveys began south to the Willamette Valley and north
30 near Lake Vancouver and up to Puget Sound. Today, Meridian Road in Thurston County near
31 the Nisqually River is the original Willamette Meridian as the state was part of the Oregon
32 territory at that time.

33
34 Mr. Beehler shared photographs of early survey equipment comprised of a compass and a 66-
35 foot-long chain. Early surveyors include Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Abraham
36 Lincoln during their careers. Early Washington survey crews included a transit operator and
37 recorder surveying rugged lands in the state. Modern survey equipment include GPS units
38 accurately measuring to less than a centimeter, a theodolite replacing the old recorder, a data
39 collector recording information electronically, and Washington State Networks, a continuously
40 operating GPS unit serving as a base station for surveying in different areas of the state.

41
42 Mr. Beehler shared several photographs of different surveyor crews engaged in surveying
43 activities.

44
45 Other efforts include topographic mapping for future recreation sites. A special project for the
46 Department of Enterprise Services was the rehabilitation of the Sundial located between the
47 Legislative and Pritchard Buildings.

1
2 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

3 **Cynthia Moe-Lobeda** said she is a founding director of the Center for Climate Justice and Fate,
4 a project by the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary. She has lectured or consulted on six
5 continents on climate change and climate justice. She cited the Board's authority for setting
6 policies to guide how the Department manages state lands and resources. The Board has an
7 opportunity to contribute profoundly in addressing the moral challenge facing humankind in the
8 21st century, which is mitigating the climate catastrophe threatening lives and livelihoods of
9 people around the world. As recognized by scientists from around the world, deforestation is a
10 driver of climate change. The U.S. has joined 140 countries to eliminate deforestation by 2030.
11 She questioned the Department's continued approval of projects deforesting state lands,
12 degrading ecosystems, generating significant greenhouse gas emissions, and amplifying the risks
13 of climate change. She urged the Board not to approve the proposed timber sales, demonstrate
14 ethical leadership, and include comprehensive climate impact analysis on all future sales to
15 include the Oracle Unit. She opposes all timber sales for consideration.
16

17 **Stephen Kropp** referenced information presented to the Board in December. Mr. Brodie
18 provided information suggesting forests aged 50 years today would be more than 150 years old
19 by 2100. He also indicated DNR is not under any obligation to conserve or protect older forests,
20 which is untrue based on the number of provisions contained in numerous DNR plans requiring
21 the protection of older forests. Mr. Brodie uses terms that are misleading, misguided, inaccurate,
22 and mistaken to describe some of the information DNR staff has presented to the Board. Recent
23 information suggests DNR has decided that it is in its best interest to simply deny reality and
24 make things up. With all due respect, Board members do not understand the policies, the legal
25 framework, and lack sufficient data. The Board does not ask the right questions enabling DNR
26 to avoid addressing issues. Superintendent Reykdal has stated he prefers not getting lost in the
27 "weeds." However, the devil is in the details and unless the Board is willing to delve into the
28 weeds, the Board will not receive the truth. The subjects are complicated and staff appears to be
29 using that to their advantage to auction as many older forests as possible because of institutional
30 bias. Many employees at DNR want to take the right actions but are hamstrung by leadership.
31 Some DNR employees have shared those concerns. The leadership has four hours to present
32 information while the public only has three minutes talking into a black box. The Board should
33 provide the public with a real forum to present their case rather than relying entirely on DNR
34 leadership to do the right thing.
35

36 **Alexander Harris, resident of Whatcom County**, commented on the connection between
37 forests and climate change. He cited the opportunity to review the affects from the heat wave in
38 2021 and what may be ahead in the near future with respect to climate change. The heat event
39 broke temperatures and hundreds of people died in the Northwest. Scientists believe those levels
40 of temperature will become more frequent and more severe in the future. Five months later,
41 Whatcom County experienced its most severe and damaging flood ever recorded with record
42 high water in the lower Nooksack system contributing to hundreds of homes flooded. Two
43 timber sales in Whatcom County are under consideration by the Board within the next year.
44 Those sales are located in forests that should be conserved to buffer communities from the
45 impacts of climate change.
46

1 **Beverly Parsons, resident of Hansville,** cited her academic degree and professional affiliation
2 with science organizations. Efforts are underway to assist people beyond reduction of science to
3 include complexity sciences to address collectively a global climate situation. The older forest
4 policy framework is grounded in reductionist science and treats forests like a combination of
5 unrelated parts removed and replaced without affecting the greater whole. The policy work
6 needs to be reframed building on complexity sciences because it is grounded in living systems
7 and focuses on supporting living systems that can incorporate broader climate changes. DNR
8 appears to be trapped in the same orientation to science. It is the role of the Board to lift
9 everyone from the trap. The Board should create an independent and interdisciplinary panel of
10 scientists with expertise in complexity sciences as well as reductionist science, and place a
11 moratorium on harvesting of state trust lands until the Board and DNR have time to absorb and
12 establish a policy that incorporates the advice of the panel.

13
14 **Jean Bray, resident of Mason County,** addressed the prior land transaction of Camp Hahobas
15 in Mason County housing a former Boy Scout camp. She had appealed to the Board to ensure
16 the good care of the 600-acre property of which over 400 acres is in DNR ownership. Some of
17 the acres are trust lands. She is hopeful the Department continues to manage the land as much
18 remediation has been completed on the property since the sale in addition to removal of scotch
19 broom by the Great Peninsula Conservancy. This year, the Boys Scout Council has worked on
20 the property to ready the property for troop use. In November, the front gate of Camp Hahobas
21 was destroyed by several trucks and has not been repaired. Recent storms have downed many
22 trees throughout the property. Hahobas Way is impassable to vehicular traffic. In 2020, a fire
23 occurred on the property started by a logger with the fire extinguished by North Mason Fire
24 immediately.

25
26 **Andy Zahn** asked the Board to cancel all timber sales in forests naturally regenerated prior to
27 1945 and to preserve legacy forests in perpetuity. He cited other natural benefits legacy forests
28 provide exceeding their value as lumber. The Board should implement a moratorium on all
29 logging in forests naturally regenerated prior to 1945.

30
31 **Daniel Harm** cited the Paris Agreement and sections that speak to international governing
32 bodies creating compliance regulatory carbon markets to achieve net-zero in a limited and
33 critical of time. The framework of the carbon market provides worth to projects that sequester
34 carbon in verifiable carbon offsets as valuable assets in an international market. He believes
35 many DNR employees care deeply about the well-being of public forests and the biodiversity
36 they contain. Based on his readings, there is no excuse for logging legacy forests or old growth
37 because of environmental reasons clearly documented by science and leaders in ecology. Today,
38 there is an economic system enabling DNR to create revenue from preserving and protecting
39 forests. DNR should become a leader in the field of preservation and carbon market
40 profitability. DNR is clinging to an economic model that is not keeping pace with the times.
41 The timber industry is going to have to adapt to the times while utilizing the carbon market for
42 economic gains. Current methodologies for timber extraction leave a large footprint not
43 accounted for in the balance sheet. The timber industry can use carbon markets to provide
44 stability during these changing times. He urged the Board to consider preserving forests while
45 improving revenue obligations and encouraged outreach by county commissioners and
46 beneficiaries of DNR's timber extraction revenue to network and reach out to those in the fields
47 of carbon marketing to bring wealth into the communities.

1
2 **Edward Chadd, resident of Port Angeles,** reported he is a member of Olympic Climate Action.
3 He underscored comments provided by previous speakers and cited a political event several
4 years ago where he publicly challenged Commissioner Franz to evaluate climate change
5 implications of forest management. Commissioner Franz promised to direct staff to consider a
6 serious evaluation of the issue, which has not occurred. The role of DNR serves as the
7 accountability mechanism for the management of state forests. He asked the Board to step up
8 and begin applying accountability that is lacking from the Department.
9

10 **Greg Bargmann, resident of Thurston County,** urged the Board to conserve and protect a few
11 groves of legacy trees remaining on DNR managed land. The older trees are valuable and are
12 disappearing mainly due to the lack of attention. Many years ago, commitments were promised
13 to set-aside a considerable portion of state lands to protect older trees and healthy forests from
14 harvesting. Today, DNR has the opportunity to build on and improve existing commitments.
15 During the December meeting, in response to a question from Dr. Brown, Mr. Brodie stated that
16 the majority of existing legacy forests are located in riparian management zones and that the plan
17 is to continue concentrating legacy forests in those zones. He finds that approach very troubling
18 for reasons previously stated by other speakers. If the approach does not meet the Board's
19 expectation, the Board should take steps to fill its predecessors' expectations and help produce
20 healthy forests. The Board should not approve bundled timber sales, should address each sale
21 individually, and vote against timber sales with legacy trees.
22

23 **Michael Feerer, Executive Director, Whatcom Million Trees Project,** reported the project is
24 a non-profit planting a million trees in various areas in the lowlands of Whatcom County over
25 the next five years. The mission of the organization is to protect critical areas of trees. He
26 supports previous comments addressing legacy forests and protecting the complexity of those
27 natural forests for biodiversity, habitat, and recreational opportunities. He cited information in
28 the Policy for the Sustainable Forest surrounding some recommendations and requested
29 clarification of some information on the delay in harvesting of some areas located in Whatcom
30 County. He supported the action of conducting a review of the pre-1900 forests to assess options
31 by May 2022, as well as a presentation on forest carbon to the Board. He recommended
32 expanding public outreach beyond the public comment period.
33

34 **Jillian Froebe** acknowledged the education she has received by listening to previous speakers
35 and is hopeful the Board also received similar benefits as decision-makers. She is a resident of
36 Whatcom County and most of her comments have been previously conveyed by other speakers.
37 She asked the Board to avoid paying lip service to public comments and not ignore public
38 concerns, comments, letters, and petitions. The state has agreements with federal agencies
39 requiring DNR to maintain and restore 12% to 22% of state forestlands to old growth conditions
40 by 2096. That is too late! The state cannot afford to continue practices targeted 74 years from
41 today given the impacts of climate change and mutual responsibility to the lives of future
42 generations of all species on the planet. Legacy forests store vast amounts of carbon, provide
43 oxygen, and cool the earth by creating shade and releasing water. Because of centuries of
44 growth and high biodiversity, legacy forests are more equipped to withstand fires and mitigate
45 other climate impacts. She urged the Board to consider individually what kind of ancestor they
46 would want to be as they consider their responsibilities in altering logging practices, preserving

1 legacy forests, and addressing the reality of climate change that will cause large-scale suffering
2 for future generations.

3
4 **Elizabeth Kerwin, resident of Whatcom County**, spoke to her personal experiences recreating
5 in local forests full of natural diversity and profound beauty. Numerous studies document how
6 mental and emotional health of humans is verifiably enhanced and preserved by contact with
7 natural beauty. It is important to consider that the mental health of her community and the nation
8 is extremely compromised and access to nature can be one of the most healing forces. Part of
9 DNR's mission is to provide meaningful recreational opportunities for citizens. It is clear
10 preserving the most biodiverse forests remaining in existence fulfills many DNR principles.
11 Commissioner Franz promised within the last year to protect forests nearing old growth status.
12 In the upper Rutsatz area, dozens of 100+ year old trees measuring over four feet in diameter
13 exist. Trails through the forest are well established and frequently used. Numerous streams feed
14 the middle fork of Nooksack protecting already endangered salmon and steelhead. Protecting
15 legacy forests, such as the upper Rutsatz is possible to enhance the resilience of the watershed
16 fisheries and communities while preserving the unique fragile and precious beauty future
17 generations deserve to experience. The Board should consider adopting a moratorium on all
18 timber sales in state forestlands naturally regenerated prior to 1945.

19
20 **Jessica Randall, resident of Jefferson County**, cited a petition signed by over 96 individuals
21 and 27 organizations to halt the Taylor Downhill Sorts harvest for numerous reasons to include
22 protecting older growth, species endangerment, and compromised streams. She received a
23 lengthy rebuttal of the petition from DNR and while DNR acknowledged the issues, the response
24 indicated DNR was proceeding with the sale because forest practice laws permit the sale. The
25 response spoke to the SEPA Environmental Checklist not including any analysis of climate
26 change impacts. That response is devastating and dangerous to Washingtonians because many of
27 the state's forest practice laws are outdated and most are based on research that does not consider
28 the impacts of climate change. The HCP describes functional and complex forests and the
29 percentage of those forests to be conserved in their natural state to support wildlife. Those
30 standards have not been achieved and will not be achieved at the rate DNR is cutting large trees.
31 It is disheartening and depressing to see the government work this way. As a practitioner of
32 medicine, she is not allowed to act knowingly in a way that causes harm nor allowed to follow
33 scientific findings produced by an industry with a clear conflict of interest. It appears to be
34 malpractice or a dereliction of duty by DNR. It may well be past the irreversible tipping point
35 for human caused climate catastrophe, but it seems irrational not to do everything possible to halt
36 its progression. She is hopeful the Board would vote no to cutting timber stands as proposed.

37
38 **Jim Stoffer, Sequim School Board Director**, conveyed appreciation of previous community
39 comments as they speak to the complexity of managing forests. He is appreciative of the
40 Board's lens and focus and the partnerships developed over the years. He encouraged
41 community members to reach out to school districts in their respective areas, as each school
42 district needs funding while also preserving lands in accordance with state laws. He looks
43 forward to working with the Legislature in support of legislation supporting schools. He
44 acknowledged and thanked Lisa Anderson for her community outreach during her tenure with
45 DNR. DNR has provided extensive outreach to communities.

1 **John Talberth, President and Senior Economist, Center for Sustainable Economy**, cited
2 letters of opposition filed with the DNR on the Taylor Downhill Sorts sales because climate
3 impacts were not considered despite the generation of greenhouse gas emissions and an increase
4 the vulnerability of the land with the effects of climate change. The letters provided extensive
5 citations to methods and sources of information available to DNR to complete a rigorous analysis
6 of climate impacts on timber sales. That information has been available to federal, state, and
7 local public agencies including DNR for many years. Despite this, DNR refuses to consider
8 climate impacts because the SEPA Environmental Checklist does not include analysis of climate
9 impacts. That action is irresponsible because climate change poses a threat to humanity and to
10 indicate climate change is not on the checklist is an incredibly insensitive response to all of those
11 who have lost loved ones, lost property from wildfires, floods, and heat waves experienced by
12 the state. Logging is a direct cause of climate change because sales initiate a chain of activities
13 generating significant greenhouse gas emissions during the lifecycle of wood products. Those
14 sources are well known and are readily measurable by existing data methods. Clearcutting
15 makes land more susceptible to climate change because during heat waves, surface temperatures
16 and open clearcuts exceed 130°F while under shaded forest canopy, temperatures are often 40 to
17 50°F cooler. Logging amplifies flood risks, wildfire risk, and many other climate stressors.
18 SEPA rules do in fact require analysis of climate impacts as climate is an important element of
19 the environment listed on the Department of Ecology's list of rules under the heading of air
20 quality. Greenhouse gas emissions are considered an air pollutant and may need to be addressed.
21 A recent appellate court decision reiterates the necessity of conducting a climate impact analysis
22 at the project level. The court's opinion coupled with clear requirements of Ecology's SEPA
23 rules provide DNR with the authority necessary to begin accounting for climate impacts
24 seriously at the timber sale level. The Board should consider the information by withdrawing the
25 Determination of Non-significance for the Taylor Downhill Sorts sales.
26

27 **Mara Barenbaum** voiced opposition to clearcutting of mature, old growth forests located on
28 state land. For many living adjacent to Rutsatz Road, access is available to recreation promoting
29 a sense of well-being and a connection to the landscape. She and her partner regularly hike
30 along the roads where a potential sale might occur. At some point on their journey they often
31 pass others and believe the road is part of an easily accessible recreational activity for many of
32 the residents along Rutsatz Road and beyond. By preserving the integrity of the remaining
33 legacy forests, the Board is effectively preserving the physical and emotional well-being of
34 residents across the state who benefit from the forests. As repeated by others, it is well known
35 that protecting the few older legacy forests is critical to preserving the natural genetic and
36 biological diversity of the forest. Protecting the few older legacy forests promotes resiliency of
37 the forest to resist climate change and reduces the risk of devastating wildfires. Several of her
38 friends have lost their homes to wildfires in California while others can no longer visit places
39 that have been logged, burned, or consumed by disease. It is no longer possible to deny the
40 direct impacts of climate change are increasing without regard to state borders. The Board
41 should consider other ethical choices to pursue and employ unbiased decisions by taking a stand
42 to protect the few older areas of legacy forests by adopting a moratorium on all timber sales.
43

44 **Mary Jean Ryan, resident of Jefferson County**, commented on the Older Forests Policy,
45 especially the prior dialogue between Dr. Brown and Mr. Brodie. The conversation helped her
46 understand the Board's current policy on remaining mature structurally complex forests. She
47 reviewed various documents Mr. Brodie cited in his presentation, which speaks to understanding

1 the current Board Policy on legacy forests. She believes the policy is in serious need of updating
2 and strengthening. Last March, as published in the Seattle Times, a review of the Older Forest
3 Policy was scheduled presumably with the intent of improving it. A public policy is intended to
4 serve a public purpose. The Board should step back, consider the bigger picture, and ask about
5 the purpose of the Older Forests Policy especially as it is operationalized by DNR. The older
6 policy appears to support the elimination of remaining older forests. The 10% to 15% targets do
7 not appear to be viewed by DNR as legally mandated. Additionally, the targets are too low. The
8 timeframe to achieve the low targets is 72 to 100 years. That timeframe appears to be wildly out
9 of step requiring urgent action given the climate crisis. What counts toward meeting the target
10 seems to be a moving target. She questioned the Board's belief of meeting those targets in 100
11 years primarily through riparian corridors and not mature forests. Overall, the policy seems too
12 little, too late, and too lax. The Board should exercise leadership and evaluate the policy with
13 fresh eyes to develop a policy the Board supports and believes would be right for this moment in
14 state history that involves the public and relies on well-established forest structure science. As
15 the Board works on the policy, members must use their authority to place a moratorium on any
16 future approvals of timber sales of older forests.

17 **Matt Comisky, American Forest Resource Council, thanked and acknowledged DNR staff**
18 **for their tireless work in 2021 to bring timber sales to market. The December market reflects a**
19 **continued strong demand for logs and lumber with homebuilders seeking carbon-friendly wood**
20 **products to replace high intensity high carbon concrete and steel products. Most of the public**
21 **comments have pertained to forests in Western Washington. He noted the importance of**
22 **ascertaining east and west forests as Eastern Washington forests are subject to different types of**
23 **policies. The Board is positioned to help meet the strong demand for wood products that**
24 **sequester carbon in not only young growing trees but also storage of carbon in wood products**
25 **produced from timber. It is also important to consider the difference between preservation and**
26 **the concept of “additionality” when considering the monetization of carbon. It is important to**
27 **understand the entire carbon market and additionality aspects to accomplish success. He**
28 **questioned the term “legacy forests” as he was unable to locate the term anywhere in the HCP,**
29 **which is the roadmap for 70 years of managing state trust lands held in trust for defined**
30 **beneficiaries. He encouraged DNR to keep up the good work in guiding the Department forward**
31 **in a positive way for the environment, beneficiaries, and customers.**

32 **Jane Brahm, Co-President, Mercer Island Historical Society and resident of Riley Cove,**
33 **supported naming the Cove after Houston Riley. The Riley family lived on of the property for**
34 **nearly a century. The house the Riley’s parents built is still standing on the property. The house**
35 **was built in 1920 and was one of the few permanent year-round homes on the Cove for many**
36 **years. Hugh Riley lived his entire life on the Cove except for the years during his World War II**
37 **service. He served in Africa and participated in the Normandy landing on Omaha Beach on D-**
38 **Day and in the Battle of the Bulge. He received three purple hearts. He is described as the**
39 **soldier in the surf in a famous photograph, one of the most iconic photos of World War II**
40 **featured on the cover of Life Magazine. As a modest man, Mr. Riley, like so many soldiers of**
41 **his generation, believed he did nothing heroic or out of the ordinary and was only doing what he**
42 **was asked to do for his country. Back home, he was a longtime member and board member of**
43 **VFW Post 5760 located in an historic building on the Cove. Hugh Riley was also an active**
44 **board member of the Mercer Island Historical Society.**

1 **Mary Rollin, resident of Everett, Washington**, reported she serves on the Snohomish County
2 Parks Board. She cited a short excerpt from a book authored by Joanna Macy, *Coming Back to*
3 *Life* about the anguish experienced by those who would confront the harsh realities of our time.
4 She urged the Board to consider public comments and save older trees and the forest that sustains
5 them.

6 **Miguel Perez-Gipson, Washington Environmental Council**, reported DNR carries out the
7 Board's policies in part through the Sustainable Harvest Calculation. Today, the Board has an
8 opportunity to determine if the policies developed 20 years ago are appropriate in today's world
9 and applicable until the new calculation in 2035. Currently, the Board groups policies as
10 economic performance, forest ecosystem health, productivity, and social and cultural benefits.
11 Collectively, they create DNR's overarching policy to support healthy forest ecosystems to
12 provide perpetual flow of economic, ecological, and social benefits from forests and state trust
13 lands. The common-law duty as a Trustee is not to favor either present or future trust
14 beneficiaries. Sustained yield management helps accomplish that duty. Within the broad
15 statutory direction, various interpretations of sustained yield management are possible. The
16 sustained yield calculation analyzes the capacity of forestlands and assigns silvicultural regimes
17 across broad landscapes to meet Board policies over space and time. Many lands play an
18 important and short-term role in meeting ecological objectives and have limited harvest during
19 the current decade. Those lands are managed as short-term or long-term deferrals within the
20 current calculation. The Board is scheduled to consider a policy on older forests during an
21 existential climate crisis as an emerging approach to forest management climate smart forestry
22 that to help forests adapt to changing climate conditions and increase carbon storage to mitigate
23 climate change. State forests need to be part of the climate change solution. DNR has identified
24 seven sales designed to harvest 49 mmbf of timber. The Board should consider limiting
25 intensive harvest utilizing the Board's current direction to employ climate smart solutions.

26 **Peter Goldman, Director, Washington Forests Law Center**, thanked Mary Rollins for her
27 passionate and poetic reminder of the joint role to repair the ailing earth. He asked the Board to
28 listen to citizens. DNR has only identified and protected a meager 2.6% of the remaining state
29 forests older than 150 years old. Dr. Brown's conversation with Mr. Brodie during the
30 December 2021 meeting offers a segue to his concerns. Dr. Brown essentially asked about
31 DNR's HCP and other planning document's commitments to growing and maintaining old
32 structural forests and whether they are mandatory or merely aspirational. He questioned
33 assurances by DNR that it can attain 10% to 15% structural forest mandated targets when DNR
34 has only attained less than .2% in older forests today. In some planning areas, DNR lacks any
35 land management plans to attain goals. The old structural forest issue is a legal issue before the
36 Grays Harbor County Superior Court in a timber sale case, as well as an important policy issue
37 for the Board to consider. The organization strongly disagrees with DNR's characterization of
38 its obligations for achieving the 10 to 15% goals. In both letter and spirit, the 1997 HCP is
39 supporting biological opinions and the Board's 2006 policy for Sustainable Forests collectively
40 require DNR to achieve targets before releasing them as surplus. DNR is playing shell games by
41 assuming it can cut older forests of 150 years old and grow them back by 2070 in riparian
42 buffers. It is time to think differently about forests, move on, and implement the HCP.

43 **Paul Butler, owner of Butler Family Forest**, said his forest is 80 acres of designated
44 timberland located in western Thurston County. He follows the principles of ecological forestry

1 as advocated by Jerry Franklin, Norm Johnson, and others. At the last meeting, many speakers
2 advocated for permanent protection of 10,000 acres of legacy forest managed by DNR, which is
3 less than 1% of the Department's holdings. Several other speakers appeared to misconstrue the
4 appeal of urging the Board to set-aside legacy forests for permanent protection, which does not
5 mean advocating for the stealing of lunch money from children or bankrupting rural counties.
6 Although not opposed to logging DNR's existing plantations to meet trust obligations, his forest
7 supports the local economy as well, but at a smaller scale. Since 2010 he has completed several
8 commercial thins to improve forest health by removing weak and overstocked trees. Over
9 100,000 mmbf of timber has been sent to local mills. Legacy forests are an insurance policy for
10 endangered species. DNR has over 150,000 acres in the zero to ten-year age category. The
11 summer of 2021 was difficult for seedlings because of record-setting temperatures at the end of
12 June and less rain. In the face of global climate change, he questioned the need to harvest older
13 forests that provide carbon sequestration. Since last year, 40% of all timber sales have been for
14 stands with an average age of over 80 years equating to over 3,300 acres. Legacy forests are a
15 potential return on investment providing ecosystem functions not possible from plantations. The
16 Board should permanently protect legacy forests.

17 **Bob Metzger** said he is a biologist with over 35 years experience working in fisheries,
18 watershed, and forestry for the U.S. Forest Service. For the last 20 years of his career he was the
19 fish and watershed program manager for Olympic National Forest. He has followed the Board's
20 meetings and presentations regarding the 10% to 15% older forests harvest target and how DNR
21 intends to meet them within each HCP planning unit. In a letter to the Board, he highlighted his
22 belief the target is an over optimistic conclusion for older forest development. During a DNR
23 presentation, staff stated several times that the projected percentage within older forest
24 conditions would be greater than 10% for all HCP planning areas. Unfortunately, it appears the
25 forecast only considered designated conservation areas rather than large areas as required. The
26 analysis and the conclusions are misleading and substantially over optimistic. His concerns
27 surround the incorporation of the riparian management zones and assumption most would be
28 become older forests as many are comprised of salmon berry and alder that would never grow as
29 older forests as substantiated by research by Oregon State and the Pacific Northwest Research
30 Station. There are legitimate questions as to how or if DNR would meet older forests
31 obligations. He asked the Board to clarify DNR data on the anticipated development of older
32 forests to ensure clear expectations of the percentage of DNR land developed as older forests,
33 develop a new older forests policy deemphasizing the age-only criteria, establish criteria for
34 structural complexity, and consider a moratorium on harvesting the naturally regenerated older
35 forests that are developing the structural complexity similar to older forests.

36 **Ron Moe-Lobeda**, owner of a small parcel of undeveloped land along Brown Road adjacent to
37 Capitol Forest participated in the gathering of neighbors and friends who organized the Legacy
38 Forest Project. While his foremost concerns are rumors of the Oracle sale, his broader concerns
39 are the harvesting of legacy forests throughout Western Washington for a multitude of reasons.
40 Given the recent exploration of several sites, many fellow participants discovered large stands of
41 trees that could qualify as legacy trees. Many of the sites offer great potential for recreational
42 uses far outweighing the small amount of revenue generated for educational facilities in the state.
43 The disruptions to wildlife and watershed benefits from forests are unnecessary. With the rise of
44 global warming, harvesting of any forest without strong, justifiable cause is called into question.
45 Other than for fulfilling the mandate to generate revenue according to the state constitution, the

1 Board is responsible for meeting the needs of all citizens. The Board should postpone any future
2 timber sales and step forward rather than backwards by evaluating current practices to develop a
3 comprehensive and responsible plan to help mitigate the negative effects of global warming
4 while respecting the benefits legacy forests provide to all who inhabit and enjoy them.

5 **Rob MacAulay** spoke in support of the Riley Cove naming proposal. As a resident of the cove
6 for 17 years, he supports the comments of Jane Brahm. The community supports the naming
7 proposal. All residents on the cove were polled with 44 responses with 43 positive responses for
8 the naming of Riley Cove. An additional 150 other Mercer Island residents and leaders signed a
9 petition supporting the naming, as well as 125 Mercer Island VFW members. Other than the one
10 opponent of the naming proposal, he is not aware of any other individuals who reside on Mercer
11 Island who do not support the naming proposal.

12 **Robert Mitchell** commented on individuals who take the opportunity to lash out when
13 experiencing frustrating interactions with DNR policies. Public officials should not take the
14 comments personally other than he is personally affronted when public land is locked from
15 access when his only intent is to remove trash and litter. The Board should understand the
16 criticisms are directed against the office and not temporary office holders. He questioned
17 whether the Serenity Now timber sale, approved in August, meets Mr. Brodie's definition of old
18 growth since it has never been harvested by Europeans. In terms of fluctuating timber revenue,
19 the Board should be hedging timber prices with futures. The sustainable harvest calculation
20 should acknowledge the margin of error on the discount rate. Each tree approved for removal
21 has a story in its rings, branching patterns, and roots. The Board should listen to those stories
22 when participating in timber auction tours. DNR should consider selling its green ecosystem
23 services assets to climate funds and finance companies.
24

25 **Rod Fleck** directed his comments to the Chair Report on Older Forests. The issues have been
26 discussed, determined, and policies have been established. However, after promises, assurances,
27 and lectures that the approach would provide certainty and clear guidance, the Board is now
28 considering issues surrounding older trees that lack clear guidance. Specifically, seven sales
29 have been continued with another two sales deferred to another fiscal year while complying with
30 rules, regulations, policies, and laws for the State of Washington and the agreement with the
31 federal government. Yet again, the sales are moved aside creating significant consequences to
32 those taxing districts expecting funds from the sales. Some of the stands include some older
33 trees that fall within the older tree definition, which could be deemed as legacy trees or legacy
34 forests that would remain as leave trees and not harvested. The presentations do not reflect those
35 facts or include that information. The sales directly affect the beneficiaries because the sales are
36 delayed. The Board should account for those impacts rather than appearing to appease and
37 accommodate those who want the Board to do more to conserve the forest at the expense of the
38 rural communities raising questions about the issue of economic justice.
39

1 **Ronald Richards** spoke to his shock after reading the Final Determination of Non-Significance
2 issued for the Taylor Downhill harvest indicating DNR did not need to consider climate change
3 impacts for forest project practices at the Environmental Checklist level. He cannot over-
4 emphasize how wrong that approach is and urged the Board to reconsider that position.
5 RCW 43.21C.030 (f) states in part, “Recognize the worldwide and long-range character of
6 environmental problems...” and, (h) Initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning
7 and development of natural resource-oriented projects.” The SEPA provisions addressing the
8 Environmental Checklist speak to considering within an environmental checklist the types of
9 emissions to the air that would result in the proposal and propose measures to reduce or control
10 emissions or other impacts to air. The issue is imperative especially when logging practices
11 affect climate change and are affected by climate change. Previously, he urged the Board to
12 consider a moratorium on clearcutting until DNR is certain clearcuts could continue to be
13 successfully replanted. His concern was increased by an article in the U.S. edition of *The*
14 *Guardian* on December 22, 2021 titled, *The Crisis Unfolding in Americas Christmas Tree*
15 *Capital* chronicling thousands of young trees dying on Christmas tree farms in southern Oregon
16 because of the 2021 heat wave that also affected his small tree farm in Clallam County. He
17 asked the Board to consider the impacts of climate change on forests and ways to reduce them
18 rather increasing impacts.

19
20 **Russ Pfeiffer-Hoyt, Chair, Washington State School Directors Trust Land Advisory**
21 **Committee**, said he comments pertain to the timber sales and the Chair Report. He enjoys the
22 monthly Lighting Talk because the information provides a greater appreciation of the complexity
23 of the work completed by DNR. He thanked Lisa Anderson for her good work with trust
24 beneficiaries. It is important for the Board to consider timber harvest and older forests in the
25 context of the legal obligations of DNR. DNR must meet trust management obligations while
26 complying with state and federal laws and Board policies. A large percentage of DNR’s
27 managed timberland is currently deferred from harvest to meet state and federal obligations with
28 the remaining timberland not subject to harvest deferrals that should be managed to produce
29 revenue under the sustainable harvest calculation. He supports approval of the proposed timber
30 sales.

31
32 **Sarah Gardam, resident of Whatcom County**, said her comments would be brief not because
33 she lacks reasons that speak to the importance of protecting old growth forests, but because of
34 DNR’s continued logging of mature native forests despite plenty of public objections, as it is
35 clear the meetings appear to be a bit of a charade. Over the last several months, caring civilians
36 have testified to the Board with intelligence, passion, and evidence-based arguments as to how
37 state lands should be managed for biodiversity, habitat, recreation, carbon storage, and many
38 other benefits in addition to timber revenue. Yet, DNR continues with business as usual. She
39 emailed letters objecting to the reasoning and underlying values informing DNR’s particular
40 timber sales and of older forests in general. DNR’s responses did not attempt to address any real
41 objections or offer any accounting for logging of older forests. The responses indicated existing
42 laws enable harvests. That argument is debatable as evidenced by trees marked for cutting or for
43 saving. As testified by many, the request is to stop destroying forests. She would like a values-
44 based answer to values-based objections. There is time for DNR to change course and save
45 some face with the public. DNR should reconsider the operating assumptions and fulfill its
46 calling to be real stewards of protectors of the natural world. The Board should adopt a
47 moratorium on all timber sales on state forestlands naturally regenerated prior to 1950.

1
2 **Sherri Dysart, resident of Mason County**, spoke as a concerned citizen of the planet and cited
3 top scientists around the world who are sounding the alarm with warnings of the planet facing a
4 tipping point of irreversible system changes. Humans must engage in transformational change
5 immediately. Scientists are also weighing frameworks for transformational change and one of
6 the prime directives is to protect and restore earth ecosystems to help reduce dangerous levels of
7 CO2 in the atmosphere. Pro-forestation is the practice of purposely-growing existing forests to
8 their full ecological potential to maximize carbon storage, biodiversity, and structural complexity
9 while avoiding emissions from harvesting forest products. It is important to rethink the
10 economic paradigm in which rural communities are trapped. A healthy economy is dependent
11 upon a healthy environment and there is a perverse incentive to log forests for short-term profit
12 when the long-term viability of life is uncertain. The Board has profoundly critical choices to
13 make at this point, such as approving the packet of timber sales to include the Taylor Downhill
14 Sorts naturally regenerated forest. The Board has the power and could steer in another direction
15 for the greater good and for being part of the transformational change to restore safety and
16 stability of climate and ecosystems. She implored the Board to choose wisely.
17

18 **Erik Steinhoff, resident of Thurston County**, said he is a founding member of the Legacy
19 Forests Project and volunteers for the Center for Responsible Forestry. He thanked the
20 Board for its service and conveyed a special thanks to DNR staff working to support the
21 meetings with particular appreciation for those who are responsible for recording the minutes.
22 He emphasized his opposition to the change in the public comment format as it is out of keeping
23 with the Board's standard practice and curtails the public's capacity to comment on DNR policy
24 and on specific timber sales. It diminishes public trust of the agency. It would be a different
25 story if the Board had imposed a moratorium on the harvesting of older forest while conducting a
26 review of Older Forests Policy as announced by Commissioner Franz in a March 2021 Seattle
27 Times article. He reiterated his request to place a moratorium on the cutting of naturally
28 regenerated older forests. The Board should unanimously disapprove of the Taylor Downhill
29 Sorts sale. He complimented Commissioner Franz, as there are many things to admire in the
30 Keep Washington Evergreen proposal announced at the end of last year; however, it would be
31 much stronger if it included a strong commitment to conserving older structurally complex
32 forests on a healthy projectory rate towards old growth. He offered a friendly amendment of
33 keeping legacy forests and called on the Board to make the necessary policy changes.
34

35 **Teri Wright, resident of Paradise Bay**, said she recently discovered a dead baby bear club on
36 the road because her habitat had been destroyed. It speaks to the inadequacy of leaving eight
37 trees per acre to provide habitat for wildlife as the reality is leaving a clearcut. According to the
38 Office of Financial Management (OFM) a net state budget surplus of nearly \$3 billion is
39 projected and another \$1.8 billion from the federal government is anticipated from the federal
40 infrastructure bill. She questioned how much profit rather than revenue is generated from timber
41 sales. A concrete figure is difficult to locate as she has checked numerous documents on DNR's
42 website with no success. The state is facing a critical time of whether to continue down the same
43 path since 1889, a path that was started before scientific evidence on climate change and
44 evidence demonstrating how activities created the climate crisis and validated the widely held
45 belief how forests serve as the lungs of the planets storing CO2 and effectively cleanse the air,
46 cool waters, provide slope stability, provide habitat for wildlife, and provide joy and beauty for
47 the population. The Board should pause, take advantage of the monetary surplus, and afford

1 some time to critically think and create a new path forward, a path that safeguards a future for
2 everyone. The American Psychiatric Association reported in February 2021 that 67% of
3 Americans suffer from diagnosable mental illnesses related to climate change. It is time to take
4 positive action to ensure a future. She implored the Board not to approve the timber sales and
5 vote to create a new path forward.
6

7 **Ed Bowen, citizen of Clallam County**, conveyed concerns surrounding the planned
8 presentation on the Old Forest Policy and cited several of the presentation graphics depicting the
9 representation of particular information and the concerns surrounding the percentages of low
10 quality habitat versus high quality habitat. The information on next steps speaks to seven sales
11 for FY 2022. He questioned the timing of the seven sales because he believes the sales are from
12 2021. He asked about the next steps missing from the presentation information and questioned
13 the decision-making process involving the beneficiaries who would benefit from the proposed
14 donation of land included on the agenda. He commented on the November 2021 storm creating
15 an emergency in the county. DNR suffered only one road loss on state lands consisting of a
16 bridge abutment, which speaks to the importance of accurate mapping. However, the Olympic
17 National Forest lost two major road systems serving as emergency evacuation routes.
18

19 **TIMBER SALES (Action Item)**

20 **Auction Results for December 2021 & Proposed Timber Sales for February 2022**

21 Duane Emmons, Division Manager, Product Sales & Leasing Division
22

23 Mr. Emmons provided several explanations in response to public comments. One main issue
24 was on the analysis of carbon and climate as part of the SEPA Checklist for timber sales. The
25 response provided to the public is more nuanced than the references purporting the SEPA
26 Checklist does not include carbon and climate change as a requirement for analysis. SEPA
27 analysis is completed through two processes with the first a formal Environmental Impact
28 Statement (EIS) at a larger programmatic/policy level. For the Sustainable Harvest Calculations,
29 staff completed an extensive analysis of carbon sequestration and climate change as part of the
30 2019 EIS. For individual timber projects, DNR does not complete another analysis as the initial
31 analysis was completed during the larger EIS process. Additionally, the Department of Ecology
32 is the lead agency for SEPA and is currently in a rulemaking process for climate and greenhouse
33 gas for project level analysis. New guidance is anticipated to be released in 2022. Should
34 rulemaking determine project level analysis is required; the Department will incorporate those
35 requirements within the review process.
36

37 Public comments pertaining to the timber sale in the Loomis State Forest questioned the age of
38 the forest. As noted by one speaker, the sale is located on the eastside of the state and falls under
39 a different set of criteria in terms of the definition for old growth. Because the sale is located
40 within the Loomis State Forest, the forest operates under a plan developed in conjunction with
41 the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department (WDFW) approved in 1996. The
42 Loomis plan supersedes other planning documents and procedures. The major component of the
43 Loomis plan focuses on development of habitat. The timber sale would provide habitat and
44 restoration to improve the health of the forest.
45

46 Mr. Emmons invited questions from the Board.
47

1 Mr. Cahill requested additional background as the sale documents reflect shelter wood removal
2 as the largest component of the sale and identified trees at an average age of 156 years. He
3 questioned how that information affects the sale. Mr. Emmons replied that the overall objectives
4 for the sale are to reduce stocking levels and remove infection vectors for current and potential
5 applicants. Part of the sale is a variable retention harvest on Units 1, 2, 3 and 5 and removal in
6 units 4, 6, 7 and 8. Each unit leaves a minimum of 13 trees per acre of the larger trees, as well as
7 any sub-mature trees on the landscape to provide a mix of cover type within the units. The sales
8 follow the guidance outlined in the Loomis Plan with staff working closely with WDFW as part
9 of a monitoring project on wildlife and snowshoe hare populations.

10
11 Dr. Brown referred to comments on the Taylor Downhill Sorts sale and asked staff to respond to
12 concerns about the contribution of the forest within the region and attainment of targets for older
13 forests. It appears the region would meet the 12% target of older forest conditions by 2090. Mr.
14 Emmons noted that many of the comments surround policies for older forest targets rather than
15 the specifics of the timber sale. The average age of the timber is 85 years. The units were likely
16 last harvested in the mid 1930s to the late 1930s. Because of the forest's age, a deep level
17 screening was not completed. Many of the comments pertained to carbon sequestration and
18 older forest policies.

19
20 Angus Brodie, Deputy Supervisor for State Uplands, noted that the concerns about the stands
21 contributing to the 10% to 15% target speak to the landscape assessments completed over time
22 with the most recent assessment completed in May 2021. That assessment identified meeting the
23 older forest targets by 2090 within the sale area with other areas dedicated for conservation.
24 Those targets are specific only to conservation areas. In those circumstances where there might
25 be doubt conservation areas could achieve goals, the Department identifies upland areas to for
26 stands meeting the goal of structurally complex that could contribute to the target. For all HCP
27 planning units, that necessity has not been identified at this time.

28
29 Dean Koenig requested additional information to references of sales certified by the Sustainable
30 Forestry Initiatives and the requirements of that certification. Mr. Emmons explained all DNR
31 public lands are certified under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative. Additionally, public lands in
32 the South Puget Planning Area are certified under the Forest Stewardship certification. Each
33 certification is by an independent third-party certification organization. Each is governed by
34 vendor-owned certification standards ranging from public process, research, recreation, and
35 sustainable management of forests based on different ecosystems and zones. Each certification
36 requires continual surveillance audits. DNR is audited each year through a subset of the
37 standards based on specific criteria with periodical recertification under all criteria. DNR has
38 been certified for approximately 14 years.

39
40 Dean Koenig asked whether a carbon or climate element is included in the evaluation. Andy
41 Hayes, Division Manager, Forest Resources Division, affirmed considerations are included for
42 climate. He offered to follow up with additional information as well as schedule a presentation
43 on the certification systems.

44
45 Dr. Brown conveyed appreciation for the explanation of a project-level carbon assessment in the
46 environmental assessment and the lack of a framework for that specific assessment at this time;
47 however, DNR has a framework established for assessing climate impacts at the policy level. He

1 requested addition information for carbon implications that were evaluated in the approval of the
2 HCP and in the Sustainable Harvest Calculations that serve as the policy frameworks guiding
3 project level implementations. Mr. Brodie said the 2019 EIS considered both climate change and
4 carbon in each EIS. In terms of sequestration, all scenarios evaluated as part of the EIS for the
5 Sustainable Harvest demonstrated a net sequestration of the forest during harvesting activities.
6 That ratio was identified at 5:1 equating to each ton of carbon emitted by timber harvest
7 activities resulting in five tons of carbon sequestered over time. The evaluation was based over a
8 50-year period. DNR also conducted several recent assessments that were presented to the
9 Board last year documenting a short period based on U.S. Forest Service Inventory Analysis
10 reflecting no net increase in sequestration of carbon. The assessment reflected some changes in
11 forest practices as well. The assessments demonstrate some range of error ranging from zero
12 sequestration to having a positive ratio of sequestration moving forward. Dr. Brown noted the
13 importance of the different timeframes as it speaks to the urgency of addressing emissions and
14 sequestration early in the century to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change. He asked
15 whether the next ten years reflect a lower rate of sequestration. Mr. Brodie said he believes the
16 alternatives reflected a lower rate while maintaining a positive ratio. Part of the reason is
17 explained by the amount of land within a conservation status, which is described as long-term
18 forest cover. When 40% to 49% of the land base is in conservation status, the rate of
19 sequestration is much higher while DNR harvests only 1% to 1.5% of the land base on an annual
20 basis.

21
22 Dr. Brown commented that one of the comments spoke to the projection of old forests targets in
23 the planning units. It is unclear whether the percentage of older forests is a percentage of the
24 entire planning area or just the conservation area. Mr. Brodie affirmed the percentage applies to
25 the entire planning area and not just conservation areas. The confusion may have inadvertently
26 occurred through the landscape assessment, as the first review to determine whether the targets
27 could be achieved were conservation areas as those areas are typically not subject to
28 management activities.

29
30 Tom Heller, Acting Assistant Division Manager, Product Sales, referred to the departure of
31 Koshare Eagle, who now resides in Colorado. .

32
33 Mr. Heller presented the results of the December auctions. The Department offered nine sales
34 with eight sales sold totaling 37.9 mmbf. All sales sold totaled \$13.4 million for an average of
35 \$352 per mbf with 2.3 bidders per sale on average. The one sale not receiving bids was located
36 in the Pacific Cascade Region. The sale was reappraised and is scheduled for auction on January
37 27, 2022.

38
39 Mr. Heller invited questions from the Board.

40
41 *Commissioner Franz joined the meeting at approximately 11:44 a.m.*

42
43 Superintendent Reykdal commented on the low volume of sales.

44
45 Mr. Heller displayed a graphic depicting originally planned FY 2022 timber sales volume of 564
46 mmbf revised to reflect 514 mmbf in the fourth quarter directly related to the Older Forests
47 Policy discussions and expounded further during the Chair Report. During the second quarter

1 DNR offered 128 mmbf and sold 120 mmbf reflecting a large difference in the original forecast
2 of 175 mmbf for the quarter. A majority of the volume moved to the third and fourth quarters
3 with some volume postponed to the future. Within the third quarter for the current plan, 12
4 million mmbf represents two sales receiving no bids earlier last year. DNR is on track to offer
5 514 mmbf for fiscal year 2022.

6
7 Dr. Brown requested confirmation as to whether the original plan volume was based on the
8 Sustainable Harvest Calculation. Mr. Heller affirmed it was based on the calculation to meet the
9 target at the end of the planning period.

10
11 Mr. Heller displayed a graphic of the dollar amount of the volume sold. He invited questions
12 from the Board.

13
14 Commissioner Peach asked about impacts of sales not offered because of litigation and whether
15 that amount is included in the Sustainable Harvest Calculation. Mr. Hayes responded that the
16 Department is holding approximately 50 mmbf in timber sales that have not been brought
17 forward because of the Older Forest Policy discussions.

18
19 Mr. Heller advised that the Department has ramped up the ability to offer timber sales in several
20 regions to attain the full volume during the Sustainable Harvest Calculation period.

21
22 Mr. Heller presented six proposed timber sales for February totaling 25.1 mmbf with minimum
23 bids of \$8.6 million for an average minimum bid of \$340 mbf.

24
25 Mr. Heller invited questions. No questions were offered by the Board.

26
27 Commissioner Franz requested approval of the proposed sales.

28
29 MOTION: Commissioner Peach moved to approve the proposed sales.

30
31 SECOND: Dean Koenig seconded the motion.

32
33 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.

34
35 *Commissioner Franz recessed the meeting at 11:57 a.m. for a break.*

36
37 *Commissioner Franz reconvened the meeting at 12:11 p.m.*

38
39 **LAND TRANSACTIONS (Action)**

40 **Nisqually 18, #808-102967, Resolution 1586**

41 Bob Winslow, Transaction Project Manager, Conservation, Recreation and Transactions

42
43 Mr. Winslow presented the Nisqually 18 project for donation to Common School Trust. The
44 parcel is 29.47 acres in size located along the Nisqually River south of the Town of Ashford in
45 Lewis County. South of the property is Common School Trust property and to the west is State
46 Forest Land Trust property. The property adds to existing trust properties. The proposal to
47 donate the property to Common School Trust is based on provisions contained in RCW

1 79.22.020. Timber on the property is not economically harvestable and would be encumbered
2 under riparian constraints preventing the Department from fulfilling the provision in the RCW
3 requiring the property to generate revenue.
4

5 Mr. Winslow described land characteristics of the property and how it supports the HCP for
6 dozen of riparian species, as well as elks and other wildlife. DNR and the Attorney General's
7 Office reviewed and approved the property title. The donation meets the provisions included in
8 RCW 79.10.020 and would be deeded to Common School Trust. DNR covers closing costs.
9

10 Mr. Winslow invited questions about the proposal.
11

12 Dr. Brown cited a public comment as to how the property was deeded to the Common School
13 Trust and whether it involved the property owner or another method. Mr. Winslow said deeding
14 of the property to the Common School Trust was determined by RCW's authorities governing
15 DNR based on the property satisfying specific criteria. It is unlikely the land has any revenue
16 potential and would likely not incur any costs to the trust. The primary benefit of the property is
17 to support DNR's HCP and public recreation.
18

19 Commissioner Peach asked about the valuation of the property. Mr. Winslow said the donation
20 is at no cost and the overall transaction cost is estimated to be \$650 for the title, insurance policy,
21 and escrow closing costs.
22

23 Commissioner Franz requested approval of the proposed resolution.
24

25 MOTION: Commissioner Peach moved to approve Resolution 1586; Nisqually 18, #08-
26 102967.
27

28 SECOND: Dr. Brown seconded the motion.
29

30 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.
31

32 **BOARD OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES (Action)**

33 **Riley Cove – Name Proposal**

34 **Rabbit Chase Creek – Name Proposal**

35 **Barney Kolker Canyon – Spelling Correction**

36 Sara Palmer, Senior State Lands Archeologist & Chair, Committee on Geographic Names
37

38 Ms. Palmer reported the committee recently reconvened from an extended hiatus because of the
39 pandemic. The committee reviews proposals submitted by the public and forwards
40 recommendations to the Board of Geographic Names (Board of Natural Resources). The process
41 involves a submittal by the public of a name with the committee conducting an initial review and
42 receiving public comments during committee meetings. Following a second review, the
43 committee approves the proposals and forwards a recommendation to the Board for approval and
44 transmittal to the federal government. Tribal consultation occurs between the two public
45 meetings. The committee discussed changing the timeline to enable consultation with the tribes
46 earlier in the process. Tribal consultation and community input is an important component of the

1 committee meetings with meetings held virtually during the pandemic affording more
2 participation by the community.

3
4 Commissioner Peach inquired about any tribal feedback. Ms. Palmer said comments from tribal
5 members were neutral in terms of the proposals.

6
7 Ms. Palmer reviewed the proposals:

- 8 • Riley Cove located at the north end of Mercer Island in King County. The cove covers
9 50 acres of Mercer Island in Lake Washington. The proposed name commemorates
10 Huston (“HU”) Riley, a US soldier who served during World War II.
- 11 • Rabbit Chase Creek is located on San Juan County at the southwest corner of the island.
12 According to the proponent, many stories have been told of landowners chasing and
13 capturing rabbits in the area. The proposal would commemorate those actions.
- 14 • Barney Kolker Canyon is located in Spokane and Stevens Counties. The name was
15 misspelled as Barney Coker Canyon. The proponent completed the research and
16 identified the person for whom the canyon was named. The intent of the proposal is to
17 correct the spelling

18
19 Mr. Cahill cited the proposed name of Rabbit Chase Creek and asked whether the proposal was
20 considered under the criteria for adding a name as opposed to another name or naming the area
21 for a Native American. Ms. Palmer explained that the committee’s purview is limited to
22 considering proposals rather than initiating proposals. One criterion the committee considers
23 when evaluating a proposal is whether the name is related to the history of the area, whether it
24 commemorates an event, or it is representative of a pattern of events that speak to the history of
25 the area. The name is related to specific historical actions that occurred in that area.

26
27 Commissioner Franz requested approval of the three proposals as presented.

28
29 MOTION: Dr. Brown moved to approve the Board of Geographic Names for Riley Cove,
30 Rabbit Chase Creek, and name correction of Barney Kolker Canyon.

31
32 SECOND: Superintendent Reykdal seconded the motion.

33
34 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.

35
36 **CHAIR REPORT**

37 **Dredged Material Management Program Rulemaking Briefing**

38 Tom Gorman, Interim Aquatic Resources Division Manager, Aquatic Resources Division

39
40 Mr. Gorman presented proposed updates to Washington Administrative Code 332-30-166,
41 modifying fees charged for dredge material management.

42
43 When navigational dredging is proposed for disposal in Washington State, dredge materials can
44 be disposed in one of the designated Dredge Material Disposal Sites (DMPS), beneficially
45 reused, or for materials contaminated or unsuitable for water disposal transported to an upland
46 disposal facility.

1 To implement the Dredge Material Management Program (DMMP), DNR co-manages the
2 program with three other agencies (Department of Ecology and two federal agencies – U.S.
3 Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency). DMMP’s role is to
4 determine whether dredge materials are suitable for in-water disposal. The sites require regular
5 monitoring and monitoring occurs when disposed materials at certain sites meet certain
6 thresholds. To cover costs, DNR is directed by RCW to establish a rule for fees with
7 adjustments to the fees to cover costs of the program. Current disposal fees are 45¢ per cubic
8 yard for disposal in Puget Sound and 10¢ per cubic yard in Grays Harbor. The disposal fees for
9 Puget Sound were increased once in 1995 from 40¢ to 45¢ per cubic yard.

10
11 The DMMP covers three primary activities associated with managing the disposal sites to
12 include site monitoring costs, program compliance costs, and DNR management costs. Since
13 1995, DNR and the other agencies have worked to reduce costs and to be efficient with fund
14 resources to the extent possible. Despite recent efforts to reduce costs, the fund balance
15 continues to decline because current disposal fees do not cover the cost of the program. The
16 average total cost per cubic yard exceeds the current charge of 45¢. DNR projected future costs
17 based on data and the same activities with one addition of targeting a minimal fund balance to
18 cover unexpected costs and to serve as a buffer when revenue is lower than projected. The
19 recommendation is retains the current fee of 45¢ per cubic yard for Puget Sound disposal sites
20 for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022, as well as for Grays Harbor. However,
21 effective July 1, 2022, the proposal is to increase the fee to 75¢ per cubic yard for Puget Sound
22 and 15¢ per cubic yard for Grays Harbor effective until June 30, 2025 with rates increasing July
23 1, 2025 to 95¢ per cubic yard for Puget Sound and 20¢ per cubic yard for Grays Harbor.

24
25 Last spring, DNR initiated the pre-ruling making scoping process and filed the formal CR-101 to
26 initiate rulemaking on June 10, 2021. Following feedback from stakeholders over the summer
27 and reviewing projections on costs and revenues, DNR filed CR-102 on October 15, 2021 to
28 include the proposed rule changes. On December 1, 2021, DNR hosted an informal virtual
29 public meeting with information on the proposal followed by a formal public hearing. The
30 comment period closed on December 15, 2021. DNR received two comments. The final
31 recommendation will be presented to the Board at its February meeting.

32
33 Mr. Gorman invited questions.

34
35 Mr. Cahill thanked staff for efforts to adjust costs to ensure the shortfall is covered. Delaying an
36 increase from 1995 is much longer than preferred. He recommended initiating a review process
37 every five to 10 years rather than more than 10 years. He supports the two-tiered fee increase to
38 help reduce financial costs for users. Staff was asked to share the fund balance with the Board
39 and how the increases were identified prior to the February meeting. Mr. Gorman affirmed the
40 request.

41
42 Dean Koenig questioned the large cost difference between sites in Puget Sound and Grays
43 Harbor. Mr. Gorman explained that Puget Sound sites are more costly to monitor and access,
44 which speaks to the difference in cubic yard costs.

45
46 Commissioner Peach said he works frequently with the Quileute Indian Reservation. The tribe is
47 currently dredging its marina and disposing the material at a site owned by the county. He asked

1 about the cost of disposal for the tribe. Assistant Aquatic Resources Division Manager Kristin
2 Swenddal advised that if the tribe is disposing material on property not owned by the state, no
3 fee is associated with the disposal. Commissioner Peach inquired as to whether the tribe would
4 incur a charge if the property (old gravel pit) was conveyed to the tribe. Ms. Swenddal said if
5 the disposal is not on state-owned aquatic lands, the tribe would not be subject to the fees in the
6 rule; however, Uplands might have a fee, which can be provided.

8 **Older Forests Presentation**

9 Angus Brodie, Deputy Supervisor for State Uplands

10
11 Mr. Brodie's presentation covered an overview of the policy framework, DNR's policy on Older
12 Forests, responses to public comments, and next steps. Prior to the presentation, Mr. Brodie
13 recognized Lisa Anderson who has accepted a position with State Parks. He acknowledged her
14 work as the Trust Outreach Specialist over the last six years and her contributions to the agency
15 over the last 20 years.

16
17 Mr. Brodie explained how policies comply within the legal framework of the following:

- 18 • Enabling Act ¹⁸⁸⁹ & Constitution ¹⁸⁸⁹
- 19 • Federal laws, e.g. Endangered Species Act
- 20 • Tribal Treaties
- 21 • Powers of the Board (RCW 43.30.215)
- 22 • Multiple Use (RCW 79.10.100..120)
- 23 • Sustainable Harvest (RCW 79..10.300..340)
- 24 • Laws of General Applicability

25 DNR uses a structured approach to develop its policies based on a sustainability framework of
26 economics, environment, and social factors. Economics reflect DNR's trust mission generating
27 revenue over the long-term and supporting local economies with jobs. The environment reflects
28 commitment to protecting the corpus of the trust through healthy ecosystems, habitat
29 conservation, and watershed protection. Social reflects how revenue generated supports critical
30 local services in many rural areas, respects tribal treaties, protects cultural and historic resources,
31 and provides public access and use of state lands to the public. The framework of sustainability
32 enforces a multi-dimensional approach to issues, as they are all interrelated and require multiple
33 time horizons. While the sustainability framework provides a good basis for policy analysis and
34 discussion, it is also a strongly held value for many of the professional women and men of the
35 agency.

36
37 DNR's management of state forests is certified by the Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) and the
38 Forestry Stewardship Council, third-party independent certification organizations. Both provide
39 DNR a check on whether the agency is meeting national and international standards of
40 sustainability.

41
42 Earlier, there were a number of comments as well as during past meetings, SEPA comments, and
43 letters on timber sales seeking to halt deforestation and forest degradation. DNR does not
44 conduct those acts within forest lands managed by the agency, because in doing so, DNR would

1 not be certified as sustainably managing forests and would not harvest second and third growth
2 forests today.

3
4 In 2006, DNR considered how policies could be implemented together and developed a section
5 dedicated to the implementation of Forest Land Planning, General Silvicultural Strategy, Forest
6 Roads, Research, External Relationships, and Implementation, Reporting, and Modification of
7 the Policy for Sustainable Forests. Not every acre of the forest or every individual action is
8 designed to achieve a sustainable outcome in isolation but it is a cumulative effect of the actions
9 that results in sustainability. To achieve the vision, a series of planning processes were
10 employed to help integrate the implementation of policies. Planning processes are not static and
11 reflect changes in methods and techniques over time. The public has a role in informing the
12 decision-making process as evidenced over the last several months.

13
14 Mr. Brodie invited comments on the information presented.

15
16 Dean Koenig requested an example of how a social consideration would fall within or support
17 the sustainability framework and future decisions regarding a forest area. Mr. Brodie explained
18 that a policy exists for visual areas and scenic highways, which has been incorporated within
19 harvest patterns by retaining more trees on a particular site or designing a timber harvest that
20 cross a particular landscape in a specific way.

21
22 Commissioner Peach asked whether the current policies provide certainty to communities and
23 beneficiaries. Mr. Brodie affirmed it is important for policies to provide certainty. All decisions
24 generate a specific period of certainty for the agency to move forward and implement the
25 decision. Some comments from the public are criticisms about dated policies, which prompt
26 questions from community members who likely did not participate in the development of the
27 policy but prefer to refer to them as old policies and therefore invalid because society has
28 changed. Although certainty is important, things do change over time emphasizing the
29 importance of the agency having the ability to adapt to changes. As a public agency, establishing
30 and implementing policies in an open and transparent process are important, as there is never
31 100% certainty moving forward, which speaks to the level of public comments the Board has
32 been receiving.

33
34 Commissioner Peach agreed change is necessary but the responsibility to junior taxing districts
35 should not change.

36
37 Mr. Brodie reviewed older forest policies that include part of the policy on General Silviculture
38 Strategy. Silviculture is the art and science of cultivating forests to achieve objectives and
39 implies active management of the forested landscape. Policies within the strategy focus on the
40 following:

- 41
42
- 43 • Active management of the greatest portion of land as possible.
 - 44 • Balancing the economic, ecological, and social benefits through actions.
 - 45 • Using intensive and innovative silviculture to produce structural diversity and revenue.
 - 46 • Targeting 10% to 15% of structurally complex forests over time
 - Using assessments to identify forest stands that may help to meet the older forest targets.

1 Other efforts include using strategies from existing policies to reach the desired future condition
2 and balance the economic, environment, and social benefits. If it is not possible to meet the
3 desired future conditions with existing policies and strategies, the Department uses existing
4 suitable stands to help reach the targets. The policy is not prescriptive other than it provides a
5 desired outcome and ways to achieve it. The recent public interest has largely focused on the
6 targeting of 10% to 15% older forests and using assessments and if they are considered in
7 isolation.

8
9 During the April and May Board presentations, the structurally complex forest desired future
10 condition originated from the 1997 HCP; however, there are no provisions in the HCP that speak
11 to committing the Department to the desired outcome and no strategy in the HCP that states the
12 Department must meet, maintain, or target 10% to 15% of the landscape to be in a specific older
13 condition. That policy was developed by the Board during the 2004 Sustainable Harvest
14 Calculation. At that time, stakeholders were conveying similar statements, as they are today in
15 that the 10% to 15% target is a commitment within the HCP. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
16 agreed it is not a commitment within the HCP; rather, it is a projected likely outcome because of
17 implementing the four conservation strategies. In 2004, the Board described a desired future
18 condition of the forest because of its policy changes adopted as part of the 2004 Sustainable
19 Harvest Calculation. At that point, all targets were transferred and combined with all other
20 policies as part of the policies for Sustainable Forest in 2006.

21
22 In 2019, the Board adopted the Long-Term Marbled Murrelet Conservation Strategy and
23 considered the connection with the 10% to 15% target.

24
25 The strategy to reach the 10% to 15% target is based on implementing the four key strategies
26 from the HCP of the Multi-Species Conservation Strategy protecting unique features across the
27 landscape, the Riparian Conservation Strategy protecting streams, rivers, wetlands, and buffers,
28 the Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Strategy providing habitat within dedicated landscapes,
29 and the Marbled Murrelet Conservation Strategy protecting forested habitat around occupied
30 sites and in dedicated landscapes. In most planning units, the riparian area alone is comprised of
31 30% of the forestland area. Those strategies in conjunction with the strategies from the Board's
32 policy conserve forests on nearly 50% of the land base in Western Washington and nearly 80%
33 of forestland over 70 years of age. It was acknowledged then, as it was in 1997, that areas
34 outside of specific conservation areas providing conservation benefits to riparian species would
35 be subject to harvest. Some of those forests would be older. The choice of conserving older and
36 younger stands ensures a long-term benefit to marbled murrelet in selected landscapes with a
37 tradeoff of allowing other landscapes to be managed for timber harvest.

38
39 In 2019, a table depicting acres available for harvest and conserved under the HCP was included
40 in the final EIS of approximately 38,000 acres of mature forest identified as potential marbled
41 murrelet habitat that would be released for harvest. The forested area was over 70 years of age
42 and naturally regenerated. DNR considered that release in 2019 and calculated the sustainable
43 harvest to include all existing policies to include the targeted 10% to 15% of older forests in each
44 of the planning units.

45
46 Mr. Brodie referred to Superintendent Reykdal's prior request to look back and forward in terms
47 of what is being created across the forest to provide a bigger picture. In response, Mr. Brodie

1 presented and explained three graphs depicting age class distributions of DNR-managed forested
2 lands in Western Washington under the HCP.
3

4 Superintendent Reykdal thanked staff for the visual information as it provides information on the
5 expectation of what the HCP would yield in older forests. Should the Board consider making a
6 policy change of designating any forests older than 120 years to conservation status, the amount
7 would only represent 1.2% of all harvestable timber. The information speaks to the positive of
8 maturing older stands if a policy change was implemented today designating any forest older
9 than 120 years. That designation would only affect a fraction of what is available. Only 3,500
10 acres remain of land potentially harvestable older than 120 years. Setting aside land for
11 protection and moving the acreage into lower stands would likely not affect the long-term
12 calculation and it would never be harvested. He plans to work with staff to identify any potential
13 impacts of the suggestion and possibly propose a resolution for the Board's consideration
14 because it appears it could be a solution to meet many expectations on a small amount of land
15 disproportionately important to the public used for other beneficial uses other than for harvesting
16 without harming the sustainable calculation.
17

18 Commissioner Franz added that effective last March, efforts have begun by putting lands 120
19 years or older on hold pending discussions with the Board.
20

21 Mr. Brodie asked whether the configuration of the stands for deferral represent approximately
22 10,000 acres. Superintendent Reykdal confirmed his calculations total 10,000 acres and within
23 Common School Trust lands, it would total 3,500 acres representing 1.2% of all school trust
24 lands available for harvest. Conserving those 3,500 acres would entail transferring 3,500 acres
25 of expectation to younger forests to avoid affecting the sustainable harvest. Mr. Brodie advised
26 that the analysis on the impact to the harvest by removing 10,000 acres would affect the harvest
27 levels as it represents removing 10,000 acres from the base that would not be replaced. It should
28 not be assumed DNR could replace the harvest amount.
29

30 Dr. Brown requested clarification as to the existing deferral in terms of 120-year-old trees versus
31 120-year-old stands. The old growth policy addresses stands of five acres or more of old growth.
32 There appears to be a size threshold question with respect to the deferral. Mr. Brodie explained
33 that it would entail any cluster of trees with a significant portion of the stand 120 years or older.
34 The definition is somewhat vague; however inventory data can be calculated using a 30 x 30
35 meter pixel to help identify the location of pockets and patches of older forests. It would be
36 important to have a discussion with the Board as to whether to establish a size limit, which could
37 reduce the number of acres or perhaps the Board would rather identify small patches to reserve
38 or retained across the landscape. Those are tradeoffs for the Board to discuss.
39

40 Dr. Brown noted that it might be beneficial to explore carbon markets to account for some of the
41 loss. Mr. Brodie stressed the importance of sequencing the policies prior to any commitments to
42 any carbon markets to avoid the possibility of losing additionality.
43

44 Commissioner Franz added that staff is exploring the context of carbon markets and how they
45 might be tied to older growth forest policies. More information will be presented at a future
46 meeting.
47

1 Commissioner Peach cautioned about the potential loss of revenue stream to fire districts for
2 deferring the harvest of 10,000 acres. Mr. Brodie advised that the analysis has not been
3 completed but it likely would be similar to the analysis completed for the Marbled murrelet
4 analysis and the impact to taxing districts. Commissioner Peach supported exploring alternative
5 revenue streams but would prefer identifying the revenue stream prior to deferral of revenue
6 from harvesting for fire departments.
7

8 Dean Koenig questioned the equation of loss in timber in terms of the deferral of acres because
9 it does not equal an acre per acre swap. Mr. Brodie explained how the Department regenerates
10 approximately 10,000 to 11,000 new harvestable acres on the Westside each year. However,
11 older stands contain more volume per acre than a younger stand. There would be some impact
12 on the harvest level.
13

14 Discussion ensued on calculating the difference in harvestable density in different age groups.
15 Mr. Brodie noted the calculation can be somewhat complicated. He cited from memory the
16 calculation of harvesting during the last decade of approximately 4% to 5% from stands over 120
17 years of age. Should the Board agree to defer harvesting that specific age group, it would equate
18 to a loss of approximately 4% to 5% for the decade's harvest level that would need to be
19 adjusted.
20

21 Mr. Brodie summarized the policies and explained how DNR manages trust lands to generate
22 long-term sustainable revenue for beneficiaries under a policy framework of sustainability. The
23 HCP is a landscape approach to protect species, habitat, and biodiversity. Changing policy leads
24 to a deliberative process to balance economic, environmental, and social benefits.
25

26 Mr. Brodie expressed appreciation to the public for testifying on the Department's management
27 of state trust lands. The comments help DNR collectively to improve the management of natural
28 resources today and in the future. DNR receives a wide range of comments that are not
29 consistent as some of the comments request a lengthening of rotations or harvesting timber at age
30 80 years while others want to shorten the rotation. Other comments object to any kind of
31 harvesting. The diversity of viewpoints demonstrates the complexity of policy decisions for
32 forest management across the landscape. A selection of some comments speaks to the
33 overarching message of not harvesting naturally regenerated forests that have an origin date prior
34 to 1945. The reasons fall within three general areas of ecological, social, and policy:
35

36 **1. Ecological:**

- 37 – Naturally generated forests are more complex
- 38 – Trees are larger in naturally regenerated stands
- 39 – Those forests contain more carbon than plantations
- 40 – All lowland old-growth has been logged in South Puget Sound

41 **2. Social:**

- 42 – These forests are learning opportunities
- 43 – Popular recreational destinations for hunters, hikers, bikers and other outdoor enthusiasts

44 **3. Policy**

- 45 – HCP obligates DNR to keep these forests

- 1 – DNR’s own policy obligates it to keep these forests until the 10% -15% targets are
- 2 reached
- 3 – There is more than enough plantations to satisfy the sustainable harvest targets and fulfill
- 4 DNR’s current commitment to beneficiaries

5 A number of community members inquired about the review process and accomplishments to
6 date. In response, staff added some additional screening protocols for stands located near older
7 growth (+120 years or older) or stands containing components of old growth. A number of
8 timber sales were delayed until the Board’s review has been completed and staff has completed
9 additional reviews of timber sales that have been the subject of public comment. DNR receives
10 public comments about the harvesting of old growth. Mr. Brodie emphasized that DNR does not
11 harvest old growth. Staff reviewed the policy framework with the Board in May, June, and July
12 2021 and during the current presentation.

13
14 Other questions from the public inquired about the number of acres of existing older forest. The
15 answer depends on the definition. Timber sales are focused on forests close to the old growth
16 definition or forests with an age class of 120 years or older. Many community members support
17 halting all harvesting of stands with an origin age of 1945, which represents approximately
18 74,000 acres. DNR has not delayed timber harvests in younger forests and has no plans to cease
19 harvesting unless directed by the Board.

20
21 Next steps include delaying seven policies and compliant timber sales of forests close to the
22 Board’s old growth definition (pre-1900) while staff conducts a review of forest and
23 conservation values. Dependent upon any discovery of conservation value, staff would explore a
24 path to transfer from trust status or earn revenue from other means, such as carbon offsets. Staff
25 anticipates the review to be completed by May 2022. Much of the ability to transfer lands from
26 trust status depends upon the success of revitalizing the trust land transfer tool with the support
27 of beneficiaries and stakeholders. Last month, the Board received a report on the results of the
28 first phase of work. The delay in harvesting has created some impacts to beneficiaries and trusts.
29 For state forest lands, approximately 21 mmbf have been deferred from harvesting with most
30 located in Clallam County (12 mmbf) and Jefferson and Thurston Counties with Common
31 Schools impacted by 17 mmbf.. The seven sales delayed total 48 mmbf valued between \$15
32 million to \$20 million.

33
34 Based on the Board’s request for information on forest carbon, staff plans to present a
35 presentation during the first quarter. Staff continues to reach out to the public to seek group
36 conversations. The pandemic has affected the ability to facilitate good conversations and staff is
37 examining other opportunities for the exchange of information.

38
39 Mr. Brodie added that unless otherwise directed by the Board, staff does not plan to reexamine or
40 revise older forest targets or the silviculture policy. He invited questions and comments from
41 members.

42
43 Dr. Brown expressed interest in receiving information on the amount of carbon the state absorbs
44 through rotational management, as well as some interest in reducing production levels in lieu of
45 potential substitution. Based on his review of research on trade and forest products by the
46 University of Washington it appears Washington is a net importer of softwood lumber with the

1 majority of imports from Canada. However, in terms of value, import represents twice the
2 amount the state exports. Any reduction in production by DNR would presumably not influence
3 demand as the Board lacks any control on demand. However, if demand for lumber is fixed or
4 likely increases, it could be replaced by imports or by the state; however, the Board discussed
5 increasing the frequency of harvesting in other parts of the state. Many in the community are
6 acknowledging lands are dedicated to forest product production and that practice should
7 continue. However, the tradeoffs are many, such as avoiding the importation of more lumber
8 because of the Board's action, the ability of making up revenue and volume by increasing
9 intensity or shortening rotation on some lands, or leaving some areas intact are important to
10 consider when considering which choice would be better for carbon sequestration. The modeling
11 published on the effect of rotations on carbon storage reflect the ability to extend rotation age on
12 private forests beyond 40 years to 60-70 years and produce more volume and more carbon
13 storage.

14
15 Mr. Cahill supported exploring Superintendent Reykdal's suggestion pertaining to the 10,000
16 acres, exploring other ways for carbon sequestration, or researching other market methods to
17 help preserve acres. Some public comments recommended changing the harvest methods and
18 accelerating efforts to increase structurally complex forests through climate smart forestry. He
19 asked to receive information on options for those trees and forests between the ages of 70 and
20 120 and those within the gap for generating revenue with sequestration and carbon markets
21 and/or different types of harvesting while allowing the removal of timber to generate revenue to
22 reduce the gap in revenue when approaching the Legislature. Today, sequestration or carbon
23 market credits are approximately \$14 a ton, while the value of forests is much greater. He intent
24 is to consider other methods to obtain value through changes in harvesting while promoting goals
25 in the HCP and generating additional revenue. He suggested expanding options as the Board
26 moves forward with discussions.

27
28 Mr. Brodie responded that trust land transfer is the full transfer of ownership into another status
29 with the trust fully compensated. The process has been successful for the Department. Another
30 option is carbon credits for forests and identifying any monetary gaps because of the loss of
31 timber harvest. Another option is not precluding harvest but at higher levels of retention or
32 extending rotations, which could be combined with carbon options as well. He offered to
33 provide information on a variety of options to review.

34
35 Superintendent Reykdal advocated for the scenarios to include reasonable estimates on the value
36 of 10,000 acres to trust beneficiaries. Until values are identified it would be a difficult
37 conversation because of the importance of understanding any potential financial impacts. Mr.
38 Brodie advised that staff has some initial estimates but it is dependent on how 10,000 acres are
39 categorized in terms of volume, age classification, and the size of acreage patch, etc.

40
41 Commissioner Franz added that staff has been exploring other value scenarios to assist the Board
42 in its discussions.

43
44 Superintendent Reykdal pointed out that as identified by Mr. Brodie, a set-aside could equal
45 1.2% of the acreage but actually equate to the 4% to 5% of expected yield over the next 10 years.
46 It is also important to consider how that 4% to 5% reduction would impact the timber industry.
47 The overall issue is population growth in the state without increasing product for residential and

1 commercial construction as quickly as the environment is deteriorating. It likely would be
2 impossible to keep pace with population growth on the planet. There comes a point where
3 arguments could continue about the importance of making a contribution; but none of it is long-
4 term sustainable, which is why he believes it is time to place value on different decisions and
5 whether revenue from those decisions could be from sources to reduce immediate harm to the
6 industry, fire districts, and school districts. It is important the Board is not all about harvesting
7 trees focused on the long-term benefit of managing forests. He is growing impatient and prefers
8 not delaying the conversation for another year, as the Board should address the larger questions
9 quickly as it is no longer possible to fund school facilities with harvest revenue given the status
10 of the climate crisis.

11
12 Commissioner Peach supported receiving information and feedback from other viewpoints, such
13 as The Center for Responsible Forestry because he believes there is an opportunity for the Board
14 to identify a solution. He recommended inviting the group as the group has not accepted his
15 invitation to discuss issues.

16
17 Commissioner Franz added that other information to consider is the lost value for beneficiaries,
18 as well as the impacts on infrastructure and the significance context of how the value of forests
19 ensures mills stay in operation, which is critical for working forests to remain in operation and
20 for providing the built environment. She stressed the importance of identifying any impacts of
21 any decisions and whether it shifts to other countries or other states to provide wood products.
22 Mr. Cahill suggested considering a broader approach to include forest health treatments which
23 also support the mills and any other options that should be considered.

24
25 Mr. Brodie summarized follow-up requests to be provided to the Board for its continued
26 discussion.

27
28 **ADJOURNMENT**

29 Chair Franz adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

30

Approved this 1st day of February, 2022



Hilary S. Franz, Washington State Commissioner of Public Lands

Approved via Webinar

Jim Cahill, Designee for Governor Jay Inslee

Approved via Webinar

Chris Reykdal, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Approved via Webinar

Bill Peach, Commissioner, Clallam County

Approved via Webinar

Dr. Richard Koenig, Interim Dean, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences,
Washington State University

Approved via Webinar

Dan Brown, Director, School of Environmental and Forest Sciences,
University of Washington

Attest:



Tami Kellogg, Board Coordinator

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net