

THE WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Situation Assessment to Guide the Design of a Potential Washington State Forest Products Roundtable

Summary Report

Conducted for the Washington Department of
Commerce by the William D. Ruckelshaus Center

June 2024

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS CENTER
Hulbert Hall, Room 121
P.O. Box 646248
Pullman, WA 99164-6248
-and-
155 NE 100th Street, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98125

Contents

Introduction	1
Who We Are.....	1
The Process	1
What We Heard	2
Envisioning a Healthy and Sustainable Forestry Sector.....	2
THEME: Public Perception, Social License, and Informed and Supportive Leadership	2
THEME: Advancing and Sustaining Forestry and the Forest Products Sectors.....	3
THEME: Support of Rural Communities through Job Creation, Workforce Development, and Community Empowerment.....	4
THEME: Healthy Forests through Future-Looking Forest Management Practices Based in Science....	5
Other Challenges and Opportunities	5
In Conclusion: The Issues	6
What It Means: The Process	7
Advice for Kickoff Meeting.....	7
To Sustain It.....	7
Other Questions: Joint Meetings with Oregon, Mass Timber Workgroup	7
Challenges for an ongoing Roundtable	7
Appendices.....	9
Appendix A: Other Process Information and Interview Questions.....	9
Appendix B: Interviewee List	10
Appendix C: Other Collaborative/Multi-Party Forums in Washington State.....	12
Appendix D: Survey results (QR code presented at the CINTRAFOR Meeting)	15

DISCLAIMER

The following report was prepared by the William D. Ruckelshaus Center, a joint effort of the University of Washington and Washington State University whose mission is to act as a neutral resource for collaborative problem solving in the State of Washington and Pacific Northwest. University leadership and the Center's Advisory Board support the preparation of this, and other reports produced under the Center's auspices. However, the key themes contained in this report are intended to reflect the opinions of the interviewed parties, and the findings are those of the Center's interview team. Those themes and findings do not represent the views of the universities or Advisory Board members.

Introduction

This report summarizes insights gathered through interviews with parties interested in and affected by forestry and the forest products sector in Washington state to inform the design and launch of an emerging collaboration around a sustainable timber economy. Staff and faculty from the William D. Ruckelshaus Center (the Center) assessed the issues and prospects for collaboration on behalf of the Washington Department of Commerce.

The project team conducted 33 structured Interviews with a diverse mix of 35 representatives of key constituencies from April through June. They explored visions of success, priorities, challenges, and opportunities around the Washington and Pacific Northwest forestry sector, forest products, and related issues. The project team explored the dynamics among parties, perspectives on the relevant facts, and other considerations to guide a sustainable forest products sector in Washington State. This input informed the design and facilitation strategy of the kickoff event of the Washington Wood Products/Forestry Roundtable (the “Roundtable”) and will help to inform future meetings of the Roundtable. Interview documents are found in [Appendix A and B](#).

Who We Are

About the Center:

The [William D. Ruckelshaus Center](#) serves as an impartial resource for collaborative problem solving in the state of Washington and the Pacific Northwest, providing expertise to improve the quality and availability of voluntary collaborative approaches for policy development and multi-party dispute resolution. The Center operates as a joint effort of the University of Washington and Washington State University. The Center specializes in collaborative governance, designing and facilitating solution-focused processes of fact-finding, identification of common interests, dialog and deliberation, and consensus decision-making.

The Process

Before bringing parties together to address shared challenges, the Center starts by interviewing representatives of key constituencies to better understand their issues and interests, along with the situation dynamics. This helps guide the design of a potential collaborative process.

The project team: Chris Page (Lead) managed the process, with strategic oversight from Julia Carboni (Director of the Center). Chris, Kara Whitman (Faculty at WSU), and Alec Solemslie (Project Coordinator at the Center) designed the process, developed materials for interviews, and conducted the interviews. Alec scheduled interviews, managed communications for the process, and took notes and helped to synthesize themes from the interviews. Chris and Kara led interviews, summarized findings, and drafted this summary with input from Alec.

Identification of Parties: The Center consulted with the Department of Commerce to identify an initial list of parties that the Center should consult in the interview process. The following broad criteria guided selection of the parties to interview:

- A balanced and inclusive set of representatives of interests related Forestry and Forest Products in Washington State.
- Geographically dispersed.
- Representative of the diverse perspectives and views on past and future engagement on these topics.
- Organization and/or subject matter expertise and leadership.
- Fits within the project time and resource constraints.

The Center's team selected an initial round of interviews representing a broad and balanced range of interests. Based on suggestions from these interviewees, the Center identified additional interviewees, resulting in interviews with 35 individuals with 32 parties listed in Appendix B. The cross-section of interviewees is not meant to be exhaustive but rather to include a voice from each significant category of interested constituency. The goal is for all interested parties to feel that their perspective was included in the assessment, whether they themselves were interviewed or not.

What We Heard

The Washington forest products industry, public and private and tribal landowners, rural communities, environmental organizations, labor unions, state and local government agencies, and other constituencies have shared interests around sustainable forestry and wood products in Washington State. These shared interests include supporting Washington's economic and environmental health, a steady and sustainable supply of forest biomass, emerging markets for cross-laminated and other mass timber products, wildfire fuels reduction, employment and economic development in rural communities, more sustainable building materials, climate adaptation and mitigation, improved forest health to support biodiversity, and more.

Interviewees generally agreed that the time seems right to convene an ongoing forum devoted to the economics and sustainability of wood products and the societal recognition of the benefits of healthy managed forests. The following summarizes the major issues, common themes, and areas of agreement and differences from the interested and affected parties that emerged during interviews.

Envisioning a Healthy and Sustainable Forestry Sector

Based on guidance from the Department of Commerce, the interviews asked respondents to envision a healthy and sustainable forestry sector. Interviewees (also called "respondents" here) noted that our state has some of the most productive forests and high-quality trees (notably Douglas Fir) in the world. However, the forestry and forest products sector that relies on those trees face many headwinds. Despite these challenges, most interviewees agreed on broad parameters with respect to future vision for forestry and forest products sector.

The project team asked interviewees to look ahead 20 years and describe a vision for a healthy and sustainable forestry and forest products sector. Common responses to this question emphasized the following:

- Abundant, healthy forestlands preserved from development.
- Societal recognition of the benefits of healthy managed forests (termed "social license") from the public and decision-makers.
- The innovative use of forest products.
- Robust markets for all parts of trees.
- A strong workforce.
- Available mills that can process all sizes of logs and can operate sustainably.
- Appreciation for the benefits of building with wood.
- A balance of forest management (on private, tribal, State and Federal lands) prioritizing BOTH ecological health and local economies and grounded in science.

Interviewees identified the following four broad themes around that future, with challenges and opportunities elaborating on the points raised by respondents for each theme.

THEME: Public Perception, Social License, and Informed and Supportive Leadership

Most interviewees would like to see broader public appreciation for the benefits of healthy working forests. Many noted that humans have been managing forests since time immemorial and that huge swaths of federal lands need forest health treatments. While respondents noted that a narrative has taken hold in some circles that all trees should be left in the ground for carbon sequestration; however, many believe the highest ecological benefits, including reduced risk of catastrophic wildfire (and corresponding carbon release) come from managed forests where thin, young, overcrowded trees get removed. They expressed hope that the broader public can come to recognize the benefits of construction with wood and its role in carbon sequestration. They also suggested elected leaders should understand and support the importance of what folks called working or multiple-use forests (including state trust lands) managed for ecological health and a variety of wood-based products. If those decision makers recognized the multiple benefits available, they might provide stable forest policies at state and federal levels.

Potential Solutions:

- Leadership at the state level, specifically from the Governor and key state agencies.
- Some suggested an industry-wide media campaign could help, though others encouraged involving non-industry partners.
- Clear messaging (public outreach) to emphasize:
 - The role that sustainable forestry and wood products can play in ecological health and carbon sequestration.
 - What sustainable forestry looks like today, rather than what forestry is perceived to look like (e.g. clear cuts), in Washington state as compared to practices in other states and countries—and how reducing harvest here means greater harvest in areas with more destructive practices.
 - New and innovative specialty forest products and their uses and the benefits of those uses.

THEME: Advancing and Sustaining Forestry and the Forest Products Sectors

Interviewees see future success requiring broader engagement in partnerships and increased investment in new forestry practices and infrastructure. This includes workforce development programs, forest health treatments with economically viable small tree removal. Respondents highlighted the importance of keeping existing mills operating and adding either new mills or expanding existing mills (with the ability to process *all* types of forest biomass from Washington State forests), within reasonable fuel cost distance of remote forestlands.

Interviewees noted the need to develop healthy markets for all forest products—beyond stud lumber to mass timber, biochar, and woody bioenergy—and that those should support family, community, and tribal forest lands, alongside larger commercial operations. Specific to mass timber, folks mentioned a need to ensure building codes allow for mass timber, the importance of architectural design innovations, and outreach to the public and policymakers as vital. Others observed that developing high value products and markets, such as engineered wood products and biofuels, would help drive innovation. Some noted that forest products would be key to a biobased economy and that excess forest biomass should be utilized efficiently.

Specific Challenges/Opportunities identified by interviewees—NOTE: It will be essential for the Roundtable to understand the complexities of these issues and dynamics in seeking creative solutions:

- **Market entry barriers** exist for products like mass and cross-laminated timber (CLT), biomass for wood-based energy (with carbon capture) and biochar—despite their appeal to many parties. Developing markets will require a paradigm shift in multiple sectors: the forestry industry is reluctant to change established practices due to the initial time and expense involved, and developers and architects are not

yet designing for CLT construction without zoning codes and incentives that support it. Collaborative efforts, supported by state policy (e.g., subsidies or incentives) can support this transition.

- **Stable, consistent, and predictable source of timber.** Some regions have a lot of source material, but the cost of transport of that material to a mill is prohibitive. Other regions experience shortages in raw material.
- **Pulp and paper industry struggles** due to negative perceptions, the need to reduce emissions, and global market challenges. This is leading to loss of investments and infrastructure and subsequently residual pulp being left in forests.
- **A certification debate** between Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). SFI is the industry certification, so gets viewed skeptically relative to FSC; however, respondents noted that FSC-certified wood comes from countries outside the US that allow deforestation.
- The timber industry has shown it can innovate and adapt, which points to opportunities such as **repurposing stranded assets** such as old mills by utilizing existing infrastructure for things such as a biofuel refining complex. The Roundtable might seek to identify ways to support mills transitioning in this direction. Sawmills are known for adapting to economic seasons and could be ideal distributors of biochar as an added value product.

THEME: Support of Rural Communities through Job Creation, Workforce Development, and Community Empowerment

Many interviewees highlighted the need to ensure that rural and tribal communities directly benefit from the forest resources in their home place, and, often, which they steward. Respondent ideas for a desired future included:

- Enhance and leverage the demand from urban markets for forest products to create sustainable and well-paying jobs in rural and tribal communities.
- Build healthy, sustainable markets for wood products to mirror the success of “buy local” initiatives in agriculture. This could support local forestry-related economies and promote locally sourced materials.
- Attract a new generation to well-paid careers in milling, logging, trucking, and other forestry-related areas and develop a skilled workforce dedicated to maintaining a healthy forestry sector.
- Encourage and empower family, community, and tribal forest landowners to gain profit from their forest lands by actively contributing to the forest product supply chain and participating in carbon markets.

Specific Challenges/Opportunities identified by interviewees:

- A few interviewees noted the **need for renewed leadership from the State**, citing a disconnect in recognition among dominant policymakers about the significance of forests to Washington State, particularly for rural communities. When asked where this leadership might come from, folks suggested the Governor, the Commissioner of Public Lands, and the Department of Commerce. Respondents see these leaders as disconnected from rural communities, lacking the understanding they once had.
- **Workforce development** emerged as another challenge, connected to opportunities: legislative investment of a few million dollars could allow the development and implementation of apprenticeship or community/technical college programs to train the next generation of forestry workers. The need applies not only to private, tribal, and community-based operations but to local, state, and federal agency corps of workers in the forestry sector. Respondents observed that young people tend to see timber jobs as dead-end jobs, when modern forestry involves computers, engineering, and high-tech equipment—and pays well.

THEME: Healthy Forests through Future-Looking Forest Management Practices Based in Science

Interviewees suggested a potential Roundtable should center on the need to manage forests for their health AND the multiple benefits that ensue: supporting biodiversity, improving hydrology, carbon storage, and reducing fire risk. Interviewees also emphasized that the forestry sector should yield benefits and goods in part to maintain the safety and productivity of forests. Interviews also revealed that managed/working forests improve the overall ecological health of watersheds simply by preventing them from becoming pavement. At least one interviewee noted that longer rotations could supply greater environmental benefits; however, there is also risk and time investment as they would not know what the market would like on this longer time scale. Respondents also highlighted the need for science-based management, emphasizing that decisions should be grounded in science rather than emotions.

Specific Challenges/Opportunities Identified by interviewees:

- Federal lands, specifically those managed by the US Forest Service that suffered from decades of fire suppression, must play a crucial role in restoring forest health statewide. Those lands also present significant opportunities to develop the economic vitality of the non-stud lumber forest products sector. To achieve this, what does the Forest Service require, considering they often face litigation? It would help to identify and address all challenges openly rather than avoiding them due to anxiety (from litigation), confront them head-on and begin doing the necessary work.
- Interviewees observed that most Washington residents could agree that we want to ensure forests stay forests instead of getting paved over. This common ground presents an opportunity to show what that means. For example, folks wondered if the public understands the degree of replanting that occurs or what happens to the environment when forests change over to something else. The fact that people love and want to maintain forests should provide common ground to build steps forward.
- We have a massive forest land base. There is a greater area in that land base for high environmental standards of timber harvest and community/timber ownership. Community forest or tribal ancestral forest. In addition to the industrial timberland space, there is a space for community-owned and operated forestlands to occupy more of the marketplace.
- In addition to the high risk of catastrophic wildfire posed by vast swaths of unmanaged USFS lands, respondents cited multiple challenges connected to climate change:
 - Carbon sequestration: It is challenging to get general concurrence on the carbon consequences of different forest practices. The Roundtable might benefit from collectively identifying a trusted information provider to present findings that would be perceived as credible by lawmakers (perhaps via independent science review, e.g., by the Washington State Academy of Sciences).
 - Urgency around the need for forest health treatments is not shared by all. The legislature is engaged in debate over how to allocate funds from the Climate Commitment Act, which prompts questions about whether forest land acquisition or forest health treatments should receive some of those funds.
 - Some see a perception by some members of the public and some policymakers that harvesting trees is bad for the environment. Many interviewees noted that harvest and its subsequent products, done well, is much better for carbon storage and ecological health, and for wildland fire fuels management. Science-based public messaging can play a key role in addressing this.

Other Challenges and Opportunities

While not rising to the level of themes, a handful of other issues arose during multiple interviews and merit consideration for a Roundtable working toward a sustainable timber economy. These include:

The need for more legislative interest and knowledge. This connects to the challenge of what some folks termed the dominant policy position in the state that the only good tree is one left standing. With most of the state population (and hence lawmaker representation) from urban areas, the rural communities and working forests appear far from the minds of most state legislators. To address this, respondents suggested legislative tours and briefings, and potentially involving lawmakers from both parties at times in the Roundtable.

Accounting for forestland in different ways. As farmers can get paid to keep land out of crop rotation at times, with funds from the Climate Commitment Act (assuming it lives past November 2024), interviewees suggested that forest landowners should get remunerated for keeping older tree stands intact. Some timber companies apparently already do; this practice could become more widespread. Similarly, riparian buffers on streams provide ecological benefits for salmon and water quantity and quality. In addition, as things stand, some subsidy or incentive would be needed to help make taking the small-diameter trees and other woody biomass out of the forest “pencil out” economically.

Collaboration on the landscape level. As ecosystems do not stop at land ownership boundaries, so too solutions to the many challenges connected to forestlands must engage parties from the private, public (state, federal, local governments), tribal, and nonprofit sectors. By focusing geographically by watershed or eco-region (e.g., as the Northeast or North Central Washington Forest Collaboratives do), or even eastern and western Washington parties separately working on certain issues, solutions can be tailored to match the scale and characteristics of the lands and communities where they’ll get implemented.

Multiparty solutions to challenges. Since no single entity can implement a set of solutions that satisfies all parties and can last, multiparty solutions must come to fruition. Interviewees cited some examples of approaches involving more than one party that could be replicated or transferred or amplified:

- Specific to USFS lands: a respondent mentioned that the Colorado state Department of Natural Resources has relatively good forestry practices and has entered into a memorandum of agreement with the Forest Service to manage on USFS lands.
- Good Neighbor Authority: [this act](#) (which may enable the above agreement) allows the US Forest Service to partner with state agencies to manage forests for multiple benefits. As of June 11, 2024, the US Department of Agriculture [invested \\$66M](#) for conservation work with states, tribes, and private landowners. Respondents mentioned that currently, tribal and local government partners who do work on USFS lands cannot get repaid for expenses incurred; this could be fixed by US Congress in a new Farm Bill.
- [Tribal Forest Protection Act](#) (TFPA): The TFPA allows federally recognized tribes to propose projects on Forest Service land to reduce threats to adjacent tribal lands, trust resources, and values.

In Conclusion: The Issues

Interviews revealed multiple interconnected and complex issues that present both challenges and opportunities in Washington’s forestry and forest products sector. Respondents reported that an ever-changing regulatory landscape complicates long term planning. They emphasized that public perception and negative attitudes toward forestry hinder support for working forests, even those with sustainable and science-based management practices. Interviewees reported that urban residents and most policymakers at the state and federal levels are disconnected from rural communities.

Those looking to the future of the forest products industry see the importance of forest management that mitigates catastrophic wildfire and sequesters carbon. They point to multiple needs: to develop a skilled

workforce along with a stable and predictable timber supply, to diversify and develop markets, and to foster innovation amidst competition and collaboration.

What It Means: The Process

Advice for Kickoff Meeting

In general: agree on goals and objectives and how to work together. Specifically, generate a shared vision, begin sharing info, then identify the primary problem areas to address, then brainstorm collective actions the group can take to advance solutions for each. Highlight the opportunity to address issues that transcend any one forest or watershed, discuss ideas at scale, and share what is working in one forest that others can learn from. It will be important for any statewide Roundtable to respect local autonomy and the unique characteristics of participating entities and areas.

To Sustain It

- Build strong relationships founded in trust.
- Develop pilot project/s to launch, track/follow, provide guidance on, and see achievements in
- Establish a clear identity, direction, and milestones (to make progress on) for this Roundtable, to differentiate it from other existing forums mentioned here.
- Charter issue-specific workgroups to tackle discrete challenges (e.g., public outreach, workforce and infrastructure development, Eastern WA topics / Western WA topics) that report back to full Roundtable.
- Set long term goals with benchmarks to measure progress, identify responsible parties and outline action steps to achieve those goals.
- Conduct regular check ins on progress and ensure everyone has the support they need.

Other Questions: Joint Meetings with Oregon, Mass Timber Workgroup

Generally, folks thought it would be worth occasionally holding joint meetings with similar interests from Oregon to discuss challenges and opportunities and share lessons learned. Most expressed interest in a smaller workgroup focused on mass timber supply chain and market development issues.

Challenges for an ongoing Roundtable

Respondents noted a lack of trust and the polarized nature of civil discourse in general, the existence of other multiparty forestry forums, and the dominant land base of the US Forest Service coupled with turnover among key personnel there as obstacles to address in sustaining a prospective Roundtable. Specific to the issues around the forestry sector, interviewees highlighted the need to move beyond the positional and transaction-centered discussions of the past to focus on the interests or values that all parties have in common.

To address polarization and lack of trust, multiple interviewees responded well to the idea that the Roundtable might “reclaim the radical middle.” They suggested that the many interested parties, even those on “both sides,” have significant common interests. These include healthy landscapes, thriving rural communities, buying local, basing decisions on sound science, reducing wildfire risk, and more. By developing and agreeing on deeply held shared values or principles such as these, Roundtable participants might set a foundation for collaboratively generating solutions to the knotty, complex challenges facing the forestry sector in Washington state.

In addition, some folks believe that politics (with intentions to find certain outcomes) has been influencing state agency science for the Timber-Fish-Wildlife policy group, which informs the Forest Practices Board that impact

rules for private forest lands and adaptive management. To address this, participants in a future Roundtable must together identify scientific providers trusted by all the parties and air any concerns early and clearly.

Several multi-party forums exist throughout the Washington State ([See Appendix C](#)) focused on Forestry, Forest Products and related interests. For example, “Eight forest collaboratives in the state of Washington formed the Washington Forest Collaborative Network (WFCN) to foster a community of practice for sharing knowledge and building support for collaborative forest work on a state level” (WFCN)¹. Others in Washington state include the Forest Health Advisory Committee (FHAC), the Northwest Forest Plan Area Federal Advisory Committee (FAC), the Forest Practices Board, DNR Forest Carbon Working Group, Northwest Community Forests Coalition, and the Washington Prescribed Fire Council. It is essential that the Roundtable learn from and complement these efforts to benefit everyone involved. **Since many potential Roundtable participants are likely already engaged in other collaboratives, boards, workgroups and more, this effort must stay focused and add real value (tangible actions and results) to maintain meaningful participation.**

It will be vital to have consistent representation from the US Forest Service constructively engaged. To accomplish this will likely take a collective effort to leverage existing relationships and build new ones along with leadership from state and local (e.g., county) officials. Interviewees also emphasized the importance of engaging open-minded conservation groups. With good-faith engagement from a broad spectrum of key parties constructively engaged over time, interviewees expressed hope that a future Roundtable might gain recognition by state legislators and other elected leaders as a trusted source of potential policy recommendations.

If a prospective Forest Products Roundtable is to accomplish all that it might, based on stories of broken pledges in the past, representatives of the various parties must commit to faithfully convey what their organizations can and cannot commit to, both in private and in public. They must consistently follow through on what they say they will do, repeatedly, over time, to rebuild trust. To move beyond the basic divide of environmentalists vs. timber companies, people from those respective “sides” need to stop seeing “the other side” as profiteers who only want to “maximize the cut” or obstructionists who want to “lock up the woods.” They must commit to working together in good faith to advance common interests, recognizing the power and value of long-term shared stewardship of the most abundant forests on the planet and the myriad benefits that can result from that stewardship.

In Closing: The Ruckelshaus Center project team is grateful for the opportunity to assist in collaboratively addressing challenges facing Washington’s forestry sector. Based on our experience and methodology, our facilitation team can bring specific suggestions for potential group behavior protocols based on input from interviewees, e.g., “Learn from the past but focus on the future” or “All representatives commit to faithfully conveying what their organization can and will commit to, both in public and private.” With commitment from participants to adhere to such protocols, the Roundtable has a chance to steer clear of dynamics and circumstances that derailed past collaborative efforts around forest management in Washington and make meaningful progress.

¹ WFCN. Washington Forest Collaboratives. N.D. <http://washingtonforestcollaboratives.org/> Accessed June 12, 2024.

Appendices

Appendix A: Other Process Information and Interview Questions

About This Process:

Interview Protocols

The assessment team developed a set of protocols to govern the interview process, based on university human subject research principles and best practices in the field of collaborative decision-making. The Center invited interviewees by email and/or phone to participate in an interview and provided background information explaining the process, the purpose, and how the interview would be used.

The preliminary information emphasized that the interview would be confidential (to be consistent with university research protocols and encourage interviewees to be as frank as possible), in that the results would be aggregated in a short summary report and specific statements would not be attributed to individual interviewees. Interviewer notes of the conversation were not retained beyond the drafting of the report, per research protocol. The Center conducted interviews by zoom video meeting technology.

Interview Questions:

1. Please tell us about your background, affiliation, involvement, and interests with respect to the forestry sector and/or wood products in Washington state.
2. What does a healthy and sustainable forestry and forest products sector look like 15-20 years from now?
3. What issues do you see as most important around forestry and forest products in WA?
4. Do you think it makes sense to convene and facilitate an ongoing group around Washington forest products and the forestry sector to share information, address shared challenges, help advance each other's interests as mutually beneficial? (Why or why not?)
5. [If so:] Would you / your organization want to participate? Who do you see as the major players?
6. What would you find most valuable (education and information sharing, relationships, collaboration in general, launching projects around shared interests, problem solving)
7. If you attended a kickoff meeting, what would you feel it should accomplish?
8. What advice do you have to sustain and make it worth people's time?
9. What challenges do you see and how to address them (e.g., silos—how to break down silos)?
10. Would your org have a role in a potential workgroup focused on the Mass Timber supply chain? Who else would have a role in that?
11. Given that forest products have a regional nature and WA has some shared issues with Oregon, do you believe it's beneficial to have combined WA/OR meetings, e.g., quarterly meeting w/joint presentation and discussion?
12. (For our assessment) Is there anyone in particular you think it is important we interview? Why is it important to speak to them?
13. What should we have asked that we did not?
14. Do you have any questions for us?

Appendix B: Interviewee List

**Asterisk indicates scheduled interview but not yet conducted as of 6/20/24*

Name	Title	Affiliation/Agency
Matt Comisky	Washington State Manager	American Forest Resource Council (AFRC)
Dan Rankin	Mayor	City of Darrington
Rod Fleck	City Attorney/Planner	City of Forks, WA
John Bull	City Forester	City of Montesano, WA
Randy Johnson	Commissioner	Clallam County
Tia Beavert*	Tribal Forest Manager	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
Paula Swedeen	Senior Director for Policy	Conservation Northwest
Jim Dooley	Chief Technology Officer	Forest Concepts
Michelle Connor	President & CEO	Forterra
Jason Callahan	Policy Manager	Green Diamond
Josh Weiss	State Lobbyist and Partner	Gordon Thomas Honeywell Law Firm
Kristin Rasmussen-Hiller	Director of Public Affairs and Communications	Hampton Lumber
Court Stanley	Consultant	Heartwood Consulting on behalf of Washington State Association of Counties
Paul Buckland	Forest Resource Manager	Inland Empire Paper Co.
Lloyd McGee	Eastern Washington Forests Program Manager	North Central Washington Forest Health Collaborative and the Nature Conservancy
Darcy Batura	Director Forest Partners	Nature Conservancy
Peter Moulton	Consultant	Northwest Community Partners, LLC
René Ancinas	CEO and Chair	Port Blakely Timber
Ed Draper	Executive Director	Pulp and Paper Association
Bill Turner	Washington Log Procurement Manager	Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI)
Lisa Perry	Community Relations	Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI)
Paul Vandeford	Green Markets	Sustainable Northwest
Steve Hinton	Conservation Scientist	Tulalip Tribes
Dan Shively*	Natural Resources Director	United States Forest Service Region 6
Russ Vaagen	CEO	Vaagen Timbers
Jerry Bonagofsky	President/CEO	Washington Contract Loggers Association
Rachel Baker*	Forest Program Director	Washington Conservation Action
Elaine Oneil	Executive Director	Washington Farm Forestry Association

Jason Spadaro	Executive Director	Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA)
Paul Jewell	Policy Director	Washington State Association of Counties
Duane Emmons	Assistant Deputy, State Uplands	Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Andy Perleberg	Forestry Lead	Washington State University Extension
Mary Catherine McAleer	Government Relations Manager	Weyerhaeuser
Meagan Hartman	Director of Business Development	Wise Wood Energy Co.
Bill Parsons	Chief Operating Officer	Woodworks

Appendix C: Other Collaborative/Multi-Party Forums in Washington State

Forest Health Advisory Committee (FHAC)

Established by RCW 76.06.200 in 2017 and chartered by Washington Department of Natural Resources. “The mission of the FHAC is to contribute to the improvement of forest health by providing guidance and advice to the Commissioner on forest health conditions and solutions thereby helping to make Washington forests, regardless of ownership, healthier and more resilient to insects, disease, invasive species, catastrophic wildfire, climate change, and other disturbance. Specifically, this committee helps to inform successful implementation of the 20-Year Forest Health Strategic Plan: Eastern Washington and Washington’s Forest Action Plan. The FHAC, through collaborative leadership, with input from a variety of constituent groups, strives to continually improve and maintain the health and resilience of Washington’s forests for current and future generations” (WA DNR).

<https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-health-advisory-committee>

Northwest Forest Plan Area Federal Advisory Committee (FAC)

“The FAC was established by the Secretary of Agriculture as part of ongoing efforts to amend the Northwest Forest Plan. The purpose of the FAC is to bring together diverse perspectives representing the experiences of communities, experts, Tribes, and other interested parties across the Northwest Forest Plan landscape to inform ways that forest management can effectively conserve key resources while considering social, ecological, and economic conditions and needs”² (USFS).

Website: <https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/stnf/home/?cid=FSEPRD1151816>

Forest Practices Board (state regulatory entity)

“The Forest Practices Board is an independent state agency chaired by the Commissioner of Public Lands or designee. The Forest Practices Board was established by the 1974 Forest Practices Act and the rules it adopts are implemented and enforced by the Department of Natural Resources”³. This board is responsible for establishing regulations that define standards for forest activities, including timber harvesting, pre-commercial thinning, road building, and the application of forest chemicals. They are also responsible for offering a forest a Forest Practices Board Manual that serves as a technical guide to the rules.

Website: <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board>

DNR Forest Carbon Working Group

Established by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, this working group uses “collaborative approaches related to the following: Conserving and managing older, carbon-dense, structurally complex forest stands located on DNR-managed lands; Increasing carbon sequestration and storage in forests and harvested wood products from DNR-managed forestlands; Generating predictable beneficiary revenue; Maintaining timber supplies that support local industry; and Addressing economic needs in rural counties”⁴.

² USFS (N.D.). Northwest Forest Plan Federal Advisory Committee to Meet.

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/stnf/home/?cid=FSEPRD1151816> . Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

³ WA State DNR (2024). Forest Practices Board. <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board> . Retrieved on June 12, 2024

⁴ WA State DNR (2024). Carbon and Forest Management Work Group. <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-commissions/carbon-and-forest-management-work-group>. Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

Website: <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-commissions/carbon-and-forest-management-work-group>

Washington Prescribed Fire Council

“The premise behind the statewide council is that although the challenges to prescribed burning may vary across different regions of the state, there is power in collaboration. The statewide council is able to address larger issues than regional councils, and is positioned to more fruitfully engage with national efforts, like those initiated by the Coalition of Prescribed Fire Councils” (WA Prescribe Fire Council)

<https://www.waprescribedfire.org/>

Northwest Community Forest Coalition (Oregon and Washington) (part of Sustainable Northwest).

“The Northwest Community Forest Coalition is focused on supporting the emergence, development, and management of community forests in the Pacific Northwest. Formed in May 2015, the Coalition brings together practitioners and experts representing community-based organizations, land trusts, counties and jurisdictions, private corporations, and regional and national non-profit organizations.”⁵

Website: <https://www.nwcommunityforests.org/community-forests-101>

The Washington Forest Collaborative Network (WFC)

Which is comprised of the following organizations:

Chumstick Wildfire Stewardship Coalition

“The CWSC’s highest goal is to change the social, environmental, and economic contexts in which we view fire by creating fire adapted landscapes, governments, businesses, and residents, all connected and collaborating to change the way we live and work in fire country... our aim is to provide space and time to address controversial topics on the front-end of forest work, avoiding litigation and the waste of resources, energy and goodwill.”⁶

Website: <https://www.chumstickcoalition.org/>

Darrington Collaborative

According to Grist/Wilderness Society (2023), “The Darrington Collaborative formed in 2015 to modernize ecological practices and innovate in ways that wouldn’t leave anyone behind. Its ten members include representatives from timber companies and environmental groups like The Wilderness Society, as well as key civic leaders...”⁷

Website not currently available.

North Central Washington Forest Health Collaborative (NCWFHC)

⁵ NWCF (N.D.). Supporting the growth of community forests in the Pacific Northwest. <https://www.nwcommunityforests.org/about-nwcf>. Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

⁶ CWSC (2024). The Chumstick Wildfire Stewardship Coalition. <https://www.chumstickcoalition.org/about-us/>. Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

⁷ The Wilderness Society (2023). A more collaborative approach to conservation. Grist. <https://grist.org/sponsored/a-more-collaborative-approach-to-conservation-darrington-washington-wilderness-society/>. Retrieved on June 12, 2024

“The North Central Washington Forest Health Collaborative, launched in 2013 with facilitation by the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, is a diverse group of local stakeholders represented by timber industry, conservation groups, tribal government, elected officials, and local, state and federal land managers working together to obtain the resources and community support to accelerate landscape-scale forest restoration on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest (OWNF) in Chelan and Okanogan counties” (NCWFHC).

Website: <https://www.ncwfhc.org/about/>

Northeast Washington Forest Coalition (NEWFC)

“Members of NEWFC believe that working together to find common ground through new and innovative ecosystem management solutions will help sustain the Colville National Forest for generations to come”. Their mission is to “Collaborate with public and government interests to steward and conserve forest ecosystems in Northeast Washington so plants, animals, and our communities can thrive”.

Website: <https://www.newforestcoalition.com/our-vision>

Olympic Forest Collaborative

“The Olympic Peninsula Collaborative brings together stakeholders from the environmental community, the timber industry, and representatives from federal and local government around shared goals of increasing timber harvest from the Olympic National Forest while benefiting the environmental quality of our forests and watersheds. The Collaborative works together with federal officials to address issues that stand in the way of achieving the stated goals. Ultimately, the purpose is to show we can simultaneously create a more environmentally sound forest, increase sustainable timber harvests on the Olympic National Forest, and provide economic benefits to timber communities on the Peninsula.”⁸

Website: <https://olympicforestcollaborative.org/>

Pinchot Partners

“The Pinchot Partners work within the Cowlitz Valley Ranger District, on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest and surrounding areas, to promote watershed health, create quality local jobs, and encourage sustainable recreation.”⁹

Website: <https://www.pinchotpartners.org/>

South Gifford Pinchot Forest Collaborative

“The South Gifford Pinchot Collaborative (SGPC) is a community-based partnership that participates in the development, facilitation, and implementation of projects that enhance forest ecosystem health, economic vitality, recreation, and public safety on the south end of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest and in surrounding communities.”¹⁰

Website: <http://southgpc.org/>

Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative

⁸ OFC (2024). Olympic Forest Collaborative, What We Do. <https://olympicforestcollaborative.org/what-we-do/> . Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

⁹ Pinchot Partners (2024). Pinchot Partners Forest Collaborative. Our Work. <https://www.pinchotpartners.org/> . Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

¹⁰ SGPC (N.D.) South Gifford Pinchot Collaborative. Our Mission. <http://southgpc.org/> . Retrieved on June 12, 2024.

“The Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative works to improve the ecosystem health and natural functions of the landscape through active restoration projects backed by best science, community engagement, and adaptive management. Tapash seeks to create resilient forest ecosystems managed across ownership boundaries in central Washington, and to build community connections in order to achieve healthy fish and wildlife populations, minimize the effects of catastrophic fire, retain cultural values, provide desirable forested areas for present and future generations, and support development of a sustainable restoration economy... The Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative is comprised of decision-makers from the Yakama Nation, The Nature Conservancy, USDA Forest Service, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Washington State Department of Natural Resources.”¹¹

Website: <http://www.tapash.org/>

Appendix D: Survey results (QR code presented at the CINTRAFOR Meeting)

Question: What do you see as the biggest issues (challenges, opportunities, or both) facing the WA forest products sector today—and what suggestions do you have to address each?

- Creating trust and productive dialogue across sectoral and ideological stakeholders traditionally divided over questions of forest management. Let sound science lead the way toward climate adaptation/mitigation via active forest management and sustainable timber supply.
- Challenge: The lack of social license we have to conduct forestry. Solutions: active promotion of sustainable forestry, early education, highlighting the type of forestry we conduct compared to the rest of the world.
- Climate change is the single biggest problem. We need to rapidly develop next generation forest product That utilize low or no value biomass to help increase the pace and scale of Forest health treatments.

Question: What should a potential multisector WA Forest Roundtable try to accomplish as its top 3-4 goals?

- 1) Grow social license based on nuance, transparency and inclusion in the timber sector. This may need to begin with breaking out of the polarized “all wood” vs “no touch” camps to embrace a more rigorous and ecologically grounded understanding of management priorities.
- 2) Explore and grow avenues for co-management of federal lands to link forest restoration with sustainable economies.
- 3) Support new mills and manufacturers to establish in needed geographies, existing operators to stay in business, and workforce efforts to develop and attract talent.
- 1) work on removing regulatory Impediment
- 2) Better inform the public and policy makers about the critical nature of Protecting our forest
- 3) Facilitate the rapid development of next generation forest product such as industrial chemicals and biochar. Also work diligently at developing markets for these materials.
- 1)How to we garner a social license to conduct sustainable forestry in Washington.
- 2) Industry-wide media campaign.
- 3)Collective support of the biomass industry and promoting the sector

¹¹ Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative (2024). Our Work, Who We Are. <http://www.tapash.org/> . Retrieved on June 12, 2024.