

HSF RMA Public Review Virtual Meeting-20260429_183024-Meeting Recording

April 29, 2026, 2:30AM

1h 28m 27s

● **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** started transcription

DT **Dobell, Trevor (DNR)** 0:03

People in the lobby.
Recognize one of them.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 0:06

OK.
Yeah. Everybody on our team ready to go ahead and get started.

DT **Dobell, Trevor (DNR)** 0:15

Yep.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 0:15

OK.
OK.
Well, welcome to virtual public meeting for the public review period of the Haines State Forest Resource Management area.
Management plan amendment.
Thanks for making time to join us folks. That just came in from the lobby and I'll wait a couple more minutes before I start off with introductions.
And we've got a short presentation.
But I'll just wait 2 minutes maybe for.
Or any other folks to log in before we get started.
OK, we've got one more.
OK.
I think we can go ahead and get started and as folks join on, can one of the division of forestry staff help me with admitting from the lobby?

DT Dobell, Trevor (DNR) 3:00

I will.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 3:00

Thanks. OK.

Well, thanks everyone for making time to join us this evening.

My name is Geneva Preston.

I'm a forest planner with the division of Forestry and Fire Protection.

This is a virtual public meeting that's being held as part of the.

Public review period for the draft, Haines State Forest Management Plan, or Haines State Forest Resource Management Area management plan.

I'll let the other division of forestry and Fire Protection staff introduce themselves and then we'll roll into a short presentation before opening up for questions or comments.

So Jeremy, do you want to start us off with introductions?

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 3:47

Sure. Evening everybody.

My name is Jeremy Dowse.

I'm the state forester and the director of the division of Forestry and Fire Protection, and I'll kick it over to Greg.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 4:00

Good evening, Greg Palmeri.

I'm the coastal regional forester and manager of the Haines State Forest for.

Some time here before that.

DT Dobell, Trevor (DNR) 4:17

Good evening.

I'm Trevor dobell.

I'm the statewide forest planner and cooperative forestry programs manager, and I'm out of Anchorage.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 4:29

All right.

Thanks folks.

I will ask that you all bear with me as I get the presentation queued up here.

Sometimes it can take a couple seconds to start working.

So, is everyone able to see the opening slide?

DT Dobell, Trevor (DNR) 4:50

I can.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 4:51

Got it, Geneva.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 4:51

OK.

Thank you.

Alrighty, so welcome to this public meeting for the public review period of the draft Haane State Forest Resource Management plan.

This meeting I'll give a brief overview of some of the policy concepts that are related to each land use designation in the state forest and some of the shifts that we're seeing in this draft as opposed to the version the last version that was published in 2000.

2.

I'll give a little bit of information about the next steps in the planning process and then the majority of the meeting will be open for comments.

Or questions from folks who have joined us this evening.

So a little bit of background before we dive into each of those.

Land use designations.

There are four within the Haines State Forest Resource Management area.

Winds are designated for resource management, public recreation, wildlife habitat or forest land uses.

And one of the.

Most significant changes between the plan that was published in 2002 and the current amended draft.

Is a change in policy that allows timber sales to be a potential use in the public recreation or wildlife habitat lands, and so this presentation is kind of focused on

some examples of.

How? How those?

Activities might manifest in the future if timber harvest were planned on those each land designation.

So I have some summary information in this presentation, but I want to really emphasize to folks.

That the way to really see the comprehensive management goals and intentions is to look to the full text of the plan and this is not a comprehensive representation of that and that plan.

Is available on the project website.

Maybe one of the division staff who's not presenting can drop a link to the project website in our meeting chat here.

DT **Dobell, Trevor (DNR)** 7:20
Andrew.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 7:21

So we'll start with resource management, designated lands.

This is one of the more kind of like broad management intentions for this land use designation.

Some of the general themes that you'll see.

And resource management designated lands are that policies facilitate a wide variety of uses.

The timber harvest strategies are variable, so some units prioritize selective harvest or limit the size of evenage harvests some units.

Have fewer of those limitations.

And just focus on the sustained yield and forest resources and Practices Act requirements.

Scenic values are considered in the design of timber sales on these resource managed lands, but those specifics of how scenic resources would be managed.

Effective timber harvest would be mitigated.

Would be specified in forest land use plans.

So you won't see specific prescriptions or actions outlined in this management plan and within the Haines State Forest Resource Management area.

300 foot buffer around anodimist streams and 500 foot like retention buffers around

lakes.

With an address.

Fish populations apply throughout the forest, and those are referred to as special management zones.

So here are some examples of subunits within the state forest that fall into this resource management category.

So we'll see in in Unit 1A, commercial timber harvest is allowed without any significant stipulations, but in other areas like in subunit 7A.

Even age harvests are limited to 10 acres or less and visual screening is a part of it needs to be a part of the design of timber sales in that area, so I will not read through all of these.

I have a few tables in here with management information for the units in each category.

This presentation will be posted on our project website.

Probably tomorrow.

So folks can revisit to read through, but I will spare you the experience of me reading through.

A table verbatim.

So on public recreation designated lands, any harvest, any timber harvest or resource development activities must be designed to exist compatibly with public recreation uses.

And so typically that would look like Timber's harvests that are designed to support. Recreation facilities or support access to areas that are important for recreation.

There's more management provisions on public recreation lands that address visually screening timber harvest activities from popular recreation sites.

And again, the special management zones for anadromous surface waters would apply through all lands in the state forest.

Sub Unit 1B is unique in that any proposal for development in this subunit would need to be reviewed specifically by the chill cat Bald Eagle Preserve Advisory Council. And as we look through these management policies, again we can see size limits on our even age harvest treatments.

I think 5 acres in unit 3H is the smallest size limit that we see and other units have a CAP at 2020 acres is the largest. Even aged timber harvest that I think is permitted in these public recreation designated lands.

Lands that are designated wildlife habitat.

Their primary use is.

Supporting Fish and Wildlife habitat values, and so any development activities would need to be designed in support of those values.

Timber Harvest would be very likely to be designed in coordination with the Department of Fish and Game and.

They would.

Be designed with the purpose of enhancing habitat and generally this will look like selective harvest in these units as well. You'll see size limits on the even aged harvest options and in many of these units public recreation is emphasized as a secondary management goal.

To moving through some examples here.

You can see these size limits on our even age harvests.

I think 10 to 20 acres is the range of size limits that you'll see in the wildlife habitat, designated subunits.

And the management intent statements consistently identify habitat values as the priority for management on these lands.

And some areas like Unit 5, you can see recreation is also.

Like a high, high priority management.

Consideration.

And finally, and forest designated lands, these are the lands that are the management intent is focused primarily on commercial timber harvest.

In these lands to you'll see some subunits that allow timber harvest that the primary focus is aligning with the forest resources and Practices Act standards, and maintaining that sustained yield.

And some subunits have more stipulations, like identifying them to be used in the small scale timber sale program.

Subunits in this classification with high habitat values emphasize collaboration in harvest design with the Department of Fish and Game, and consistently throughout the state forest.

These special management zones apply.

To an adrus.

Water bodies.

So.

Uh oh.

It looks like maybe my table didn't update so we can see.

In unit 1C or in subunit 1C.

There is a note that the special management zones might be expanded to prevent erosion on steep terrain.

And, for example, subunit 3C is identified as only usable for small commercial sales.

But other lands are open to larger scale timber sales.

Else.

So.

Moving into our next steps in the planning process.

The draft is available for review that is available digitally on our project website, and hard copies will be available in the Forestry Office in Haines. If folks are interested to come, look at a physical copy and we'll ask that you submit your comments by 5:00 PM on June.

5th, you're welcome to do that through e-mail.

To the project e-mail address that you see on this slide or physical mail, or if you'd rather submit comments in person, we'll have our final public meeting for this review period tomorrow in Clouan at the Alaska Native Sisterhood Hall.

So we'll have options to submit comments in writing or record.

Oral testimony.

And in the nearish future you can.

Be expecting public notice of our intent to adopt for this plan.

So during the intent to adopt period, the division will publish an issue response summary where we.

Acknowledge the topics of comments that we received during this review period.

And the divisions response to those comments will identify any recommended revisions that will make to the plan and that information.

Will be available for review for 30 days.

The timing of that depends some on the volume of comments that we receive or the content of comments that we receive during this public review period. But our target is for that to occur in fall of this year.

So with that, I think I'll leave this slide up for a little while if anyone wants to take note of addresses or e-mail addresses.

But we can go ahead and open up for comments or questions.

You will need to raise your hand before we so we know to bring your access to your microphone.

So the feature to do that will be at the top of your team's window.

The center icon is shaped like a hand.

So I'll go ahead and.

Open up for questions or comments.

OK.

I see.

Erst.

Maybe you should have access to your microphone now, but you'll still need to UN.

We can hear you.

AM **Avey W Menard** 18:36

Yeah. Thank.

Thank you.

Thank you, Geneva.

Thanks all the DNR staff who are here on the virtual call and additionally for the day prior and tomorrow in terms of setting up these hearings and doing the work you've done to put together the draft, RMP seems as though there are a few, only a few people.

On the virtual call. So I'm gonna try to pace myself.

I feel like I could ask an endless amount of questions.

First thing I wanted to ask.

I happened to see the tenant of Valley State Forest.

RMP was adopted fairly recently.

And I notice that there are like management policies and categories of management policy in that document that aren't in the, you know, chapter 2, Forest wide management policies for the HSF.

I'm wondering for DNR staff who worked on both of those, whether there's you.

Could you know shed any light on the difference between those two processes and what went into making those management decisions? I'm thinking specifically about.

Like the climate adaptation element, I think it's called Forest Health and climate change in the Tanana Valley.

RMP in a provision or a management policy on cultural resources and whether there's an opportunity to recommend including those kinds of management policies in the draft.

RMP for the Hain State Forest. Thank you.

PS

Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 20:06

Thanks for that question, Avie.

I can take a stab at it and if any other division of forestry staff want to follow up, please do.

I mean the primary difference between the Tana Valley State Forest and the Haines State Forest Resource Management area is that they are categorized under different authorizing statutes or their designated under different authorizing statutes.

And so.

That doesn't necessarily mean that we have changes in our.

Management approach in terms of climate adaptation or cultural resources. But I mean from my perspective, there was a little bit of a different.

Mindset entering the two projects or I was hesitant as a planner to.

Directly mirror.

The Hanes plan with the Tanana Valley plan because I was still learning the differences in terms of the enabling statute.

I think there's absolutely space for a comment or a recommendation to add information to the Hanes plan.

And that's essentially the purpose of this public review period.

So some of that can be.

Chalked up to my learning curve and I don't know if anyone else wants to shed any light on that difference.

DA

Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 21:50

No, I think.

I think you.

I think Geneva hit it.

You know, it was a new planning process we put.

You know it.

We were putting the carbon, the new carbon legislation, in there.

The interior, you know, the boreal forest to the interior does have some different disturbance drivers than our, you know, seeing down in, in the Haynes State Forest and and and so some of that was appropriate. And it also has some.

Umm.

There are some critically important sites that Shippo would identify in the Tanana

Valley state forests.

And so that was that was addressing some of that stuff too.

So but I I think it was, it was the first plan that Geneva had done. And so she added some of that stuff to it.

DT **Dobell, Trevor (DNR)** 22:40

And I would add, please leave that in your comment.

That's a very good comment. Thank you.

AM **Avey W Menard** 22:48

No. Appreciate it.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 22:52

Yeah. Thanks avy.

We'll move on to Eric.

You should have access to your microphone now, Eric.

You may need to unmute yourself.

That should be at the top right of your screen.

EH **Eric Holle** 23:20

Katie Palmer with Eric Holly on the same computer.

I have a simple question.

I just want to know how many pages long the clan is.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 23:32

Gosh, that's I off the top of my head.

I think it's somewhere close to 230, but I don't actually know the exact number of pages off the top of my head.

EH **Eric Holle** 23:43

OK, I thought I had seen a much larger number. That's why I was asking. OK, thanks.

This is Eric.

Can I jump in here now with a couple of questions?

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 23:54

Sure.

EH **Eric Holle** 23:56

I actually have a bunch of questions so.

I think I'll start with the most general one.

What is the goal?

I mean what?

What is the justification for changing what's in place? What's driving this?

Desire to change the existing plan.

Is it still?

Intended to be a way to get carbon offset.

And enhance the state economy.

Or is there another philosophy?

Behind this, do you want to answer that and then wait for other questions or?

How would you like to? Let's see.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 24:48

Yeah, I think.

Let's talk through one or two questions now and then maybe see if any other folks want to ask questions and want to make sure that we have time space for everyone to participate.

So.

The goal of management in the state forest is to.

Maintain multiple uses and support a variety of resource values that are described in the enabling statutes.

Which unfortunately are across the room for me right now, so I can't read it verbatim, but those include.

Like Fish and Wildlife resources traditional uses.

Extractable mineral resources and timber.

Among others. So the management goal for this state forest includes balancing a wide range of values and uses one of the goals in the revision is to include carbon offsets among those uses.

And there needs to be language in the plan that identifies carbon offsets as a

potential use before.

Any planning or like consideration of projects can occur. So that's part of our goal with the amendment and beyond that, we're also making some changes to our policy to reflect that.

Management of that broad range of.

Uses. That's described in the authorizing statutes in our policy across the forest.

EH

Eric Holle 26:53

OK.

Well, if you'll give me a second question, then I will ask.

Another question, how can the public access?

Easily access without doing a research project.

Objective data.

That shows that timber sales, particularly timber sales, in the resource management areas.

Provide an economic benefit, in other words, is I would.

Wonder where I could see a real cost benefit.

Analysis where the costs include.

Administrative costs and you know labor to layout timber sales.

Rd. building.

Such things as that versus.

The amount of money that would be expected to go into the state coffers.

PS

Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 28:10

Asking about the a comparison between revenue from timber sales and versus the amount of money that's invested in developing a timber sale.

EH

Eric Holle 28:25

Exactly and in in past years, that's been very difficult to find because of the way that that information is.

Divided up in the the state records.

PS

Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 28:42

Well, I would think.

Our division annual report would be a good place to start, but.

I'll pass that off to Greg or Jeremy.

You two are a little more involved with the execution.

DA **Douse, Jeremy A (DNR)** 28:59

Oh yes, Sir.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 28:59

Of policy than I am.

DA **Douse, Jeremy A (DNR)** 29:01

And I'll start and Greg can start kind of at a statewide perspective and and Greg can get if if he has information for more specific.

Information. Then he can provide that.

But so Eric.

There is.

There is data that you can find through the University of Montana Bureau of Business and Economic Research.

They do mill surveys up here.

They're part of the.

Work with the Forest Service to do mill surveys across the state.

And you can get an idea of the the level of impact economic impact that it has on the state. And I would, I would just warn that that revenue directly like in terms of stumpage what what the state receives from from timber sales is I would say it.

It's, you know, there is a the state is getting a profit on that.

But even beyond that, not a huge profit cause.

Stumpage is not is not intended to not be, you know super high.

It covers Land Management costs and the state receives some money for that.

But on top of that, you know, there's also the added benefits of employment at the mills.

So you know that's that's revenue that's generated in those in those communities and then those the the value added products that they're creating that particular the ones that stay in state are being used by contractors to do things like build housing and you know.

So there's some added benefit to it, but but if you just wanted to like, look.

At kind of what the state of the?

Of the industry is in Alaska, that University of Montana, it's Ber Bureau of Business and Economic Research does do that. That mill survey work.
And then I'll kick it to Greg, if he's got anything to add.

EH **Eric Holle** 31:01
Yeah.

PJ **Palmieri, Greg J (DNR)** 31:09
Yeah, Jeremy, I I really don't have anything to add to that. I think that's.
A good direction to go.

EH **Eric Holle** 31:17
So do you remember?

PJ **Palmieri, Greg J (DNR)** 31:18
Look for that information.

EH **Eric Holle** 31:20
I'm 10.
But they have been for a long time.
OK.
Well, I'll, I'll. I'll take a break from my questions then, but thanks for that.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 31:48
Thanks for your question, Eric.
And if we have a a few minutes go by without other questions, feel free to to chime back in.
Looks like Avi got their hand up again.
I believe you still have access to your microphone.

AM **Avey W Menard** 32:20
Yeah. Thanks, Geneva.
Maybe this is a a follow up to Eric's question.
I mean, the presentation today really did outline what I think is the biggest change to the plan, which is the shift from the 2002 prohibition on commercial timber harvest

or other types of timber harvest activity in areas designated wildlife habitat and public recreation. Is there any?

Like record of decision or basis.

Upon which DNR is made that determination that there is a compatibility there, beyond what's provided in the draft RMP.

I've I've read the draft.

It's obviously a big document.

I haven't gone through it with a fine tooth comb.

I think there is a great amount of detail and attention paid to the resources present on each unit and subunit, and like you laid out Geneva, there are the acreage limits and you know, even age harvest limits and selective harvest preference for those areas.

But as a basic question, there was an administrative determination in the 80s and again in 2002 that said timber harvest isn't compatible as a matter of fact, with the areas we've identified the best and highest resource value is wildlife habitat or public recreation and just as.

A matter of public input, obviously.

I imagine DNR has fielded or heard some concern about how it made that decision.

Is there a decision document?

Or anything DNR could point the the public to that provides a basis for its decision there.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 34:01

Thanks for that question, AB.

I think.

This might be a good question for for Greg to speak to.

Just given his specific experience in this area.

I don't.

We don't have.

Like a memorandum or like an explicit decision document.

Other than the revision of plan policies.

That like, identifies a moment where that shift has occurred. I think a lot of that.

Thought process has evolved over decades of correspondence with department of Fish and Game and the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation and their feedback on.

The timber harvest activities that have planned been planned and have occurred in this area.

But.

Greg maybe can provide a little bit more detail and certainly more experience than I can with that question.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 35:19

Yeah. Thanks, Geneva.

I appreciate the question.

Can you maybe point to your reference to where there was a determination in the previous management plan of incompatibility of uses?

Please.

AM Avey W Menard 35:37

Yeah, I'll have to look into the 2002 document, but that commercial timber harvest was prohibited activity in all of the wildlife habitat and public recreation lands.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 35:50

Certainly, but it wasn't determined to be incompatible.

It was a policy decision.

That was made at the time.

By the managers in charge.

And the decision.

For this policy change is based on the legal status written in the statute.

And that's where it comes from.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 36:17

Yeah, yeah, the add to Greg's point there, Evie, the decision would be at the at the the point of disposal, right.

So we're just making a policy call here, just like they did back in the, you know, in the previous version of the plan.

No decision document was made.

I mean, the plan is the decision document.

So to speak.

And so the same thing here.

So, but if a timber sale were to happen.

Happen in those areas because that's a disposal of state interest for sure, there would be a a best interest finding, which is what our decision document would be.

Before any timber harvest would take place and I want to make sure everybody's completely understanding here that any timber harvest that takes place in those land classifications has to be in alignment with the management intent.

So if it's for wildlife habitat, we are altering the condition of.

The forest, the vegetation to meet a habitat objective.

That 80 F&G has completely, you know, worked with us on same thing with recreation. We would be working with DPOR to do things like improve access to recreation facilities or whatever the case might be.

I just want to make sure that that's clear.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 37:41

Thanks Jeremy.

Thanks Greg.

Another question from Avi.

And then we'll go to Eric.

AM **Avey W Menard** 38:24

I see Eric.

I see.

Eric raised his hand.

So I'll defer. Thank you.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 38:29

OK. Thanks.

Let's see.

Eric, you have access to your microphone. Go ahead.

EH **Eric Holle** 38:45

OK. Can you hear me now?

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 38:47

Yes.

EH

Eric Holle 38:49

Thanks.

This is a really broad question. I hope it's not too broad, but.

It's. Excuse me, it's widely acknowledged.

By International Union for Conservation of Nature and other similar.

Scientific bodies.

That there is an extinction crisis going on now in.

In the world that is perhaps even more serious than climate change.

And.

I wonder if.

That is somehow.

Acknowledged.

In other words, are there prescriptions and guidelines that acknowledge that?

That will be in this plan.

Particularly regarding.

Connectivity.

Between.

Different regions of the forest.

Especially.

Where old growth?

Large parcels of old growth exist.

And so when I talk about biodiversity, I'm talking about not just, you know, the.

Large mammals.

And.

The more.

Charismatic megafauna, but also the.

The small stuff, you know, the Michael Risa fungi that connect trees below the surface in flying squirrels and things like that.

Does that play a role in this new management plan?

PS

Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 40:52

That is a broad question.

I think.

The division of forestry as an agency.

Doesn't really have the authority to write management policy that addresses animal populations, or like the habitat conditions that are needed to support animal populations.

And so our tools really for addressing like.

The needs of the biotic community in you know in this landscape would be like having the ability to use forest management activities in a way that the Department of Fish and Game is advising.

The division to do so the the Department of Fish and Game is the agency that has legal authority to make recommendations or develop policy about how to support. The animal populations and on state lands in Alaska.

And so our our tool to address like the.

Extinction crisis that you referred in your in your comment would be an ability to respond to the Department of Fish and Game if they are recommending or requesting habitat enhancement treatments. Because our like our kind of.

Realm of of operation as the division of Forestry and Fire Protection is pretty strictly limited to forest resources.

Like vegetation treatments and.

EH **Eric Holle** 42:40

My wife.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 42:41

Designing ways to access vegetation areas to make any changes.

So we don't have any policy that's written specifically about managing animal.

Populations. But we do have a lot of policy that references deferring to the recommendations of Fish and Game.

Which is the group that has authority to make those decisions.

EH **Eric Holle** 43:13

OK.

DA **Douse, Jeremy A (DNR)** 43:15

Before we move on to the next question, just to add to that, right, like US Fish and Wildlife Service regulates threatened and endangered species and if they had identified something and identified critical habitat, then we would have to adhere to

that.

Additionally, they're the ones that you know provide us with the the statutes that we have to follow for like Baldwin Golden Eagle Protection Act and that sort of thing. So just to make to make that clear too.

EH **Eric Holle** 43:45
OK.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 43:46
Thanks Jeremy.

EH **Eric Holle** 43:48
Thanks. I I have a couple of I think very simple.
Quick questions and I would be done if you would like.
Or would you rather jump back to AV right now?
Or someone else.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 44:05
I think we have time to do one or two more questions with you, Eric, and then we can we can go back to touching base with AVY.

EH **Eric Holle** 44:15
OK. In the previous plan?
Clear cutting was the preferred method for harvest.
I don't know.
Maybe specifically on resource management plans, I'm not sure about that.
And so I wonder if is that the same.
And is the rotation period still the same?
And is there a new?
Completed inventory that comes as part of this.
The new plan.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 44:57
I will go ahead and and hand that question off to Greg.
Those are resource specific for sure.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 45:07

Thanks, Geneva and Eric, absolutely you can reference our latest inventory report online on our website.

EH Eric Holle 45:08

I.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 45:16

It was published in 2025, revised from a previous publication of that document. And the inventory work that we've done since the last management plan revision occurred in 2012 and 2018. Finally, with a comprehensive sampling of our. 2nd girl stands.

They contributed to the growth model and the inventory report you find on our website.

Remind me again what your other question was, Eric, I'm sorry.

EH Eric Holle 45:54

Is the rotation period the same or changed?
Or has it been divided up based on specific?
Microclimates.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 46:11

Right. The rotation age is the same.

EH Eric Holle 46:19

OK, in.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 46:19

Eric, you did. You did ask about clear, clear cuts as the preferred. Silver cultural system too, and I believe we took we have changed that. There's a whole slew of silver cultural systems that could be used. Clear cuts are one. You know, it's even age management and it is a legitimate silver cultural system. But there's a whole slew of silver cultural systems that could be used.

EH **Eric Holle** 46:44

OK.

Thanks. I'll look into the the full plan.

My wife Katie is here.

She could ask a question if you have time for that.

Is that OK?

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 47:00

Go ahead, Katie.

EH **Eric Holle** 47:02

Well, I'm just wondering when you say some of these things are not the responsibility of the forestry Department, I'm wondering who in the state is responsible, for instance, for what we now know is essential to the forest, which are the mycor. And I would like to know, I.

Don't think Fish and Game is necessarily responsible for that.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 47:27

No, I don't think phishing game has any.

Any responsibility or authority in that in that realm? I mean, it's certainly part of.

The forest system and it's part of the forests.

That Greg manages here.

I'm curious if you can refer us to some examples of like management practices that are specific to Microsoft.

Mycorrhizal communities.

Or if you have examples of other like.

EH **Eric Holle** 48:07

Well.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 48:11

States or other nations that that you think effectively address that topic.

EH **Eric Holle** 48:16

Yes, yes, I do.

In Chile, there is a law now and it has been a law for quite some years.

That no activities can occur.

If if the mycorizy are impacted, no activities, whether it's, you know, mineral or forestry, but definitely not forestry, definitely forestry cutting and things like that.

Cannot occur because the mycorizer are considered equal to all to the wildlife to all the plants. Everything that you know normally is considered. For instance, here when you're looking about, you're talking about cutting and how that will be done.

The Mycoriza now it's it's a law there that they have to consider the mycorizae for every activity that's done.

And.

And also ABC Forrester named Herb Hammond.

Maybe you are familiar with him. His plans always consider impacts to Michael Rizal Fungi also.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 49:29

Hmm.

DA **Douse, Jeremy A (DNR)** 49:31

Geneva I can so.

Michael Risell Fungi are they're endemic in this in forested soils across the world, right?

And and they're important here, just like they are in any forested ecosystem. They do, even after, after treatments, they are present.

They're particularly enforced.

They don't tend to be host specific.

They are present in the soil.

And but they are really they're they're critically important for reforestation.

You know, we're working with.

With AD F&G to do a study now it's up in the interior.

But it this has been done replicated in other parts of the country to show the importance of red back bowls for the dispersal of of mycorrhizal fungi in treated areas and and we're and they're coming up with, you know, some like real management.

Guidelines for the dispersal of woody debris across the treatment area for small

mammal habitat so that they can disperse mycorizable fungi.

But if you look at like the work that even NRCS has done in Alaska in forested ecosystems, you know, short of very severe burns.

In black spruce stands after treatment.

Microsoft Fungi continues to exist in those stands in that in the soil, those stands.

DT **Dobell, Trevor (DNR)** 50:57

And I'll add one other thing that you know, they follow the Forest Resources Practices Act, minimizing soil disturbance and encouraging natural regeneration are two of the key elements for encouraging more fungus to remain on site.

EH **Eric Holle** 51:16

OK.

Thank you.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 51:18

Yeah. Thank you for your question and those references to some of the international examples that you shared.

We appreciate that.

EH **Eric Holle** 51:28

The woman.

The woman in Chile is Juliana Ferri, who who got this legislation.

Baby really was one the person to enable that to happen in Chile years ago.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 51:44

OK.

Thank you.

Yeah. Thank you for that.

Let's go back to Avi.

See, you have your hand up again.

AM **Avey W Menard** 51:54

Hello again, DNR.

This is may be a follow up to the the last few questions I saw in the 10 valley RMP.

There is use of the term adaptive management both for climate adaptation, but I also think for force management practices.

I wonder from the Managing foresters in the Haines State Forest whether there's an appetite for just including that language in the draft RMP.

For the hainstein force to make it clear that that's, you know in the toolkit of forest management strategies.

And then I have a follow up after that question.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 52:37

Well, I think that that's.

A perfectly fine.

Comment to submit.

Either in writing or.

If you come to the meeting in clock one.

Yeah.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 52:56

Avi mean, our FERPA is adaptive management, right?

Like the definition of adaptive management is to do something and to evaluate its results and then make adjustments based on that. And we do that. You know, FERPA is is very much that we have compliance monitoring, but we also have effectiveness monitoring where we, you know we deter.

If what the practices that we are.

Asking the the.

Operators to implement, if they're actually effective in meeting their their intent.

AM Avey W Menard 53:32

Yeah. Thank you both Jeremy and Greg.

That sounds right to me.

I'm I didn't assume that there was an absence of that kind of process in forestry.

It just stood out to me, frankly, reading the RMP as kind of a more affirmative thing that is maybe more easily digestible to the public.

In terms of outlining management process.

In addition to that, understanding how you operate within the context of FERPA.

And try to use basically the best available data.

I'm also curious.

Frankly, interested in seeing in the Haines State Forest RMP some acknowledgement that traditional ecological knowledge is available, you know, database basically to draw from in making management decisions and putting forward kind of the best, best forestry practices within the context of the RMPI. Don't know if you.

Have fielded any.

Questions, comments, recommendations around?

How the department?

Engages with TEK, either broadly or in any specific management area, but just curious what your initial thoughts are about the possibility of having traditional ecological knowledge written into the Haines State Forest management plan as something that the department would look to as part of its decision making. Process in managing the forest.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 55:05

Yeah.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 55:09

Jeremy, do you want me to chime in first or?

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 55:12

You. Yeah. You want to take a stab at it?

Yeah, that's for sure.

And then I can.

I can if if.

I think that I can have.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 55:19

Yeah, I think that traditional ecological knowledge is definitely an appealing source of information and data. And it's also something that.

I mean, from my perspective as a planner, I don't want to cultivate a sense of entitlement to that information or to assume that like.

An indigenous group that's local to any of our management areas would just. Like.

That that relationship would automatically exist without building it first.

So I think.

Like in our current management areas like relational dynamics like we're not at a point where we're seeing that exchange of information. And I think we're definitely making strides toward that, but.

I think one of my, I guess thought processes is that like.

Like would want to confirm that that's like.

Some something that we would have permission to include before putting it in a management plan.

I'm not sure if Jeremy would want to follow up on that at all.

DA

Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 56:38

Well, I think that's a good, good way to answer it the the way. So we have, we do have a a tribal liaison within the department now in the state.

You know the state is not like the federal government in that we're not as we don't have that same kind of government to government relationship that that the federal government does.

But we are making, you know, there were we have that that liaison to to help with some of this this process.

What I would say though, is that what's?

What's great about this public process that the state has is that we take all information and we do, particularly in Alaska. You know, obviously because of the number of tribes that are in Alaska, we make a point of reaching out to the tribes, you know, just like we.

Would any like boroughs or any other group to to get information from them and and you know that tends to come through that the TEK information tends to come through in that process even though it's not maybe officially called Tek.

AM

Avey W Menard 57:39

Yeah. Thank you both both for those responses.

My perspective on it is pretty similar to what we just covered with adaptive management that it's already well within the scope and likely within the existing practices of forestry and just considering whether it might be worthwhile to name it. As you know, part of the available set of.

Of tools you're looking to draw from and Geneva your your point is well taken.

And that, you know, I wouldn't recommend putting into the management plan some

kind of binding obligation to follow TEK because that puts a burden that hasn't been discussed with any knowledge holders to supply that information.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 58:19

Mm-hmm.

AM **Avey W Menard** 58:21

But I do wonder if there's more of a middle distance that just acknowledges, because frankly, there isn't that sort of, you know.

Federal framework that has made.

Much more clear.

In the last several years, especially that TEK is part of its, you know, linen resource management, decision making processes both writ large and in specific agreements with tribes.

But that to me it's an opportunity for Alaska to set a good example because of the presence of, you know, of the Alaska Native community in the state.

But I'll have something written up for public comment for sure in terms of having something that might fit within the context of the RMP itself.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 58:59

Thanks. Thanks.

I appreciate that feedback, Evie and I really appreciate your perspective about.

Sort of.

Just identifying this kind of middle in between space that we're occupying on that topic.

Thank you.

AM **Avey W Menard** 59:31

And if it's all right, I do have one more question.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 59:35

Sure, go ahead.

AM **Avey W Menard** 59:37

Yeah, this one's a little.

Wonky, maybe?

The Haines State Forest enabling statute and the the chill cat preserve statute both identify that among the purposes are the, you know, continuation of traditional uses and what is it beneficial uses and traditional uses and other recreational opportunities. But I've seen in every version of the Hain state.

Forest RMP that traditional uses is kind of subsumed within the category of recreation and I wonder if.

There's ever been a consideration whether traditional use really ought to have a standalone management guidelines or management policy around it.

Because the way I read the statute it, it is distinct enough from other recreational uses and it singled out in the statutory language of the Enabling Act in a way that I don't think is reflected so clearly in management policy in the RMP.

And that's it's not as though there was a big change between the 2002 and this draft. It it wasn't in the 2002 management policy either.

And then this is where I'm a little bit in the weeds on it.

The definition that is supplied in this draft RMP and the 2002 RMP suggests that traditional uses means traditional modes of access under the Alaska Land use Law in 3804. But that statute wasn't passed at the time that the Haines State Forest was estab.

And so I I don't think it's what they were referencing the legislature in 1982.

I think it's more clear on the record that what they meant was.

Preserving the way of life of the local community, including with specific reference the native community, and so I I wonder if there is time in this public comment and and draft review process to really consider whether to align management policy with the statutory purposes of the forest there.

Is more attention given to the specificity, the local specificity of traditional uses in the area?

DA

Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:01:55

Geneva. I'm gonna go ahead and respond to that if that's if that's OK, Avi.

It's a really interesting point you bring up and and one that I see in other parts of the state.

You're right.

Currently, traditional use would typically refer to access, and it's in even that point is changing to to, you know, include things like snow machines and ATV's as a

traditional use and and for the state from everything that I've.

Seen in policy.

The term traditional is does not refer to to native populations like you would think it would.

It refers to what Alaskans have used.

Previously, right.

So traditional use could be.

Hunting or fishing or gathering or subsistence activities with like a little less subsistence.

Not the federal version of subsistence.

So it's it's I think it's I think the state.

Takes that word that that term traditional.

And and applies a different definition to it than like what the federal government does.

AM Avey W Menard 1:03:05

Yeah. Thanks for that. And I I would tend to agree as well specially that distinction between like capital S and and lowercase S subsistence and Even so like I think the traditionally compatible uses are laid out in the hinstein force enabling statute.

And so I think it would be better aligned with that legislation if that were the definition.

Used.

And applied throughout the draft RMP as opposed to looking out to what is a S 3804.

Because you just go down.

I don't know from section 310 to 3:15 it says the traditionally compatible uses are and it lays out that list like you just mentioned, Jeremy, which includes subsistence. But but.

Not, you know, a certain range of subsistence practices that I understand for constitutional reasons have to apply to all rural Alaskans.

But Even so, there's a local element to that, and the established patterns of use are going to have that local character. And I think that's something that the hinstein force RMP really ought to reflect in how it manages the forest.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:04:16

Think that would be a fantastic comment for for you to make AB.

I find that stuff really interesting too, and it's it's like this is going back to, you know, statehood and, you know, certainly things with Anil Ka and and all that so.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:04:38

Avy, let's go. I see Eric.

You have your hand up again.

You should have access to your microphone.

EH **Eric Holle** 1:04:53

I actually didn't have any more questions I but I would.

Say.

I'd like to say Ditto to what Avey has brought up, and I hope that I believe you have a meeting in Clack one and it seems like that would be.

A good.

Opportunity to look a little more deeply into the issues that.

Avie brought up here.

Anyway, I appreciate your answer.

Regarding that, Jeremy and.

Hopefully you can maybe take a deeper dive into that before the plan is finalized.

Anyway, thanks again.

I'll probably bow out now, but thanks very much.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:05:48

OK.

Thank you.

Thanks for making time to join us this evening.

Go ahead avy.

AM **Avey W Menard** 1:06:23

Just going to keep letting it rip, but before I do, I want to say thank you as well.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:06:26

OK.

AM Avey W Menard 1:06:29

I just.

I appreciate the time and commitment D&R staff has made to really seeing the public process through.

And I appreciate your willingness to continue doing that.

One question I had has there been?

Has there been any consideration of reclassifying any of the units?

I mean or subunits in the forest. That was one of the the things that stood out to me in the updated RMP is that the underlying kind of resource values present in terms of what are the highest priority hasn't changed.

You know, if you're able to say, as a matter of process whether any were under serious consideration.

Based on any kind of survey inventory, new information, conversations with departments in the last 20 years.

Yeah, just obviously don't want to go too far into the black box.

But just as a matter of curiosity.

Yeah. Whether there was any consideration of identifying a different highest and best use for any of the units or subunits in the forest.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:07:39

That's yeah.

Thanks for that question, I.

At my level, I was not involved in any discussions about.

Potentially changing the classifications of the land within the state forest boundary.

That's.

In terms of like the information that would drive that discussion.

Like we didn't receive any input or recommendations from the from other like management agencies to indicate that there was a significant shift I guess in the resource distribution on the landscape since the 2002 plan.

I don't know if Jeremy or Greg received information that didn't trickle down to me.

But I wasn't involved in any conversations of that nature.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:08:43

I I.

Frank probably has the best information on that, just being kind of the local forester and being in this community. I would say though that the way that the resources are allocated across the the forest, you know, there's been a long commitment to recreation in those in those L.

Classifications, but most of the the forested grounds is in the forest classifications, so the distribution seems to make sense.

But I'll let Greg.

He might have more information.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:09:15

Sure. I don't know that I have.

Anything really specific there hasn't been.

A discussion at all about changing the classifications.

In my tenure for many of the agencies.

That we work with over.

Or that I've worked with over the years.

I can say that.

The development of classifications of lands in the state of Alaska.

Is really led by our mining lens and water.

Division that that is our lead planning entity for DNR.

And.

In regards to the Haines State Forest management plan specifically.

Conversations that I had with those individuals in leadership about.

Land classification in the forest at the beginning of this process, which dates back to.

Spring of 2024 and fall of 23, really.

Umm.

They educated me on on the.

Work and effort that would be required.

To make a recommendation of a change.

And part of their.

Emphasis on the challenges that we would face if that was in fact.

The division's intention in in our amendment to to reclassify lands, which it wasn't.

But I was simply inquiring with them.

On process.

That they pointed out that you know.

The length of time, the period that these classifications of these specific lands has existed.

Is a significant weighted factor.

In identifying those classifications as correct.

And so making a proposed change to overturn those classifications.

Would be would require.

A very significant study, as you referred to and.

Probably a quite lengthy process.

To to make the determination that a change would be required.

And.

You know that that is the extent of involvement in that conversation as we begin this process, you know, with that lead agency, who does that planning in those classifications for state lands across the state.

As as the leaders in DNR, I don't know if that helps you Navy, but.

I can tell you that was my experience with that topic.

AM Avey W Menard 1:12:24

Yeah, Greg, I really appreciate it.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:12:25

I.

Sorry Avi, I did.

I cut you off.

AM Avey W Menard 1:12:33

No.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:12:35

I wanted to to add as well a lot of the classification.

Determinations.

On state lands like they're tied to factors that if they change or that's occurring on a more like a geologic time scale because it's a, it's a consideration of the like site quality's.

The drainage like.

Groundwater behavior like soils types.

Presence of anadromous streams. It's sort of like a lot of those.

Classification decisions are based on on landscape features that wouldn't change in a human lifetime.

And you know, including the forest classification, it's based on the sites ability to grow production.

Forest stand it's not based on the presence or age of trees or the volume of of wood that's present at that time.

And the classifications that come to mind for me that are more temporal or more subject to change would be settlement or agriculture, both of which it imply an intention to dispose of lands to other outside ownerships.

And because of the legislative designation of the state forest.

That's not possible.

It's not possible for land within the state for us to be.

Sold to outside organizations.

So part of the part of the logic behind not changing things would be that.

It's it's so unlikely, I guess that those influencing features would have changed.

In a period of 30 or 50 years.

AM Avey W Menard 1:14:43

Yeah. Thank you both for that.

It really was just a a matter of curiosity.

I mean I've I've seen in the administrative code that like the the public can propose a classification or reclassification, and I've had a hunch that it was much more.

High level back end decision making than just that.

Some sort of public initiative, but yeah, getting getting a sense of for one, I didn't know it was DMLW.

That really weighed in heavily on those decisions, but it makes sense putting those things together that it's it's looking at really long time frame factors in the land. So thanks.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:15:28

Thanks avy.

Yeah, I see a hand up for.

Roy, you should have access to your microphone now.

RJ Roy Josephson 1:15:53

Yeah, I got a question on the carbon credits.

Understand that's part of this management plan update and if that goes through, is there a mechanism in place where it's likely that the division can sell some of those credits and get money to help help run the the state forest with carbon credits?

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:16:20

I'm gonna. I'll go ahead and take that one, Neva.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:16:24

Thanks Jeremy.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:16:26

So yeah. So Roy, as you know, the legislation legislation passed.

There seems to be an echo, I wonder.

You guys hear me OK?

There you go.

So yeah, the legislation passed a couple of years ago with the idea was to see what opportunities the state had for implementing carbon projects that, you know, part of the reason that this plan is going through just like the other state forest is to have that as an.

Allowable use on the on the state forest.

That you know that there's a carbon program in the in state government now and they're trying to find opportunities to get carbon projects.

On state land, not just state forest, but just all general state lands.

So you know that that's something that could occur.

It's. There's what we mostly have access to are the voluntary, the voluntary market right now.

And there's some, you know, there's some.

There's two ways that we can do that.

Essentially, it's improved forest management, which is kind of offsetting timber harvest to A to a some future date.

And then you can get carbon credits that way.

Or there's reforestation.

Which you know, in like burned areas that are not coming back.

They're not reforesting appropriately and and you can get carbon credits over the rotation that way. The IFM projects seem to be problematic. There's not as much of A, you know, the markets are really, really highly variable and just volatile. And there doesn't seem to be a lot of.

Opportunities for ifm.

Right now.

You need to have that additionality in place to which is, you know, the quote UN quote, threat of the timber being harvest to be able to even have a project.

Exist and in in many cases where there's no access in Alaska, that's that's problematic. And then the reforestation thing is mostly something that there are some project developers that are looking kinda interior Alaska to see what opportunities there might be.

But even that seems challenging. So.

The long winded way to say that, yeah, we're still looking for opportunities.

The state is still looking for opportunities for carbon projects, but we haven't found much as of yet.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:18:56

I want to address one thing I heard in Roy's question.

Uh, kind of specific?

Umm. Inquiry about if the revenue from.

Potential carbon offset projects in the state forest would be made available to support the management of the forest.

I think the.

It's been a while since I've looked this up so I'm I wanna give that disclaimer first.

But I think that this the enabling statutes for the carbon offset program do define that the revenue from that program would be divided between.

The like the general.

General funds for the state and a portion of it would be put in the like a renewable energy fund, but there's not any direct like stream of revenue that circles back to management of the state forest system, to my knowledge.

DA **Douse, Jeremy A (DNR)** 1:20:03

My understanding of it as well.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:20:23

I'll give us a quick time check here.

We've got about 10 minutes left in our in our meeting time for this evening.

So any folks who have additional questions, feel free, but I do wanna bring attention to that. We have about 10 minutes left.

AM **Avey W Menard** 1:20:55

I did have.

Sorry, I did have one more question that I just remembered.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:21:01

Go ahead avy.

AM **Avey W Menard** 1:21:03

I know.

And you pointed out that in at least some units or subunits, decisions will be coordinated with the Bald Eagle Preserve Advisory Council.

The the is that a?

Is that a policy or legal decision and is it based on like adjacency to the preserve or some underlying identification?

Of the you know, connection between resources across the boundary from the preserve to the forest.

And yeah, maybe I'll leave the question there.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:21:39

That's a that's a good question.

I think so.

The Advisory Council for the Bald Eagle Preserve would be a part of the review process for any any decision, so they would be included in the review of a best interest finding or a forest land use plan for any proposed activity.

I'll let Greg elaborate, but my understanding is that these subunits where the.

The inclusion of the Advisory Council in the design phase of a potential timber sale would be connected to to sub units that are adjacent to the Eagle preserve.

Yeah, go ahead, Greg.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:22:30

So specifically in areas where that is called out as a requirement, what you'll find is that.

That there's a land designation or I'm sorry. There's a use designation in there that falls under an interagency Land Management agreement.

For Division of Parks on State Forest.

And so giving them the opportunity to have.

More of a collaborative interaction in that particular area is recognizing the authority that we've given them under the what we call an ILMA for management of recreation in that particular subunit.

And this this is this is in addition to or goes, you know, is a president.

To the typical elaborative review process that the Bald Eagle Preserve Council would have that Geneva mentioned.

AM Avey W Menard 1:23:38

Yeah, that's really helpful. And then that.

That ILMA is it attached as an appendix in the RMP?

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:23:52

Yes.

AM Avey W Menard 1:23:53

Thank you.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:23:54

All our agreements with parks and our shared management agreements with parks are part of the document in the appendices.

AM Avey W Menard 1:24:01

Yeah.

OK.

That's all my questions for tonight. Thank you all.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:24:16

Thanks avy.

Well, if we don't have additional.

Questions from anyone?

We've got about 5 minutes left, so I will go ahead and.

Wrap up the meeting.

Sorry, I'm working on turning my camera back on.

Go ahead and close out the meeting for tonight.

I think Many thanks to the folks who made time to join us this evening.

And thanks for your thoughtful questions.

Please do.

Share your comments and recommendations with us in writing.

If you have more questions or process questions, feel free to reach out to me.

My contact information is all over our project website.

And we'll look forward to seeing your comments in e-mail or via mail.

Or perhaps we'll see you tomorrow in Cloquan.

But thanks everyone for joining us this evening.

AM **Avey W Menard** 1:25:36

Thanks everybody.

Geneva I had one question about this recording.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:25:41

Yes.

AM **Avey W Menard** 1:25:42

Will this be up on the Plan Amendment page at some point?

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:25:47

Yes, there's a menu tab called meeting archives.

AM **Avey W Menard** 1:25:48

If.

Got it.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:25:53

It takes a little bit of time for me to do the processing and proofread the transcripts, but eventually it will be posted in the meeting archive section.

AM Avey W Menard 1:26:05

OK.

Thank you.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:26:21

I will stay on until it's 8:00 officially, but other folks are free to go if. If you'd like.

AM Avey W Menard 1:26:33

All right. Thanks, DNR.

Thank you, Jeremy.

Thank you, Geneva.

Thank you, Greg.

Thank you, Trevor.

Have a good night.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:26:39

Thanks avy.

Thanks. Thanks for calling in.

DT Dobell, Trevor (DNR) 1:26:41

Thank you.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:26:41

Thanks, baby.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:26:47

I'm gonna stay on till 8.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:26:50

Yeah, we've made it this far.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:27:03
I was going to ask Roy how he was doing.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:27:09
Yeah. Did you all know who that was?

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:27:12
That was.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:27:12
Roy.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:27:13
Yeah.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:27:14
Yeah.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:27:15
Or.

PJ Palmieri, Greg J (DNR) 1:27:16
Yeah, yeah.

DA Douse, Jeremy A (DNR) 1:27:20
I think he was still the area Forester when I first started the first time I started working vision and I I think there was a there was a resource meeting in Anchorage up in the 14th or 15th floor or somewhere up there.
That was the first time I met you, Greg.
It was like in 2009.

PS Preston, Geneva S (DNR) 1:27:51
I'm at rovette.
I think the first public meeting that we held.

DT **Dobell, Trevor (DNR)** 1:27:55

Yeah.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:27:55

Here in Haines for this project and it took me about two weeks to put it together that he was the area Forester from from years past. But I figured it out eventually.

PJ **Palmieri, Greg J (DNR)** 1:28:07

Yeah.

Yeah.

PS **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** 1:28:14

OK.

I'm gonna go ahead and stop the recording.

● **Preston, Geneva S (DNR)** stopped transcription