

## Registered Voter

This comment is in regard to what qualifies as a forest offset.

Existing WA forest practice regulations require landowners to comply with some limitations and conditions on harvesting timber, both to protect public safety (e.g., from landslides) and to protect the environment and other precious resources (spotted owls, e.g., or archeological sites). Harvest sites can also be conditioned by regulation to require reforestation at the landowner's expense. I urge you to write new CC rules that exclude these compliance set-aside areas or required [private] reforestation conditions to ALSO be counted as carbon offsets in the carbon markets. If that were the case, then CC impact would actually pay the landowners to comply with existing forest practice rules.

Secondly, existing conservation easement programs already provide incentives for the landowners to set aside forested land. I urge you to write the new CC rules to prevent landowners to ALSO claim these easements as forest offsets for sale in the carbon market.

In both of these cases, if the rules allow for what amounts to 'double-counting' forest land that is already set aside from harvesting based on other state or federal programs and rules, then the legislation will not result in a net increase of total forest left standing to help stem the impacts of climate change. Please do not allow the rules to render this legislation completely ineffective.