
Minutes
Board of Natural Resources Meeting
February 7, 2023
Webinar/In-Person, Olympia, Washington

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

The Honorable Hilary Franz, Chair & Washington State Commissioner of Public Lands

The Honorable Chris Reykdal, Superintendent of Public Instruction

The Honorable Lisa Janicki, Commissioner, Skagit County

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

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

Dr. Wendy Powers, Dean, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences,
Washington State University

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Franz called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

Boardmembers provided self-introduction. A meeting quorum was confirmed.

WEBINAR/SAFETY BRIEFING

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

LIGHTNING TALK - Information

Recreation Benefits

John Moon, Boulder Unit Forester, Cascade District, Northwest Region

Mr. Moon's presentation covered Northwest Region's multi-use recreation landscapes, regulatory and policy framework used to manage and make decisions for landscapes, the Reiter Foothills recreation area, and several examples of managing trust lands for recreation and timber sales within the same footprint.

The Northwest Region covers 300,000 acres of state trust lands, 28 recreation sites, 118 miles of trails, and five multi-use landscapes (areas of recreation, timber sales and commercial leases). The Reiter Foothills Forest includes formal developed recreation, an active timber sales program, and two communication site leases. Work within the landscapes is under the auspice of three objectives of trust obligations and sustainable harvest goals, public access and recreation, and robust environmental protection framework through the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and the Forest Practices Act.

Because of overuse and widespread public use of trails and streams, the agency closed the Reiter Foothills recreation area in 2008. Over the next several years, the Reiter

1 Foothills Recreation Plan was developed with support from a diverse group of
2 stakeholders. The recreation plan was adopted in 2010. Reiter Foothills reopened in
3 2012. The area today includes 33 miles of motorized trails and 4 miles of non-motorized
4 trails. Since 2010, the area has generated \$27.5 million in revenue for beneficiaries and
5 produced approximately 77 mmbf of timber.
6

7 Mr. Moon shared information on several timber sales as examples of forests and
8 recreation management generating revenue for beneficiaries.
9

10 Superintendent Reykdal inquired about the funding sources for trail improvements. Mr.
11 M6on replied that two main funding sources for recreation include capital funding from
12 the Legislature and grants through the State Recreation and Conservation Office, as well
13 as limited funding from gas tax and the Discover Pass.
14

15 Chair Franz added that DNR's recreation program includes approximately 40 personnel
16 funded primarily through various grants DNR is able to receive. Many recreation non-
17 profit organizations contribute to required grant matches.
18

19 Commissioner Janicki asked whether the recreation areas include signage or kiosks
20 informing the public of the working forest. Mr. Moon advised that sites include signs
21 and kiosks. Regular public meetings are conducted to engage with public groups. When
22 logging operations are active, signs are installed alerting the public to the presence of log
23 trucks and logging operations. Several signs/kiosks were installed near motorized trails.
24

25 Chair Franz said the agency is working on changing signage at a number of high use
26 recreational areas with large boards containing information about DNR, responsibilities
27 of DNR, and information about multi-functional use of the landscape.
28

29 Mr. Moon addressed comments about the Department's efforts to prevent formation of
30 unauthorized trails. Working in conjunction with trail user organizations and volunteers,
31 much work has been completed through partnerships by taking advantage of the timber
32 harvesting process and moving stockpiles of stumps removed during the creation of
33 logging roads to manage unauthorized trail access points.
34

35 PUBLIC COMMENTS

36 **Robert Mitchell** spoke to governance through non-violence as practiced by Gandhi, even
37 in response to harvesting the degrading dismissively nicknamed Sauerkraut parcel. He
38 suggested assigning respectful names rather than trivializing the violence of removing
39 trees. Renaming parcels scheduled for auction might result in fewer auction approvals.
40 He reemphasized his claim of DNR overreacting to minor violence by locking public
41 lands from access and punishing non-violent users as collateral damage. More
42 knowledge might be helpful to small forest landowners wanting to be part of the solution
43 by demonstrating how stand growth is more influenced by mycorrhiza fungal networks
44 than any models currently predict. He suggested considering compensation of loggers
45 and beneficiaries financially for arrearage instead of logging trees. DNR revenue in the
46 timber sales report is 40% above projections. Arrearage may be increasing profits by
47 holding down oversupply. He asked the Board to move the DNR study of financial
48 revenue sources in addition to carbon markets. DNR did not seek legislative approval to

1 enter the carbon market. He asked about other financial instrument options and the
2 possibility of hedging commodity prices with futures.
3

4 **Paul Butler** referred to his requests over the last 18 months to protect the little remaining
5 older and mature forests in Western Washington. He realizes DNR does not understand
6 the value of legacy forests. Legacy forests are naturally regenerated remnants and the
7 last unprotected lowland temperate rain forests not converted to tree plantations. They
8 are a legacy of what was ravaged prior to World War II. In 2021, Commissioner Franz
9 reported on the pause of timber sales of legacy forests while DNR reviewed the Older
10 Forests Policy. Several months later, DNR announced ending the review with no
11 changes to policy required but that DNR would follow the science. Scientists, including
12 Jerry Franklin have said unprotected remnants should be preserved intact. The lack of
13 recognition of legacy forest value carries over to how DNR interacts with some
14 beneficiaries. Commissioners from several counties in Western Washington expressed
15 interest in protecting legacy forests; however, DNR is not making it easy. At a minimum,
16 DNR should postpone sales containing legacy forest remnants, which would allow DNR
17 to work collaboratively with the counties to explore other alternatives. Legacy forests
18 provide more value vertically rather than horizontally.
19

20 **Miguel Perez-Gibson, Washington Conservation Action**, commented on the
21 presentation on the Eastside Sustainable Harvest Calculation. The last Eastside SHC was
22 completed in 1996 when he served as the Department's Forest Resources Division
23 Manager. The presentation will raise several policy questions on sustainable harvest
24 units, forest certifications to consider for the Forest Stewardship Council, forest health
25 management, and the HCP. It is essential to recognize that over 80% of the eastside is
26 Common School Trust land while county trusts are less than 3% with the remaining 15%
27 divided over six different federal trusts. Historically, eastside harvests have averaged
28 10% to 15% with more minor investments in silviculture resulting in a decrease in overall
29 forest health, which created the need for general fund monies from the Legislature to
30 fund forest health treatments. Several of the policy questions pertinent to the eastside are
31 also applicable to westside sustainable harvests. They include climate, species
32 composition, harvest intensity, multi-objective optimization, such as stored carbon and
33 ecological functions, using alternative harvesting techniques resulting in various levels of
34 tree retention, and consideration of how forests across the state need similar policy
35 questions. He acknowledged DNR staff for the successful Turning Wheel timber sale as
36 it serves as an example of managing state forests for all Washington citizens. The
37 Turning Wheel sale leveraged the ability to build a bridge for recreation.
38

39 **Matt Comisky, American Forest Resource Council (AFRC)**, said he represents
40 purchasers of DNR timber producing carbon-friendly wood products. Finished wood
41 products require an extensive network of foresters, biologists, loggers, truck drivers, and
42 mill operators to produce wood products. The upcoming timber sales presentation
43 reflects a lack of discussion on the arrears as requested by Commissioner Janicki in
44 January. He supports DNR moving forward on the eastside SHC; however, the State
45 Lands Prioritization Report is not mentioned from House Bill 1711 as one of the plans
46 the Department needs to incorporate into the SHC. A more detailed discussion is
47 warranted on climate and forecasting future climate change. He referred to a 2021

1 presentation by Angus Brody on forest resilience and climate change in terms of how
2 state lands are addressed.

3
4 **Bill Turner, Sierra Pacific Industries**, said DNR's timber sales program supports four
5 sawmills in the state. At the last meeting, a speaker levied an accusation of a timber theft
6 on a timber sale involving Sierra Pacific. DNR staff investigated the accusation and
7 found the accusation was false. He expressed appreciation to DNR staff for their follow-
8 up. The company has a good working relationship with DNR staff in the field. Company
9 personnel often work in coordination with DNR staff to improve recreational sites after
10 timber harvesting. The company modified its harvesting practice following a timber
11 harvest to protect a trail. During the decommission of a road, the company stockpiled
12 rocks for recreational use.

13
14 **Doug Cooper, Hampton Lumber**, said Hampton Lumber operates sawmills in the
15 communities of Darrington, Morton, and Randall with two mills actively sourcing DNR
16 logs from Eastern Washington. The company is part of the critical manufacturing
17 infrastructure needed to accomplish forest resiliency treatments that are essential to the
18 sustainability of DNR trust lands in Eastern Washington. With the potential of
19 decreasing harvest volumes in Western Washington, it is critical to have a robust,
20 transparent, and accountable SHC for trust lands in both eastern and western Washington.
21 Forest health depends on maintaining milling and logging infrastructure to combat the
22 threat and impacts of catastrophic wildfire in rural and urban areas of Washington.
23 Responsible and sustainable management of forests is part of the solution for 21st century
24 economic, social, and environmental challenges. Public forests in the Pacific Northwest
25 are the best available and realistic land base to increase timber outputs to support the
26 remaining timber industry, needs of society, and to continue providing a positive
27 contribution to the environment. He looks forward to learning how the SHC incorporates
28 the Forest Plan for State Trust Lands in Eastern Washington within the calculation.
29 There is a great deal of interest in how the assumptions and forest treatments will build
30 resiliency around rural communities. Of additional interest is DNR's climate modeling,
31 the science, and how response is based on future weather trends. DNR must provide the
32 public with the most up-to-date and accurate forest inventory and growth and yield data
33 to ensure transparent and accountable outcomes.

34
35 **Rod Fleck, City of Forks**, said the proposed geographic names represent a remarkable
36 list of proposals of great local culture and historical recognition reflected in the rich,
37 diverse, and inclusion of state history. The proposals should be packaged together as a
38 lesson plan that could be utilized by those teaching history. He questioned the lack of
39 any public discussion or inclusion within the Board's agenda regarding the Department's
40 request for legislation this session. Particularly, last week's introduction of Senate Bill
41 5688 with a request for authorization to provide the Commissioner of Public Lands the
42 ability to enter into multi-generational 125-year leases for ecosystem services and eco
43 services credit sales. The Board is referenced in the legislation with an option to delegate
44 the Board's authority by resolution. The bill only addresses one-half of the impact of
45 state managed timberland as the value for product versus the jobs associated with the
46 product, especially in rural areas. The term of legacy forests now described an area of
47 timber stands with an average age from the 1920 to 1960s, which is a concern.

1 **Ed Bowen, Clallam County**, addressed the proposed sales, sales results, and the Eastside
2 SHC. The proposed sales previously included two Clallam sales that have been pulled.
3 He questioned the withdrawal of the Wild West timber sale affecting junior taxing
4 districts in Clallam County. The sales results are confusing as the information lacks the
5 location of regional sales. The Eastside SHC presentation includes a breakout by county
6 but lacks an explanation of the operable acres or the total number of trust acres. He asked
7 whether the figure of 675,000 acres is the operable acres used to calculate the next SHC.
8 He urged caution in comparing Westside versus Eastside for State Forest Transfer Trust
9 lands. The timeline for completing the inventory versus the yields is confusing.

10
11 **Sarah Gardam, resident of Whatcom County**, said each major forest that falls is a
12 major death today for an increasingly fragile ecosystem. She has witnessed the falling of
13 so many in just the last two years as she has monitored DNR razing of legacy forests with
14 impunity. Public awareness about this destruction is growing with more and more people
15 waking up to what is being done to the last few remaining older forests in the lowlands of
16 Western Washington. The more the Board ignores the people, the more effective they
17 become at spreading the word and bringing others into the movement to save forests that
18 deserve love and respect for what they contribute to the planet. The Board should halt
19 the harvest of legacy forests while the good people who testify at meetings are still asking
20 nicely. Please reconsider the next SHC accordingly.

21
22 **Daniel Harm** reported the Brokedown Palace timber sale is located in extremely steep
23 and wet north facing slopes with bedrock hollows and insufficient buffers abutting cliff-
24 like inner gorges directly above the middle fork of the Nooksack River, adding that
25 across the valley to south facing slopes are three landslides on Sierra Pacific Industries
26 (SPI) land. One is hundreds of feet long and tracks along the entire face of the slope.
27 The second has destroyed a road. The dark irony is that the operations are directly above
28 a \$17 million dam removal project intended to help salmon. He stated that within
29 Brokedown Palace is a rich, healthy, complex ecosystem teeming on the verge of old
30 growth despite slow growing northerly slopes. There are dozens of 500 to 600-year old
31 fallen cedars and Douglas firs. Logging the parcel would be utter travesty that is being
32 watched closely. Is it worth the risk? A quick history of good forestry science since the
33 1950s is spraying DDT from helicopters onto public lands or spraying 245T and 24D
34 (Agent Orange) onto public lands. Scientifically stating that old growth is dead and
35 useless is a question for the crowd as anyone older than 50 years could be considered
36 dead and useless. Old growth has been squandered and the industry is fighting for
37 scraps that are left. The question is what will happen in 10 years if trees are all logged.
38 DNR should stop citing Jerry Franklin to justify land management practices. Dr.
39 Franklin has clearly stated he would never log a stand such as Pennywise. It is important
40 to have a thriving forest product industry but one that is based on true ecological forestry
41 not green-washing misinformation. He wants to see rural communities and education
42 thrive. With \$80 million on the legislative table, it is possible to co-create a future of true
43 ecological forestry that would conserve and protect the last remains of legacy forests, a
44 mere 5% of DNR's land base.

45
46 **Ed Chadd** agreed with the comments offered by Mr. Butler and Ms. Gardam as it is
47 insanity at this point to continue logging the state's last older forests in the Department's
48 portfolio. Those forests are climate mitigation workhorses. As a speaker for the last 18

1 months during meetings, he does believe there has been any impact on the Board from
2 individuals pointing out the need to change management of forests. Luckily, there is an
3 effort by the Legislature to allocate funds to replace land with legacy forests. The
4 proposal is economically sensible and funding would help to harvest land elsewhere and
5 ensure timber communities remain whole. He urged the Board to join others who are
6 interacting with legislators for a budget proviso to allocate funds from the Climate
7 Commitment Act to solve the problem permanently.
8

9 **Lynn Fitz-Hugh** objected to the sale of Hopscotch this month and Juneau next month, as
10 well as logging legacy forests in general. There are several measures before the
11 Legislature including one for the Trust Land Transfer Program and one request for new
12 funds from the New Natural Climate Solutions Fund to enable DNR to purchase
13 substitute lands in order to protect permanently the remaining 5% of legacy forests. She
14 shared an example of how much carbon would be sequestered if only 8,000 acres of
15 legacy forests were protected from logging and how much emissions would be avoided
16 over the natural life of the trees. Last year, DNR auctioned 15,000 acres of legacy forests
17 or twice the annual emissions of Thurston County. The Board has been consistently
18 asked to address climate change as the actions are creating staggering emissions on a
19 planet that is out of time. The average age of trees in Hopscotch is 103 years and
20 contains approximately of 36,000 metric tons of stored carbon. Perhaps by the end of the
21 legislative session, the Board will have tools to enable the purchase of substitution lands.
22 The Board should adopt a moratorium on logging until other solutions can be
23 implemented.
24

25 **Julie Ratner** commented that many individuals in attendance are dressed in black with
26 bright yellow armbands to illustrate how they stand united to save legacy trees. She
27 asked the Board to protect the last 5% as they are irreplaceable trees representing the
28 crown jewels of Western Washington. When legacy trees are clearcut, the entire self-
29 sustaining ecosystem collapses. The loss of biodiversity occurs and literally tons of
30 stored carbon would be released including the hub of the brain of the underground
31 network. She asked the Board why it is not possible to steward the last 5% of legacy
32 forests before the total remaining forests equal less than 1%. There are plenty of other
33 younger trees available to harvest. She urged the Board to begin the new year as an
34 opportunity to lead, preserve, and steward precious resources. Listen to Dr. Ramirez and
35 over 100 conservation groups who support President Biden's Federal Rule to protect
36 legacy forests from logging. The public attend meetings hopeful the Board will commit
37 to a moratorium on selling legacy forests to include Hopscotch, Juneau, and Buttercup.
38

39 **Gordon Wheat** said he represents the Physicians for Social Responsibility Climate Task
40 Force. He is grieving for the trees but even more for the symbiosis that provides the
41 nutrients for the forest supported by legacy trees. The richest and most productive
42 mycorrhizal ecosystems on the planet are in temperate forests in the Pacific Northwest.
43 Soil ecosystems have more biomass, store more carbon than trees, and provide nutrients
44 making legacy forests the most productive ecosystems on the planet. Acre for acre
45 legacy forests produce more wood biomass and store more carbon than any other
46 ecosystem including tropical rain forests. This is because symbiotic mycorrhiza as the
47 nitrogen-fixing bacteria produces the richest source of nitrogen in any ecosystem on
48 earth. Nitrogen together with decomposition nutrients of fungus are transported to the

1 tree roots. In exchange, legacy trees have surplus sugars from photosynthesis in its large
2 canopy to support mycorrhiza symbiont with sugars. All ecosystems are destroyed by
3 clearcutting legacy forests. Without large legacy trees, most mycorrhiza dies and releases
4 70 to 80 percent of stored forest carbon. According to the DNR Charter, the Board is to
5 manage state trust lands to generate healthy forests and sustain revenues for the trustees
6 of Washington. However, each time a legacy forest is clearcut, the mission is abandoned
7 by the Board and healthy forests are destroyed for future generations.
8

9 **Alice Grendon** said she is grieving for the trees and for her own future and future
10 generations. Scientists have indicated the planet has a decade to attain net-zero
11 emissions. To achieve that goal, all remaining legacy forests must remain intact. The
12 planet is currently experiencing a climate catastrophe and it is only getting worse. It is
13 the job of the Board to protect her, young people, and future generations. Members in
14 charge of public instruction sit on the board of universities and by selling legacy forests;
15 they are selling the future of those they instruct. She cited names of timber sales
16 scheduled for logging. The Board is selling trees of which most are pre-1900 second
17 growth irreplaceable forests. The Board should consider a moratorium on logging of
18 legacy forests until a solution can be identified by the Legislature.
19

20 **Beverly Parsons, Kitsap County**, commented that similar to other speakers, she too, is
21 grieving for legacy forests. The harvests should be halted. For many months she has
22 been part of a collective voice calling for protection of forests, especially halting the
23 harvest of the thousands of acres of legacy forests on DNR land. Yet it continues.
24 Boardmembers are rational good people who care about the lives and health of their
25 children, grandchildren, and future generations. Yet, Boardmembers continue to make
26 the same decisions. Boardmembers should be aware of the massive amount of data
27 supporting the preservation of legacy trees. She is also aware of the skewed information
28 brought forth by the timber industry. She questioned whether Boardmembers have
29 experienced threats or the possibility of losing grants or funding from certain industries
30 their institutions need. She questioned whether the timber industry and other related
31 businesses are politically threatening members and their employers with their finances
32 and legal capacities. Alternatively, it could be that members are so busy and so driven by
33 the tyranny of the urgency that they simply do not have the time to work out the
34 entanglements involved in changing course. She asked how individuals can help the
35 Board withstand whatever pressure they are experiencing and how she and others can
36 help the Board make morally and socially just actions.
37

38 **Dave Sweitzer, Washington Hardwoods Commission**, reported the mission of the
39 Commission is to educate and advocate for the sustainable supply of hardwoods in the
40 marketplace. The Commission works with small and large landowners, sawmills, pulp
41 and paper mills, state agencies, and other public and private sector institutions.
42 Currently, the Commission and its members are engaged in projects with Nature
43 Conservancy, the Olympic Natural Resource Center, and others to enhance the
44 sustainable supply of alder, which is the primary hardwood. DNR is a critical partner in
45 the supply of hardwoods, particularly alder both today and in the future. With the help of
46 Senator Van De Wege and others, the Commission secured a pilot project for DNR to
47 increase hardwood supply. The project is proving beneficial and successful. The
48 Commission looks forward to continuing to engage with the Department and the Board as

1 the SHC process moves forward. The sustainable and carbon friendly products members
2 produce, such as lumber for furniture, pencil stock, paper products, and critical toilet
3 paper depend on the success of the DNR timber sales program.
4

5 **Barak Gale, Temple Beth Hatfiloh, Olympia**, said he is grieving for legacy forests
6 because they support habitat for diverse species. The planet is losing precious species at
7 one to 10,000 times the historic rate. DNR's website states that ecological health,
8 especially relative to viable wildlife habitats of both dry and moist forest types in Eastern
9 Washington, often depend on a sufficient supply of older trees. He is grieving for legacy
10 trees because they sequester enormous amounts of carbon and because large diameter
11 trees store disproportionately massive amounts of carbon and are a major driver of carbon
12 cycle dynamics in forests worldwide. It takes decades for green recruitment trees to
13 achieve the attributes of legacy trees. Recently, he joined with friends in a local park to
14 celebrate the Jewish New Year of the Trees. The centuries-old tradition involves blessing
15 trees with the belief and hope the words are not merely words but move everyone and
16 bring divine flow for health and life on the planet. There is a sacred text from the fifth
17 century that says if not for the trees, there could be no human life. He asked the Board to
18 stop authorizing timber sales of legacy trees.
19

20 **TIMBER SALES - Action**

21 **Auction Results for January 2023, FY 2023 Update, Proposed Timber Sales for** 22 **March 2023**

23 **Joe Koontz, Assistant Division Manager of Timber Sales, Product Sales & Leasing** 24 **Division**

25
26 Mr. Koontz reported in January 2023, the Department sold eight of the nine sales offered
27 totaling 36.8 mmbf for \$13.2 million with an average stumpage price of \$416 per mbf.
28 The average number of bidders at 3.1 continues to remain high. The one unsold sale will
29 be reoffered in the next several months. Mr. Koontz invited questions.
30

31 Commissioner Janicki asked whether the stumpage price of \$416 per mbf was considered
32 an average price over the last year. Mr. Koontz replied that the Department has
33 experienced a good market, as the stumpage price of \$416 per mbf is an above average
34 price over the last six months. As the market begins slowing, lumber futures market
35 pricing may drop. Another impact on the value is the type of logging. For example, a
36 high percentage of cable logging can decrease the dollars per thousand board feet as well
37 as the mixture of species. January sales predominately featured Douglas fir. The
38 addition of hemlock or white woods could reduce prices.
39

40 Mr. Koontz reviewed the status of current fiscal year timber sales. A graphic reflected
41 the current plan for auction volume, forecasted volume for the remaining year, sold
42 volume, and timber sales reoffered. The agency has only offered one month of sales in
43 the third quarter, which explains the large difference between planned volume and sold
44 volume. The projected volume reflects a reduction of 26 mmbf from last month's
45 number. Deferred sales moved from the third quarter to the fourth quarter were the result
46 of environmental factors (weather) as well as staffing shortfalls.
47

48 No questions were offered by the Board.

1
2 Mr. Koontz presented the March timber proposal of nine sales totaling 47.6 mmbf with
3 an estimated value of \$11.1 million and a delivered value of \$232 per mbf. Two sales are
4 located in the Pacific Cascade Region, one is located in the Northwest Region, three are
5 located in the South Puget Sound Region, and three are located in Olympic Region. Mr.
6 Koontz invited questions.
7

8 Dr. Brown referred to comments regarding the older average of tree sales particularly the
9 Corkey, Uptick, and Buttercup timber sales. After reviewing the maps he identified some
10 leave tree areas that are likely older trees based on policy. He asked whether the average
11 age reported is for the entire unit or only for the planned harvest area. Mr. Koontz
12 advised that the average age is for the entire unit and includes both old and young trees.
13 Dr. Brown asked whether it is likely conceivable that the average age of harvested trees
14 would be younger trees than reported in the sales packet. Mr. Koontz affirmed that
15 interpretation. The average age for the proposed timber sales is 1949 with stands ranging
16 in age from the 1920s to 1962.
17

18 Chair Franz asked whether it would be difficult for staff to identify the average age of
19 harvested trees for improved transparency. Mr. Koontz advised that the process would be
20 difficult because it requires measurement and coring of each tree, which is impractical in
21 a logging environment. Dr. Brown said it appears the statistics are based on a sample of
22 the entire unit. Mr. Koontz affirmed that interpretation.
23

24 With no additional comments or questions from the Board, Commissioner Franz
25 requested consideration of a motion to approve the proposed sales.
26

27 MOTION: Commissioner Janicki moved to approve the proposed sales as presented.
28

29 SECOND: Dr. Brown seconded the motion.
30

31 ACTION: Motion was approved unanimously.
32

33 Mr. Koontz provided an update on the Pennywise timber sale in response to comments
34 during the January meeting. Concerns were conveyed about harvesting of leave trees by
35 the operator. Regional staff followed up on the complaint and found no unauthorized
36 removal of leave trees. During the sale layout process, several trees marked with blue
37 bands were determined to be located within the right-of-way boundary of a new road
38 location. Those trees were removed to accommodate road construction. While
39 documenting the pre-sale layout, leave trees that were exchanged were recorded in an
40 Excel spreadsheet and mapped by each leave tree location identifying them by size,
41 species, and leave tree number. The terms and conditions of the Pennywise timber sale
42 have been enforced and all retention trees were fully documented and accounted for
43 during the timber harvest.
44

45 Superintendent Reykdal asked how the timber crew was unaware of the scheduled new
46 road within that specific area. Mr. Koontz advised that often a sale layout identifies leave
47 trees and the logging road location. However, in the case of the Pennywise timber sale,
48 the engineer visited the site after the initial layout and identified a better location for the

1 road. Its speaks to a timing issue as it is often not unusual that a road identified in the
2 initial layout is changed when the engineer visits the site, which is likely what occurred
3 with the Pennywise timber sale.
4

5 Superintendent Reykdal asked about the circumstance if other leave trees are not
6 available within the stand for replacement. Mr. Koontz advised that field staff would
7 have identified replacement trees because numerous trees were available in the sales unit.
8

9 Mr. Cahill thanked staff for following up on the issue. He asked for additional
10 information on the follow-up process for timber sales to ensure operators are following
11 prescribed requirements. Mr. Koontz explained that the Contract Administrator for each
12 sale visits the sites at least once weekly during harvest operations to monitor logging
13 activity to ensure areas are marked for harvesting, leave trees are protected, logging
14 methodology is followed, and riparian zones and buffers are protected. The process is
15 fully documented with all visits to the site documented by the Contract Administrator and
16 Foresters. Additionally, the Forest Stewardship Council requires field documentation.
17 Certification audits of logging units are based on random sampling.
18

19 Commissioner Franz recommended scheduling a future lightning talk on the full sales
20 process.
21

22 Superintendent Reykdal referred to the larger conversation on legacy forests and
23 statements that the Department is expediting the harvest of older trees to minimize any
24 potential result should the Board place a moratorium or change practices during the SHC
25 process. He asked about the availability of data for the last four quarters to help identify
26 the age of harvests and whether the amount of older tree harvested have been historically
27 higher in age than in previous years.
28

29 Duane Emmons, Assistant Deputy Supervisor for State Uplands, said staff can provide
30 the data for average stand ages. In terms of pre-1900 forests, DNR set-aside through the
31 marbled murrelet decision in the HCP and other protections over 100,000 acres of pre-
32 1900 stands. DNR protected over 850,000 acres statewide through the HCP and other
33 conservation efforts. The inclusion of riparian protection and other protections for
34 Northern spotted owls resulted in the agency protecting over 1 million acres or half of the
35 land base. When considering the Board's decisions for the SHC for the marbled murrelet
36 and prior to rendering decisions, much of older areas were not considered as DNR paused
37 harvesting of those areas until the Board determined areas best suitable for marbled
38 murrelet protection. As staff worked through the next SHC decade beginning in 2015, a
39 number of areas were off limits. The trend was to harvest younger stands because older
40 stands contained structures desirable for protection of the species. At that time, DNR
41 harvesting trended toward younger stands for the first part of the decade. After the
42 decisions in 2019 and 2020, remaining harvesting tended to occur in forests of older
43 trees, which speaks to the obvious difference in the average age between the decades.
44

45 Commissioner Franz noted that it took nearly 20 years to complete the Marbled Murrelet
46 Habitat Protection Plan. During that process, a substantial amount of westside forests
47 were paused from harvesting for marbled murrelet. The Board and agency still
48 maintained a responsibility to meet the SHC, which focused on younger stands of trees

1 while the agency and the Board finalized the HCP. During that period, trees aged and
2 now those areas are opening for harvesting pursuant to the HCP and Marbled Murrelet
3 Long Term Conservation Strategy, which is why there is a noticeable differential
4 between younger and older harvests whereas the historical record reflects harvesting has
5 included a combination of both older and younger forests.
6

7 Dr. Brown requested clarification as to the question of protected number of acres as the
8 number does not represent older forest entirely as some younger forests were protected in
9 response to the discussion during the development of the HCP adopted in 2019. It would
10 be interesting to review data as to the degree to which protected areas as part of the HCP
11 and other protections are comprised of older forests versus how much was released for
12 harvest after adoption of the HCP. The conversation today surrounds the importance of
13 each sale but it is in the context of an estate management strategy. The amount may be
14 insignificant if it pertains to a small number at the edges versus a big release.
15

16 Mr. Emmons replied that previous presentation materials would likely include
17 information for the Board. When the Board adopted the murrelet HCP, large special
18 management areas were created comprised of older forests with marbled murrelet habitat,
19 as well as larger areas with a mix of stands to serve as buffers around marbled murrelet
20 management areas.
21

22 **LAND TRANSACTIONS - Action**

23 **Picnic Pines Auction, 02-097673, Resolution 1594**

24 **East Joseph Auction, 02-0975674, Resolution 1595**

25 **Deb Whitney, Project Manager, Land Transactions Program**

26 Ms. Whitney reported the proposed Picnic Pines auction is for property located in
27 Spokane County. She displayed a map identifying the vicinity of the Picnic Pines parcel
28 lying east of Medical Lake and southwest of the City of Spokane. The 13.1-acre parcel
29 has legal access on the county's Silver Lake road intersecting the parcel with four acres
30 located above the road and nine acres located below the road. The area above the road is
31 unbuildable because of wetlands and lake setback requirements. The property is zoned
32 Rural Transitional and Low Density Residential allowing for one dwelling unit per 10
33 acres. Land to the east and north of the parcel is DNR managed Common School Trust
34 land. The parcel was formerly Common School Trust property and exchanged into the
35 land bank to position for auction. Ms. Whitney identified the boundary lines of the
36 parcel. Portions of the Picnic Pines parcel were leased to the former RV Park located to
37 the west of the property in 1971 for recreational use and for septic and overflow areas.
38 Over the years, the RV Park experienced several ownership changes and a default of the
39 lease in October 216. The septic system needs repair and updated regulations may
40 require a larger footprint. DNR does not believe it is in the best interests of the trust to
41 retain the property and segregated the property to position it for public auction.
42

43 The property was appraised and staff recommends a minimum bid of \$120,000 for the
44 Picnic Pines property. The public auction would be a sealed bid auction with bids opened
45 at the DNR Deer Park Work Center located north of Spokane. Auction revenue would be
46 allocated to the Land Bank and used to acquire replacement lands for future trust
47 management. Ms. Whitney invited questions from Boardmembers.
48

1 Commissioner Janicki commented that ownership of a former septic site is concerning as
2 it could involve the possibility of not selling the parcel and being responsible for
3 repairing a failed septic system in existence for many decades. She asked about the
4 possibility of actions DNR might be required to complete if the parcel fails to sell. Ms.
5 Whitney said staff anticipates a successful sale; however, if the parcel was not sold, DNR
6 would reoffer the parcel for sale through another auction.
7

8 Mr. Cahill questioned the management of the abutting parcel. Ms. Whitney advised that
9 the remaining parcel of Common School Trust land include a grazing lease and a
10 communications site lease. DNR does not anticipate releasing the property as the area is
11 anticipated to experience growth over the next decade. At that time, the Department may
12 want to consider selling the property.
13

14 Robin Hammill, Assistant Division Manager, Acquisitions and Divestitures, added that
15 the property is considered transition land. Both parcels proposed for auction were
16 transition lands at some point. Transition lands are lands that are close to urban growth
17 boundaries (UGA) or will become part of a UGA within the next 10 years. Staff assesses
18 those parcels to determine if they should remain in the trust or sold. The adjacent land is
19 currently encumbered with a grazing lease and a communications site, which speaks to
20 the need to retain road access.
21

22 With no other questions, Ms. Whitney requested consideration of a motion to approve the
23 Picnic Pines Auction, Resolution 1594 as presented.
24

25 MOTION: Superintendent Reykdal moved to approve Resolution 1594; Picnic Pines
26 Auction as presented.
27

28 SECOND: Dean Powers seconded the motion.
29

30 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.
31

32 Ms. Whitney presented the proposed East Joseph Auction proposal. The 0.36 acre
33 unimproved vacant parcel is located in Spokane County within the Spokane City limits
34 with access provided by East Joseph Avenue, a county road. The parcel is zoned Light
35 Industrial in an area experiencing low market demand. The property is not contiguous
36 with other DNR managed lands and is fenced on three sides by neighboring properties.
37 The parcel has experienced trespassing and homeless encampments with neighbor
38 complaints to the City of Spokane resulting in DNR required to clean-up and maintain the
39 property free of litter and homeless camping. DNR executed a land use license with a
40 neighboring business to use the parcel for parking and equipment storage to assist in
41 maintenance of the property. DNR permitted the licensee to install a gate and fence on
42 the roadside of the property to fence the property completely. DNR desires to retain the
43 fencing and entered into an improvement agreement with the licensee permitting DNR to
44 sell the improvements at a fixed value of \$4,349.06. The property was appraised and
45 staff recommends a minimum bid of the appraised value of \$50,000. The public auction
46 would be a written sealed auction with bids opened at DNR's Deer Park Work Center.
47 Auction revenue would be allocated to the Land Bank for future acquisition of
48 replacement land for future trust management. The high bidder for the East Joseph

1 Auction property must also pay the fixed amount of \$4,349.06 for the improvements,
2 which would be forwarded to the licensee following closure of the property. Ms.
3 Whitney asked for any questions. With no questions from the Board, Ms. Whitney
4 requested approval of Resolution 1595 for the East Joseph Auction.

5
6 MOTION: Superintendent Reykdal moved to approve Resolution 1595 for the East
7 Joseph Auction as presented.

8
9 SECOND: Dr. Brown seconded the motion.

10
11 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.

12
13 Superintendent Reykdal asked whether the Board has the authority to delegate land
14 transactions to the Commissioner for approval or whether there is a dollar threshold level
15 that requires action by the Board.

16
17 Bob Winslow, Transaction Project Manager, Conservation, Recreation and Transactions,
18 verified the statutory requirement for Board approval. The statute for timber sales
19 requires the Board's approval of sales exceeding \$100,000 or more. No threshold exists
20 for land transactions. Superintendent Reykdal recommended pursuing legislation to
21 either enact delegation authority to the Commissioner or establish a dollar amount.

22
23 **BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES - Action**

24 **Sara Palmer, Chair, Washington State Committee on Geographic Names**

25 Ms. Palmer presented two proposed names changes of Gooseberry Creek in Okanogan
26 County and South Tucannon Spring in Garfield County. The proposed names were
27 initiated through the efforts initiated by the Secretary of Interior to eliminate derogatory
28 names. The process involved collaboration with the tribes, which have approved the
29 proposed names.

30
31 Additionally, two names are proposed for areas in Mason County that were previously
32 considered during a similar renaming process intended to remove names derogatory
33 towards Black people. The federal government undertook a similar process and
34 submitted names that did not reference Black people, which represented an erasure of the
35 community's history. To rectify that situation, community members working with the
36 Living Arts Cultural Heritage Project in Poulsbo took advantage of the current renaming
37 process to recommend names reflective of the area's Black history. The committee
38 recommends replacing the names of two bodies of water with the names of the actual
39 Black pioneers. The names proposals include Rodney White Slough and Nathaniel
40 Sargent Lake both located in Mason County. Both gentlemen were early pioneers in
41 Mason County and were residents in those locations.

42
43 Chair Franz thanked Ms. Palmer and the committee for their work. She supports Mr.
44 Flecks proposal to develop curriculum of the naming process. She urged Ms. Palmer and
45 the committee to consider collaborating with local schools to develop curriculum.

46
47 Commissioner Janicki inquired as to the identity of the entities assisting in the renaming
48 of the Mason County locations. Ms. Palmer said the request was initiated by the

*Amended
November 7, 2023
Dawn Kellogg*

1 community group in Poulsbo. The committee also consulted with the landowner, county
2 authorities, and with Congressman Derek Kilmer's office, as well as receiving a letter of
3 support from the Mason County Board of Commissioners. The committee's outreach is
4 broad and can involve many individuals and groups to ensure accuracy of the
5 information. The committee's website includes directions on how to submit a naming
6 proposal. The derogatory place names process includes public engagement. The
7 committee emphasizes the importance of the work and offers its assistance. The
8 committee is often reliant on the public to submit proposals to the committee, as well as
9 relying on community members to identify place names that might be problematic.

10
11 Mr. Cahill noted that according to state statute, the state is not able to identify places and
12 propose names as it must be initiated by organizations or communities.

13
14 MOTION: Dr. Brown moved to approve the following geographic names changes as
15 proposed:

- 16 • Gooseberry Creek – Name Proposal
- 17 • South Tucannon Spring – Name Proposal
- 18 • Rodney White Slough – Name Proposal
- 19 • Nathaniel Sargent Lake – Name Proposal

20 SECOND: Mr. Cahill seconded the motion.

21
22 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.

23
24 *Chair Franz left the meeting at 10:53 a.m.*

25 26 CHAIR REPORT

27 Eastern Washington Sustainable Harvest Calculation

28 **Duane Emmons, Assistant Deputy Supervisor for State Uplands**

29 **Justin Schmal, Acting Assistant Division Manager, Budgets and Planning Group**

30 Mr. Emmons reported the briefing is on the Eastern Washington Sustainable Harvest
31 Calculation (SHC) and planning work over the next several years to establish the SHC.

32
33 The SHC forecasts the next hundred years and examines the projection of growth and
34 harvest with the harvest levels established for the first 10 years of the 100-year planning
35 horizon. The planning factors sustainable flow of volume for current and future
36 generations into perpetuity to ensure a balance of harvesting today, throughout the
37 decade, and the next 100 years. Other planning objectives include consideration of
38 habitat conditions and other objectives to ensure the SHC does not set levels of
39 overharvesting that would harm species, violate Forest Practice Rules, or create other
40 implications.

41
42 The Eastern Washington SHC is applicable to DNR lands in Eastern Washington from
43 the east slopes of the Cascades to Spokane County and involves different tree species and
44 ecosystems than those existing in Western Washington. The SHC is required by both
45 policy and statute in conjunction with the trust obligation to manage land sustainably.

1 DNR recognizes climate changes creating other forest health issues and issues that need
2 to be addressed in the SHC.
3

4 The last purpose of the SHC is the business need. The last Eastern Washington SHC was
5 completed in the late 1990s. A number of reasons exist for the lack of the update. The
6 Eastern Washington SHC was adopted in 1997 followed by the Western Washington
7 SHC. DNR moved into the Lake Whatcom Landscape Plan in conjunction with the 2000
8 Western Washington SHC. Additionally, DNR was engaged in major land plans to
9 include some amendments to the HCP followed by efforts on the Marbled Murrelet
10 Long-Term Conservation Strategy. Additionally, DNR experienced staffing and funding
11 constraints and a lack of inventory in Eastern Washington contributed to delaying the
12 update of the SHC.
13

14 The planning process will also incorporate forest health treatments required in statute
15 adopted by the Legislature several years ago requiring DNR to develop a Forest Health
16 Plan and prioritize forest health treatments to protect communities and trust assets.
17

18 A SHC is required under all certification systems. In Western Washington, DNR is
19 managing under the Forest Stewardship Council certification for the South Puget
20 planning area and statewide under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative. The lack of having
21 a current Eastern Washington SHC has been a finding in the agency's certifications over
22 the last several years. DNR has demonstrated how actions completed by the agency have
23 enabled DNR to meet certification objectives. However, DNR also must demonstrate
24 active work on the East Washington SHC or the certification could be in jeopardy.
25

26 Superintendent Reykdal asked whether the mandate for the forest health treatment
27 prioritization is funded by the Legislature. Mr. Emmons said the Legislature created the
28 Forest Health Revolving Fund for activities in Eastern Washington that include a forest
29 health component. Any revenue derived from those treatments is deposited to the Forest
30 Health Revolving Fund and is used to fund forest health treatments. Additionally, the
31 fund balance, when it reaches a specific threshold of unobligated funds, requires DNR to
32 distribute those funds to beneficiaries. DNR continues to seek capital funds for some
33 treatments.
34

35 Mr. Emmons described some of the early pitfalls of the forest health treatment mandate
36 and how it essentially shut down harvesting temporarily in Southeast Washington as
37 DNR was losing too much revenue and was unable to fund operational requirements.
38

39 Mr. Schmal presented factors affecting the Eastern Washington Forest Estate Model, the
40 model used to calculate the SHC level. The overarching policy document is the Policy
41 for Sustainable Forests comprised of a series of policies approved by the Board guiding
42 management and stewardship of forested trust lands and broad direction to manage trust
43 lands effectively for beneficiaries and the people of Washington.
44

45 Mr. Schmal reviewed several policies affecting the model. The policy on wildlife habitat
46 requires DNR to meet requirements of federal and state laws and contractual
47 requirements for protecting threatened, endangered, and sensitive species and their
48 respective habitats as governed by the 1997 HCP and linked Habitat Management Plan.

1
2 In addition to existing buffer requirements required by Forest Practice Rules, the Policy
3 on Riparian Conservation requires the Department to establish riparian zones along fish
4 bearing waters, perennial non-fish bearing waters, and when necessary along seasonal
5 streams in Eastern Washington. The Department is also required to establish wetland
6 management zones. In some areas of Eastern Washington, the Department implements
7 riparian and wetland protective measures exceeding forest practices standards.
8

9 The policy on Special Ecological Features require identification of forest and state trust
10 land special ecological features of regional and statewide significance that fill critical
11 gaps in ecosystem diversity and protect such areas to remain consistent with the trust
12 objectives including transfer out of trust land status, retention and long-term deferrals,
13 creative partnerships, and other available mechanisms. To date, DNR has placed over
14 31,000 acres in protected status through the Natural Areas Program. In addition to large
15 areas, smaller areas of significance such as cliffs, falls, and other unique features are
16 protected during timber sale layouts.
17

18 Harvest deferral is an effort to meet multiple objectives and to abide with state and
19 federal laws and Board policies. Certain areas of DNR managed lands may be deferred
20 either long- or short-term. Short-term deferrals are deferred from harvest during a
21 planning decade. Long-term deferrals apply beyond the 10-year period and are
22 unavailable for harvest in subsequent decades or indefinitely. Approximately 11% or
23 73,000 acres have been deferred long-term in Eastern Washington.
24

25 Mr. Schmal reviewed sustainable harvest units, which are impactful and are comprised of
26 smaller landscape units. SHC levels are calculated for each sustainable harvest unit.
27 Sustainable harvest units affect the forest estate model because interdecadal flow is
28 regulated at the sustainable harvest unit scale. The current policy on interdecadal flow
29 allows harvest volume to vary up or down up to 25% from one decade to the next.
30

31 Mr. Schmal reviewed sustainable harvest units utilized during the Eastern Washington
32 SHC in 1996. The units were synonymous with DNR's district boundaries. Within the
33 Policy of Sustainable Forests, the definition of sustainability for the SHC requires
34 establishment of Eastern Washington sustainable harvest units as part of the SHC. Staff
35 will seek guidance on developing sustainable harvest units as the calculation is
36 developed. Those efforts include analyzing sensitivity analysis on different sustainable
37 harvest unit configurations and presenting information and recommendations to the
38 Board on possible sustainable harvest unit boundaries.
39

40 In Western Washington, 20 sustainable harvest units are primarily trust-based with the
41 exception of Capitol Forest and the Olympic Experimental State Forest. In Western
42 Washington, 17 of the sustainable harvest units are comprised of State Forest Transfer
43 Lands within each county and one large sustainable harvest unit in Western Washington.
44 Mr. Schmal outlined how trust land acreage and locations differ between Eastern and
45 Western Washington. A majority of trust lands in Eastern Washington are federally
46 granted. A concentration of State Forest Transfer Lands exists in Klickitat County of
47 approximately 19,260 acres. Staff plans to complete sensitivity analysis to determine
48 different sustainable harvest unit configurations for review by the Board later in the year.

1
2 Mr. Schmal reviewed forest practice requirements. In 1974, the Legislature passed the
3 Forest Practices Act regulating activities for growing and harvesting timber on all non-
4 federal and non-tribal lands including forested state trust lands. The Forest Practices
5 Board adopts Forest Practices Rules and implements the Act. He highlighted several
6 areas where Forest Practice Rules are directly represented within the Eastern Washington
7 model that include riparian buffer widths and harvest restrictions, wetland buffer widths,
8 reforestation requirements, and Bull trout protection.
9

10 Dr. Brown inquired as to whether the presence of many intermittent streams in Eastern
11 Washington has been considered in the update of the stream layer. Mr. Schmal affirmed
12 the presence of many Type 5 streams with intermittent flows. Forest Practice Rules
13 require an equivalent limitation on those streams but they are not necessarily buffered
14 during a timber sale; however the remote sense layer for streams is complex and is based
15 on topography and basin size and it also models those areas of streams regardless of the
16 occurrence of stream flow. The Rules require equipment limitations on non-seasonal
17 streams rather than buffers.
18

19 The HCP is a voluntary agreement with the U.S. Fish Wildlife Service and the National
20 Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration to comply with the Federal Endangered Species
21 Act. HCPs provide conservation strategies to minimize and mitigate impacts to listed
22 species. Incidental take permits are issued for approved HCPs covering permitted forest
23 activities in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The HCP signed in 1997 is
24 effective for 70 years with options to extend. The HCP provides the Northern spotted
25 owl, Marbled murrelet, riparian and other multi-species conservation strategies for all
26 lands west of the Cascade crest; however, in Eastern Washington, the HCP only covers
27 portions along the Cascade crest in the range of the Northern spotted owl and provides a
28 conservation strategy for the species. The majority of Eastern Washington trust lands
29 reside outside HCP protected areas. In that circumstance, DNR follows Forest Practice
30 Rules including those for riparian and wetland areas.
31

32 Mr. Schmal outlined the requirements of the HCP to protect Northern spotted owls. In
33 2004, the only amendment to the HCP was for the Klickitat HCP Planning Unit often
34 referred to as HCP Amendment #1 or the Klickitat Amendment. The administrative
35 change to Northern spotted owl habitat management in the Klickitat Planning Unit was
36 developed through a collaborative process with state, federal, tribal, and private
37 organizations specifically to address forest health concerns since the original plan often
38 promoted overly dense stocking of certain types of stands. The amendment also sought
39 to increase the quality of habitat that contributes to the conservation of and objectives for
40 the Northern spotted owl. It was implemented by shifting nesting, roosting, and forage
41 management areas away from stands that were not conducive to sustaining or maintaining
42 that habitat and shifting to areas capable of supporting habitat. Non-suitable for habitat
43 are considered desired future condition areas within the Klickitat HCP Planning Unit.
44

45 The three Habitat Conservation Planning Units in Eastern Washington for the Northern
46 spotted owl include Klickitat HCP Planning Unit, Yakima HCP Planning Unit, and Lake
47 Chelan HCP Planning Unit comprised of approximately 117,000 acres of forested state
48 trust lands managed for Northern spotted owls in Eastern Washington.

1
2 The Loomis State Forest is 134,000 acres of DNR managed land located in north central
3 Washington. The forest is the largest contiguous block of state trust lands in the state and
4 one of the most constrained because of the Loomis Landscape Plan and the Lynx Habitat
5 Management Plan. Mr. Schmal described the purpose of the plans, which address
6 specific conditions unique to the landscape. Constraints of the Loomis Landscape Plan
7 include increased leave tree retention of 13 trees per acre, larger riparian buffer widths
8 with an increase in tree retention of 18 trees per acre, and implementation of the decadal
9 harvest acreage limit. The Lynx Habitat Management Plan impacts forest management
10 of large blocks of state trust lands in the northeast region. The Plan institutes
11 conservation measures to provide and improve habitat for the Canada lynx. The plan was
12 developed separately from the HCP and after the federal listing of the species. Mr.
13 Schmal described protection components of the Lynx Habitat Management Plan.
14

15 New policy ideas are related to recent planning documents to align the model with the
16 Plan for Climate Resilience, the 20 Year Forest Health Strategic Plan, and the Forest
17 Health Treatment Prioritization and Implementation Plan for state trust lands in Eastern
18 Washington.
19

20 New policy considerations could include:
21

22 Forest resiliency:

- 23 • Tracking forest resiliency with a metric
- 24 • The metric could be set as an explicit goal in the model
- 25 • Stand density index versus maximum stand density index

26 Forest Health Treatments:

- 27 • Harvest in high priority landscapes where model harvest acreage does not align
28 with strategic plan targets

29 Climate Change:

- 30 • Model changes to harvest intensity and species composition
- 31 • Climate change impacts could be incorporated within the model through
32 vegetation ecotype shifts over time
- 33 • Those shifts could impact the type of harvest activities and subsequent planning
34 activities and other silviculture
- 35 • Ecotype shifts would be a new strategy for explicitly incorporating climate
36 changes into the model

37 Mr. Emmons reviewed the timeline for the project. Next steps include providing
38 background on the forest estate model framework for Eastern Washington, an overview
39 of incorporating climate impacts into the Eastern WA model, technical updates as
40 required under Resolution 1591, and feedback received from third party and Technical
41 Advisory Committee reviews. The schedule calls for adoption of the Final
42 Environmental Impact Statement and Board decision towards the end of June 2025.
43

1 Vice Chair Brown commented that the next phase involving the generation of new yields
2 could presumably involve a forestry state modeling effort, incorporation of forest
3 resiliency metrics, and some economic objectives, as well as other objectives. He asked
4 about those other objectives and whether there would be any alternative management
5 strategies for consideration.
6

7 Kate McBurney, Assistant Division Manager, Forest Resources Division, reported the
8 team is working on SHC modeling. The yields pertain specifically to the growth and
9 yield elements and projecting the growth of inventory into the future. Harvesting is
10 modeled within the yields. The policies on economics and other factors are integrated in
11 the yield but lack clean separation as they are addressed specifically in the forest estate
12 model. It would be possible to identify a specific objective for forest resiliency goals, as
13 the information would be in the forest estate model yields that could be tracked over time.
14 Other details included within the yield include the harvests, types of treatment, and leave
15 tree retention.
16

17 Mr. Cahill asked about the inclusion of wildfire within the modeling and whether the
18 state's plan to reduce wildfires and protect communities has been factored within the
19 scope for modeling. Ms. McBurney responded that the issue tends to be complicated
20 other than the team has addressed potential ways to address wildfire in the future in terms
21 of when and where it might occur. The team plans to work closely with forest resiliency
22 scientists within the division to develop a good strategy for predicting future fire
23 locations. It likely would not be possible to complete those efforts within the current
24 timeframe because the process is labor intensive and requires time to complete. The
25 intent is producing a good model of current actions on the land base, as well as including
26 more integrated forestry resilience goals that could be modeled over time to assist in
27 reducing density of stands to help address wildfire risks.
28

29 Mr. Cahill acknowledged the difficulty of preventing wildfires on a large landscape. His
30 ideas centered on whether firebreaks around communities on DNR land have been
31 considered or serve as another area for harvest to help reduce risks around some
32 communities.
33

34 Commissioner Janicki offered that climate change would be worthy of either a lighting
35 talk or an in-depth presentation on how the modeling will incorporate climate change, as
36 well as forest health treatments. Another request is more information on the status of
37 arrearage for the current Western Washington SHC. Mr. Emmons said staff plans to
38 schedule more in-depth information briefings on climate adaptation as well as work
39 occurring by staff at the Webster Nursery in terms of how different seed stock is included
40 in yields and models to account for changes in the climate.
41

42 Vice Chair Brown commented on the discussion of the forest health revolving fund that
43 spoke to how much of the work completed has not been profitable. He asked to what
44 degree economic objectives become either less prioritized in Eastern Washington or
45 become a question of reducing costs rather than increasing revenue with the ultimate
46 objective of increasing resiliency.
47


1 Mr. Emmons agreed that the economics are different because of how the agency is
2 funded for the eastside versus the westside of the state. The revolving fund enables the
3 agency to pursue more treatments to position forests for future benefits. The
4 conversations are different as the costs and revenue feeding the model are different for
5 both sides of the state. As previously discussed, net present value will continue to be the
6 overall objective in the modeling with consideration of different objectives to provide
7 balance for all objectives.


8
9 Mr. Emmons added that the Board will continue to receive more background information
10 on the forest estate model framework for Eastern Washington, an overview of climate
11 considerations, and technical updates.


12
13 **ADJOURNMENT**

14 With there being no further business, Vice Chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 11:51
15 a.m.
16
17

Approved this 7 day of March, 2023


Hilary S. Franz, Washington State Commissioner of Public Lands


Jim Cahill, Designee for Governor Jay Inslee


Chris Reykdal, Superintendent of Public Instruction


Lisa Janicki, Commissioner, Skagit County

approved via webinar
Dr. Wendy Powers, Dean, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences,
Washington State University


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

Attest:

Tami Kellogg, Board Coordinator

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net