
Minutes
Board of Natural Resources Meeting
March 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 9:01 a.m.

Board members 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.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – January 17, 2023 and February 7, 2023

Chair Franz requested a motion to approve the minutes of January 17, 2023 and February 7, 2023.

MOTION: Superintendent Reykdal moved to approve the minutes as published.

SECOND: Dr. Brown seconded the motion.

ACTION: The motion carried unanimously.

LIGHTNING TALK - Information

Land Bank

Robin Hammill, Assistant Division Manager, Strategic Planning Section, DNR Uplands
Ms. Hammill reviewed the Department's land transactions through a variety of programs, such as direct transfer of state trust land to a governmental entity, re-conveyance of state forestland to counties, exchange of land, selling property at auction, or purchasing property.

1 Prior to 1977, proceeds from the sale of all trust lands were deposited into the permanent fund.
2 The Legislature created the "Land Bank" to maintain and enhance the trust asset base through
3 replacement land purchases as a buy first process. Initially intended to replace resource lands,
4 the act was amended in 1984 to include replacement lands with the potential of generating
5 revenue. The land bank is a tool created to maintain the trust land base and serves as a holding
6 area for purchased properties to become trust land and former trust land to be auctioned. The
7 land bank has both a land and cash component. DNR identifies trust property to sell and
8 conducts a public hearing on the proposed exchange of land bank land with an equal value of
9 trust land. DNR exchanges the land bank purchased property with the equal value of trust
10 property and sells former land bank land (former trust land) during a public auction. Ms.
11 Hammill reviewed the Board's approval process for land bank transactions.

12 13 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

14 **Thomasina Cooper, speaking on behalf of Thurston County Commissioner Tye Menser,**
15 read a letter from the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners regarding the
16 Hopscotch and Buttercup timber sales in Thurston County. Although approved by the Board,
17 both sales contain species of rapidly dwindling legacy forests of structurally complex and
18 biodiverse forest patches predating World War II and the rise of plantation forestry in
19 Washington. The Thurston County Board of County Commissioners has asked the Department
20 on multiple occasions to either postpone the sale of the county's 3,100 acres of unprotected
21 legacy forests or include them within Phase 2 of the new carbon project. Those requests have
22 not been honored. Meanwhile, another Thurston County timber sale is planned for approval
23 containing legacy forest acres in Juneau units 1 and 2. The State Legislature is working on two
24 programs to provide a path for Thurston County to protect the last remnants of legacy forests.
25 One proposal is the Transfer Land Trust Program (TLT), which might allow Thurston County to
26 apply to swap land to protect legacy forest parcels. The second proposal uses funding from the
27 Natural Climate Solutions Account as part of the Climate Commitment Act to protect carbon
28 dense older forests at risk of harvesting in the near-term. Either avenue may provide long-term
29 solutions for Thurston County; however, based on currently scheduled sales, the delay to enact
30 new laws could result in the logging of a large number of older trees. The Thurston County
31 Board of County Commissioners requests the suspension of the Juneau timber sale until such
32 time Thurston County can act with new tools from the 2023 legislative session. The Department
33 should also defer any other sales containing legacy forests and work collaboratively with
34 Thurston County to identify alternatives.

35
36 **Esther Kronenberg, Olympia,** supported Thurston County Commissioners, Superintendent
37 Reykdal, and an overwhelming number of residents in opposition to the destruction of
38 remaining legacy forests. Approximately 100 years ago, Capitol Forest was logged and
39 regenerated as a legacy forest. Today, it is considered old growth by DNR standards. At the
40 time of logging, loggers did not know science as it exists today and how vital forests are for
41 clean air, water, and habitat for animals and humans. David Milarch, founder of the Archangel
42 Ancient Tree Archive, has been cloning ancient trees, which contain genetic memory of
43 surviving droughts and fires for thousands of years. He commented on the global devastation of
44 forests around the world and the real tragedy because the genetics of trees were never studied to
45 see what key role they play in environmental issues. Today, it is known how critical trees are
46 when considering the planet has been largely deforested. It would appear new science would
47 offset greed, but that has not occurred. Instead, trees continue to be logged and old growth trees
48 continue to be cut down across the world. The continued logging of the remaining trees is done

1 with the full knowledge of a devastating legacy of destruction that everyone's grandchildren
2 will curse when they live in the wreckage that has been sanctioned today. She urged the Board
3 to leave a living legacy by not cutting down forests.
4

5 **Matt Comisky, American Forest Resource Council**, representing a majority of purchasers of
6 DNR timber from state trust lands, thanked staff for continuing to offer Habitat Conservation
7 Plan (HCP) compliant timber sales as it has been an ongoing challenge. Staff is working hard
8 within a short timeframe to make up the losses in the decadal target. Recent studies of forest
9 inventory data reveal working forests store an average of 4.92 tons of CO2 per year.
10 Unmanaged U.S. Forest Service forests store approximately 2.88 tons of CO2 per year. When
11 factoring mortality from insects, disease, and fire working forests lose approximately 14% of
12 their annual growth while federal forests lose 71% of their annual growth. Growth and carbon
13 storage in wood products from public land is approximately 49% versus 4% from federal lands.
14 The state's annual harvest is sufficient to build 350,000 homes each year.
15

16 **Ed Bowen, Clallam County**, supported the proposed Lost Mountain land exchange. The public
17 process in Clallam County was effective although it was necessary to participate to understand
18 the benefits the exchange will offer to all parties. He asked for consideration to include the
19 identification of operable acres within the update of the Sustainable Harvest Calculation. At the
20 last meeting, he addressed that need despite the presentation lacking information on actual
21 operable acres. The Board should address policy on the TLT Program as he is amazed at how
22 the proposal proceeds with the agency treating the program as a procedure rather than as an
23 established policy or as dictated by the governing RCW. His concern surrounds the loss of
24 revenue to junior taxing districts as they are viewed as a stakeholder rather than as a beneficiary
25 and an active participant.
26

27 **Rod Fleck, City of Forks**, asked for clarification of terminology surrounding "acres conserved
28 and net acres harvested" within the proposed timber sales presentation. He asked for examples
29 to help the public have a better understanding of how the terminology is used. Previous requests
30 for not approving sales because it would result in the loss of the last remaining larger trees in
31 Washington are untrue. Within the state and in the Olympic Peninsula, the state has set aside
32 tens of thousands of acres of trees. DNR has set aside approximately half of its land base.
33 Additionally, larger trees nearing 55 years of age are not necessarily the massive old growth
34 trees proposed for harvesting. The Sustainable Harvest Calculation (SHC) allows for the harvest
35 of those trees, which generates revenues and jobs for fire departments, hospitals, and libraries.
36 The continued use of those terms and the outright use of sound bites should be a warning to the
37 Department as it appears to be applied as the basis for moving forests into the carbon project or
38 setting aside trees for aesthetics. The Department must maintain consistency of the SHC and
39 harvest trees while preserving many thousands of acres in the state.
40

41 **Doug Cooper, Hampton Lumber**, said Hampton Lumber operates sawmills in the
42 communities of Darrington, Morton, and Randall employing 500 employees who rely on a
43 stable and local timber supply. He recognized DNR Product Sales and Marketing staff for the
44 consistent reporting to the Board on the status of timber sales volume. As a purchaser of state
45 timber, Hampton is frustrated by the lack of success in achieving the plan and approved volume
46 targets. The Board should ask how the Department plans to achieve selling of 170 mmbf of
47 timber in the fourth quarter. The Board should direct staff to correct the issues that are
48 producing results below expectations. Hampton Lumber is an active and successful purchaser of

1 DNR and U.S. Forest Service timber sales offered on the eastside of the Cascade mountain
2 range. Too often, there are claims for new milling infrastructure necessary to support forest
3 health and resilience projects and that the region suffers from the lack of competition. A review
4 of timber sales on DNR's website for the Northeast Region for the last three years reflects only
5 one sale as a no-bid sale. Stumpage values will be lower due to the attributes of the sale, such as
6 reduced volume per acre or piece size as compared to the westside. He encouraged the Board to
7 support efforts to continue to utilize contract timber sales to accomplish forest health and
8 resiliency projects in Eastern Washington.
9

10 **Robert Mitchell** responded to several comments offered at the last meeting by acknowledging
11 that it is understood wood products do not appear by magic as the concern surrounds too much
12 violent destruction of public property. Many children understand the disconnect by viewing the
13 logging industry acting in its own budgetary interest to seek more supply to depress bids.
14 Timber lobbyists should be congratulated for amending the DNR ecosystem services bills.
15 Environmentalists who supported the original bill should realize that unless the SHC is reduced,
16 the ecosystem services bill would not permit reduction of timber auctions. Timber auctions have
17 been recognized as a significant source of revenue for DNR; however, the continued reliance on
18 this model is unsustainable both ecologically and financially. The current system of timber
19 auctions often leads to over harvesting, which has a negative impact on the environment and
20 creates a lack of predictability and stability in revenue generation. DNR should shift its focus by
21 exploring alternative revenue sources, such as carbon credits, payments for ecosystem services,
22 and a land endowment fund. Those revenue sources would provide DNR with a more stable,
23 diversified, and an environmentally conscious revenue stream. By pursuing alternative revenue
24 sources, DNR could create new opportunities for growth while minimizing the impact on the
25 environment. The Board should vote against the proposed timber auctions.
26

27 **Paul Butler, Thurston County**, referred to a discussion during the February meeting on the
28 average age of timber sales. Staff indicated the average age includes all trees within a sale both
29 harvested and leave trees. Dr. Brown asked whether older trees were likely to be leave trees
30 whereupon staff confirmed that assumption. While it may be true, leave tree areas are such a
31 small percentage of a sale significant stands of older forest are not protected by that approach.
32 One example is the Hopscotch sale. Unit 1 included 20% of older forest while Unit 2 contained
33 65% older forest. The Board questioned the extent of difficulty to break out the average age of
34 harvested timber versus the average age of the unit. Staff affirmed the difficulty as each tree
35 would need to be assessed for age. The important question is the percentage of older forests in
36 the timber sale. That amount should be reported prior to each timber auction. DNR has data on
37 stand age and its associated area based on Lidar images and sample coring previously
38 completed. Examples of those compilations can be found in older forests presentations to the
39 Board in May, June, and December 2021 and January 2022. DNR is seeking legislative support
40 to enable the sale of carbon credits, which he and other citizens support. He questioned the need
41 to log stands best suited for storing carbon. The Thurston County Board of County
42 Commissioners understand the value of protecting legacy forests. The Board should respect
43 those wishes.
44

45 **Miguel Perez-Gibson, Washington Conservation Action**, referred to the Chair Report on the
46 Eastside Sustainable Harvest Calculation covering policy objectives and modeling. The Board
47 should consider anticipated climate change effects on forests and the ability to withstand
48 drought, insect infestations, and species phenology, which will determine sustainability of the

1 forests in the next 100 years. The Policy for Sustainable Forests requires DNR to protect trust
2 assets from catastrophic loss from wildfire, wind, insects, and disease. DNR must guard against
3 catastrophic loss over the next century because of climate change. The westside calculation
4 must consider the same risks. DNR cannot continue to harvest state land by largely clearcutting
5 forests with minimal retention because it is not prudent. Forests established prior to climate
6 change must be carefully stewarded. According to the Policy for Sustainable Forests,
7 sustainable management must consider the next 100 years. Modeling for the SHC speaks to the
8 type of modeling program DNR is using. The Board has directed the Department to use multi-
9 objective optimization tools to explore additional objectives, such as stored carbon, watershed
10 protection, and attributes of wildlife habitat. Alternative harvest techniques that include varying
11 levels of tree retention and alternative thinning regimes should be considered. Although eastside
12 forests represent a small percentage of the overall timber volume in the SHC, it is essential (to
13 protect) the general ecology of Eastern Washington. As the Governor has stated, failing to plan
14 for climate change would be planning to fail.

15
16 **Ed Martin, Western Forest Products (WFP)**, reported the company owns a saw mill and
17 engineered wood facility in Clark County. The company produces green energy wood crossarm
18 products and is unable to meet market demand because of log supply shortages. Solar, wind,
19 and biomass projects across the state and the nation are rapidly increasing the amount of wood
20 needed to transmit electrical energy from renewable sources. Renewable energy dovetails
21 perfectly with trees, another renewable product. To make the product, the company needs
22 timber 80 years or older. Access to that type of timber on the working forests of DNR land is
23 critical. The withholding and inconsistent offerings of timber sales that meet the age criteria
24 from trust lands over the last two years has crippled WFP and its customers. WFP wants to
25 support the explosive market. People in Washington want green energy using renewables in
26 each step of the process. Trust beneficiaries want the increased revenue that is returned to them
27 from green energy projects in the form of premium stumpage values that are paid for quality
28 timber. Simply put, people want American made renewable products. Do not let the myopia
29 comments from those that prefer and use wood each day result in wood coming from a distant
30 country with sketchy environmental practices. DNR trust land has the most robust HCP in the
31 nation. He urged the Board to support a win-win for the environment, trust land, beneficiaries,
32 communities, and the nation by ensuring the full spectrum of timber is brought forward as
33 timber sales.

34
35 **Daniel Harm** said he lives in Whatcom near the middle fork of the Nooksack River. A short
36 hike away is an old growth grove with dozens of Doug fir trees multiple centuries old. He
37 recently discovered a Doug fir tree with its lowest branch over three feet in diameter. The grove
38 is located in the upper Rutsatz. A short drive away is Brokedown Palace, an exquisite forest
39 close to the heart of a living river ecosystem. He likes to explore timber roads and is struck with
40 how mind-blowingly impressive timber roads and timber operations are as they encompass a
41 feat of engineering, will, and force. With that impressiveness is terror at the scale of destruction
42 with roads cracking and disintegrating, sides of mountains crumbling into rivers, and a pace of
43 erosion that is violent and deadly to all sources of life. He questioned the outcome of the land if
44 it was managed for sustainability and measured in centuries as opposed to next quarters' profit
45 margin. In his view, it likely would require courage, patience, innovation, resourcefulness,
46 massive collaboration, and an awe-inspiring resiliency and determination of the human will.
47 There is the capacity to run timber operations more neatly with less hastiness and less cutting
48 corners with more reverence to the landscapes not siphoned for wealth and power. It is possible

1 to turn off the native older forests money-printing machine as conserving older forests is a risk-
2 off approach to long-term ecological resilience. He encouraged protecting the last remains of
3 older forests and summoning the will and innovation to manage commercial plantations more
4 ecologically.
5

6 **Lynn Fitz-Hugh** referred to her previous testimony attesting to DNR cutting 15,000 acres of
7 forestland in 2022 equating to greenhouse gas emissions of two times Thurston County's 2018
8 emissions. She had stated that it was not possible to continue that path and in response, Dr.
9 Brown had asked and was given confirmation that leave trees are the largest trees. By policy,
10 DNR leaves eight trees per acre, a precious few in a 95-acre parcel such as Juneau. It does not
11 mean that all large trees are saved. Logging ignores the question of what is forest and what is
12 plantation monocrop. Legacy forests regenerated and were able to do so because of existing
13 understory and diversity, as well as the ability of trees to communicate, share resources, and
14 respond to threats. During a logging operation, machines are used that destroy the understory
15 along with the use of herbicides to prevent regeneration. Those operations destroy the
16 possibility of regenerated forests that are resilient against disease, drought, and are needed as
17 the world heads into the ravages of climate change. A mother tree without its offspring is not a
18 forest. Thurston County Commissioners have asked the Board to protect Juneau, a legacy parcel
19 up for auction this month in the hope that the legislative session will provide other ways to save
20 legacy forests. Juneau holds 38,200 mega tons of stored carbon and draws down 574,000 mega
21 tons a year. As a matter of respecting self-governance and the right of beneficiaries to decide
22 what is in their own best interests, the Board should offer a motion removing Juneau from the
23 sales packet.
24

25 **Dr. Julie Ratner** invited everyone to take a breath and thank the trees and the fact that it is not
26 necessary to buy oxygen tanks to breathe. She asked the Board to stop selling legacy forests. It
27 is equally important DNR uses the carbon sequestration metric for all parcels to make climate
28 change central to its calculations. Public forests are among the state's greatest assets. Jerry
29 Franklin, a former ecologist at the University of Washington, stated that older trees help sustain
30 biodiversity and can absorb carbon for thousands of years if trees remain untouched. Existing
31 mature forests store up to 70% more carbon compared to logged land. A wildlife biologist has
32 indicated that part of the triffecta is protecting rare stands of older trees to maximize carbon
33 storage capacity. It is important for the Board to listen to the experts from DNR, University of
34 Washington, and the U.S. Forest Service and manage the precious lands with future generations
35 in mind. Listen to one of the kindergarteners who sent the Board drawings and letters asking for
36 the protection of trees. One student said she wants to save old growth forests because people
37 need nature to live. The Board should commit to achieving the state's climate goals by
38 removing all legacy forests auctions.
39

40 **Erin Greenlee** commented that everyone is from a different background, with different hopes,
41 and different interests to protect. However, everyone shares the same planet, a planet
42 increasingly imperiled. Arguments for cutting legacy forests and the money and jobs it provides
43 to local communities are real concerns by real people. She understands those concerns, but
44 questions the cost of ever-increasing climate disasters, the cost of fighting forest fires, and
45 longer fire seasons. Cleaning up and rebuilding after more intense floods, drought, and storms
46 to say nothing of the costs to health and life is often overlooked when speaking to the cost of
47 jobs and the economy. If the environment is no longer capable of supporting life, jobs and the
48 economy no longer matter. Trees and legacy forests have enormous powers of carbon storage

1 and drawdown. The value of forests left standing is far greater than as timber. She joins with
2 Thurston County Commissioners to pull Juneau from auction and to place a moratorium on
3 logging of all legacy forests on state land.
4

5 **Jessica Randall, Jefferson County**, thanked DNR for the swift response to the notification of
6 leave trees harvested during the Pennywise timber sales two months ago. More information will
7 be available following the post-cut compliance review. She spoke to the Chinese philosophy of
8 *Li*, the natural order of things. When Westerners consider natural order, it is straight lines, right
9 angles, hierarchy, or even nature following the laws based on contemporary scientific principles.
10 The idea of *Li* refers to patterns of nature such as the shapes of clouds or mountains. The supposed
11 randomness is not random because there is a certain natural wisdom at play; something that is
12 beyond our complete understanding. It is also known that interference with the natural
13 arrangement of stars into rows and columns would likely destroy the Universe. That is how she
14 feels about the forest as it is being rearranged into rows and columns. She is watching the
15 destruction of the natural world, the diminishment of local species, contamination of water,
16 depletion of soils, and the changing climate. Science is always a step or two behind *Li*. It could
17 be argued about what is known, but it is also important to admit that there is much unknown about
18 the natural order of things. She asked members to consider this as they decide which place to cut
19 and which place to save.
20

21 **Brel Froebe, Whatcom County**, thanked the Thurston County Board of County
22 Commissioners for sending a letter to DNR requesting removal of the Juneau timber sale. The
23 Juneau unit represents 39% of state forest purchased land with Thurston County receiving
24 approximately 50% of the revenue from the timber sale. The Board should listen to the trust
25 beneficiary. When Commissioner Janicki was elected to the Board by the Washington State
26 Association of Counties (WSAC), Commissioner Janicki spoke to the importance of
27 representing the diverse needs of different counties. One county has explicitly requested
28 removal of the Juneau timber sale. When asked about scenarios where a trust beneficiary
29 requests a moratorium, Commissioner Franz has responded on more than one occasion that the
30 trust beneficiary decides on the outcome. He asked the Board to respect the wishes of the trust
31 beneficiary and not approve the Juneau timber sale or any other pre-1945 timber sale.
32

33 **Charlotte Persons, Olympia**, urged the Board to offer a motion to remove the Juneau parcels
34 from the proposed sales packet. The Board should honor the request of the Thurston County
35 Board of County Commissioners to postpone the Juneau sale until a program and funds can be
36 identified to protect legacy forests in Thurston County. Commissioner Franz recently expressed
37 her wish to work with county officials to manage timber on state trust lands. Please respect her
38 desires and make this coordinated action with Thurston County a possibility. County
39 Commissioners recognize the value to the county of naturally regenerated legacy forests.
40 Legacy forests with more complex structure and understory have a stronger resistance to
41 drought and disease and older trees drawdown more carbon than smaller trees.
42

43 **Beverly Parsons, Hansville, Kitsap County**, acknowledged the pressure the Board is under
44 from the timber industry to lead people to believe the only way trust beneficiaries can receive a
45 return on the their lands is through harvests. Do not be misled, as there are many other ways to
46 approach the well-being of rural and other communities. The Board should not approve the
47 Juneau sale and listen to the wishes of the trust beneficiaries. Such sales allow a version of
48 forests to survive but it does not support a forest to thrive. The action is within the power and

1 responsibility of the Board. Older forests often are essential for thriving and not merely
2 surviving. By protecting the few remaining legacy forests, the Board helps everyone to thrive.
3 Caring relationships between humans and nature generated and regenerated legacy forests for
4 centuries before European settlers dominated the land. The Board should pause and halt the
5 careering train of destruction and disrespectful practices toward forests.

6
7 **Barbara Carey** advocated for the future by asking the Board to defer logging the few
8 remaining non-plantation forests in Washington. Win-win solutions that would trade mature
9 forest areas already primed for timber harvest are a real possibility. Unless the Board
10 discontinues the cutting of remnant old forests today, none will be left to preserve. The diverse
11 forests are carbon sequestering better than any engineered system. Her adult children wonder
12 what kind of future if any, they can hope for, when their home state sacrifices the last giant
13 healthy trees forever for money that could have come from other sources. Please consider the
14 climate chaos that could have been lessened if more of the old forest was saved. The Board has
15 a voice and tremendous influence to resolve the conflict so that the last bastions of the state's
16 natural forests are preserved and local communities and the timber industry are not harmed.

17
18 **Teresa Jennings, Thurston County**, cited her grandchildren's awareness of the climate
19 changing with a generalized warming trend creating a hotter future for them. It is also readily
20 apparent to many that the temperature forests of the Pacific Northwest and those with stands of
21 significantly older trees are an important tool that could be used to mitigate climate change.
22 What is extremely difficult to understand is the Board not taking every opportunity to mitigate
23 the problem by preserving stands of trees, such as Buttercup, Hopscotch, and Juneau. The
24 biodiverse legacy forests in Thurston County are currently under threat of clearcutting. It is hard
25 to look in the eyes of young people and see the cynicism that is growing and to see their
26 increasingly lack of faith in government to make appropriate responses on behalf of their future.
27 The Board should amend the current proposed sale by excluding the Juneau timber sale and
28 revisit the sales of Buttercup and Hopscotch.

29
30 **Sarah Gardam, Whatcom County**, asked for the pause of sales as mentioned by other
31 speakers.

32
33 **Lee First** reported she is a resident of Rochester in Thurston County. She referred to the recent
34 McCannon timber sale located in the Chehalis River headwaters. The Chehalis Basin has a long
35 history of catastrophic floods. In 2016, the Office of the Chehalis Basin was created to address
36 the issues of flooding and salmon. She attended the monthly meetings and assisted in promoting
37 local actions for alternatives against building a dam. Habitat restoration and floodplain
38 restoration are important to prevent flooding and save salmon in the basin. Kevin Hanson, a
39 Thurston County hydrologist, indicated that if large old trees were retained in the headwaters,
40 they would have held water similar to that of a dam. She understands the McCannon sales did
41 not meet the definition of old growth; however, the trees are over 100 years old and comprise a
42 structurally dense and diverse legacy forest. Logging the forest would impact flooding in the
43 basin and reduce the amount of cold water available for salmon during hotter months. Both the
44 federal and state draft Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) report that the construction of a
45 dam would decrease salmon population by 80% and impact the ongoing recovery effort to save
46 the southern Orca population. Actions by the Board could help prevent flooding in the basin and
47 could mean the difference between saving salmon in the basin versus not having salmon. She

1 understands the Board has elected to withdraw a sale after approving a sale and is hopeful the
2 Board will take similar action for the McCannon timber sale.

3
4 **Jim Oliver** urged the Board not to approve the Juneau timber sale. Unit 3 of the sale is less than
5 100 yards away from Mima Falls and less than a football field from one of the most popular
6 hiking trails in Thurston County for both visitors and local residents. At first, he found it
7 difficult to believe that such clearcutting exists, especially so close to Mima Falls; however the
8 math does not lie. If logging proceeds as planned it will devastate one of the flagship ecological
9 areas in Thurston County. Long-term ecological research conducted across the region reveals
10 that tree plantations can reduce summer stream flows in smaller basins, such as Thurston
11 County, by as much 50% when compared to watersheds with mature forests. Those reductions
12 in stream flows persist more than five decades and clearcuts in the watershed today will
13 contribute to water shortages well into the latter half of this century. Clearcutting mature forests
14 and milling trees into paper and wood products results in the rapid release of stored carbon.
15 Plantation trees replanted after logging eventually begin to sequester carbon but it requires
16 decades or centuries to regain all carbon released during logging and milling processes.
17 Scientists have learned young plantations are net carbon emitters for the first 10 to 20 years
18 following a clearcut. Many of the dominant trees in the proposed timber sale measure more than
19 four feet in diameter and are close to 200 feet tall. Because these forests were often selectively
20 logged in the early 1900s and allowed to regrow they are much more structurally and
21 biologically diverse. Only 77,000 acres remain of unprotected mature legacy forests on Western
22 Washington state lands. Once cut, the state loses an opportunity to regain old growth habitat
23 that has virtually disappeared in the region. He stands with Thurston County Commissioners in
24 urging the Board not to approve Juneau or any other timber sales in legacy forests.

25
26 **Peter Goldman Washington Forest Law Center**, spoke on behalf of the Center for
27 Responsible Forestry. He urged the Board and DNR to work towards a just and fair process in
28 pending court litigation over how DNR designates and protects approximately 80,000 acres of
29 remaining old forests. Within the last two years, citizens opposing the logging of very old
30 forests have filed multiple appeals of timber sales in multiple counties. The appellants asked the
31 court to find that DNR was not following its HCP and subsequently adopted policies governing
32 the designation and achievement of 10% to 15% of fully functional structurally complex old
33 forests in each planning area. For over a year, the parties worked collaboratively with DNR
34 legal counsel and subsequently voluntarily withdrew several of the appeals so the issue could be
35 efficiently and orderly litigated in one county. Oral arguments before Division 2 of the Court of
36 Appeals was scheduled on March 14, 2023; however, a timber company, Murphy Company of
37 Oregon moved to dismiss the case as moot as the trees had been logged. That tactic would
38 deprive the Center, DNR, and the public the right to know the answer to the legal question.
39 DNR and the Board must now decide with its counsel whether to agree with the timber
40 company or ask the court to consider the case and let the issue be decided. Justice and fairness
41 demand that DNR not agree with the unjust dismissal motion and not capitalize on the
42 unfortunate reality that the wheels of justice often turn slower than the chain of a saw.

43
44 **Joshua Wright, member of Mason County Climate Justice**, remarked that while the state has
45 impressive old growth forests, the unfortunate reality is the area of old growth forests, which is
46 typically in mountainous areas of the state. In the Puget lower eco region, very few old growth
47 forests remain. The organization has requested DNR work in collaboration to identify other
48 options for the Sure Wood timber sale, which would clearcut the only remaining legacy forest in

1 eastern Mason County and prohibit the opportunity for the forest to regenerate old growth
2 forests in that ecosystem. He supported previous speakers requesting preservation of the Juneau
3 forest. He is hopeful both parties can work together to identify a better solution than logging the
4 area, which represents one of few opportunities to regenerating old growth forests in Mason
5 County.
6

7 **Mary Jean Ryan, Jefferson County**, thanked staff for its work on revitalizing the TLT
8 Program. DNR's original legislative request was \$25 million from the capital budget to fund the
9 project list. She is hopeful that those in support will work jointly to ensure the program moves
10 forward. She acknowledged the work by DNR at Dabob Bay. At the well-attended public
11 hearing in Quilcene last week, attendees expressed overwhelming support for completing inter-
12 trust exchanges. She asked for a pause on the Juneau timber sale. The situation surrounding
13 Capitol Forest deserves attention and a new approach, as well as many other locations around
14 the state. She asked for scheduling a series of worksessions for stakeholders on the SHC.
15

16 **Alice Grendon, Thurston County**, reiterated her grief for the trees and for her own future and
17 future generations. She asked DNR not to sell mature, biodiverse, and complex forests in
18 Thurston County. Thurston County Commissioner requested protection of the forests as they
19 serve as a vital part of Thurston County's Climate Mitigation Plan and mitigation strategies.
20 The Washington State Supreme Court has ruled that it is possible to integrate many diverse
21 public benefits of forests into the management of state forestlands beyond maximizing revenue
22 generation from timber sales. Local officials have requested the preservation of mature forests
23 for the good of the public.
24

25 **Bill Turner, Sierra Pacific Industries**, said the company operates four sawmills and two
26 renewable energy plants in the state. DNR's timber sales program supports the mills. A
27 recommendation in the presentation on the Eastside SHC includes modeling of eco type shifts
28 and incorporates climate change impacts. He asked the Board to reject the modeling concept for
29 the SHC. Climate change is occurring; however, assuming what on-the-ground impacts would
30 be in a model is speculation, especially if the model is only used for the first decade. Modeling
31 the effects of climate change is guessing the impacts. However, longer growing seasons and
32 more summer rain could benefit forest growth while drought and heat could slow growth.
33 Should the Board elect to model climate change impacts, he recommended three scenarios of (1)
34 no action to serve as the control, (2) increased growth because of longer, warmer, and wetter
35 growing seasons, and (3) drier and slower growth to provide a range of alternatives. Choosing
36 one at this point is not advised.
37

38 *Chair Franz recessed the meeting from 10:15 a.m. to 10:44 a.m. for a break.*
39

40 **TIMBER SALES - Action**

41 **Auction Results for February 2023, and Proposed Timber Sales for April 2023**

42 **Duane Emmons, Assistant Deputy Supervisor, for State Uplands and Joe Koontz,**
43 **Assistant Division Manager of Timber Sales, Product Sales & Leasing Division**

44 Mr. Emmons advised of the removal of the proposed Juneau timber sale from the packet of
45 sales following comments raised by the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners.
46 Delaying approval of the sale enables staff to discuss sale details including information on the
47 Forest Board Purchase and Repayment Trusts 02 and 42.
48

1 Commissioner Janicki expressed appreciation for pausing the sale and the opportunity to learn
2 more about the specific trusts.

3
4 Chair Franz advised of a planned meeting with one Thurston County Commissioner.

5
6 Mr. Koontz presented the results of February sales. The Department offered 10 sales totaling
7 46.5 mmbf. Nine sales were sold totaling \$16.8 million for an average of \$379 per mbf. One
8 unsold sale was a contract harvest sale of unsold sorts re-offered and sold on March 1, 2023.
9 Results of that sale will be reported as part of the March results. The market continues to
10 improve, with auctions generating an average of 3.3 bidders per sale. Mr. Koontz invited
11 questions. The Board offered no comments.

12
13 Mr. Koontz reviewed the status of Fiscal Year 23 planned volume. The graph reflects current
14 plan for auction volume, forecasted volumes for the remainder of the year, sold volume, and
15 timber sales reoffered. The Agency has only offered two of the three months of sales in the
16 Quarter 3 update, which speaks to the difference between the plan and sold volume. The
17 projected volume for Western Washington is 442 mmbf and for the Eastside, the Department
18 anticipates 63 mmbf harvested by the end of the year. One contributing factor affecting timber
19 sales is the late winter affecting how staff prepares timber sales for final evaluation by the
20 Forest Practices.

21
22 Mr. Koontz invited questions on the fiscal year update.

23
24 Dr. Brown asked whether the current plan for Quarter 4 is higher than the planned volume to
25 make up for arrearage. Mr. Koontz explained that one bar within the graph represents planned
26 volume and the other bar represents sales moving forward because of delays.

27
28 Chair Franz emphasized reasons for the delay in sales because of staffing, weather, or litigation.

29
30 Commissioner Janicki recommended including the forecast for the next four quarters as a
31 snapshot of the level of planned versus sales volume to address the cumulative arrearage for the
32 decade. Mr. Koontz acknowledged the request.

33
34 Mr. Koontz presented eight proposed sales totaling approximately 30 mmbf with an estimated
35 value of \$13.5 million. Three sales are located in the Pacific Cascade Region with one sale each
36 in the Northwest, South Puget Sound, and Northeast Regions, and two sales in the Southeast
37 Region. Mr. Koontz reviewed the type of sales offered for auction. Staff prepared an additional
38 graph for sales in Western Washington. The six proposed sales in Western Washington total
39 1,200 gross acres. Approximately 30% of the acreage (352 acres) was conserved to protect
40 unstable slopes, cultural resources, riparian areas, wetlands, wetland management zones, and
41 leave tree areas. Net harvest acreage is 860 acres.

42
43 Dr. Brown inquired as to whether leave tree acres were separate from conserved acres. Mr.
44 Koontz explained that leave tree acres are reflected in the conserved acres.

45
46 Mr. Cahill asked about acreage discrepancy between the summary in the packet versus the
47 graph and whether acreage as reflected represents the total reviewed acres. Mr. Koontz replied

1 that the information within the packet reflects all sales statewide while the graph depicts only
2 sales in Western Washington. All acreage as reflected was reviewed.

3
4 Mr. Koontz reviewed a pie chart depicting the estimated revenue to be generated by trust.

5
6 With no further questions from the Board, Mr. Koontz requested the Board's approval of the
7 proposed April sales as presented.

8
9 MOTION: Dr. Brown moved to approve the proposed sales.

10
11 SECOND: Superintendent Reykdal seconded the motion.

12
13 Superintendent Reykdal conveyed appreciation for withdrawal of the Juneau sale because it is
14 timely to work closely with the county to ensure harvesting is tailored to meet the trust mandate
15 while considering benefits to the public and the environment.

16
17 Commissioner Janicki asked whether the 14% Forest Board Repayment is from the Juneau
18 timber sale. Mr. Koontz affirmed it would be from that sale. Commissioner Janicki asked that
19 future presentations include information on how repayments are handled when a timber sale has
20 been paused.

21
22 Chair Franz responded that the letter from Thurston County was received late last week and
23 speaks to some misunderstanding as to the trust that would benefit from the sale, as well as
24 specific units not matching. The Forest Board Repayment is a rare occurrence and it presents an
25 opportunity to learn about the trust. Staff plans to present more information at the next meeting.

26
27 Dr. Brown said the information on conserved acres was very helpful as it demonstrates how the
28 Department manages forests to account for riparian areas, steep slopes, older trees, and other
29 environmental issues.

30
31 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.

32
33 **LAND TRANSACTIONS - Action**

34 **Lost Mountain Land Exchanges, 86-102692, Resolution 1598**

35 **Bob Winslow, Transaction Project Manager, Conservation, Recreation and transactions**

36 Mr. Winslow presented a vicinity map of the Lost Mountain property located in Clallam
37 County. The proposal pertains to two parcels with one property transferred to the Gates family
38 and the second parcel transferred from the Gates family to the state. The parcel to the Gates
39 family totals 7 acres and is an exchange from State Forest Transfer Trust. The property includes
40 a small bench on the northern portion with the remainder having riparian features. The proposed
41 exchange and sale from Gates to the state is another 7-acre property comprised mostly of bench
42 with some timber. That parcel provides road access to state forestland to the north. The
43 transaction would consist of an exchange of State Forest 01 Trust with the purchase from the
44 Capitol Trust. Benefits of the exchange and purchase include securing legal road access to
45 adjacent state trust land, future timber revenue for trust beneficiaries, and enhancing the long-
46 term asset value of trust lands.

1 DNR conducted a public hearing in September 2022 with 10 attendees to include former Board
2 member Bill Peach. Questions addressed during the hearing focused on county road condition,
3 timber haul/Jake Brake noise, private road maintenance, reforestation species, gates and public
4 access, public use and abuse of property, and future revenue distribution from timber sales.
5

6 Both parcels were appraised. The Gates property was valued at \$68,400 and the state property
7 was valued at \$20,000 primarily because the property did not include many operable acres with
8 the Gates property containing more operable acres and legal road access. DNR proposes
9 exchanging the \$20,000 of State Forest Trust Land and paying \$48,000 cash from the RPRA-
10 Capitol Trust to acquire the entire Gates property. The proposed trust allocation would provide
11 2.05 acres valued at \$20,000 to State Forest Land Trust-01 and 4.95 acres valued at \$48,400 to
12 Capitol Trust-07.
13

14 Mr. Winslow invited questions on the proposed land exchange and purchase.
15

16 Commissioner Janicki commented on the number of isolated parcels the state owns. The
17 proposal affords access to many acres of state trust land.
18

19 MOTION: Commissioner Janicki moved to approve Resolution 1598
20

21 SECOND: Superintendent Reykdal seconded the motion.
22

23 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.
24

25 **RECORDING FEE INCREASE - Action**

26 **Pat Beehler, Chief Surveyor, Surveys and Maps Programs, Engineering Division**

27 Mr. Beehler presented the request for a recording fee increase for survey maps. The Public Land
28 Survey Office (PLSO), established in 1951, is responsible for preserving land survey records
29 that identify survey points describing common land boundaries and to maintain a system of
30 permanent reference to boundary monuments. The PLSO collects land boundary data, currently
31 more than half a million documents with many from corporations and individuals that were not
32 available to the public. The PLSO continues to collect pre-1973 property records, which are
33 considered "historical" but valuable in establishing new surveys.
34

35 The PLSO maintains an online database of statewide survey records from each county in the
36 state. The online resource is free to access. Funding for the program is from a dedicated account
37 established in 1982 by the Legislature. Survey fees are collected by county auditors and
38 forwarded to the State Treasurer and deposited to the dedicated account. Yearly revenue is
39 approximately \$840,000 with operating expenses of \$928,000. Staff monitors the account and
40 assesses future revenue needs.
41

42 Currently, the recording fee for a deed or an easement is \$203.50, which is considered a
43 surcharge in addition to the \$64 fee for survey maps. The county is also able to collect a fee on
44 the recording of a map. The fee is established by the Board of Natural Resources as required by
45 WAC 150.050 at the beginning of each biennium. The last increase was in 2015 from \$46 to
46 \$64.
47

1 Mr. Beehler reviewed the WAC amendment process, which included a public hearing on
2 January 11, 2023. One person, Gary Letzering, a surveyor, spoke in support of the proposal to
3 increase the fee. The proposal for consideration is to increase the fee from \$64 to \$100
4 effective July 1, 2023 and issue a permanent rule.
5

6 Superintendent Reykdal questioned whether the Board has the authority to include an inflation
7 factor to avoid a request each biennium. Mr. Beehler said staff discussed the possibility of an
8 inflation factor but prefers to consider changes equating to even dollars.
9

10 Chair Franz said another option is a percentage increase based on lapse of time to reduce the
11 amount of time to pursue the amendment process.
12

13 Dale Mix, Division Manager, Engineering Division Manager, advised that a review by staff of a
14 cost adjustment factor was deemed to be inconsistent with the RCW.
15

16 MOTION: Dr. Brown moved to adopt Resolution 1599, authorizing a recording fee
17 increase as presented.
18

19 SECOND: Superintendent Reykdal seconded the motion.
20

21 Mr. Cahill commented that following his review, he agrees a fee increase is necessary to avoid
22 any funding issues by the next biennium. He asked whether the Department plans to hire
23 additional staff to work through the backlog as additional funding would need to be approved
24 by the Legislature. Approval of the fee increase does not mean the Department can
25 automatically hire additional staff.
26

27 Mr. Beehler affirmed that the legislative appropriation of any additional funding would support
28 efforts to address numerous storage boxes of survey files.
29

30 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.
31

32 CHAIR REPORT

33 Model Overview and Eastern Washington Sustainable Harvest Calculation 34 Policy Feedback

35 Duane Emmons, Assistant Deputy Supervisor for State Uplands

36 Kate McBurney, Assistant Division Manager, Forest Resources Division

37 Mr. Emmons reported the briefing will include an overview of the modeling used to establish
38 the Eastern Washington Sustainable Harvest Calculation, as well as policy considerations for
39 incorporation within the SHC.
40

41 Ms. McBurney described the model designed for strategic forest planning generating long-term
42 forecasts of financial, ecological, and social outcomes based on selected courses of action.

43 Another definition is an optimization model designed to identify an optimal solution, such as
44 where, when, and how many forest management activities could be conducted while the
45 Department meets its fiduciary responsibilities and complies with state and federal laws.

46 Components of modeling provide a landscape level of forecasting actions, serves as a strategic-
47 level planning tool, and is designed to improve activities and outcomes across the landscape.

48 Strategic modeling is not designed for harvest unit planning. The distinction between the two

1 different types of models is planning time. The strategic model considers outcomes over 100
2 years for sustainable land management and financial returns.

3
4 The strategic model considers a spectrum of outcomes to produce a sustainable land plan and to
5 ensure the Department is a good land steward while also considering other objectives, such as
6 habitat protection, climate impacts, and forest health. The model is able to incorporate policies
7 by completing scenario analysis or alternatives.

8
9 Modeling is comprised of input and output data. Input data includes geographic and land
10 attributes utilizing inventory data (forest data, species, age of trees, and tree spacing. The result
11 is inputted into a growth and yield model to predict tree growth over 100 years depending upon
12 the type of management activity. Another input is policy and statutory requirements (actions
13 and constraints). Economic assumptions are included in terms of present day costs for timber
14 and management. Those assumptions and data form the basis for modeling. The optimization
15 model requires minimization or maximization of some incremental measure or criterion.

16
17 Following input of data, the model produces thousands of iterations and selects the alternative
18 that meets the objective function while accounting for all requirements and policies.

19
20 The objective function for the Sustainable Harvest Calculation is Net Present Value (NPV), a
21 financial term referring to the sum of both current and future cash flow or revenue minus cost.
22 Discounted cash flow reflects the 'time value' of money and accounts for preferences in the
23 timing of costs and revenue and desired return on investments. DNR's mandatory trust mandate
24 is intergenerational equity, which requires a long-term perspective on the discount rate.

25
26 Model constraints are necessary to meet different regulatory, policy, and procedural
27 requirements categorized by:

- 28
29 1. Hard constraints must be met in the model. Examples include the harvest flow constraint
30 with no deviation by more than 25% from decade to decade for target volumes
31 2. Soft constraints or goal such as Northern spotted owl habitat goals or Canada lynx habitat
32 goals in Eastern Washington

33 Modeling outcomes provides information on long-term sustainable production levels, forecasted
34 long-term value, and projection of future land conditions. The information is used to evaluate
35 different management strategies or alternatives.

36
37 Dr. Brown referred to resilience goals for forests and the potential negative returns in many of
38 the units in operation and how those goals could be in conflict, such as the goal to address
39 intergenerational equity in the form of more resilient forests that might be at a cost. It appears
40 modeling addresses resilience as a cost that could potentially drive more costs to the trusts. He
41 questioned whether it is possible to achieve a positive outcome on the Eastside within the
42 modeling, and the point where resilience becomes the primary goal rather than revenue. Ms.
43 McBurney explained that the model serves as a decision support tool. It is possible to input a
44 different resiliency goal to model different results.

1 Mr. Cahill said if the Board elects to include other constraints, such as climate or other factors,
2 the modeling would reflect those as costs. Ms. McBurney acknowledged that it could but it is
3 dependent on how the factors are included. Some constraints could be included within input
4 data. However, if entered as a constraint, it would result in a cost. Mr. Cahill surmised that the
5 modeling process entails working with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to determine
6 the appropriate place to add information to the model. However, the output will result in net
7 present value with the three outcomes of long-term sustainable production levels, forecasted
8 long-term value, and projection of future land conditions. Ms. McBurney agreed modeling is
9 complex. Staff is scheduled to review other modeling components that might clarify the
10 process. At this point, the framework is maximizing NPV, tracking different inputs, and
11 identifying where policies should be included while understanding the outputs as reports are
12 generated and reviewed with the TAC.

13
14 Superintendent Reykdal asked about extent of the model to accommodate market pricing and
15 whether the model interacts with some assumptions about the competitive price on less volume.
16 Ms. McBurney said she would follow up with the modelers for adjustments of price over time.
17 At this time, prices are fixed for specific types of logs. She is unsure as to whether the model is
18 capable of modeling changes over time.

19
20 Superintendent Reykdal inquired as to the model the Department uses for the SHC. Ms.
21 McBurney replied that the Department uses the REMSOFT model or Woodstock.
22 Superintendent Reykdal asked whether staff uses the same model for analytics. Ms. McBurney
23 said analytics are completed through several other modeling programs to include U.S. Forest
24 Service programs.

25
26 Mr. Cahill asked about timeliness of updates to the model by the U.S. Forest Service. Ms.
27 McBurney said the model is open source enabling staff to adjust and update to account for
28 changes.

29
30 Dr. Brown said one of the concerns for eastside forests is fire and other disturbances that might
31 affect growth and yield. He asked about the degree those influences are factored in the modeling
32 versus treating those factors as risks. Ms. McBurney explained that it has been a question
33 discussed with the TAC several times. At this time, no resolution has been identified; however,
34 staff continues to explore options because data are available on previous incidents and
35 disturbances. It would be difficult to predict the location of future fires. Staff is exploring ways
36 to address the issue. One possible avenue is working with the Department's Forest Resilience
37 Division as the division is compiling existing information that would be scientifically defensible
38 in 10 years for the next SHC.

39
40 Chair Franz said although the data available today is not as predictive as the work to be
41 completed by the resilience group for the next SHC, information is available through the
42 climate impact group and the work forecasting impacts the state is likely to experience because
43 of climate change in both Eastern and Western Washington. That information is available for
44 modeling even though it may not be deemed scientifically definitive at this time.

45
46 Ms. McBurney said staff is incorporating climate changes in the modeling by influencing
47 harvesting intensity in specific areas, such as areas of drought by limiting options. The
48 modeling addresses how forests will shift to potentially drier conditions. It is also possible to

1 introduce disturbances. Staff is working on how to incorporate those elements within the model
2 to ensure data can be explained.

3
4 Commissioner Janicki requested information on the composition of the Technical Advisory
5 Committee as it appears public engagement occurs later in the process, which may overlook
6 some people who may not be a member of the advisory group who should have an opportunity
7 to provide feedback on some of the modeling assumptions.

8
9 Chair Franz responded that prior to COVID, the Department created a number of advisory
10 committees. One committee was in the area of commercial real estate. Another committee
11 comprised of members with technical expertise supported technical work in support of the SHC
12 and in management of forest lands in the state. The TAC was established by the Board.

13
14 Ms. McBurney identified the 12 members of the TAC representing the University of
15 Washington School of Environmental and Forest Sciences, Washington State University
16 College of Agriculture, Human, and Natural Sciences, Large forest landowner/manager
17 Counties, Conservation caucus, and the Timber industry. Members contribute different
18 perspectives and expertise.

19
20 Commissioner Janicki advocated for more representation from the timber industry and
21 scheduling stakeholder community meetings in Eastern Washington.

22
23 Chair Franz affirmed staff would explore opportunities to involve major landowners in Eastern
24 Washington. During the SHC process, stakeholder engagement is ongoing, which can be shared
25 with the Board at the next meeting, as well as language from House Bill 1168.

26
27 Mr. Emmons reviewed the policy components of the SHC. The most impactful topics include
28 Economic Performance and Forest Ecosystem Health and Productivity policies within the
29 Policy for Sustainable Forests. The Economic Performance category includes policy on
30 sustainability, policy on recalculation of the SHC, the model flow constraint that prevents
31 deviation more than 25% up or down from the previous decade, and setting sustainable harvest
32 units for Eastern Washington. Under the Forest Ecosystem Health category, policies include
33 Forest Health, Catastrophic Loss Prevention, Wildlife Habitat, and Ecological Features.

34
35 Dr. Brown asked how the team plans to consider the recent resolution to consider multi-
36 objective planning and alternative harvests. Mr. Emmons advised that discussions with the TAC
37 will cover those issues utilizing the REMSOFT program to model multi-objectives.

38
39 Ms. McBurney said staff and the TAC considered those objectives for the Western Washington
40 Sustainable Harvest Calculation. The information will be included in the data to be analyzed for
41 the Eastern SHC.

42
43 Mr. Emmons noted that since the 1996 Sustainable Harvest Calculation recalculation, the
44 Department adopted 2006 policies on forest health and catastrophic loss comprised of the 20-
45 Year Forest Health Strategic Plan, DNR's Plan for Climate Resilience, and the Forest Health
46 Treatment Prioritization and Implementation Plan. With the passage of House Bill 1168, a
47 revolving fund enabled DNR to accelerate forest health treatments and restoration. The plans
48 guide the Department's work in Eastern Washington.

1
2 Since 1996, changes in the inventory have occurred in terms of the method of collecting data.
3 Other changes include GIS data, Lidar, and Forest Estate Modeling Software. Since 1996, the
4 Department has completed:

- 5
- 6 • 1996 Loomis State Forest Landscape Plan
- 7 • 2004 HCP Amendment for Eastern Washington
- 8 • 2006 Lynx Habitat Management Plan
- 9 • 2006 Policy for Sustainable Forests
- 10 • 2017 20-Year Forest Health Strategic Plan
- 11 • 2020 Climate Resiliency Plan

12 Some staff recommendations include consideration of future harvest and silviculture informed
13 by ecotype shifts based on incorporating climate change impacts in the model. Forest health
14 prioritization framework could drive where forest health treatments should be conducted. Using
15 forest resilience metric to track forest health and resiliency over time could drive harvest
16 activities.

17
18 Ms. McBurney addressed questions on how climate change impacts would be modeled. The
19 modeling will calculate outcomes based on projections of how climate might change using
20 temperature and other variables.

21
22 Chair Franz pointed out that the Forest Health Strategic Plan includes all lands in Eastern
23 Washington. The Forest Resilience Group completed an assessment of over 2 million acres by
24 analyzing current conditions on the landscape, condition of forests, and identifying treatments
25 for forests to ensure forests are healthy and resilient and resist fire and other disturbances, such
26 as disease, insect infestations, and drought. The information is included in the plan documenting
27 existing disturbances and future disturbances likely to continue.

28
29 Mr. Cahill asked how the information will assist in determining the benefits of cutting all trees
30 as opposed to thinning trees for each situation in different decades based on potential climate
31 changes. Ms. McBurney said thinning is predominant in Eastern Washington as there is a higher
32 level of uneven age management.

33
34 Superintendent Reykdal commented that economically, eastside forests contribute far less
35 revenue than westside forests affording an opportunity to support the environmental aspects of
36 eastern Washington. Mr. Emmons replied that the discussion on alternatives will help define
37 how the model will be developed and the policies that should be considered to determine impact
38 on revenue and volume and ecosystem benefits. The Board may elect to focus more on
39 catastrophic loss prevention or resilience rather than revenue or volume. The model will inform
40 different policy decisions based on modeled impacts. The team is exploring ways to capture
41 policy considerations within the model by working with the TAC to consider the best
42 approaches to include climate within the model. The inclusion of policy impacts will be a
43 component of the EIS alternatives analysis for the Board's consideration when selecting the
44 final alternative. Additionally, the Board will also assess financial impacts in the EIS.

1 Mr. Emmons outlined next steps with the Board proposing concepts for policy with staff
2 working on transforming concepts into policy objectives for input into the model to produce
3 action alternatives. Action alternatives will be analyzed for potential environment and financial
4 impacts. The Board then selects the final action alternative. Staff develops DNR policies based
5 on the Board's selection followed by approval of the final policy.
6

7 *Dr. Brown left the meeting at 12:33 p.m.*
8

9 Mr. Emmons invited the Board to consider and offer other policy ideas for possible inclusion in
10 the model.
11

12 *Chair Franz left the meeting to testify before the Legislature at 12:35 p.m.*
13

14 Superintendent Reykdal said feedback from the Board focused on the public engagement
15 process sooner and providing a timeline, consideration of any issues as to whether there is any
16 sensitivity to the economic impacts of loss for varied reasons, as well as interest in some
17 modeling that promotes more forest resiliency and catastrophic loss prevention.
18

19 Commissioner Janicki said much of the land in Eastern Washington is not state land. It is just as
20 catastrophic to trust beneficiaries if federal forests continue to burn. Exercising a good neighbor
21 authority and with a good body of science it might enable DNR to understand what a
22 maintained forest would be, which is of interest to her. Although not directly related to the
23 SHC, it would inform what is occurring on the ground.
24

25 Dean Powers recommended scheduling the presentation earlier in the agenda to avoid
26 scheduling conflicts. Mr. Emmons affirmed staff will continue to work on time management.
27

28 Mr. Emmons displayed a chart of high-level milestones and emphasized that the funding from
29 House Bill 1168 provided for third party review of growth and yields and the strategic model.
30 Future meetings will focus on refining policy concepts and discussions for incorporating climate
31 impacts, as well as any technical updates and feedback from the TAC as the model is
32 developed.
33

34 **RECESS TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

35 Superintendent Reykdal recessed the regular meeting at 12:41 p.m. to an executive session to
36 discuss anticipated litigation, pending litigation, or any other matter suitable under RCW
37 42.30.110 for approximately 20 minutes. No action will follow the executive session.
38

39 **RECONVENE AND ADJOURNMENT**

40 Superintendent Reykdal reconvened and adjourned the meeting at 1:02 p.m.
41
42

Approved this 4 day of April, 2023

Absent

Hilary S. Franz, Washington State Commissioner of Public Lands

Jim Cahill

Jim Cahill, Designee for Governor Jay Inslee

Chris Reykdal

Chris Reykdal, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Lisa Janicki

Lisa Janicki, Commissioner, Skagit County

Wendy Powers

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

Dan Brown

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

Attest:

Tami Kellogg

Tami Kellogg, Board Coordinator

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