

From: [Cheryl Heywood](#)
To: [Eric J. Lowell](#)
Subject: RE: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:59:25 AM

Excellent, thanks.

From: Eric J. Lowell <elowell@mrsc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:34 AM
To: Cheryl Heywood <cheywood@trl.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers

Cheryl,

It doesn't change my take on what I said below. There will likely be a loss to TRL but likely minimal and over several years.

Eric

From: Cheryl Heywood <cheywood@trl.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:24 AM
To: Eric J. Lowell <elowell@mrsc.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers

Keeping you in the loop – what is your take on the following?

I am available to talk if needed.

[Forest rule change threatens steep tax losses | Chinook Observer](#)

Thanks,
Cheryl

From: Eric J. Lowell <elowell@mrsc.org>
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:51 PM
To: Cheryl Heywood <cheywood@trl.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers

Cheryl,

After reviewing the information you forwarded, it's difficult to say how much the proposed changes would impact TRL. The impacts would be to the district's timber excise tax revenues as opposed to its regular property tax levy. In looking at TRL's 2025 budget document,

timber excise tax is around 4% of TRL's budget. The impacts would be minimal in my estimation.

The figures that were provided are estimates of the amount of harvestable time that would be lost due to the new restrictions. This loss is not a single-year loss of actual revenue to the districts, and this assumes that all of that timber would end up being harvested. From browsing the [2020 UW document](#) referenced in the materials you forwarded, not all small forest landowners intend on harvesting the timber on their land, so I don't think the figures provided are a true reflection of the actual decrease in revenues that taxing districts would see. The timber wouldn't be harvested in a single year. You were provided with figures that show timber that could be harvested, but the timber harvested would occur over several years or decades and not in one year.

Let me know if you have further questions concerning this inquiry.

Regards,

Eric Lowell

Finance Consultant

206.625.1300 x105

MRSC Empowering local governments

From: Cheryl Heywood <cheywood@trl.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:49 PM
To: Eric J. Lowell <elowell@mrsc.org>
Subject: Fw: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers

You don't often get email from cheywood@trl.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

From: director@pacificcountyedc.org <director@pacificcountyedc.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:56 PM
To: 'Kelly Rupp' <kelly.rupp@leadtoresults.com>; Cheryl Heywood <cheywood@trl.org>
Subject: FW: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers

From: Lisa Olsen <lolsen@co.pacific.wa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:21 AM
To: director@pacificcountyedc.org
Subject: Proposed Increased Timber Buffers

Importance: High

Hi Sue,

Yes, please comment from the EDC and encourage as many individuals as possible as well!

This is an email I am sending out and all this information will be posted on our website today.

Thank you!

Lisa

October 20, 2025

Dear Pacific County Residents,

I am reaching out to you for your support on an issue that is critically important to our local economy and way of life.

The Forest Practices Board* is set to vote on new buffer requirements for private forest land at their November 12 meeting. These proposed changes are based on a 101 page report done by the Washington State Department of Ecology. The following paragraph is an attempt to abbreviate the difference between the current buffer negotiated in the 2001 Forest & Fish Agreement and what is being proposed currently:

The current buffer requirements for non-fish-bearing perennial streams are a 50-foot, no-touch buffer for the first 200 feet upstream of the "end of fish" or "fish break. " After that, the requirement is half the buffer width for half the stream length, no-touch.

The new requirements are proposed to have two different subsets:

- a. For streams over 3 feet wide, bank full width, the requirement would be a 75-foot, no-touch buffer for the first 600 feet upstream of the fish break, followed by a 75-foot buffer to the end of the stream that may be thinned to 50 feet or a 65-foot no-touch buffer.
- b. For streams under 5 feet wide, bank full width, the requirement would be a 75-foot no-touch buffer for the first 600 feet upstream of the fish break and then a 50-foot no-touch buffer to the end of the stream.

This change was voted on at the June 6 meeting by the following votes of those that comprise the board:

IN FAVOR:

ABSTAIN:

Dept. of Natural Resources
Agriculture
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Commerce
Dept. of Ecology

AGAINST:

Small Forest Landowners	Dept. of
Large Forest Landowners	Dept. of
Timber Products Union	

Gen Public Member
Gen Public Member

Gen Public Member

** Two positions on the board are unfilled: One General Public Member and the Elected Member of a county commission or council. Three names were submitted to the Governor's office by WSAC (WA State Assoc of Counties) in February and no member has been selected still, as of today, to fill the seat on this board with this very important matter at hand. The counties had NO VOTE at the June 6 meeting due to the Governor's office not picking a member from those that submitted applications from Pacific, Lewis or Jefferson counties.

Attached is a letter the Pacific County Commissioners sent to the Forest Practices Board on Thursday, Oct 16. We are hoping you will agree to this letter and send your encouragement to the Forest Practices Board to VOTE NO to these proposed changes. Please email your comments to forest.practicesboard@dnr.wa.gov

If you would like to send your comment to any other board members, please do but make sure to send to this main address to ensure all members receive your comment. Copying the State Agency Heads is an excellent idea to make sure they are completely aware of the opposition to this proposal. All email addresses for board members and agency heads are included in another attachment to this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out either by email, phone or stopping by the Commissioner's office here at the county annex building at: 1216 Robert Bush Drive W, South Bend.

Another attachment included is a signature sheet to sign if you do not email or want to offer friends and neighbors the opportunity to sign on. These can be delivered back to our office on Robert Bush Dr in South Bend no later than **Nov. 3, 2025** and we will scan and email them for you, if that is easier.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to reach out to the decision makers on this matter and please share with anyone else you think might also want to weigh in. I know this is a lot of reading but this is a **critically important issue** and I want to make sure you are informed. Our county was built on timber, fishing and farming and we need to let those making the decisions in Olympia know that ***we are still here and wanting to keep our natural resource-based industries healthy - not cripple them with continued over regulation.*** We have been told that in the absence of a strong opposition this rule will most likely go through, which is unacceptable. **Please let your voices be heard!**

*The Forest Practices Board is an independent state agency chaired by the Commissioner of Public Lands or designee. The Forest Practices Board was established by the [1974 Forest Practices Act](#) and the rules it adopts are implemented and enforced by the Department of Natural Resources.

******All the information in this email is posted at the top of our Pacific County Website.
Please share with others in whatever format is easiest for you!******

Respectfully,

Lisa Olsen
Pacific County Commissioner, Dist. 1
W: 360-875-9334 C: 360-942-8840 email: lolsen@co.pacific.wa.us

ATTACHEMENTS TO THIS EMAIL:

October 16, 2025 Letter from Pacific County Commissioners to the Forest Practices Board
Table of Impacts to Counties from UW Study referenced in Commissioners letter
Email addresses for State Agency Heads and Governor's office staff
Email addresses for actual members of the Forest Practices Board
Signature Sheet for those that do not email
One Pager from Forests and Fish (prepared for June 6 meeting)
One Pager re Scientific Studies from WFPA (WA Forest Products Association)
Letter from former Representatives Jim Buck and Debbie Regala who were the Co-Prime Sponsors of the Forest and Fish Agreement in 2001 and are OPPOSED to this implementation.

All Timberland Regional Library incoming/outgoing email messages are subject to public disclosure requirements per Washington State's Public Record Act, chapter 42.56 RCW. Senders and receivers of Library email should presume that this email and any attachments are subject to release upon request, and to state record retention requirements.