

Donna Albert

Thank you. Yes. Um, I'm, uh, concerned that, um, whatever,

however your process, um, is that it that it actually measures the reduced carbon in a way that is, um, real, so that so that you're, you're not. The

process has to be, um, aligned with what's actually happening on the ground. And my concern comes from experiences at state agencies like DNR and um, watching their processes DNR and uh, um, Department of Commerce, others uh, where there's uh, assumption there are assumptions that, uh, for instance, uh, removing biomass from a forest reduces fire load, that kind of thing, or that, uh. Wood products are, um, more are sequestering more carbon than they are. Um, so, um, as you know, the, uh, we're actually lagging behind in, uh, cutting our carbon emissions in the state of Washington. Our in law, we're our carbon limit for twenty thirty is, or I should say, our greenhouse gas emissions limit for twenty thirty is a forty five percent reduction from nineteen ninety levels. We're not getting there, and I'm concerned that part of the reason is because we're not really understanding the physical carbon reduction effects of our actions. So I think there should be some way of evaluating whether this Cap and

invest program is actually succeeding in reducing carbon emissions, greenhouse gas emissions in the real world. And I am also concerned that, for instance, in the state legislature there's no difference. And at DNR there is no difference between um timber Plantations and naturally regenerated forests. That's, uh, that's kind of a big blind side. Uh, big blind spot. And so I guess I'm, I'm concerned that whatever you do is actually reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the real world, and we're not stuck with old definitions or outdated concepts. Thank you. Yeah. I don't know if I said my name. Donna Albert. D-o-n-n-a A-l-b-e-r-t. Montesano, Washington. Thank you.