

BOARD OF FORESTRY FINAL MINUTES August 8-10, 2018

DAY ONE: Wednesday, August 8, 2018

Location and teleconference sites:

Fairbanks, 3700 Airport Way, Large conference room

Teleconference sites: Anchorage – 550 W. 7th Ave., Suite 1450; Juneau – 400 Willoughby Ave., 4th floor, conference room A; Fairbanks (Aug. 10) – 3700 Airport Way, Large conference room

Call to Order and Roll Call. Chris Maisch, State Forester, called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m. Teleconference sites were connected in Juneau and Anchorage. Members Chris Beck, Denise Herzog, Jaeleen Kookesh (on teleconference), Jim Durst (sitting in for Bill Morris), Will Putman, Eric Nichols, Chris Stark, and Mark Vinsel were present. A quorum was established.

Jaeleen introduced herself, the board introduced themselves to her.

Also present in the conference room: Dan Rees: Ft. Wainwright Natural Resource Manager, also TVSF CAC member; Tim Dabney, Deputy Director Division of Forestry; Todd Nichols, ADFG Habitat; Tom Malone, TVSF CAC Chair; Tom Paragi, ADFG Wildlife Biologist; Paul Keech, Regional Forester.

Anchorage teleconference: Kyle Mosel, OPMP, Andrew Sayers-Fay, DEC, Earl Crapps, DEC
Juneau teleconference: Tom Lenhart, Assistant AG, Department of Law; Joel Nudelman, Division of Forestry; Gretchen Pikul, DEC Water; Meredith Trainor, SEACC.

Public Meeting Notice. The meeting was noticed by issuing public service announcements and press releases (handout in packet), mailing announcements to interested parties, and posting a notice on the state's Online Public Notice System and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) website.

Approval of Minutes. By unanimous consent, the Board reviewed and approved the February 23, 2018 minutes with the following corrections to dollar amounts: Page 1: \$102.0 changed to \$102,000. Page 7: \$300. changed to \$300,000. Mark Vinsel made a motion to approve, Chris Stark seconded.

Approval of agenda. The agenda was modified from the original agenda to allow for more public comment time, since several individuals had expressed interest in commenting. Alison Ariens's presentations were moved to Wednesday, and Jason Moan's presentation on spruce beetles was delayed to the next BOF meeting. The revised agenda was approved by unanimous consent. Mark Vinsel made a motion to approve, Chris Beck seconded.

Announcements.

- Mark Vinsel: Aug 10 is Alaska Salmon Day.
- Chris Beck: Agnew::Beck is doing a series of planning projects on the F-35 fighters in FNSB, and asked whether there are timber issues that could be addressed in the plan.
- Chris Maisch asked about a Ft. Knox Mine celebration coming up. Kyle Mosel, OPMP explained that it is a celebration of the Gilmore expansion to Ft. Knox on August 15th.
- Senate state affairs is holding a hearing open to the public August 16 1:30-4:30 at LIO in Fairbanks about Ballot Measure 1.

Forest practices budgets, legislation and regulations

Chris Maisch, Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Division of Forestry (DOF): State is still in fiscal crisis for funding state government. Division of Forestry recently finished FY19 budget

process, which was better than in the last four years when we received decrements. We were able to add back a position in Haines for \$402,000, which re-establishes a Forester II position in Haines. It is a seasonal position, but we will have enough funding with federal dollars to make it year-round. We were working toward a closure of that office, but now we can keep it open.

Contracts for air tankers are part of our interagency agreement, including suppression resources for dropping retardant. A new contract came up this winter, and was re-awarded to ConAir, which will increase daily availability and our ability to fight fire. We have two 90-day contracts to cover the fire season, and we can extend them.

We were short about \$700,000 in our aviation budget with a more expensive helicopter contract, but we received an increment at the end of the session to pay for the air tankers. Not funding it would have drastically affected fire preparedness.

No additional significant cuts to report. We are flat on General Fund. Federal work has increased with the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) work, plus forest inventory analysis program in Interior Alaska.

California looking at most expensive season ever. The weather here is rainy, so we are sending folks south, especially now that our season is significantly reduced in risk.

In FY19 we picked up capital items for deferred maintenance; total statewide is \$20 million.

1. Asbestos in Delta between logs,
2. Paving out in back of Fairbanks DNR building where forklift and heliport are located. Will start paving this month.
3. Facility in Mat-Su will get a facelift for code and safety.

Will Putman: As AFS keeps moving forward on contracts for Type 2 crews, how will that mesh together? Chris Maisch: We are going to continue our program the way we have, but meshing them will be a challenge. We are looking at boundary changes, which will change which crews manage which communities. For Type 2, we only have 28 crews left. In the past, we've had 70 crews. This is a big issue, because it's a big part of our workforce. Three years in a row we've had below-average fires, and we're not sure what's in store. This could be an agenda item in the future.

Jim Durst: You've been successful in getting receipt authority. Has that been a change? Chris Maisch: Yes, receipt authority is a strategy. DNR does generate a lot of receipts in MLW. In their budget, there has been a shift to rely on revenue to supplement GF. We are not as big a revenue producer, and we're struggling in SE Alaska. Parks has recently shifted to more receipts as well. DNR fee regs have just been changed. DOF didn't have significant increase, but other divisions did. Chris Stark: Do you have a ballpark on what the other groups get from receipts? Chris Maisch: DNR gets more than appropriated, not sure what the numbers are.

Chris Beck: What is the general trajectory in firefighting for AK? Chris Maisch: Three years we've been below average, and this year way below: only 390,000 acres, when 1.2 million acres is our average. We now have extreme years—either way above or way below. Budgeting should work as 10 year average of costs, but state hasn't done that for many years. We are talking with OMB about budgeting, to stop having to ask for disaster funding. In general, the cost for responding to fires is an upward trend, but it's not nearly as much as in Lower 48. California has stopped talking about fire season—it's a fire year. We don't have enough experienced staff and crew. Contractors might become part of the answer here.

Eric Nichols: When will we talk about fireproofing, closing out roads? Chris Maisch: Politicians and public are starting to realize this is a problem.

Andrew Sayers-Fay, Director, Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Division of Water (DOW): DEC DOW budget similar to last one. Since 2015, faced almost a 40% reduction. Like DNR, they are looking for other funding. An increase in receipts has replaced half of the reduction. DEC DOW has eliminated 25 positions since 2015. This year DOW did not receive decrements. DEC took a small decrement in administrative services, but the budget is largely the same. We are at the end of adjusting to a new reality engaging with BOF on FRPA issues, focusing on the FRPA activities required in statute.

We've had a recent change in Section 404 dredging permits, in contrast to wastewater permits. DEC DOW will be more involved in permitting decisions, and will consider opportunities there.

Todd Nichols for David Rogers, Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G) Division of Habitat: Taking the place of retired Jim Durst,- Habitat. Budget has not changed from last year. Our budget won't affect our responsibility to FRPA activities.

Antidegradation and Tier 3 Waters criteria. Andrew Sayers-Fay, DEC Division of Water (DOW): Introduced Earl Crapps, DEC DOW. Earl: Regulation package approved by EPA on July 26, both for wastewater discharge and 401 certifications. All those regulations we've been discussing are now in effect. Tier 3 criteria: still under discussion about how to proceed.

Andrew Sayers-Fay: Regarding Tier 3, last fall and winter, DEC worked closely with DNR, DOT and ADFG to recommend a process. Discussed having a board like BOF, giving public an opportunity to discuss Tier 3 issues, but Governor didn't introduce a bill on this. For some members of the public, Tier 3 and fish protection are related, like the ballot initiative. Don't know which topic will get resolved first. It could increase the interest in those topics. Chris Maisch agreed; there is lots of public interest.

State regulations

Negotiated timber sales to local manufacturers. Alison Arians, DOF: Updates to the negotiated sale regulations under 11 AAC 71.045(e) and .055(a) were filed by the Lt. Governor and went into effect on June 29, 2018. The regulation changes:

- Extend the maximum time period for negotiated timber sales under AS 38.05.115 from one year to two years.
- Clarify that a best interest finding is needed for a negotiated sale under AS 38.05.118
- Delete the requirements for .118 sales to be in areas of high unemployment, underutilized manufacturing capacity, and underutilized allowable cut. This is consistent with the changes to AS 38.05.118 made two years ago.
- Clarify that a negotiated sale under .118 can be made to local manufacturers of wood products or users of wood fiber at appraised value.
- Specify that a negotiated sale under .118 is at appraised value.

Credit goes to Jim Schwarber for shepherding these changes through. The updated regulations are in the new edition of the blue fieldbook in your packet.

DNR Fee regulations (11 AAC 05). Alison Arians, DOF: DNR fee regulation revisions were signed on June 1 and went into effect on July 1, 2018. The revisions move the fees for each division's set activities into their own section with new section numbers. The regulations:

- Do not change the forestry fees, which only cover beach log salvage and log brands. These fees are now in 11 AAC 05.080. Cross-reference to the fee regulations are updated in the regulations on negotiated state timber sales (11 AAC 71.035), beach log salvage licenses (11 AAC 71.415), and log brands (11 71.530 and .570).
- Do not change the standards for waiving fees for state, municipal, and federal agencies – i.e., the requesting agency must still show that a waiver is in the public interest.
- Do increase many fees, including fees for material sales and commercial harvest of non-timber forest products. These products are managed by the DNR Division of Mining, Land, and Water (DMLW).
- Do add a \$250 fee for filing an administrative appeal or request for reconsideration. This would include appeals of best interest findings and Forest Land Use Plans for state timber sales.

For the DMLW services, the regulations set a maximum fee; that fee may be reduced by director's order. DMLW is using this provision to reduce the initial fee level under the regulations by up to 20% for many of the services they manage, including mining and material operations, non-timber forest products, easements and rights-of-way, and surveys and platting.

The fee regulations are over 120 pages; regulations are available on-line at <http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/aac.asp>

DNR material sale regulations. Alison Arians, DOF: The DNR Division of Mining, Land, and Water (DMLW) is continuing to work on amendments to separate the 11 AAC 71 regulations on material sales from those on timber sales. The amendments would place the material sale regulations in a new section and update material sale requirements. The amendments will change the citation, and possibly the definition, for “material.” The FRPA regulations reference this citation in the 11 AAC 95.900 (45) definition of “material”, so a conforming change to the FRPA reference will be needed. There is no review draft yet; we will forward a draft to the Board when it is available.

Public notice regulations. Alison Arians, DOF: The DMLW has completed scoping. Draft regulations are not yet available. The project has been scaled back and doesn't affect forestry. No decision has yet been made to propose any regulations on this topic.

Mark Vinsel: What are examples of materials? Chris Maisch: Gravel, other materials. We'll establish a new section in FRPA to reflect changes when they are finished. Eric Nichols: In regards to the fee changes, it will be interesting to see if it reduces the number of appeals. Chris Stark: Was the intent to reduce the number of appeals? Chris Maisch: No, it was designed to gather some costs, as part of a broader attempt to raise revenue. \$200 is a lot less than it costs to process an appeal. Chris Stark: Is it meant as a deterrent? The fee was \$0 before. What does the process cost? Maisch: The cost is into the response. Chris Stark: Maybe it should be clearer that the expense is for the response. Chris Maisch: DNR overall is trying to raise money, and it's part of the overall fee structure. Chris Stark: How many appeals does DOF usually get? Chris Maisch: DOF had 2 appeals this year. Stark: If this is a revenue enhancer, \$400 is not much money. Eric Nichols: How do you handle appellants that appeal every single time? Chris Maisch: This fee change is occurring for DNR as a whole, including DMLW, not just DOF.

Legislation

HB 199 – Fish habitat permitting. Alison Arians, DOF. The House Special Committee on Fisheries introduced a committee substitute (version M, April 2018) in March, and held hearings to introduce the substitute and hear testimony in April. The committee did not vote on the bill. This is the second year of the legislative session, so the bill died in the committee at the end of the session. To reconsider the bill, it would have to be reintroduced in the next session.

17FSH2 Fish habitat permitting initiative status. Alison reviewed the initiative history.

- The Stand for Salmon petition (17FHS2) for an initiative on fish habitat permitting was denied by the Lt. Governor with advice from the Dept. of Law that the initiative would unconstitutionally appropriate resources by broadly prohibiting development activities.
- Stand for Salmon appealed the denial decision to the Alaska Superior Court. Superior Court judge Mark Rindner ruled in favor of appellants, clearing the way for collection of signatures.
- Stand for Salmon collected enough valid signatures to place the initiative on the ballot.
- The State appealed the decision to Supreme Court and requested expedited ruling. The court granted the motion for an expedited ruling. The state submitted its brief in January and oral arguments were heard on April 26, 2018.
- If upheld by the Supreme Court, the initiative will be on the November 6, 2018 general election ballot. The court decision is due by September 5.
 - *Note: on August 8, during the Board of Forestry meeting, the Supreme Court made its decision: We conclude that the initiative would encroach on the discretion over allocation decisions delegated to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game by the legislature, and that the initiative as written therefore effects an unconstitutional appropriation. But we conclude that the problematic sections may be severed from the remainder of the initiative. Accordingly, we reverse the judgment of the superior court and remand for the superior court to direct the Lieutenant Governor to sever the offending provisions but place the remainder of the initiative on the ballot.*
- An initiative is enacted if a majority of the votes cast favor the measure. An initiated law becomes effective 90 days after certification of the election by the Lt. Governor, is not subject to veto, and may not be repealed by the legislature within two years of its effective date. It may be amended at any time (Article XI of the Alaska Constitution).

Chris Maisch: We have been advised by Department of Law not to venture into an opinion on initiatives. The BOF wrote two letters on HB 199. Tom Lenhart agreed, saying that the state should not take a position on the ballot initiative. As individuals, Board of Forestry members can take a position, without identifying themselves as a BOF member. Jaeleen Kookesh has been active in opposing the ballot measure before she was appointed to the BOF, but is not identifying herself as a BOF member.

Eric Nichols: If the Supreme Court rules in favor of the appellant, what legal ramifications are available to us? Chris Maisch: The Legislature can modify it. Eric Nichols: Can we sue legally on this? Tom Lenhart: My suggestion is that we shouldn't talk about this today. Jim Durst: Watched the testimony for Supreme Court, and there were three possibilities: approve, disapprove, or make it constitutional by removing some language. There seemed to be multiple potential outcomes. Mark Vinsel: Are staff from Representative Stute's office here? (No, only from Josephson's office.) Does Rep. Stutes have intentions of reintroducing her bill? The question may be moot. Eric Nichols asked where Rep. Josephson's district is. Josephson's staff responded: Mid-town Anchorage, U-Med district.

Forest Management

Roadless Rule litigation. Tom Lenhart, Dept. of Law, Assistant AG. Longtime counsel for Division of Forestry.

1. Litigation: Not a lot new in circuit court in DC. Final briefs have now been filed. In the fairly near future, case will be put on oral argument schedule, probably this fall. We will proceed with oral arguments, then the case will be ripe for decision, and we will wait for Circuit Court decision. Could take a few months to more than a year, but we could expect at beginning of year.

Regardless of who wins, the losing party can always file a petition to have it reviewed *en banc*. All judges weigh in, on a panel. Rarely are those granted, but for Tongass exemption it was granted. The 11-judge panel invalidated the decision. We feel we've made a very good case in the briefs, but the decision depends on the judges.

Chris Stark: It depends on who is sitting on the court. That doesn't tell us "not roadless" As soon as roads are put in, that's not roadless. Tom Lenhart: Whether a road's been built has nothing to do with it. There are specified amounts of time for filing appeals. If nobody files an appeal within those days allowed, then the decision is final. This is the last case standing that could possibly have been brought under the original statute of limitations. In the future, when a federal decision applies, the roadless decision that could change. Chris Stark: There is a philosophical side, too, which says a road is the end of roadless.

2. Active pieces of federal legislation: On the House side, legislation would exempt Tongass from the Roadless Rule, and would restore former exemption lost in 2011. Senate side didn't address the Tongass RR, but they could add it in conference session. Conference process will be underway end of August. It is a long shot.
3. Senator Cantwell introduced one other stand-alone piece of legislation: to make roadless legislation into law. This is also a long shot.
4. USDA rulemaking to replace Roadless Rule: Governor Walker requested Secretary Perdue to undertake a rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure act. Accepted by Secretary. Last week was the initiation of formal process. State is cooperating agency with USFS, has signed MOA. Division of Forestry will stand up an internal committee and a public citizens' advisory committee to advise internal team. Kyle Mosel will address internal team.

Kyle Mosel: MOU was signed last week and is available publicly online on DOF's website: link on announcement in news section on DOF website. My piece will be cooperating agency interface during NEPA, following regular CDQ operating procedures. Chris Maisch: USFS also invited tribal organizations (must be an elected body to participate). Meredith Trainor: Who is other co-chair? Chris Maisch: Heidi Hanson, Deputy Commissioner DNR. Other participants will be ADFG, DOT, DEC. This group will look similar to 2008 team that Kyle chaired. This process has a tight time frame. The Secretary would like to publish a final rule in 18-24 months. Our advisory group will include interested parties. The groups are described in the MOU for balanced representation in the SE region.

Eric Nichols: What is the timeline? Chris Maisch: The state's input for USFS will be done by the end of October, first part of November. Eric Nichols: 10 weeks is not much time. Chris Maisch agreed. Mark Vinsel: Is this a scoping process? Chris Maish: It's a NOI, notice of intent. We'll be looking for advice in between the two end points: "no change" vs. "open up entirely." We will look at what other options should be considered. The goal of cooperating agency group is to give them a range of options to be considered. We will not give a preferred alternative. We'll give them a range of options and participate as a cooperating agency. Eric Nichols: What about total timeframe? Chris Maisch: 18-24 months, to be completed by June 2020. Eric Nichols: Even if this is in place, the plan would need to be changed. Chris Maisch: The plan may need to be amended. Eric Nichols: Another 2 years for that to happen; starting today, that could be a 5-year process. Chris Maisch: We will see how the rulemaking process comes out, then see what changes need to be made to the plan. Agreed; lots of procedural issues before building a road.

Chris Stark: Will the BOF be able to follow the 10-week process? Chris Maisch: We are working with professional facilitator, Meridian. It will be like the Tongass Advisory Committee, with website and minutes on it, along with important decision points. Group will meet 3-4 times in SE communities to hear residents. To meet the timeline, there will have to be teleconferences and also in-person meetings. Process

will be transparent with lots of points for public comment along the way. Chris Stark: What is DOF's position? Attorney is telling us to take no position on ballot initiative. Chris Maisch: We have made our opinion clear. We will find a way to give them options for consideration. We aren't coming up with a consensus or preferred outcome, but instead, we will present some logical alternatives in between both ends that people would support.

Good Neighbor Authority (GNA), including Vallenar Bay: Paul Slenkamp, MHT and Greg Staunton, DOF, for Jim Eleazer.

Paul Slenkamp: Forester for Mental Health Trust. GNA is a collaborative effort to get a timber sale on the market. For the Kosciusko young growth forestry project, a timber sale contract was put out in September for 30 million BF of young growth. The sale includes 12 harvest units, 3 different silvicultural prescriptions: even-age (clearcut), uneven aged (2-acre openings), and two-aged (15-20 acre openings). Road construction underway now. Will be \$2-3 million in stumpage above base rates. We are upgrading two miles of roads, fixing two culverts that are not up to standards, and fixing recreational bridges. This project benefits the island, puts money into community. No harvest yet, since we are still doing unit layout. Harvest is planned for some time in March or April. Project going smoothly.

Greg: Area Forester in Ketchikan. Vallenar is the second GNA sale with USFS for young growth, and includes 155 acres on Gravina Island, tied into the Vallenar Road project. In the last month, DOF put together 5 units, for a total of 89 acres, flagged and reviewed by USFS. Now conducting change analysis with the original plan. We are within original footprint. Our current goal is to sell timber before September 30, 2018 before end of fiscal year for USFS. It is a tight timeline, but we are optimistic.

Jim Durst: How much volume is in Vallenar sale, in total? Greg: 14 million BF, approximately, but we haven't finished editing the cruise. It's a mix of young and old growth, and part of USFS young growth sales. Chris Stark: No new roads? Greg: Correct. This sale uses the Vallenar access road that was put in in the 1950s. We reconstructed a portion of that road to access the sale. Chris Stark: Do we have red pipe issues on this new road? Greg: There are no drainage structures except logs buried in the road. Streams had reclaimed the original channels. We put in structures to handle those channels. The majority of fish habitat was 2 to 3 chains below the road alignment because of topography.

Sikes Act opportunities on Alaska military lands. Dan Rees, Ft. Wainwright, Natural Resource Manager: Sikes Act would allow Ft. Wainwright to do projects with DOF. Sikes Act passed in 1960 for Department of Defense natural resources management, to get input from USFWS and state agencies that manage fish and wildlife. The Act requires a natural resource management plan. Most of the DOD land is in Fairbanks and Delta Junction, with a small parcel in Tok and Haines, as well as some land near Black Rapids Glacier. Ft Wainwright is interested in wildfire hazard management, especially related to military training activities; they use a lot of pyrotechnics. Because there are a lot of values at risk, we are aggressive with fire management. We have a small timber sale program: not high value, and most of it is firewood, around communities that use a lot of firewood. DOD sales are not supposed to be for revenue, but for mission: reducing fire danger, road construction, clearings for helicopter landing sites.

There is a process for DNR DOF to be a cooperator. Ft. Wainwright could fund projects through cooperative agreements; usually one-year projects with short extensions. Eielson recently started using Sikes Act agreements, and Elmendorf has been using it. We'd work with DOF on designing projects that could be mutually agreed upon; for example, using fire crews to create shaded fuel breaks, and help with timber sale program. Other entities that we could work with are the Plant Materials Center in Division of Agriculture for seeds for vegetation erosion control, as well as agreements with SHPO.

Eric Nichols: Do you have issues with metal in your trees? Dan Rees: Sometimes there are expended rounds in firewood, but we tell people if there might be metal in the trees. Eric Nichols: We have had a lot of trouble with metal in the trees for sawing. Is it lead or copper? Dan: It's a range of different materials.

Managing for wildlife and forestry in the Tanana Valley. Tom Paragi, ADFG:

Handout:

Unlike in boreal forest in other regions of the world, the types and distributions of wildlife habitat features in the Tanana Valley of eastern interior Alaska continue to be largely shaped by wildland fires, insect outbreaks, flooding, and other natural disturbances. A comparatively small scale of sustainable timber harvest primarily for local use occurs near a few forest roads. However, as fuel oil prices increased in the mid-2000s, communities considered use of wood as an alternative fuel for heat and electricity cogeneration.

The rise in wood energy interest caused us to proactively consider how to best integrate forest and wildlife management for optimal public benefits if boreal timber harvesting were to increase substantially. Different wildlife species have different habitat needs, so there is no single, generalized prescription for bird and mammal habitat conservation. However, we reviewed forestry-wildlife interactions in boreal regions using scientific and agency literature from North America and Eurasia to identify unifying themes that can produce mutually beneficial outcomes for timber production and wildlife. Management practices that retain certain stand-level features and landscape-level habitat connectivity can be beneficial to both forestry outcomes.

Our goal was to summarize key findings that can serve as guiding principles for forestry and wildlife habitat management in the Tanana Valley in a manner consistent with the intent of the Alaska Forest Resources and Practices Act in which “allowance shall be made for important fish and wildlife habitat. (AS 41.17.060(c)(7)”. Maintaining diverse and connected forest habitats will help maintain healthy forests and wildlife populations for human and ecological benefits. For example, maintaining important habitat for vertebrate predators of insects, voles, and snowshoe hares makes forests more resilient to short-term feeding damage on young trees. Proactive habitat conservation on managed forests should reduce any future need to restore or intensively manage individual wildlife species or restrict forestry practices.

We propose five principles and associated guidelines below to serve as voluntary best practices. Our report discusses scientific reasoning behind each guideline and practical factors involved in their implementation through collaborative efforts of State of Alaska agencies that manage forests and wildlife:

1. Planning and managing forests to maintain habitat for diverse wildlife species is likely to maintain forest ecosystem resilience to environmental disturbances
 - a. Describe habitat features and their landscape connectivity to the extent possible from existing environmental data and use this information in forest planning
 - b. Focus new stand inventory to include habitat features that are important for wildlife and use this information in forest planning
 - c. Design larger timber sales in uplands to emulate wildland fire patterns
2. An integrated approach to forest and wildlife management at the stand and landscape scales maintains habitat benefits
 - a. Favor diverse woody regeneration that includes deciduous trees and willows
 - b. Recruit and retain snags, cavity trees, and woody debris
 - c. Identify landscape connectivity beneficial to wide-ranging species
3. Stand-level management of habitat and wildlife can mitigate wildlife damage to desired forest products

- a. Manage habitat to reduce herbivory
- b. Maintain habitat for predators of herbivores
- c. Monitor abundance of vertebrate herbivores and their predators
4. Landscape-level planning and management of access is relevant given competing interests, the scale of natural disturbances, and a desire for a managed forest on state lands
 - a. Include wildlife habitat values when considering options in road access for timber harvest and post-disturbance salvage
 - b. Involve wildlife stakeholder interests when planning forest road networks
5. Consider best practices for wildlife habitat conservation in managed forest as hypotheses and verify their effectiveness for adaptive management of forests and wildlife
 - a. Involve stakeholders in discussions of options and tradeoffs in monitoring strategies
 - b. Establish a scientific advisory group to guide prescriptions and monitoring
 - c. Verify presumed best practices for wildlife habitat using scientific methods
 - d. Utilize suitable techniques and willing help to monitoring a broad network of sites.

Implementing these guidelines might best proceed in cooperation with the Tanana Valley State Forest Citizens Advisory Committee. This group could work with stakeholders to identify species priorities, define habitat landscapes and access routes, and engage scientist help in design of monitoring wildlife response to future timber harvest. A major challenge will be limited staff and funding in state forestry and wildlife agencies. Ideas for future steps are presented.

Further notes from Tom's presentation:

Could use federal funds to work on planning, layout and monitoring. We could use GIS information to provide information about wildlife habitat during the writing of the Five Year Schedule of Timber Sales, including game management units. Need to prioritize and focus on what areas are most important.

Could use digital tablet technology with feller-bunchers so wouldn't have to flag the sale areas. We could help show where you could increase the timber harvest boundary, but keep some areas of late-seral features within the harvest area to provide cavity nesting areas, and areas of mature cover for moose to hide in.

Now, we have a great situation here in the Tanana Valley: a real opportunity to work proactively to protect wildlife and provide timber supply. Marty Freeman and Jim Durst helped in these processes; it was a constructive approach. The technical report is getting close to completion. We will also have a brochure for stakeholders, and we've been invited by Tom Malone to the TVSF CAC to give a presentation at the October meeting. we'll get the CAC's thoughts on the brochure then.

Denise Hertzog: When will the report be complete? Tom Paragi: By September, hopefully, and we will let the Board know about it, and put it on our website. Eric Nichols: I'm wondering about concrete results. Are you going to sample species before and after? So much wildlife stuff I see, there is no scientific method. Tom Paragi: That's exactly what we are focusing on. We need to focus on a limited number of questions with our staff. We want to set up adaptive management to see before and after. Chris Stark: Is Eric claiming that there is no scientific evidence that this works? There is lots of evidence. Tom Paragi: Most of our info is from areas outside of Alaska, but yes, there is science. Eric Nichols: When you're asking to leave one resource for another resource, are we actually benefiting the other resource? We should make sure that we are benefiting that resource. Tom Paragi agreed.

Mark Vinsel: It seems like the TVSF CAC is where the local knowledge of the "before" could be measured at least anecdotally. "After" will span generations. Eric Nichols: I have seen anecdotal evidence not reflect what timber harvest has done. Tom Paragi: I have done a lot of interviews with people, and the local knowledge can guide questions that I can ask scientifically, gathering pre-treatment information.

Mark Vinsel: A large group is best. Tom Paragi: The CAC is really the funnel point to bring in broad citizen engagement. Frustration with resource management is that people don't always understand the situation and the change, whether from fire or timber harvest. We need to get citizens involved in the process early on, getting their concerns on the table as soon as possible. Jim Durst: Early on, you could be talking about Thompson's warbler, possibly looking more at ridgetop systems. Under FRPA, under the big trees in valley bottoms you probably have fish. FRPA already says things about rivers and riparian management. Are you programmed to work within FRPA boundaries? Tom Paragi: Many riparian stands go well back from riparian buffers. For the Tok sale of 880 acres, if all those were harvested, there wouldn't be much riparian forest left in that 2-3 mile section. We are looking outside units that wouldn't be cut until the harvested areas have grown up and filled in; a small portion would be kept.

Will Putman: This collaborative approach is great, and I applaud you for it. As someone working with planning activities as a non-governmental agency, I'm assuming we can request your help, working within your staff constraints? Tom Paragi: Julie Hagelin and I would like to scope this with CAC and TCC to see how much capacity we have. Will Putman: It might just be document review. Tom Paragi: With the new focus in wood energy, we'll have more interest if fuel prices go up. We're preparing for a big increase in interest.

Mental Health Trust forest management activity and land exchange. Paul Slenkamp, Mental Health Trust (MHT) Land Office: Tongass land exchange is not a quick process. We're hoping to be able to get the conveyance completed soon. There have been procedural errors, and cost overruns have been significant. The overall cost is \$7 million. MHT has to pay all associated costs to USFS. Surveys are completed on USFS lands. Naukati is done, Hollis is done, BLM has worked on Shelter Cove. Surveys cost \$2 million. If we can get the appraisal straightened out, we can move forward. We have had difficulties getting accurate appraisals.

Chris Maisch: Are you factoring tariffs into the appraisal? Paul Slenkamp: That is a problem. Is today's value appropriate? Mark Vinsel: Is Mitkoff parcel part of this? Paul Slenkamp: No. Phase 1 was 2,400 acres (Naukati). Signal Mountain and Minerva Mountain in Ketchikan are part of 2nd phase. We need to make sure there's no trespass issues prior to conveyance.

Eric Nichols: USFS doesn't have a reasonable timber sale for next 3-5 years. If they are lucky they will sell through Good Neighbor Authority. We're nowhere near what the plan calls for. This volume is critical for the industry. The longer it delays, it makes everything more critical and puts a lot of pressure on the state. Chris Maisch: This will be a just in time sale at best.

Public comment I:

Alison reported that many people had emailed the Board of Forestry about the Tongass Roadless Rule. She passed out a packet containing all the comments so far. All the comments will be gathered in an Appendix to the minutes at the end of both business meetings.

Juneau: Buck Lindekugel, SEACC.

Anchorage: none

Sitka: Andrew Thoms

Fairbanks: none

Buck Lindekugel: SEACC and our members strongly support the national Roadless Rule, particularly with the Tongass in it. During the summer of 2002, eighty-six percent of the Alaskans who spoke at public hearings throughout Southeast Alaska supported permanent protection for all Tongass Roadless areas.

...

To be successful, this rulemaking process must:

- be transparent and open;
- provide fair and balanced representation for both development and non-development interests on any public advisory committee established; and
- make Alaska's roadless protections STRONGER than the federal roadless rule.

[See appendix for the full text of Buck's testimony.]

Andrew Thoms: Sitka Conservation Society director. Has longtime experience with Tongass, worked with Tongass Advisory Committee (TAC). Our recommendations were pragmatic to have a viable timber industry. We prioritized the way we wanted to see the land managed—wanted the right scale for the regions. I'm not a fan that roadless has been opened up, but I'm glad that it's a rule-making process. I'm glad that the state will provide a stakeholder group to advise that, and I'm happy that this is not a legislative action. Please work to make sure that in the rule-making process, you continue pragmatic work with the TAC, to fit the pieces together the way they make sense. We don't want to continue the conflict. With the continued conflict and uncertainty, there is not room for timber industry and environmental functionality. Uncertainty is not good for any of us. I ask that you continue to use the TAC process. And a request: be vigilant as you move forward.

Air quality and wood energy in the Fairbanks Borough. Nick Czarnecki, FNSB: Problem: Fairbanks got a "Serious" air pollution designation in 2017. (North Pole is much worse, but has improved quite a bit over the last 3 years.) What are contributions? Woodburning contributes 50% of particulates. After 7-8 years of data collection, the evidence shows that wood smoke is the primary contributor in Fairbanks. Sulfate is next, coming from powerplants and home heating oil.

EPA delegated regulatory authority to ADEC, who delegated control of local area sources to the Borough through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with ADEC. FNSB 1) acts as primary regulatory authority for area sources including solid fuel-fired heating devices, commercial and residential space heating, and small sources that fall below permitting thresholds, and 2) implements PM_{2.5} control strategies to attain the standard that are shown to be feasible & cost effective.

FNSB Air Quality Division does education and outreach, as well as Wood Stove Change Out Program. Since 2010, have changed out 2,500 stoves. Local codes: burn bans that happen during the winter time are controversial.

FNSB is currently in a SIP process, and now in the stakeholder part of the process: professionally facilitated, 36 stakeholders, residents in Fairbanks and North Pole. It includes point sources (power plants), wood burning community, local wood-cutters, pellets, military, economic. Look at control measures available, and what is palatable for the community. DEC, EPA and stakeholder group results will be used by borough as well as state for showing their implementation in Serious SIP. Finishing the SIP by 2019 is a federal mandate, but we won't be done by then, and will have to request an extension.

Many people depend on wood in Alaska. In North Pole & Fairbanks, we can't eliminate it, but we can make changes with stoves (change-out) and with using dry fuel. Fuel moisture of >20% is a problem; produces pollution. (DOF also talks about this on website). Could mandate sheds that keep the wood dry.

Potential SIP requirements:

- Dry wood only sales by commercial wood sellers
- Development of a Regional Kiln or Wood Drying facility

- Require all homes to have wood storage
- Require dry wood to be clearly labeled
- Distribution of information related to moisture content at time of sale of wood

Possibilities for Coordination

- Help promote importance of burning dry wood: cutting wood in spring/early summer to provide sufficient time to dry, preferably cutting a year early. Include required training on how to know if the wood is dry as part of getting permit (e.g. moisture meters)
- Sharing data for planning purposes: Number of permits issued, Number of permits for harvesting 20+ cords/season.
- Coordinated Education and outreach

Mark Vinsel: North Pole's pollution was high, but significantly dropped over the last four years. Are there studies of rates of pulmonary disease to correlate with that? Are people in North Pole having more health problems? Nick Czarnecki: There have been some health studies, but not in NP. It's difficult to get a statistically relevant sample size with a smaller population, but a lot of health studies have shown the link between pulmonary disease and pollution, and also bone development of young children. Mark: Your chart shows a drastic improvement—in a small community, an epidemiologist might be able to see improvement. Health care is the biggest uncontrollable cost. That outreach, especially if there's been an improvement, can show people = improving air quality is saving money and improving health.

Eric Nichols: In your modelling of dry wood, what level of attainment do you have to hit to get compliance? Nick Czarnecki: Modelling is complex. We don't have a registration program. We don't know where the wood stoves are. We do have survey data that we can extrapolate. Model shows if you take all of the wood burning heating needs and convert it to Number 2 heating oil, we can attain our goal. That would be a radical change. The number of stoves now present is probably above the possible level, even if they are all burning dry wood. Eric Nichols: I don't know whether you'll be able to attain this. Nick Czarnecki: It is possible scientifically. Eric Nichols: How much sulfate is emitted from transportation? Nick Czarnecki: about 9%.

Will Putman: I am a wood burner now. 40 years ago, when I was a forestry student in Missoula, after the 1973 oil embargo, lots of inversions and pollution, and very high particulate levels. Fairbanks has an even worse inversion problem. CO was the problem then, and there was no mention of particulates. Mark Vinsel: In Juneau there are wood stove burn bans and more pellet stoves are being used now. Are people replacing their wood stoves with pellets? Nick Czarnecki: They do have a lower emission factor, but both wood stoves and pellet stoves are two orders of magnitude higher than oil or natural gas. We have seen some people moving to pellet stoves. Recently, we incentivized a conversion process with \$4 million from EPA to convert from wood to non-wood.

Jim Durst: I'm an oil-burner, and I'm pleased to see you looking at sulfates. The public needs to know. Regarding Tom Paragi's presentation, does the FNSB know how much wood goes through wood stoves? Where would demand for wood be in the next 5 years? Nick Czarnecki: DEC and FNSB has a shared consultant, and we're using 5 years of survey data. Would be good to get permit data to see how much wood is burned from wood-cutters vs. people who get their own wood. There is some price elasticity: UAF economics researcher looking at this piece.

[Jaeleen Kookesh left the teleconference.]

DOF forest management program: Goals, opportunities, and barriers in the Fairbanks-Delta Area; field trip overview. Paul Keech, DOF: Overview of acreage in the Fairbanks-Delta area in state

forest and forest classifications, allowable cut, and proposed acres/volume to be cut in Five Year Schedule of Timber Sales. Both Delta & Fairbanks harvesting well below their allowable cut.

Commercial timber sales are active on State, Borough, University of Alaska, and Native Corporation lands throughout the Fairbanks and Delta areas. On State lands, the Fairbanks office has 105 active timber sales under contract with 32 operators, the Delta office has 30 active timber sales under contract with 11 operators. Demand for saw logs remains stable, Northland Wood Products continues to be the primary purchaser of saw logs; they process approximately 731,700CF or 3,000,00 BF annually. Fuel wood demand has slowed slightly in the last few years due to lower fossil fuel cost. Superior Pellet Fuels is the primary purchaser of fuel wood producing 3,000 tons of pellets annually. There are numerous commercial firewood vendors also operating throughout the Fairbanks and Delta areas.

FRPA activities in Fairbanks-Delta Area: 2 New Notifications (DPOs), 79 Harvest acres in New notifications, 2.3 Miles of Road Noticed, 1 FRPA inspection on private land, Galena and FNSB.

Personal Use Firewood: Fairbanks Area averages annually 350 to 400 permits for about 1,500 cords, Delta Area around 75 permits for a total of 300 cords.

Reforestation. Regeneration surveys continue to be conducted every spring in the Fairbanks area. 40,000 white spruce seedlings were ordered for planting summer of 2019. Scarification is also a common treatment after harvest in Fairbanks and the areas is trying different applications to determine what method achieves the best results. Reforestation and post-harvest treatment continue to play a very important role in ensuring future timber.

Challenges

No seedlings this summer because BC didn't have capacity. We get the seeds, then send them to growers. Next year will have seedlings. Road maintenance: recent rains have been an issue for roads. Hard to get manpower to get out and inspect the roads. Beavers can create a lot of damage. All logging roads are public roads and are used for hunting, recreation, and we have dumping problems with trash. Rainstorms also create problems. We will see how the new road with more rock in it performs.

Trespass and theft. Bonanza Creek, experimental forest, trespass with people who are selling firewood. Not a lot of time, but we get a lot of calls about trespassers.

Opportunities

Division of Forestry is working with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to access Pitman Robertson funds for road maintenance and repair. Division of Forestry staff in Delta Jct. worked with Department of Fish and Game staff to roller chop more than 20 acres of bison, 150 acres of moose, and approximately 250 acres of grouse habitat. Will continue to assist more in the future.

Regulation changes: penalties for starting fires. Increases tools in our tool box to improve ability to improve prevention.

DAY TWO

Friday, August 10: Division of Forestry Area Office, Mile 123, Tok Cutoff, Tok

Teleconference sites: Anchorage – 550 W. 7th Ave., Suite 1450; Juneau – 400 Willoughby Ave., 4th floor, conference room A; Fairbanks (Aug. 10) – 3700 Airport Way, Large conference room

Call to Order and Roll Call. Chris Maisch, State Forester, called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m. Teleconference sites were connected in Anchorage, Juneau, Fairbanks. Members Chris Beck, Denise Herzog, Jim Durst (sitting in for Bill Morris), Will Putman, Eric Nichols, Chris Stark, and Mark Vinsel were present. A quorum was established.

DOF forest management program: Goals, opportunities, and barriers in the Tok-Copper River Area. Derek Nellis, DOF:

Tok Resource Management Goals

- Implement a standard timber sale documentation process.
 - Review and standardize all active timber sale contracts, maps, and administrative documents.
- Produce a meaningful FYSTS
- Transition local producers and personal use harvesters to utilizing green wood due to the dwindling supply of standing dead fire kill.
- Establish personal use harvest areas with year round access and clearly defined boundaries.
- Support the supply of biomass to the Tok School plant through hazardous fuels reduction.

Copper River Resource Management Goals

- Maintain and improve personal use wood harvest opportunities.
- Establish year round access to personal use wood lots.
- Establish small over-the-counter timber sales to meet small scale commercial operator needs.
- Become more familiar with the area.

Tok/Copper River Area Opportunities

- Biomass markets
 - Tok School – proven successful in producing heat and electricity
 - Tok Biofuels – residential heating
 - Total current market demand of approximately 3,000 ton annually (60-100 acres)
- Personal Use Demands
 - Tok Area online sales
 - 2017 – 120 permits for 1,010 cords
 - 2018 – 27 permits for 133 cords
 - Copper River Area online sales
 - 2017 – 91 permits for 374 cords
 - 2018 – 32 permits for 135 cords
- Approximately 500 MBF annual demand by local value added producers.
- Commercial firewood demand is strong
 - \$200-\$300/cord delivered
- Copper River Area Personal Use house logs and saw timber inquiries.

Tok/Copper River Barriers

- Access/Infrastructure. 2/3 of State Forest is north of the Tanana River, and it's difficult to cross it.

- Porcupine Ridge: ice bridge road is access for Tok. Otherwise it's 70 miles driving around. Winter roads: seeps along the river can cause problems, even when very cold. We have to identify straight slow-moving places to make the roads.
- Markets. Only a fledgling biomass market, not a large-scale demand.
- Staffing/Budget. Derek is the only full-time staff for both areas. Hard to facilitate fieldwork. Working alone is challenging.
- Cold in winter. Roller chopping needs to happen when not much snow, cooler temps. Difficult to load and prep. Things start to break when it's very cold.

Will Putman: How are you set for access and supply of green sawtimber for Dry Creek and Joe's operations with fuelwood and timber? Derek Nellis: Joe Young has 1.5 years left on his Tok River habitat sales. Dick Malchow set them up in late 80s and early 90s. We have more sawtimber sales than what the demand is calling for. We can support that industry for quite a while at its current demand.

Mark Vinsel: On the river crossings, when I see how glaciated these rivers are, and how much gravel, I expect the calm places shift around a lot. It's hard to see where it's deep. Once it's iced over, it's hard to see what's going on underneath. Do you have any kind of guidance or procedures? Seems like a lot of risk. Derek Nellis: We have guidance on depth of ice needed for different kinds of equipment. Early in the season we bore and check. We drill holes every few feet and measure ice thickness. Then we monitor the ice thickness through the season. As soon as we can, we plow the snow off with a pickup to make the ice thicker, and then we add water to build up the ice. We need to keep doing a systematic approach. Being the only person on staff is hard. We'd like to have someone else in the field—another full-time staff would be helpful. Chris Maisch: We have specs for ice bridges from CRREL (Cold Regions Research). Mark Vinsel: You can't assume that where the calm places were before still will work the next year. Chris Maisch: We always want water under the ice bridge—sometimes the water drops and that weakens it. Derek Nellis: Moon Lake freezes solid in the winter; makes good access. Chris Maisch: Tanana has very large banks—hard to build the ramps down to the river. Hard to get enough snow to build the ramps sometimes. We've had to use brush to mix in, but then the brush has to be removed. Denise Hertzog: We sometimes use timbers, and then they have to be removed later.

Chris Beck: Previous school superintendent came last night at the social expressed problems with access. Derek Nellis: Timber harvest is the purpose of the state forest. We're actively managing this area that's been identified for timber harvest. There are substantial areas outside the SF not designated for forestry. We're providing access and timber resources in the SF, and leaving other places that are managed for different resources. We provide opportunities for public comment during the planning stages.

Forest Inventory & Analysis

FIA GOALS:

- Estimate forest area by forest type and stand size class
- Estimate number, volume, biomass, and carbon storage for tree species by diameter class
- Estimate number of trees affected by damages
- Monitor change over time in forests and spread of invasives
- Research locally/regionally relevant forest issues

INTERIOR FIA GOALS:

- Develop cooperative efforts among groups involved in resource inventory
- Obtain baseline inventory and use to understand future boreal forest change
- Incorporate boreal forest carbon storage components into estimates (ground layer, soil)
- Understand complex boreal forest dynamics (fire, permafrost, carbon storage, species distribution)

- Integrate remote sensing into on-the-ground inventory

Denise Hertzog: Do they do this sampling in future years? Derek Nellis: Yes. They are now establishing permanent plots, and they will go back and measure the same parameters, ideally on a 10-12 year cycle. In the Lower 48, it's every 10 years. States in the South are getting sampled every 5 years. Chris Maisch: In the south, the timber industry is buying that interval down to use the FIA data for their business. In the west it's 7.5 years. Alaska will be lucky to do 10-12 years. Our grid is much larger. Denise Hertzog: Species? Derek Nellis: ground cover, all trees. This is public data and will be available to all. Will Putman: Includes moss, fuel cover. At TCC, at the same time FIA started, we got some support from Indian Affairs, so we established permanent plots with the same protocols as FIA. We can add these auxiliary sites, and we can use technical services and manuals and training services available to us. We've been doing this for 4 years, though more slowly. Getting the same volume of sites is hard, so it will be hard to do statistics. We're sampling just on Native allotments. Relying just on FIA there would only be a handful of sites. We're putting in a lot fewer plots, but they are all on Native allotments. Chris Maisch: It's a systematic random grid throughout AK, with different landowners. Will Putman: We will probably sample at the same interval: 10-12 years. We're putting in one subunit per season, 8 different units. We have one allotment that we've thinned, also some areas have been burned. Upper Tanana, Upper Yukon, Kuskokwim.

Mark Vinsel: Fascinating. Over 2-3-4 cycles, will be good to see if Dr. Juday's predictions will come true: expansion of boreal forest into the permafrost. Good if same personnel will be doing the same sampling. Chris Maisch: There is a rigorous QAQC, and some get checked by senior members. They are very thorough. Derek Nellis: this is meant to supplement remote sensing data. Chris Maisch: NASA has been a big partner. They have a new sensor—LIDAR, infrared, and hyperspectral. All those tell you different things about health of vegetation, calibrated against ground plots. Remote Sensing will be a lot quicker and cheaper in the future. Will Putman: We thought we could just design our plots within the strips of Remote Sensing, but there weren't very many of our allotments within those strips. Coarsening the grid in Alaska just to deal with the scale of Alaska—will rely on RS data. Collecting all these really neat stuff, but we're still not sure how they will piece it all together.

Chris Beck: Will some combination of sites and remote sensing provide a revised and comprehensive map of forest resources? Chris Maisch: Yes. They will publish reports for the blocks and areas. Will Putman: It will be hard to extrapolate, on such a big grid. Derek Nellis: A cover type map would be feasible, at least coarsely accurate. For example, sawtimber white spruce. Chris Maisch: It will also be useful to determine carbon flux, fire intervals, permafrost depth. Will Putman: Soil samples are very time consuming, but FIA and we are sampling it because so much of the carbon is tied up in the soils. Not a complete soil profile, but getting at the carbon sample.

Chris Stark: when did the program start nationwide? Tim Dabney: In 1930s, began in southern states. USFS revisiting sites when I started working there. Chris Maisch: Will be able to see what happens with urban development, expansion. Will Putman: They are very secretive about sites, because they don't want to affect landowners' decisions about what they do with their land; want to get a true sample.

All landowners group. Christine Klein, UA, Chair of land grants trust. Forest stewardship. All landowners group met on August 7th. 11 agency members, including USFS, DOF, MHT, UA, Sealaska. Also had DNR Division of Mining, Land and Water (DMLW) as our guest for the first time, so we could look at some of areas that we need to get permitted or renewed for timber operations in SE. We had a very productive meeting. The purpose of our group is to collaborate on timber sales in similar areas. Not all of our lands are contiguous but are often adjacent to one another. We have been trying in recent years to coordinate our sales and share infrastructure. We have fewer failures and

more successes, and that helps communities, buyers, and landowners. We are trying to work more effectively together to get our sales out so industry can rely on our timber sales for 75 million board feet a year. Want to avoid criticism from industry, community, state, and delegation.

This last year we did projections, and it looked like we would sell 75 million BF. At this meeting we checked in, and our preliminary updates look like we will get that out by year end, 2018-19. We updated our projections for 2019 and '20, and though quite far out, it looks like we are on track.

It was helpful to have DMLW were there, for them to see how we work on these things together. We have several permits in SE Alaska, and we gave them applications in Wrangell area: log storage area for short term, log raft permit for storage, permit for anchor buoys.

We also talked about the annual forest service meeting. Some of the landowners will be sponsoring forestry students to attend. All of the landowners have a number of sales around the state, but this group focuses on SE.

University forest management activity, including Haines proposal: Christine Klein/Patrick Kelly: Christine Klein, UA Facilities Management: While the University has other sales and projects underway (Mat-Su and Ketchikan), the Haines area sale has garnered more interest than others. The Board of Regents approved us to proceed on the Haines sale, and we are working toward that. In the last couple of weeks we've been responding to public comments, then doing fieldwork to see what's out there. We will do some updates for the public, and we are getting additional help with communication with the community. Haines likes a lot of interface compared to other communities.

Patrick Kelly, UA Forester: We have initiated the process with USFWS to engage them and their raptor experts with Chilkat Eagle Nesting Preserve. We've also engaged ADFG to continue cataloging anadromous fish streams and resident fish streams throughout the sale area, and will continue through a series of field trips. Economic analysis will be thorough that we'll put into the negotiated sale. We are working with Haines community representatives. Stakeholders from timber and fishing, as well as local officials have been vocal in their communication with the University. We are moving forward, and will have a finding in the next month or two.

Chris Stark: About the Haines community comments, if the comments are negative, will that sway how you operate? Haines seems ticked off. Christine Klein: In Haines, we had a majority of 65% of strong support for the timber harvest. Our mission on UA lands is pretty clear.

Mark Vinsel: What products will you be selling? Patrick Kelly: Value added to small mill operators who have wanted to participate. People have approached the University to form a committee. There is significant interest from local people who want harvest on their property. Also local native interests who want their property logged. We are gathering all the data and cases of concern. We will have a win-win for the Haines community and the UA on this project.

Chris Beck: Represents recreation on the Board. I've recently been in Haines, and understand the intensity of the community. I think it's reasonable to address the visual impacts of logging on the community. Without getting into the complexity, do you consider the visual impacts when you plan your harvest, especially as seen from the water? Patrick Kelly: There will be visual impacts. We are not yet sure to what extent, but there will be a decision from the action committee to the Haines committee. Chris Beck: Recommends to take the visual impacts into account seriously.

Applied research needs in the boreal forest. Ed Packee, Young Timber Industries, formerly with UAF. Looking at good forest management in the interior. Need to develop methods that are effective,

economical, but ecologically sound. Managing by habitat types is a good way to do it, like Canada. Most of the valley up here is complex. Valley was never glaciated.

Current policy: looks like cut and run, logger's choice. Joe Young is a good example of who we need to provide wood for. Some loggers say just 450 trees to the acre. That's a minimum—in Canada are talking 6000 stems/acre. They are interested in moose browse. Old growth stands, 150 stems/acre. What is the target you want? Need to have long-term crop goal. Sawlogs, house logs, a mix, or just firewood. Scarify the soil. Does one technique fit all sites? Don't believe so. What does root depth do? Not very deep. Is it nutrient rich? What scarification in shallow soil? What is the active layer for the soil? Canadians have looked at wood quality very carefully. BTU values: aspen and white spruce have the same BTU. But I see tables that show aspen is way below, using Eastern data. In the west, the values are much higher. Why is there a genetic difference? USFS gets their data from Midwest and East. We should look at Canadian data. Have found significant differences. Within and between species, can have greater variety of specific gravity, knot sizes. Get back to stocking levels.

The Division needs a forester type that understands forestry. Need to identify applied forest management research needs. Coordinates field information into field manual. Show what worked, and what didn't. Gather information about what worked best. Best results and most cost effective. Need a research coordinator to work with Division and other landowners, identify topics for research students. Could get a lot of information. Where to get funding? McIntire-Stennis grants have to have an almost 50-50% match. M-S grants are now in the department of Biology. Is that who you want getting the funding for management? How do you get at it? The BOF could demand an audit of UAF use of M-S funds. Go back 5-10 years. See where they are squandering the money. LTER. Not criticizing that, but they are not looking at applied research. What if BOF through the legislature took \$10,000 away from the university forestry program, and said they could match it 50-50. UAF not losing any money. Doesn't have to be PhD. Could be undergraduate.

Chris Stark: Instead of going to the legislature and getting funds away from UAF, do you see talking with UAF and asking them to redirect the funds? Ed Packee: Not effective with Biology department.

Chris Maisch: What about using university trust lands? Would that qualify for M-S funds? Ed Packee: University finds a vehicle to provide matching fund. Chris Stark: It just can't be federal.

Will Putman: The CAFI project (Cooperative Alaska Forest Inventory) was one of the projects that UAF started, that had a lot of value, but it's currently languishing. Ed Packee: Yes, it established what kind of growth are we getting on this kind of site. The growth and yield program was jettisoned. Will Putman: There was a dearth of published material coming out of that project. Ed Packee: I put in permanent sites in 1980s. I left when that set of remeasurements were coming up. Part of problem was statistical effort. I had 3 different statisticians, then they disappeared. Looked at the stats early on. Can't produce on growth and yield in a 5-year period. I wanted a 5-year gap.

Handout: AEA Wood Energy project updates. Devany Plentovich, Alaska Energy Authority (AEA):

- The Alaska/Yukon Territories Wood Energy Conference is tentatively scheduled for the week of April 15, 2019 in Fairbanks.
- Cordwood Operator Training is targeted for February 2019 in Tanana.
- Prefeasibility studies are in progress for:
 - Bartlett Regional Hospital – Juneau
 - Silver Gulch Brewery – Fairbanks
 - Mentasta clinic and multifamily housing
 - Holy Name Church – Ketchikan
 - Victory Bible Camp – Sutton

- Alaskawoodenergy.com is in development! This will be your one-stop-shop for Alaska biomass information including:
 - Maps with links to project information
 - Completed case studies, prefeasibility studies, and resource assessments
 - Applications for technical support, prefeasibility studies, grants
 - Biomass 101
 - Wood usage and economic feasibility calculators
 - IBooks and Handbooks
 - Upcoming Events
- Anvik’s cordwood heating system is operational at the water treatment plant.
- POW’s Southeast Island School District now has operational cordwood systems and greenhouses at Thorne Bay, Naukati, Kasaan, Hollis, Coffman Cove, and Whale Pass.
- Tanacross received a loan through the AEA Power Project Fund and will be starting operation this fall. Three cordwood boilers will be heating the clinic/community center and the water treatment plant.
- The Fairbanks North Star Borough has successfully negotiated a contract to design and build a powerhouse adjacent to the Big Dipper Ice Arena to house the Biomass CHP system and Chip Silo. Construction will commence as soon as the contract is signed by the Assembly.
- Tazlina, Huslia, and Hydaburg are constructing cordwood systems this summer.
- Craig High School received a USFS Wood Innovations Grant for design of a chip heating system.
- Alaska Gateway School District’s Northway School will receive a grant for the design of a chip heating system from Alaska Energy Authority and USFS.

USFWS update on yellow-cedar review process. Erin Knoll, USFWS

The Species Status Assessment for yellow-cedar is almost complete. The document will undergo peer review once we have a first draft. We will address peer review comments, then a decision on whether listing is warranted or not is expected to be made in Fiscal Year 2019 (October 2018 - September 2019).

Public comment II

Juneau: no public commenters

Anchorage: none.

Fairbanks: none

Individuals: Haines:

1. Shannon Donahue, SEACC & Great Bear Foundation: Thank you, teleconferencing option has been helpful to get engaged. University has represented Haines as saying we are overwhelmingly in favor of the timber sale. It’s better to say we have a complex reaction to it. We don’t really know what’s going on, and we want more public process. We would like to be involved but we’re not sure how to do that. We want to make sure that the process is thoroughly paying attention to all sides. Please don’t characterize opposition as mostly out-of-towners.
2. Sylvia Heinz with Mud Bay Lumber Co. No comments.
3. Elsa Sebastian, Executive Director, Lynn Canal Conservation: We are a grass-roots environmental organization representing 190 members, mostly local Haines people. Lynn Canal members are concerned about the impacts of the UA sale. A number of important conservation issues are associated with this timber sale, including the Chilkat chinook salmon and bald eagles.

There are also forest practices issues. The scale of the project relative to this watershed, together with a relatively small timber demand could make a big impact on our community. The University is required to give public notice, but no specific requirements. After the community

found out about this sale, the University's land management office denied multiple requests for a public meeting where Haines residents could receive information. The workshop style forum that was eventually held was inadequate, and many of the important questions that needed to be asked were not allowed. We've recently gotten information that UA would be willing to participate in a task force. We're grateful for this, but we'd like to formalize this relationship for a project of this scale. We'd like to be able to provide input in planning, during logging and also for reclamation after the sale is done. Thank you to Chris Beck, recreation Chair, for mentioning the impact of visual effects. Much of UA land is along rivers that are used for tourism rafting. Private land grant holdings should have some kind of mandated public process. Haines has many ideas about how this can be rolled out. Lynn Canal is looking forward to this voluntary effort. (Complete comment emailed, and included in Appendix on page 17.)

4. Joe Young, Young's Timber Inc.: Three years ago we did a UAF presentation to the Board, so you should have that in your notes. I encourage you to review those and move forward on ecosystem management of forests. Thanks to the BOF coming to Tok, and thanks to Derek. We hope that you see the things we are working on. It's really good to do fieldtrips and see what's out there.
5. Spike Jorgenson: I live in Tok. Thank you for being here. This region is a part of the unorganized borough. The legislature is our city council. We don't get much input or feedback. Two census times ago, rural became the minority. State agencies in town reflect how we view what our state is like. The state agencies are those that are here at this table. Forestry. 95% positive input for what's going on here in town. DOT is also here, and school district. I have a Bachelor's degree in fisheries in forestry. Then mammology and public policy for graduate school. My son works in mining and works with Joe Young. I want to say patently that our experience is VERY positive here in town. It was interesting to hear the comments today because the school district, Chicken, Dot Lake, Mentasta, mining operations—nothing in your conscious presentation, but they really depend on you. All of that fits into what forestry is doing, and your great presence here. Native lands, Doyon is a big part of the ownership. Areas of environmental concern—not good science. Your information is good science. Nice to hear your presentation.

We find here that the state agencies won't work together. Forestry problems: all of the logs that are piled up on the edge of the road should be delivered to the school. Three state agencies aren't talking to each other to get them delivered, and it's an eyesore.

Alaska Highway, Haines to Fairbanks pipeline. This community organized that when the pipeline was abandoned, it was supposed to be held for the community. The state never treated it that way. It became forestry and DOT. Forestry has the park where the Lions Club is.

It's hard to get young people jobs. We appreciate you being here to listen to things we struggle with. The general attitude here is that we'd like to see our forests managed for multi-uses. We'd like to have you help us with it. We'd like to do forestry, and also mining. Thank you for being here. We are the coldest inhabited community on the planet. It is really cold here and interesting that we can even grow trees. Learning this environment is really an experience for us.

Biomass: Get updated biomass projects map from Devany: send that to BOF. Biomass projects have really expanded compared to 10 years ago.

Discussion of Board duties, recent focus, upcoming priorities

Chris Stark: I'd like to know about the spruce bark beetle outbreak, and also what we will do about all the dead trees. Eric Nichols: What went wrong in the Kenai? Too little too late for salvage, and lost those initial markets. We should review what went right and what went wrong. The government got in there late, and NPS (Park Service) dragged their feet. Will Putman: There was a retrospective review after the Caribou Hills fire, and a meeting. Spruce Bark Beetle SAF. Would be good to look at those meeting notes. [Alison will look up those meeting notes.]

Mark Vinsel: Would like to hear about fish habitat standards on ballot initiative. Something will be on the ballot. Next meeting should be after the November election. Representative Stutes will be re-elected or not, and if she is, I'd like to hear about her intentions legislatively, whether the initiative passes or not. If it does pass, we might have work to do as a Board with things that aren't aligned in FRPA, etc.

Will Putman: AFS will have released their solicitation for EFF crews—maybe someone from AFS to see how that will proceed forward. It's important for rural communities.

Chris Stark: Would like a presentation on ecosystem management. Have a professional explain how it is done elsewhere. What is the ADFG fact sheet for? Jim Durst: Marty worked with ADFG to update handout. This is what they arrived at. Please put this in the future agenda; have someone from ADFG talk to us.

Eric Nichols: Tongass Roadless Rule update.

Chris Maisch: Would like to hear about University and research. Chris Stark: Would like to know where the University is coming from on research, also Haines sale. Also would like to talk to leadership from the University in terms of forestry program, with reorganization, and how M-S funds are being used. How to better integrate applied work.

Eric Nichols: UA is a land grant university. What is the underlying mandate? Where does this come from? Mark Vinsel: Paul Slenkamp (MHT) comes to every single BOF meeting, but we haven't had the same representation for the UA trust. It would be good to have a similar relationship with UA Trust.

Chris Beck: With a group of other recreation and trails advocates, have started an ambitious project. We've raised some funds to do a study of the economic value of recreation. Could do a 2-minute overview on this at the next meeting. Recreation trails often cross state and public lands, and there are access issues, in addition to the complexity of motorized vs. non-motorized. Would like some input on it. Chris Stark: Would like more than two minutes.

Chris Maisch: Would like to hear about small miners and what is going on there, especially as it relates to access issues and management of state forests. Denise Hertzog: Could get someone to talk about. Chris Stark: What are the products being used? Spike Jorgenson: Fortymile Miners Organization is the oldest in the state, and the oldest governing authority. School land trust has been abused by the state. Chris Maisch: schools own Sections 16 and 36; they are set aside for school trust. (Not at the next meeting but the next one after that.) Spike can talk about that with current information.

Chris Maisch: Thanks, Ed Packee, for suggesting the social hour. Make that a standard feature when we're out and about. Some money is coming back into Division of Forestry program, so next year we can do two face to face meetings. We have a lot of important topics that will take a two-day meeting. Chris Stark: We get so much more out of in-person meetings. Denise Hertzog: Second. Chris Beck: Site visits are very important. Chris Maisch: Southcentral region will come next for in-person meeting in Spring; we could do Palmer, or we could meet in Haines and do a Southeast meeting instead. We could take the ferry

from Juneau to Haines. Start the meeting in Juneau, take the ferry, then finish in Haines, and people can leave from there. November meeting teleconference, then Spring meeting in person, perhaps in Haines.

Next meeting: Look at forest practices map to see where the regions are, rotating meetings.

Wrap-up

Next meeting date: **November 14th teleconference.**

Possible agenda items for next meeting:

- Update on ballot initiative 17FSH2 – fish permitting vote result and implications for FRPA if passed.
- Spruce bark beetle: what’s coming, what should we do about it? Review Kenai meeting info.
- Meshing contracts for AFS and Type 2 crews. AFS solicitation for EFF crews in rural communities.
- AEA wood energy projects: map & update
- Yellow-cedar Endangered Species Act review (Erin Knoll)
- Fuel logs project update from Tok Wood Fuels
- Representative Stutes and update on HB 199 (will it be re-introduced?)
- ADFG handout update
- Report on University research and funding, including McIntire-Stennis funds. How best to integrate applied science?
- Ecosystem management: presentation on how it is done elsewhere
- UA Haines sale update, and presentation on their mandate as a land grant university. (Ask them to come to our meetings, update like MHT does.)
- Chris Beck’s study of the economic value of recreation, especially trails
- Issues for small miners, especially access and management of state forests. Also, products being used.
- Tongass Roadless Rule update, and presentation of maps of .8% of land base of Tongass in forestry designation.
- School land trust, Sections 16 & 36: Spike Jorgenson
- FY19 Budgets and FRPA implementation
- Southeast forest management issues (Edna Bay LTF?)
- Status of state timber program
- Tier 3 stream implications (check with Crapps)
- If applicable, consider inviting appellants of state SE timber sales to address the Board
- If applicable, consider inviting DNR Commissioner or deputy to speak about delays in appeal responses
- Strategic plan for BOF
- Discuss creating a BOF award for innovation, artistic value, community engagement
- Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop—re-launch?
- Ethics Training

Board comments:

Mark Vinsel: Welcome to Alison; thank you for what has been a seamless transition. Thank you to Rep. Talerico (Chris will send a BOF thank-you to him.) for coming on the fieldtrip. Happy to hear about the collaboration with ADFG and DOF on working to get Pittman-Robertson funds. Really impressed with the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the three operations we saw, especially the boiler in school operations. Tony Lee at the Tok School should get a Governor’s Award for Industrial Arts. Interesting to meet some of the TVSF CAC. Advisory committees are very important for community. Happy to hear about how things are working well with local employment, for example, the locals working for the fire crew and Joe Young. Glad to see that community thinks the Division is doing a good job.

Will Putman: I'm glad to get back to the Upper Tanana, and see it from a different perspective than for a particular project. Thanks to Alison for it going smoothly. Appreciated Spike's comments, especially about the community's relationship to the layers of government. On biomass, I'm impressed how the Tok community rallied to make things happen. I agree that Tony Lee's work is really impressive. All three operations had motivated and competent people. It's great to see the positive results of this.

Eric Nichols: I got here in 1990, have been here for 28 years, and have been through some tough market cycles. We are reaching the point in SE where we have to ask whether we have a viable timber industry. The last plan amendment has taken away another big chunk. We don't have a lack of trees or infrastructure, but there is not enough land base left where timber harvest can be practiced. Risk and capital investment: who will be able to keep this up? Revisiting the Roadless Rule will maybe work if they can do it quickly. But the timber under contract: it's a just-in-time situation. We are down to being able to harvest .8% of the Tongass. Society has to decide whether it wants a timber industry. Fishing and tourism is important, but timber is year-round and creates livable jobs. A lot of other industries are part time and hard to raise families on. Supreme Court is going to change two sentences, and then we'll have a whole new set of regulations. It will be one more straw that will break the camel's back. You can't run a business when you don't have a cost-efficient supply. I haven't gotten to this point before, but if we can't get the roadless clawed back into the land base, it's not a viable industry.

Jim Durst: Appreciated the opportunity to sit on this side of the table. I've been impressed by the quality of the discussion, and the integrated nature of the board. I see a hunger from the board to address a number of issues. Stay focused to be most effective. Shepherd through the system with all the things that the board members can see with timber in the state. Chris Maisch: Thanks for substituting for Bill Morris.

Chris Stark: Can appreciate Eric's situation. Maybe this board could hear again what the case is out there: .8% of the Tongass land base? I was amazed. I'd like this board to see the maps, and I would like to see what is the benefit of a timber industry. I trust Eric and I think he's right. We have to show communities the benefit. There is a difference between Tok and Haines. I propose that the BOF starts rewarding good work. Thank you, Alison for coming back.

Denise Hertzog: Thank you to Alison, and thank you to Marty for her years of service. Eric's comments hit close to home. What's happening in SE is sad and disturbing. I hope we can help out, maybe by helping to change communities' perspectives. Tok is innovative, and I'm impressed at how they use the whole tree. I learned a lot from a different ecosystem perspective.

Chris Beck: Second many of these things. As a new board member, it's been a transformative couple of days, to see what's happening on the ground, and to see a much broader scale of the BOF and DOF, including the economic future of rural communities. Most specific of my impressions: the complexity of institutional systems, including Dry Creek, Young's operation, Tok School, and how the state can nurture those things or keep them from being successful. It's great to see the cooperation. In the absence of local government, this group can step in and clarify a need for timber harvest. It would be good to have a better method to broadly guide Alaska toward a more intelligent use of its resources. We lurch from unregulated excessive to shutting it down entirely. We need to find a middle ground—our group can perhaps bring people to the table and move people in that direction. This has been a useful and interesting trip.

Chris Maish: Definitely prefer face to face meetings, and we will move in that direction in the future. Thanks to the local people for hosting us here. Joe Young has come a long way since I've first been here. It energizes me to come down here and see all that people are doing. There is a lot at stake with the roadless project, and I'm feeling that pressure. We have a big task ahead of us, and I appreciate the reenergizing. Thanks to Alison.

Adjourned: 10:45am.

Attendees

Wednesday, 8/08 Fairbanks meeting location:

Denise Herzog, Board
Jim Durst (subst. Bill Morris), Board
Will Putman, Board
Mark Vinsel, Board
Chris Beck, Board
Chris Stark, Board
Eric Nichols, Board
Chris Maisch, Board
Tim Dabney, DOF
Alison Arians, DOF, speaker
Dan Rees, Ft. Wainwright, speaker
Tom Paragi, ADFG, speaker
Nick Czarnecki, FNSB, speaker
Paul Keech, DOF, speaker
Todd “Nik” Nichols, ADFG, speaker
Tom Malone, TVSF CAC Chair
Paul Slenkamp, MHT, speaker
Kevin Meany, DOF
Jim Smith, DOF
Julie Hagelin, co-author w/ Tom Paragi

Juneau teleconference site:

Tom Lenhart, AGO, speaker
Joel Nudelman, DOF
Gretchen Pikul, DEC Water
Meredith Trainor, SEACC
Megan, Rep. Josephson staff
Lisa, Rep. Josephson staff

Anchorage teleconference site

Devany Plentovich, AEA, speaker
Andrew Sayers-Fay, DEC, speaker
Earl Crapps, DEC, speaker
Christine Klein, UA, speaker
Kyle Mosel, OPMP

Ketchikan teleconference site

Greg Staunton, speaker

Individual teleconference:

Jaeleen Kookesh

Friday, 8/10 Tok meeting site:

Denise Herzog, Board
Jim Durst (subst. Bill Morris), Board
Will Putman, Board
Mark Vinsel, Board
Chris Beck, Board
Chris Stark, Board
Eric Nichols, Board
Chris Maisch, Board
Alison Arians, DOF, minutes
Tim Dabney, DOF
Ed Packee, UAF, speaker
Derek Nellis, DOF, speaker
Todd “Nik” Nichols, ADFG
Patricia Young, Young Timber Industries
Joe Young, Young Timber Industries
Spike Jorgenson

Haines teleconference

Elsa Sebastian, Lynn Canal Conservation
Shannon Donahue, SEACC & Great Bear
Foundation
Sylvia Heinz, Mud Bay Lumber Co.

Anchorage teleconference:

Megan, Rep. Josephson staff
Lisa, Rep. Josephson staff

Juneau teleconference:

Joel Nudelman, DOF
Gretchen Pikul, DEC

Handouts

- Agenda
- Public notice
- Draft minutes from February 2018 Board of Forestry meeting
- BOF letter #2 to Governor regarding HB 199, March 2018
- 2017 Board report to Governor
- Field trip agenda
- Alaska Forest Resources and Practices Act (yellow fieldbook) reprinted May 2018
- Alaska Forest Resources (blue fieldbook) reprinted June 2018
- Errata sheet for Implementing Best Management Practices for Timber Operations (purple fieldbook)
- USFWS update on yellow-cedar review process
- Wood energy projects progress report
- Briefing paper on Potential Sikes Act Projects for DNR
- Update Fish Habitat and Timber fact sheet
- Managing boreal forest for timber and wildlife in the Tanana Valley
- HB199M – Fish habitat permitting bill update
- Blue fieldbook, yellow fieldbook
- State regulations
 - Fees
 - Public notice

APPENDIX: Public Comments received on the Tongass Roadless Rule for the Board of Forestry Meeting: August 8 & 10, 2018

Larry Hurlock, <larrynorte@yahoo.com>

The stories about abuses by logging in the Tongass are legendary. I've lived here 65 years in SE and heard about the nonsense that went on to insure the companies made money.

And, the last thing we need is another subsidy for industry -- govt road building.

Another Murkowski boondoggle for political purposes. Must have gotten that from her father while they lived in Ketchikan before they moved here to Juneau and bought my brothers house.

Dear Alison Arians,

Please accept my testimony for hearings in the Board of Forestry on changing the roadless rule for Alaska.

In 2016, relying heavily on the recommendations of a diverse group of regional stakeholders, the Tongass Forest Plan was updated to include a 16-year transition to young growth timber harvest in the region, a sustainable alternative to old growth logging that doesn't require additional logging or road building in Roadless Areas. I remind State Forester Chris Maisch that he represented the State of Alaska on the Tongass Advisory Committee, which unanimously recommended making all Tongass roadless areas off-limits to logging just two years ago, in the 2016 Tongass Land Management Plan Amendment Roadless Rule.

I support roadless protections on the Tongass and oppose the State of Alaska's petition to exempt the Tongass from these protections.

My husband and I commercial fished for 17 years and ran a sport fishing lodge in Tenakee so our livelihood depended on intact forest and healthy streams. We are now subsistence users of the forest and the possibility of more Tongass degradation is at the very least disturbing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify,

Joan McBeen

PO box 23

Tenakee Springs, AK 99841

Dear Ms. Arians,

I am writing in opposition of repealing the current roadless protections on the Tongass. I oppose the State of Alaska's petition to exempt the Tongass from these protections.

As a longtime Alaskan I would like to protect the Tongass and would like to leave it roadless and pristine for Salmon and other wildlife.

Sincerely,

Laura Powers

2185 Fritz Cove Road

Juneau, AK 99801

I want to express my support of the roadless rule. We need to protect what is left of our natural beauty of Alaska! We need to protect our dwindling salmon stocks! Tourists do not want to look at the scars of clear cutting.

Thank you
Rich Tolles
HC 60 box 4012
Haines, Ak. 99827

I am writing to register with the Board of Forestry my strong support of the Tongass roadless rule, and my equally strong opposition to any efforts to weaken it or harm the Tongass forest. Alaska needs an intact forest to protect the water, protect the salmon that my neighbors in Tenakee Springs depend on, protect the wilderness values that I love, and draw carbon out of the steaming atmosphere. Wherever the Tongass is cut by roads or reduced to stumps, its value is lost to the vast majority of us (who vote) and to future beings (who have no way to speak in their own defense). Thank you for doing everything you can to protect the forest, the water, the salmon, and the agreements that will protect them.

Kathleen Dean Moore
PO Box 37
Tenakee Springs, AK 99841
907-736-2494

To the Board of Forestry,
I SUPPORT the Roadless Rule and urge you to resist any effort to allow roads through the Tongass. We must protect our waters, our forests, and our wildlife. We do not need to be destroying the Tongass any further or opening it up for degradation.

If this process does go forward, I support

- a transparent open process,
- equal representation on the part of environmental and pro-industry groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be part of that process,
- to see an Alaska Roadless Rule that is STRONGER than the federal Roadless Rule

Thank you for your attention to this --

Mary-Claire Bernstein
Mary-Claire Bernstein
1890 Glacier Hwy
Juneau, AK 99801

Hello,

I would like to offer comments relating to the petition Gov. Walker and the state of Alaska submitted to the federal government about the "Alaska-specific" Roadless Rule impacting the Tongass National Forest.

I am an Alaskan citizen and I support the national Roadless Rule protections and want to keep the Tongass in it. I would like to remind State Forester Chris Maisch that the Tongass Advisory Committee (in which he represented the State of Alaska) unanimously recommended making all Tongass roadless areas off-limits to logging just two years ago, in the 2016 Tongass Land Management Plan Amendment. In light of this, I believe that Alaska's recent petition was made in bad faith and is not in the best interests of Southeast Alaska's biggest economic drivers: fishing and tourism.

However, if this "Alaska-specific" Roadless Rule goes forward I strongly emphasize that:

- this must be a transparent, open process;
- there must be equal representation between environmental and pro-industry groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be part of the process; and
- the Alaska Roadless Rule must be stronger than the federal Roadless Rule.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments!

Elisabeth Genaux
4155 Aspen Ave.
Juneau, AK 99801

Hello,

My name is Matthew Jackson. I was born in Ketchikan and have lived in Sitka for the last 5 years. My father was employed in the Ketchikan Pulp Mill and was laid off when it closed, so I appreciate the economic impact of logging and also the impacts of the boom and bust cycle of natural resource extraction. It's clear that the days of big logging are gone - we've cut down all the big trees, and the Tongass Advisory Committee and the 2016 TLMP made it clear that Fisheries, Tourism, and medium-scale second growth forestry industries are the future of the Tongass.

I urge the BOF to stand by the decisions made in the 2016 TLMP, to honor the "Roadless Rule" and to protect our remaining old growth forest, salmon habitats and pristine wilderness. Tourists do not come to Southeast to see clearcuts, nor do clearcuts support wild salmon runs, long-term deer populations, or our Alaskan way of life. Logging in the Tongass always required massive taxpayer subsidies. Efforts to prop up an artificial timber industry in the Tongass appear to be senseless pandering to the resource extraction industry, since the number of jobs and economic impact it could generate in the rosier of scenarios pales in comparison to the documented expenses to our fisheries, tourism industry and way of life. Sustainable resource extraction has an important place in Alaska's economy, but old-growth logging and expensive new road development in the Tongass surely do not. I hope the BOF has the wisdom and foresight to stick with the 2016 TLMP and not waste any more time and money trying to undermine the Roadless Rule or prop up a dead old-growth timber industry.

Sincerely,
Matthew Jackson of 1403 Halibut Point Rd, Sitka AK

Dear Ms. Arians.

I am writing to let you know that as an Alaskan living amid the Tongass National Forest I support the national Roadless Rule and oppose the State of Alaska's petition to exempt the Tongass from roadless protections. If, however, the process to roll it back continues we Alaskans have a right to demand a transparent, open process, participation by environmental groups on any panels and an Alaskan Roadless Rule that is stronger than the federal one. The petition was made in bad faith and runs counter to the biggest economic factors in Southeast Alaska, that is, fishing and tourism.

Additionally, as a citizen I want the right to protect our waters by designating them as Tier 3. I ask you to tell the Department of Environmental conservation to stop delaying and give us that right.

Bonnie Demerjian
Box 1762
Wrangell, AK 99929

I am writing to express my strong support for protections under the Roadless Rule in the Tongass National Forest.

I consider protections for clean water and salmon habitat to be highest priority as these are essential and renewable resources.

I also believe that concerns of local residents should be heard and given very high priority in decision-making.

Thank you for this opportunity and for considering my comments.

Maureen Knutsen
PO Box 134
Naknek, AK 99633

I am an Alaskan resident and have been for 51 years. I have seen the degradation of the Tongass National Forest during these years. Let us please cherish the remnants of this forest and not build any more roads in it.

I am sorry to bring up climate change but that is also a consideration, the less trees in the world, the hotter it is going to become. It is too bad we have an idiot for a President right at the moment.

Thank you for considering defending this forest.

Charlotte Tanner
PO 886, Ward Cove, AK 99928
(320 Bawden St. #602, Ketchikan, AK 99901)
To the Alaska Board of Forestry:

Concerning the state's petition to create an "Alaska-specific" Roadless Rule, I am writing to express my support of the existing national rule, with no changes, exceptions or variances for Alaska.

I live across Icy Strait from Chichagof Island, and over the last 30+ years have walked and paddled the Tongass National Forest for work, play, and subsistence from Portland Canal to Russel Fjord. The existing roadless rule protects Alaskans' livelihoods and lifestyles, as well as ecosystems. Changing it risks fishing and tourism jobs, and subsistence, recreation, and spiritual values for all Alaskans and visitors from all over the world, all for the benefit of a handful of timber industry owners and workers. A better long-term strategy for everyone is to let timber industry adapt to changing market conditions and technologies, versus clearcutting the last remaining old-growth to delay the inevitable transition.

I speak from my decades of communing with the wild places of the Tongass, and avoiding or hurrying through those that have been used and abused by people: the wilderness offers an ineffable but priceless power to heal and uplift, that quickly dissipates in the presence of roads and other trappings of humanity.

And I speak from my knowledge as co-founder of Spirit Walker Expeditions, a Gustavus-based wilderness sea kayaking outfitter now in its 31st year: visitors do not pay thousands of dollars to tour roads and clear-cuts.

So I oppose the state's petition to create an "Alaska-specific" Roadless Rule.

But in the event that a rulemaking takes place, I demand that the process

- be transparent and open,
- have equal representation by environmental and industry groups, and
- consider *strengthening* protections for Tongass ecosystems and wilderness character.

As an example of the latter, regarding another item on your agenda, Alaskans should have the right to protect our clean waters by designating them as Tier 3.

Sincerely,

Nathan Borson
PO Box 211
Gustavus, AK 99826
717-862-8378

*I am a very strong supporter of the roadless rule & clean water act.
Also saving our salmon etc.
I am sending this as part of the petition in support. Thank You for being a part
Of a on going struggle not just for environments..but as being human.
Rosa Gaona
907-209-1813*

Dear Alison Arians,

Please accept my testimony for hearings in the Board of Forestry on changing the roadless rule for Alaska.

In 2016, relying heavily on the recommendations of a diverse group of regional stakeholders, the Tongass Forest Plan was updated to include a 16-year transition to young growth timber harvest in the region, a sustainable alternative to old growth logging that doesn't require additional logging or road building in Roadless Areas. I remind State Forester Chris Maisch that he represented the State of Alaska on the Tongass Advisory Committee, which unanimously recommended making all Tongass roadless areas off-limits to logging just two years ago, in the 2016 Tongass Land Management Plan Amendment Roadless Rule.

I support roadless protections on the Tongass and oppose the State of Alaska's petition to exempt the Tongass from these protections.

My husband and I commercial fished for 17 years and ran a sport fishing lodge in Tenakee so our livelihood depended on intact forest and healthy streams. We are now subsistence users of the forest and the possibility of more Tongass degradation is totally unacceptable.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify,
Samuel McBeen
PO box 23
Tenakee Springs, AK 99841

Good Day,

I totally support the National Roadless Rule and want to keep it for the Tongass National Forest. Roadless protection in the Tongass is very important to Alaskans. The roll back proposed is very bad for this forest and also to tourism.

If this goes forward, you should make sure there is equal representation on the part of environmental and other groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be

part of that process.

I would like to see an Alaskan Roadless Rule that is stronger than the Federal Roadless Rule, not weaker.

Thank you,

Ms. Terry Cummings

6740 E. 10th

Anchorage, AK 99504

55 year resident of Alaska

Hello,

I would like to voice my support for protecting the Tongass from rules that allow new roads to be constructed; a rule unique to the Tongass and devastating to its wildlife and rivers. Please don't allow this to happen!

Sincerely, Mike Monasmith <mikemonasmith8@gmail.com>

I have lived in the Tongass since 1968 and care deeply about the nature of the Tongass. I recall in earlier years seeing from planes and the ferry large areas of the Tongass logged. The mountain sides look scalped and that is because they were. Still traveling on the ferry there are large areas where the mountain sides look strange where the trees all re-grew at the same height.

I've walked under regrowth. The understory is dead, because the trees are all at the same height. It is devastating to see because a healthy forest means rich undergrowth for rainforest plants and wildlife. It also enhances the chances for survival of mankind as we continue to exasperate global warming.

In short it is good for mankind and wild plants and animals to maintain the roadless rule.

Patricia OBrien

(907) 789-9405

Dear Sirs,

As a 35 year Alaskan who arrived when the Tongass was being liquidated to feed two money-losing no-bid long term contracts, I've been pleased to see the heavily subsidized timber industry facing the music of market forces. The Tongass deserves protection, not government-subsidized decimation. For that reason, I was disturbed to see Governor Walker and the State of Alaska request a roll-back of the Roadless Rule in the Tongass.

Old growth forest, like the salmon it sustains, has been destroyed in nearly its entire range in the United States, and I understand that many would like to destroy it here. It's sad that some people never learn. Logging, especially in Alaska, is a short-term, parasitic industry that cuts its way to unemployment and then looks for some other area to cut. That's why so many loggers originate in the depressed logging towns of Oregon and Washington. Having destroyed their own

resource, they're happy to destroy ours. It's not a "renewable" industry, especially with the slow growth of Alaska timber. Meanwhile, intact forests are critical to slowing global warming, as logging turns loose vast amounts of stored carbon. In case you haven't noticed, Alaska is being heavily affected by warming ocean temperatures and other aspects of global warming.

Just two years ago the Tongass Advisory Committee unanimously recommended making all Tongass roadless areas off-limits to logging just two years ago, in the 2016 Tongass Land Management Plan Amendment. That was the right call for our fishing and tourism future, not to mention our climate future. Now, with The Leader in Washington, those who would like to revive the moribund logging industry by cranking up the subsidies and destroying more Old Growth are back at work.

In any discussions about the Tongass I request:

- a transparent, open process,
- Equal representation on the part of environmental and pro-industry groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be part of that process,
- to see an Alaska Roadless Rule that is **STRONGER** than the federal Roadless Rule

Please show that the Alaska Board of Forestry has learned something from the wholesale destruction of old-growth forests all over the country. Nobody is creating more wilderness. Please leave our alone.

Thanks,
Stuart Cohen
725 5th St.
Juneau, AK 99801

You CANNOT build roads through this invaluable land!
What age are you living in and think that this sort of 'progress' could possibly benefit the planet?!

Nancy Furniss

Dear Ms. Arians,
The citizens of SE Alaska have prospered under the Roadless Rule. Millions in federal and state dollars subsidize the forest industry, and many workers are from out of state. Reversing the Roadless Rule is sheer folly-politically expedient for the current occupant of the White House and his followers, but it is wasteful policy, and unnecessary to preserve the SE Alaska forest industry.
Save the Roadless Rule.
Thank you.
Sincerely,
Peter Mjos
Anchorage

Dear Mr. Arians:

I am a 50+ year resident of Southeast Alaska. My family has been in and out of Alaska for 4 generations. I strongly support maintaining the Tongass Roadless Rule. I don't believe that there is sufficient timber left to harvest to warrant the impacts that extensive road-building would incur. I am concerned about prioritizing harvest of slow growing Alaska timber at the expense of our productive salmon fisheries and blossoming visitor animal-viewing industry.

Thanks,

Gretchen Bishop

Dear Board of Forestry - I strongly support the roadless rule that has been in place for the Tongass National Forest. As an active recreational user of the Tongass, I appreciate the wildness of the Tongass as I kayak throughout SE Alaska.

As you proceed with this new process, let me remind you of the unanimous decision just two years ago made by the advisory group supporting the roadless rule provisions during the Tongass Plan amendment.

This new process must be open and transparent. It should have equal representation for all user groups, industry, and environmental organizations. If you stack the advisory group with industry people, you open yourselves up for distrust and legitimate criticism. Remember, the prime economic engines in the Tongass are fishing and tourism, with forestry providing a miniscule fraction of the SE economy. Be realistic and focus on 21st century realities.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Gretchen Keiser
3271 Nowell Ave
Juneau, AK 99801

Buck Lindekugel: SEACC and our members strongly support the national Roadless Rule, particularly with the Tongass in it. During the summer of 2002, eighty-six percent of the Alaskans who spoke at public hearings throughout Southeast Alaska supported permanent protection for all Tongass Roadless areas.

...

To be successful, this rulemaking process must:

- be transparent and open;

- provide fair and balanced representation for both development and non-development interests on any public advisory committee established; and

- make Alaska's roadless protections **STRONGER** than the federal roadless rule.

Since its adoption in 2001, the Roadless Rule has maintained the resiliency of our intact forests, provided key habitat for abundant wildlife, and safeguarded Southeast Alaska's extraordinary salmon runs and the subsistence, commercial, and sport uses they support.

Building roads on these remote and rugged lands results in tremendous costs to taxpayers and benefits far less than one percent of Southeast Alaska's economy.

State Forester Maisch represented the State of Alaska on the Tongass Advisory Committee. The TAC unanimously recommended making all Tongass roadless areas off-limits to logging in the 2016 Tongass Plan Amendment. Governor Walker applauded the TAC's "great work."

Less than two years later, after the federal district court for the District of Columbia rejected all the State's claims against the roadless rule, the State filed its petition with the Secretary of Agriculture. The flip-flopping makes you wonder why any Alaskan would be willing to participate in another stakeholder process with the State of Alaska. We consider the State's petition to be in bad faith, contrary to the best interest of Alaskans, and harmful to the real drivers of Southeast Alaska's economy today – recreation, tourism, guiding, and fishing.

The State's petition perpetuates the stale, tired efforts by Roadless Rule opponents to mischaracterize the Rule's actual scope and effect. It ignores the fact that USDA narrowly tailored the Roadless Rule to limit only two activities in roadless areas, road construction and logging. The petition ignores the Rule's established exceptions, including Federal Aid Highway projects connecting communities, access to mining claims, and logging incidental to otherwise permitted activities, including utility corridors and hydropower projects.

To be successful, this rulemaking process must:

- be transparent and open;

- provide fair and balanced representation for both development and non-development interests on any public advisory committee established; and

- make Alaska's roadless protections **STRONGER** than the federal roadless rule.

Finally, as a follow up to DEC's presentation earlier, we can only express our dismay over DEC's continued failure to implement a Tier 3 process for Alaskans. Although EPA recently claimed that Alaska has such a process, DEC has failed to make that process accessible to those Alaskans who have already nominated four extraordinary Alaskan waterbodies as Outstanding Natural Resource Waters. DEC continues to allow corporations to pollute our shared waters but denies all Alaskans their right to protect them! Instead of treating our clean water as one of Alaska's most valuable resources, DEC uses its abundance as an excuse for neglecting it. It is way past time to put Alaska's clean water at the front of the line.

To the Alaska Board of Forestry: As Alaskans, we support the Roadless Rule and the right to protect our waters. We value the clean waters, salmon and other seafood production, recreation and tourism that are tied to an intact Tongass. The 2016 TLMP amendment made all roadless areas off-limits to logging and we feel it is critically important to remain that way. In short, we support roadless protections on the Tongass and oppose the State of Alaska's petition to exempt the Tongass from these protections.

Sincerely,

Karen and Jeff Wilson

Juneau

Dear Alison,

I live and grew up here in southeast Alaska and I care deeply about the health of the Tongass National Forest. I support the national Roadless Rule, and believe it should apply to ALL our national forests. We deserve the right to protect our waters and forests. The fact is that they do not belong to us, but to the whole world, as well as future generations. We need healthy ecosystems and carbon sinks now more than ever. Building roads through it only subsidizes those who would pillage this precious wilderness for personal profit.

If this process is going forward we demand:

- a transparent, open process,
- Equal representation on the part of environmental and pro-industry groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be part of that process
- to see an Alaska Roadless Rule that is STRONGER than the federal Roadless Rule

Thank you,
Natalie Watson
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Alison,

Greetings! My name is Zach Brown, and I am director of Inian Islands Institute. As an educator, I rely on roadless spaces to educate and inspire my students. And as a resident of Southeast Alaska, I rely on roadless spaces for hunting deer and fishing cohos to feed my family.

I support the Roadless Rule. Please maintain this crucial rule to protect our forest home.

Best wishes,
Zach

Zachary Brown
PhD, Stanford University
Founding Director, Inian Islands Institute
<http://inianislandsinstitute.org/>

Please keep the protections in place for our forests, I find them to be highly valuable just as they are, and as the rest of the planet becomes more and more desertified and altered by human activity, their value only increases. My vote is that you manage them as a rare and precious and fragile gem, that is what they are. Thanks.

Dan Trail

Box 2178
Wrangell, AK 99929

I support the national Roadless Rule for the Tongass National Forest and believe that it should be strengthened for this forest. I object to the Governor's decision to petition to exempt the Tongass from Roadless Rule protections.

I see the Governor's action as an attempt to circumvent the work of the Tongass Advisory Committee on which the State had a representative.

The desire to give an artificial subsidized boost at taxpayer expense to a dying industry is foolish, especially since any success will be at the expense of our main industries—tourism and fisheries.

Further, The State needs to come into compliance with the Clean Water Act, and give citizens the right to protect our waters by designating them as Tier 3. The Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) should stop delaying and give us the right to protect our clean water.

Sincerely,
Margo Waring
11380 N. Douglas Hwy
Juneau, AK 99801

Alaska Board of Forestry Members,

I am a 50-year Alaskan, most of that spent in Southeast, and I am writing in support of the current national Roadless Rule and in support of strong protections for Tongass fish and wildlife.

Healthy and productive salmon streams, wildlife areas, and abundant recreation opportunity are central to Alaska's economy and way of life.

In Southeast Alaska alone, fishing and tourism account for 26% of all employment and \$2 billion to the regional economy. Much of the most valuable and productive fish and wildlife habitat is found within Roadless Areas. Safeguarding this habitat - including the Tongass 77 - is critical to ensuring Alaska salmon stay strong and continue to provide economic benefits in the future, and must be prioritized as we seek a path forward for renewable energy development and a sustainable and stable forest products industry.

Please ensure that fishing, hunting, recreation and tourism have a seat at the table and have a voice in any decisions affecting how the Roadless Rule will be handled in the Tongass. And please add all possible support to keeping the Roadless Rule as it currently exists in the Tongass.

Thank you,

Marsha Buck
8445 Kimberly St.

Juneau, AK 99801

Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to write, as I cannot attend the current meetings. I'm a commercial fisherman from Kupreanof/Petersburg and am currently working.

Im wondering why we are continually reopening this issue. We know that the roadless rule helps to protect the environment that we depend on in so many ways, including economically. I am writing simply to show my support for the roadless rule, and to urge you NOT to diminish its scope in any manner.

Sincerely,

Mary Harrop
Kupreanof, Alaska

Dear Ms. Arians,

I am writing to let you know that I support the national Roadless rule for the Tongass and I would like to see it made even stronger.

Thank you,

Doug Woodby
3240 Nowell Avenue
Juneau, AK

As an Alaskan, I support the National Roadless Rule and want to keep it in the Tongass.
Sincerely, Jerry C. Sharrard, Sitka, Ak

Please listen! As an Alaskan (and as an international sailor that has seen what happens when you open up roads in these areas), I support the National Roadless Rule and want to keep it in the Tongass. Sincerely, Nola Kathleen, home in Ketchikan, AK and boat in Sitka, AK

Hi Alison,

This summer I have had to sit by, powerless to help, as forests burned and friends lost their homes. I see the Great Barrier Reef off of Australia is dying. I see an unprecedented red tide smothering all life on the coast of Florida.

One of the benefits of having intact mature forests is their ability to store the greenhouse gases that contribute to the climate change and the resultant fires and other disasters that are ravaging the planet.

The great forests of our planet have been cut down to supply materials for runaway population growth. Many of these great forests that have been cut have been turned into sustainable productive forests.

These sustainable forests are more commercially viable than the most desirable old growth forest left in Alaska.

There are not many places left that we can protect from the destruction that modern machinery wreaks. It is my hope that the Forest Service protects our remaining heritage by stepping back from considering new roads at least until global warming is stabilized and on the mend.

I understand the politicians that want a return to the old days of clear cuts and mills running around the clock. That was 50 years ago! Alaska Pulp had open ended contracts and no environmental oversight. It was a disaster for the entire ecosystem. The financial gains though great, were short lived. Had they been allowed to continue there would be nothing left for us to discuss.

We can compare other once great and lucrative industries to that of clear cut logging. Whales, seals and otter were all nearly hunted to extinction. Now they are under stress from climate change, like us. Are we going to give up on these other forms of life, now that we have universally agreed on protecting them?

Thank you for taking my comment.
Tim Murray
Wrangell

Dear Board of Forestry members,
I am writing to urge you to keep the present roadless rule intact for the Tongass National Forest.

I worked as a research fish biologist for 24 years in the Tongass and I have seen first hand the many impacts of roads on fresh water and anadromous salmon through the Tongaas and Churgach National Forests. Road construction and culverts have denied access to fish to 1000's of miles of fresh water streams. Roads have heavily impacted the amount of siltation in spawning streams. Road access is necessary to harvest more old growth timber in the Tongass. However, second growth harvest can become the new real industry of the Tongass and require maintenance and improvement of existing roads.

With the present reality of climate change and ocean acidification, it is of primary importance to protect fresh water fish habitat.

The life cycle is not just ocean or fresh water. The fish need both. Please put more effort into fixing the roads already in existence before allowing the problem to be increased by adding new roads.

Thank you,
Brenda Wright
17430 Andreanoff Dr
Juneau, AK 99801

As a 27 year resident of Juneau and avid user of the Tongass National Forest, I keenly support the inclusion of the Tongass in the national Roadless Rule.

If Governor Walker and others in the state administration feel inclined to “mess around” with the Rule, all voices must be heard and considered equally.

I will fight hard if there is any attempt to weaken protections on the Tongass. It is time for Owen Graham and his cronies to realize the economics of logging what is left of Tongass old-growth just doesn't pencil out without huge government subsidies. As a taxpayer, I have had enough of my money used to destroy habitat on the Tongass.

Do not weaken the Roadless Rule.

Sue Schrader
Cell: 907-209-5761
PO Box 240325
Douglas AK 99824

Ms Arians:

This is a comment to the Alaska Board of Forestry about the Roadless Rule for the Tongass.

As a life-long resident of Southeast Alaska, I am writing to urge that we keep the existing Roadless Rule for the Tongass. It already allows for roads between our communities, hydro-electric development, other necessary travel and for some mining.

I and many others in my community spent time providing input into the Tongass Advisory Board for the Tongass Management Plan Amendment. That board represented many regional interests, including timber industry interests, yet it was unanimous in saying that future logging should not require substantial new roading, and supporting the Roadless Rule.

Currently the timber industry constitutes only about 1% of employment and income in Southeast Alaska. But industries that depend on intact landscapes and streams - fisheries and tourism - constitute about 26% of regional employment. We've seen that timber harvest on the Tongass has required federal subsidies and in its aftermath leaves many long-lasting problems, such as stream culverts under logging roads, that require repair and maintenance for which there is often no funding. Please do not damage our part of the world and the economy that we have in the name of the old, admittedly out-dated USFS view of what should happen here.

Thank you,
Judy Brakel Box 94, Gustavus, Alaska 99826 907-697-2287 judybrakel@gmail.com

Dear Ms. Arians:

I want to let the State Forester, Chris Maisch, and the Board of Forestry know that I oppose the State's petition for an Alaskan exemption to the national Roadless Rule. The state should be telling the federal government that it wants to keep this rule in place on the Tongass and Chugach National Forests because the important industries to our economy are fishing and tourism. For these industries, the Roadless Rule maintains the forest as it is needed to keep salmon runs healthy and keep scenic recreation areas in tact.

I am especially upset that the State would so quickly act to overturn the time and effort from many stakeholders that went into the 2016 Tongass Land Management Plan Amendment. Keep this Amendment and the Roadless Rule as they are.

Sincerely,

Kris Benson
Juneau, Alaska

Even though I do not live in Alaska, I visit often enough to be entitled to comment on the revision of this rule. The forest ought to be protected "as is". The timber industry should not be allowed to profit at the expense of the environment. Too little of our natural areas remain for the sake of corporate profits. Do the right thing; Respect our Earth.

Frank Van Bree

1501 Allentown Rd

Sellersburg, In 47172

I am writing to you in support of Alaska's current "roadless rule." We need open public hearings and transparent processes for legislation that impacts the Tongass.
Sincerely, Lorrie Wright

Hello Alison,

Please include my comments in the records of the group discussing changes to the roadless rule. I am strongly opposed to any weakening of protection for those areas of the Tongass which are still undisturbed by industrial activities. In these times of a mindset which thinks only of immediate gratification with little regard for the future, it is prudent to strengthen the roadless rule. As one travels around the Tongass as I have done for over fifty years, the devastation caused by clear-cut logging is still apparent. It is especially disturbing that the roads which enabled logging were created at great taxpayer expense. Once logged, the Tongass lands tend not to recover, thus losing their value for the foreseeable future. The roadless areas, both designated wilderness and the LUD II lands should remain roadless and undisturbed.

Thank you.
Ralph Wells

I support stronger roadless protections on the Tongass National Forest than the Federal Rule. Our fisheries and tourism depend on a healthy forest ecosystem.

The timber industry is dead and gone in Southeast Alaska. There's no going back to the millions of board feet of old growth logging. While our dinosaurs in Congress may think so, the majority of Alaskans and the American public know better. The Tongass working group made the right decision, stick with it.

We need a fair and open process regarding our Federal and State public lands, no back door industry deals. Please ensure that our forest lands which our current economy depends on are protected to the highest standards for now and for future generations.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ely
POB 1014
Haines, AK 99827

Dear Ms. Arians,

As an Alaskan, I support the national Roadless Rule and want to keep it in the Tongass, but if this process is going forward we demand:

- a transparent, open process,
- Equal representation on the part of environmental and pro-industry groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be part of that process,
- to see an Alaska Roadless Rule that is stronger than the federal Roadless Rule

Sincerely,

Laura Baldwin
Anchorage 99501

Public Comment received August 7, 2018 on Tier 3 Waters for the Board of Forestry Meeting: August 8 & 10, 2018

Dear Alison,

I would like to encourage the State of Alaska to get into compliance with the Clean Water Act and give citizens the right to protect our waters by designating them as Tier 3.

The Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) needs to stop delaying and give us the right to protect our clean water.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify,

Joan McBeen

PO box 23

Tenakee Springs, AK 99841

Notice from SEACC to their email list:

Take Action: Board of Forestry meeting on Roadless Rule and Tier 3 THIS WEEK!

Buck Lindekugel, SEACC

Last week, the federal government announced they had accepted a petition from Governor Walker and the state of Alaska in an effort to roll back Roadless Rule protections for the Tongass National Forest by creating an ‘Alaska-specific’ Roadless Rule that only effects the Tongass!

This week, you have the chance to do something about it by telling the Alaska Board of Forestry (BOF) that Alaskans SUPPORT the national Roadless Rule and want to keep it in the Tongass, but that if this process is going forward we demand:

- a transparent, open process,
- Equal representation on the part of environmental and pro-industry groups on any citizen or public advisory panel that might be part of that process,
- to see an Alaska Roadless Rule that is STRONGER than the federal Roadless Rule

The Alaska Board of Forestry, which advises the state on forest management, is meeting this Wednesday and Friday, August 8th and 10th. Among the topics to be covered is the state’s petition on the Roadless Rule. The Board of Forestry needs to hear from Alaskans that we support roadless protections on the Tongass and oppose the State of Alaska’s petition to exempt the Tongass from these protections.

The BOF is taking public comments which means you can remind State Forester Chris Maisch that he represented the State of Alaska on the Tongass Advisory Committee, which unanimously recommended making all Tongass roadless areas off-limits to logging just two years ago, in the 2016 Tongass Land Management Plan Amendment. Let him know that Alaska’s recent petition was made in bad faith and is not in the best interest of the biggest economic drivers in Southeast Alaska – fishing and tourism.

You can participate by attending one of the meetings in-person, via a local teleconference session, or by writing in. According to the Draft Agenda, there will be a Roadless Rule Update at 8:45 am on Wednesday morning, with public comment scheduled at 11 am and a second opportunity for public comment on Friday at 9:00 am.

In addition to the Roadless Rule, the BOF will also be discussing antidegradation regulations and Tier 3 criteria. The state, which is long out of compliance with the Clean Water Act, has yet to

give citizens the right to protect our waters by designating them as Tier 3. Tell the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) to stop delaying and give us the right to protect our clean water. DEC will be providing an update on Tier 3 on Wednesday at 8:35 am.

Public Comment received August 10, 2018 on University timber sale for the Board of Forestry Meeting: August 10, 2018

My name is Elsa Sebastian, I'm the executive director of Lynn Canal Conservation. LCC is a grassroots conservation organization, based in Haines, with a mission to protect watersheds and quality of life in northern Southeast Alaska. We represent 190 members.

Lynn Canal Conservation and our members are concerned about the impacts of the University sale just now reported on by Christine Klein. There are important conservation issues in this area, including the need to protect habitat for the survival of the Chilkat chinook (which is an ADFG stock of concern), and the need for upmost sensitivity when logging adjacent to the Chilkat Bald Eagle Preserve. Btw, I'm glad for Chris Beck's question about the visual impacts of this sale. Tourism is critical to this community, and the University's lands are directly adjacent to rivers that are busy throughout the summer with rafting trips and guided fishing operations.

Lynn Canal Conservation and many of our members have provided the University with information to draw their attention to these conservation concerns, I'd like to make a few comments that I believe are pertinent to this body in its responsibility for resolving forest practice issues in Alaska.

Many in the Haines community were dismayed by the University's public process, especially in the initial stages.

The scale of the University's timber sale relative to the size of this watershed and the relatively small timber economy in Haines, makes it clear that operations on 'private forest land' can have significant and potentially transformative impacts on Alaskan communities. Although the University gives public notice for their land use, there are no concrete rules for how they should interact with the communities that stand to be impacted by their operations.

After the community of Haines found out about this sale via a University press release, University Facilities & Land Management Office refused to meet with the Haines Borough Assembly, and denied multiple requests from the Assembly and Mayor to hold a public forum where Haines residents could gather to receive basic information and have their questions answered publicly. Many felt that the workshop style event that was ultimately offered by the University was inadequate, and community members who left didn't share common information.

We recently received information from the University which indicated that the University would be willing to participate in a voluntary task force run by local residents, and indicated that this could be a forum to exchange input, and ideas and concerns related to the University's timber sale. UA indicates that this effort would be welcome by their institution.

We're glad for this indication of the University's willingness to engage with such a body if it forms, but we also feel that for a timber sale of this scale, such a relationship with a community working group needs to be formalized. We also want to see such a group having the opportunity to provide input not just in the planning stage, but through the logging operation and throughout reclamation.

I want to wrap up by saying that I think the Board of Forestry, as a partner in the Memorandum of Agreement with UA and MHT, has a responsibility to ensure that there is a clear protocol for how the signers work with communities when they propose timber sales of this scale.

For now, Lynn Canal Conservation is looking forward to the opportunity to participate in the voluntary task force that the University has referenced. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Elsa Sebastian

Executive Director

Lynn Canal Conservation

Phone: 907-766-2295

Cell: 907-518-1580
