



**December 2017**

## **Washington, D.C. Updates**

After 11 months of Republican control of the Congress and the White House, President Trump and Congressional Republicans scored their first major legislative victory with the passage of a sweeping overhaul to the tax code. The tax reform effort dominated December's Congressional agenda, which left several other major issues unresolved and requiring almost immediate attention when Congress reconvenes on January 3.

The biggest unresolved issue facing Congress will be passing a Fiscal Year 2018 funding measure, which has proven illusive since the fiscal year began on October 1. Congress has passed two Continuing Resolutions (CR), including the latest CR which funded the government at current levels through January 19. Congressional leadership is also discussing a larger budget deal that would amend the 2011 Budget Control Act (BCA), which set caps on domestic spending – both defense and non-defense.

Many Republicans want to increase defense spending, while Democrats and some Republicans also want to loosen the spending cuts on domestic non-defense programs. Meanwhile, many conservatives, including a sizeable block of House Republicans, have opposed amending the BCA to increase discretionary domestic spending – presenting a huge challenge for House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-WI).

Until an overarching agreement is reached on the budget, many other issues hang in the balance – including potential fire funding and federal forest management reforms. A legislative solution to end “fire borrowing” and to arrest the growth of wildlife suppression costs within the Forest Service's budget will require an amendment to the BCA. Some Republicans want to limit any budget amendment to merely address fire borrowing, while Democrats are pushing for changes to address the continued growth in the ballooning 10-year average wildfire costs.

There is consensus on the need for federal forest management reforms to be packaged with a fire funding fix, but the size and scope of that package will likely be determined by the extent of the fire funding budget fix. Democrats may be willing to accept more management reforms if the budget fix ends fire borrowing *and* addresses the growth of the 10-year average. So, despite strong support for a package of federal forestry management and fire funding reforms, the issue is caught up in much larger debates over government spending and budget agreements – a frustrating, but all-too-common dilemma in the current political environment.

In addition to the overall budget debate, Congress will also face other difficult challenges, including legislation to aid young undocumented immigrants, the so-called dreamers, and

proposals to restore Obamacare insurance subsidies. Congress will also face continued pressure to provide disaster relief for storm-stricken parts of the country and some Western lawmakers continue pushing for yet another reauthorization of Secure Rural Schools county timber payments.

*Joseph Participates in Roundtable meeting with Secretaries Zinke and Perdue.* On December 11, AFRC President Travis Joseph participated in a federal forest management roundtable meeting with Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke and Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue. The meeting was also attended by leaders from other forest products industry companies and associations, as well as sportsmen's organizations. There was extensive discussion about the need to increase active management of federal forests, end the practice of fire borrowing, and evaluate the governments' current approach to fighting wildfires.

The meeting was also attended by senior staff from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, which includes the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Following the roundtable, Travis Joseph joined a small group of AFRC member company representatives for meetings with Administration leadership to discuss key Northwest forest management issues. /Heath Heikkila

## **Congress Passes Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act**

On December 27, the Congress sent [H.R. 1306, the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act](#), to President Trump for his signature. The bipartisan bill sponsored by Congressman DeFazio and cosponsored by Congressman Walden contains three separate titles, each with important implications to forest management in Western Oregon.

Title I will place approximately 17,519 acres of public land in Oregon in trust for the benefit of the [Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe](#). A substantial amount of this acreage is currently part of the statutorily unique O&C Lands managed by the BLM. The Secretary of the Interior will be required to reclassify an equal amount of public domain land as O&C Lands to ensure "no net loss" in total O&C acreage. The public domain lands will be located in the vicinity of the land conveyed to the tribe. The bill also clarifies that the land placed in trust for the Cow Creek may not be used for gambling under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 and timber harvested on the tribal land shall be subject to federal law restricting the export of unprocessed logs.

Title II will place approximately 14,742 acres of public land in trust for the benefit of the [Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians](#). A large portion of the designated acreage is currently part of the O&C Lands managed by the BLM. Identical to Title I, the bill requires the Secretary to reclassify an equal amount of public domain lands as O&C Lands located in the vicinity of the land conveyed to the tribe. None of the lands would be available for gaming purposes under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and unprocessed timber harvested on the tribal land cannot be exported.

Title III of H.R. 1306 clarifies that management of Coquille Forest in Coos County, Oregon must be on equal footing with all other federally recognized tribes. Currently, management of the [Coquille Tribe's](#) forest lands is subject to the standards and guidelines of nearby and adjacent forest plans – including the Northwest Forest Plan. This arrangement is inconsistent with all

other forests managed by tribes, which are regulated by the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act and its implementing regulations. Title III requires the Department of the Interior to manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with **only** those laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land – not the Northwest Forest Plan.

AFRC offers its congratulations to the Cow Creek Umpqua Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Coquille Tribe, and the Oregon Congressional Delegation for a major legislative victory. In addition to correcting a historical injustice, the bill promotes active forest management, will increase timber volume available in Western Oregon, and help create and sustain jobs in tribal and rural communities. /Travis Joseph

### **Changes Coming to Olympia as 2018 Legislative Session Approaches**

The Washington Legislature will convene for a 60-day session on January 8, 2018, a so-called “short session” that is the norm on non-budget writing years (even years). However, observers expect legislators to be very busy. The biggest change is that Democrats gained control of the State Senate following a November 7 special election in the 45<sup>th</sup> Legislative District, which covers parts of the affluent suburbs east of Seattle. Democrats now control the House of Representatives and the Senate by a single vote and Democrat Jay Inslee remains Governor.

With the change in control of the Senate there will also be changes to committee rosters and chairmanships. The current Senate Natural Resources and Parks Committee will be modified to also oversee agriculture and water issues. Senator Kevin Van De Wege (D-Sequim) will chair the committee while Judy Warnick (R-Moses Lake) will serve as the ranking member. Senator Van De Wege has been an advocate of the forest products industry and active management of DNR’s state trust lands. Warnick has been a key player on Capital Budget issues, including advocating for increased state funding for DNR’s forest health efforts in Eastern Washington.

Passing a Capital Budget is likely to be one of the first major efforts of the new legislature. The 2017 Legislature set a record for the longest legislative session in history, but failed to pass a Capital Budget after the divided House and Senate couldn’t reach agreement on a legislative solution to a water rights issue known as the *Hirst Decision*. Last year’s Capital Budget negotiators largely reached an agreement on the funding package, however, which included \$15 million for DNR forest health restoration programs.

The 2017 Legislature was able to reach agreement on a two-year Operating Budget that included increased K-12 education funding and a change to property tax collections in an attempt to satisfy the State Supreme Court’s *McCleary Decision* regarding school funding. The Court has since called the adequacy of the funding package into question and continues holding the Legislature in contempt.

Environmental groups are also pressing the legislature to act on carbon legislation, which the Republican-led Senate had refused to consider. A carbon tax has long been a goal of Governor Inslee and environmental groups are threatening to put an initiative on the November ballot if the legislature does not act. With such narrow majorities in both chambers, a handful of rural, moderate Democrats will likely play a pivotal role in carbon tax legislation – not to mention other important legislative matters.

While major forestry legislation is not expected to move in a short session, there appears to be growing interest in oversight of DNR's approach to the Marbled Murrelet Long Term Conservation Strategy, the Trust Land Transfer program, and the timber harvest arrearage calculation. Legislation creating a new dedicated budget account for DNR's Good Neighbor Authority activities on federal lands could also move forward. */Heath Heikkila*

## **AFRC Files Brief in Challenge to BLM's Illegal Management Plan for Western Oregon**

Does the O&C Act mean what it says? The answer to that question got a little closer on December 12, when AFRC (joined by Josephine County) and the Association of O&C Counties filed their opening briefs in Washington, D.C. in their challenges to BLM's illegal 2016 Resource Management Plan for Western Oregon. This follows the court's denial in late September of the government's motion to transfer venue to Oregon. (see [September 2017 Newsletter](#).)

In the opening brief, AFRC lays out the history of the O&C Lands and their establishment, in the 1937 O&C Act, as a reserve for sustained-yield timber production. AFRC also shows how the text of the Act requires the BLM to: 1) identify all "timberlands;" 2) determine and declare the "annual sustained yield capacity" of the timberlands; 3) manage the timberlands in "conformity with" the principle of sustained yield; and 4) sell or offer no more and no less than the annual sustained yield capacity of the timberlands, with a statutory minimum of 500 million board feet annually. The 2016 RMP, which places 80% of the O&C Lands into various reserves that do not permit sustained-yield timber production, violates the Act. (see [August 2016 Newsletter](#).)

Briefing in the case is scheduled to be complete on March 27, 2018, with a hearing and decision date to be determined. AFRC is represented in the case by attorney Mark Rutzick. */Lawson Fite*

## **AFRC Asks Supreme Court to Review White Castle Decision**

AFRC's legal team submitted a [petition for certiorari](#) to the Supreme Court on December 18, asking the Court to review the Ninth Circuit's dismissal of the appeal by Scott Timber Co. and Carpenters Industrial Council regarding the White Castle timber sale in the BLM Roseburg District. (see [July 2017 Newsletter](#)).

The petition asks the Supreme Court to decide if the ability of an intervenor to appeal certain decisions depends on whether the government appeals, or what the effect of the decision is. The Ninth Circuit has a "general rule" that intervenors can't appeal decisions that a project requires an EIS. By contrast, the Tenth Circuit has ruled this type of decision is appealable, and the Third Circuit also applies a flexible test for appealability. These tests all interpret laws which limit appeals to ["final" decisions](#) or to [decisions relating to an injunction](#).

The "split" between the circuits is a reason for the Supreme Court to take the case and clarify the law. Additional reasons are the importance of the issue to the rights of intervenors and the important underlying environmental law issues.

The White Castle project would harvest only 187 acres and would not result in any spotted owl take. Nevertheless, the U.S. District Court found an EIS was required. Scott Timber purchased the timber sale and Carpenters is the union at the mill that will process the timber.

BLM did not appeal, and the Ninth Circuit dismissed the appeal because it did not believe the district court's decision was final. It reasoned that the project would be further considered during development of an EIS. Between the date of the dismissal and the filing of the Supreme Court petition, however, BLM informed Scott Timber that the project will not proceed to an EIS due to land use plan changes—underscoring that the decision is final for all practical purposes. The Supreme Court will decide in early 2018 whether to take the case. If it does accept the case, oral argument would likely occur in late 2018.

AFRC attorneys Scott Horngren, Sara Ghafouri, and Lawson Fite prepared the petition, with essential help from AFRC's Cindi Kaneshige. Tyler Welti of Venable LLP also provided review and input. */Lawson Fite*

## **President's Monument Revisions Bring a Cascade of New Litigation**

President Trump [spoke](#) at the Utah State Capitol on December 4, announcing [revisions](#) to Utah's Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monuments using his authority under the 1906 [Antiquities Act](#). The Act gives the President authority to “declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated on land owned or controlled by the Federal Government to be national monuments.” However, it states land reserved for a national monument must be “the smallest area compatible” with care and management of the objects to be protected.

Regarding the two Utah monuments, the President determined that the expansive areas previously designated—1.7 million acres for Grand Staircase-Escalante by President Clinton, and 1.35 million acres for Bears Ears by President Obama—were in excess of the smallest area compatible with care and management of the specified object. His proclamations also stated that Congressional action taken in the interim to protect archaeological and paleontological resources decreased the area needed to be withdrawn. Grand Staircase-Escalante will be [modified](#) into three units encompassing about 1 million acres. Bears Ears will be [modified](#) into two units totaling about 201,000 acres. Both modifications will go into effect in early February.

Presidential modification of Monument boundaries is a relatively common historical occurrence, happening [eighteen times](#) previously. In 1911, for example, President Taft reduced the Petrified Forest National Monument by almost half. President Franklin Roosevelt significantly reduced parts of the Grand Canyon National Monument in 1940. And in 1915, President Wilson reduced Mount Olympus National Monument (now Olympic National Park) by over 300,000 acres. Most recently, President Kennedy removed almost 4,000 acres from Bandelier National Monument in May 1963.

Monument proponents reacted to the President's action with litigation. [Five lawsuits have been filed](#) against the two proclamations, by plaintiffs ranging from The Wilderness Society and Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance to several Tribal nations to the clothing company Patagonia. In response to some of Patagonia's public statements, House Natural Resources Chairman

Bishop (R-UT) [invited](#) its CEO to testify. Chairman Bishop wrote, “The Committee believes that major public policy decisions involving millions of acres of public land should be discussed, debated, and considered in the light of day.”

The lawsuits face an uphill battle because of the broad discretion given to the President in determining the “smallest area” compatible under the Antiquities Act. Litigation challenging Presidential proclamations has often failed, starting with [Cameron v. United States](#), a 1920 Supreme Court decision upholding the designation of the Grand Canyon National Monument. Contrary to decades of practice, these groups contend that only Congress may remove any land – even one acre – from a National Monument. They base their argument on a 1938 Attorney General’s opinion which told President Roosevelt he could not abolish Castle Pinckney National Monument in New York. Of course, President Trump did not abolish either Utah monument, so the application of the Attorney General opinion is questionable. */Lawson Fite*

### **Secretary Recommends Modifications to Cascade-Siskiyou**

The day after the President’s Utah visit, Secretary of the Interior Zinke released his [final report](#) and recommendations on all monuments designated from 1996 to the present that were (1) over 100,000 acres or (2) made without adequate public consideration. The report is the culmination of an unprecedented review process which enabled public comments on the 27 monuments and included Secretarial visits to eight monuments, including Cascade-Siskiyou in southern Oregon and northern California. The Interior Department reported receiving about 2.8 million public comments during the review process.

The Secretary recommended changes to Cascade-Siskiyou. Specifically, the report suggested to the President: “The boundary should be revised through the use of appropriate authority, including lawful exercise of your discretion granted by the Act, in order to address impacts on private lands and to address issues concerning the designation and reservation of O&C Lands as part of the monument and the impacts on commercial timber production.”

In a [press release](#), AFRC President Travis Joseph described the recommendation as “a positive step. Congress already set aside these lands eighty years ago for the specific purpose of sustainable timber production in the O&C Act, and the President – regardless of party – doesn’t have the authority to rewrite the law. We filed suit against the monument expansion because President Obama’s proclamation violated the O&C Act and exceeded his Antiquities Act authority. We thank Secretary Zinke and Interior staff for taking a closer look at this expansion and we urge President Trump to take action to follow the law.”

AFRC’s litigation regarding the Monument is presently stayed while the President considers these recommendations. Unlike virtually every other monument dispute in the history of the Antiquities Act, the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument expansion sets up a direct conflict between the President’s delegated authority on one hand, and Congress’s retained authority on the other hand. While the Utah revisions and other controversies address whether the President has the power to amend or withdraw a monument proclamation, no other monument raises the issue of a proclamation void from inception as beyond the President’s delegated authority. Further, while many monument advocates have relied on the Federal Land Policy and

Management Act (FLPMA) to argue the President may not shrink monuments, Congress included a “savings” provision in FLPMA that ensures the O&C Act will control. Other recommendations in the review include boundary revision of Gold Butte National Monument (Nevada); revising the proclamation of Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument (Maine) to allow for “promot[ing] a healthy forest through active timber management;” revising the proclamation for Northeast Canyons and Seamounts National Monument (off the coast of Maine) to restore fishery management by the relevant management council; and boundary or proclamation revisions to Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument (New Mexico), Pacific Remote Islands National Monument, Rio Grande Del Norte National Monument (New Mexico), and Rose Atoll National Monument (American Samoa). The Secretary also recommended adding three monuments in Kentucky, Mississippi, and Montana. No changes are recommended to the remaining monuments under review, including Giant Sequoia and Berryessa-Snow Mountain. */Lawson Fite*

### **Billy Williams Nominated as Permanent US Attorney for Oregon**

On December 20, President Trump formally [nominated Billy J. Williams](#) to be United States Attorney for the District of Oregon. This appointment indicates continuity in the office and its programs, which include defense of forest projects that are subject to court challenges in the District Court in Oregon. Williams was nominated as temporary U.S. Attorney by the judges of the District Court in early 2016 after the [resignation](#) of S. Amanda Marshall, who had been appointed by President Obama.

Williams has worked at the United States Attorney’s Office in Oregon as a career prosecutor since 2000, where he has served as the First Assistant U.S. Attorney, Chief of the Criminal Division, Chief of the Violent Crimes Unit, and as the Tribal Liaison. He previously served as a Senior Deputy District Attorney in Multnomah County, where he supervised the Career Criminal Unit. He prosecuted major crimes of violence, including aggravated murder, adult and child sex offenses, domestic violence, narcotics trafficking, vehicular homicide crimes, as well as investigations of officer-involved shootings. Williams holds a B.A. from Washington State University and a J.D. from Willamette University College of Law.

Williams has bipartisan support, as Oregon Senators Wyden and Merkley earlier [urged](#) the President to keep him on, with backing from the Oregon State Sheriffs’ Association. */Lawson Fite*

### **AFRC Files Ninth Circuit *Amicus* Brief in the Wolverine Fire Case**

The Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics appealed the decision from the United States Eastern District of Washington, in which Judge Rice held that the Forest Service’s use of its emergency response regulation, 36 C.F.R. 220.4(b)(1), by constructing a community protection line in response to the 2015 Wolverine Fire on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, complied with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Wolverine Fire was a severe fire that lasted over two months during the summer of 2015, burned over 62,000 acres, required the evacuation of 559 residents in the surrounding areas, and threatened 936 homes and structures. Based on the imminent threat to lives, property, and important natural and cultural resources, the Forest Service began the construction of a

community protection line due to “the lack of natural barriers, extreme fuels loading, absence of adequate safety zones, limited number of resources, long term drought, and address mortality to the bud worm infestation, weather and extreme fire behavior.” The details of Judge Rice’s ruling can be found in AFRC’s [July 2017 Newsletter](#).

On December 22, AFRC filed an *amicus curiae* brief on behalf of Lake Wenatchee Fire & Rescue (LWFR), an all-volunteer fire department with four stations that serves the communities impacted by the fire. Because North Central Washington has faced an increase in heavy fires over the past several years, LWFR supported the Forest Service’s ability to act quickly and reduce the risks to isolated communities and local firefighter personnel during future fire events. We expect that the Ninth Circuit will schedule oral argument for this case in late 2018 or early 2019. AFRC appreciates the support from our allies in this case. /Sara Ghafouri

## **NEPA Efficiencies on the Willamette National Forest**

In December, the Middle Fork District of the Willamette National Forest initiated the Lowell Country project, a vegetation management project that aims to commercially treat approximately 17,000 acres of forest stands in the Fall Creek watershed. The project seeks to meet multiple objectives ranging from the enhancement of late-successional forest characteristics to the provision of a sustainable supply of timber products. Commercial treatments will consist primarily of thinning previously managed stands in the stem-exclusion stage of seral development. The Forest Service has indicated that the project has the potential to yield over 300 million board feet of timber, treat approximately 19,000 acres of hazardous fuels, and improve aquatic habitat on up to 15 miles of streams.

These types of projects are nothing new for the Forest Service; they have been thinning previously managed stands for decades. What is unique about this project is its scale. Typically, the Forest Service will complete a NEPA document, such as an Environmental Assessment (EA), that considers far fewer acres of commercial treatment than is being analyzed on the Lowell Country project. For example, the most recent two EAs completed by the Middle Fork District considered commercial treatment of approximately 1,700 and 4,500 acres and consumed 160 and 250 pages of analysis respectively. If the Lowell Country project yields an EA document that is comparable (or even slightly larger) in size to those completed for the District’s past two projects, then the District will have planned for the commercial treatment of over **10-times** the number of acres of those projects with the same sized NEPA document.

This new approach is not a shortcut that would lead to insufficiencies in environmental analysis but rather a new type of efficiency that recognizes what has been learned from decades of repetitive and redundant management treatments. As mentioned above, the vegetation and aquatic treatments being considered on this project are nothing new.

AFRC has been reviewing thinning projects on Forest Service managed land for over a decade. For the most part, these projects have yielded routine NEPA documents, routine timber sale designs, and routine end-results following implementation. The Willamette National Forest alludes to this predictable process in the scoping letter for the Lowell Country project: *By relying on decades of past experience and through proposing a conventional project, with low complexity at a larger scale, the intent is to gain efficiencies in the planning process.* In other

words, the District is not reinventing the wheel this time nor are they approaching Lowell Country as if it were the first project of its kind to be considered. Instead, they will consider the analysis and impacts from similar management actions repeatedly implemented across the Forest and apply what has been learned to Lowell Country. The intent is that the outcomes will be the same, but they will have been achieved with less paperwork and less taxpayer money.

Additional information on the Lowell Country project can be found here:

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=52868>. /Andy Geissler

## **Deschutes Project Receives Honor**

On November 7, the [West Bend Project](#) on the Deschutes National Forest received the [2017 Forest Service's Chief's Honor Award](#), the highest award given by the Forest Service. The Project which covers 26,000 acres of forest immediately west of the City of Bend, began in 2010 and will continue through 2020.

The Deschutes Collaborative, a group of 19 volunteer community stakeholders representing interests from environmental groups to industry, began working on the West Bend Project in partnership with the Deschutes National Forest in 2011. Through many meetings, field trips, and discussions the group crafted recommendations that helped to restore this landscape. The diverse stakeholders sought solutions to improve the health of the forest, support active restoration to reduce the risk of catastrophic effects of wildfire, improve wildlife and fish habitat, help thriving local businesses that depend on the forest, and improve the well-being of those who work in, live by, and love the forest.

Some of the valuable resources in the West Bend Project area that this work will protect and enhance includes the Tumalo Falls area (a municipal watershed that supplies clean drinking water to the City of Bend), hundreds of homes and private properties in the Wildland Urban Interface that will be safer from wildfire, and year-round recreation areas and trails popular for road and mountain biking, river rafting, trail running, and other outdoor activities.

AFRC would like to congratulate the Deschutes for receiving this award, especially Forest Supervisor John Allen and Bend-Fort Rock District Ranger Kevin Larkin who worked jointly with the Deschutes Collaborative to help bring restoration forestry back to the Forest. AFRC also would like to recognize member company Interfor who has done much of the commercial thinning work in the project area and has utilized most of the sawlogs that have been removed from this area.

In addition to this award Healthy Forests, Healthy Communities produced a [video](#) that highlights the project and the many amenities found on the Deschutes National Forest and in the Bend, Oregon area. /Tom Partin

## **Join our Team: AFRC is Hiring a Communications Director**

*Is this the right job for you?*

Are you looking for a challenging – but rewarding – job that is different every day and exposes you to new learning opportunities? Are you passionate about the local forest products industry and its contributions to economic and environmental sustainability in the Pacific Northwest? Do

you want to work for a team-oriented organization with a work-life balance that is making a difference in public land management? If so, the American Forest Resource Council might be the right fit for you.

*Who is the American Forest Resource Council (AFRC)?*

[AFRC](#) is one of the nation's leading non-profit trade associations representing the forest products industry. Our mission is simple: help ensure our members have an adequate, reliable supply of timber from public lands to manufacture the wood products every American uses every day.

Our membership is diverse and dynamic. AFRC members directly employ over 20,000 people, own and operate more than 110 modern, efficient sawmills, and sustainably manage more than 3.3 million acres of forestland. We work in Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California to monitor over 75 million acres of public forests. We represent both small and large businesses who make plywood, veneer, dimensional lumber, cross-laminated timber, and other specialty wood products.

As a dynamic [team](#), we are obsessive about responsible and sustainable forest management, the future of our public forests, and the plight of rural communities. In fact, AFRC and its members recently put our money where our mouth is by partnering with Habitat for Humanity to use local wood products manufactured by our members to build an affordable home for a deserving family in Springfield, Oregon. Check out the project, which captures the passion and philosophy of AFRC, [here](#).

*What would I be doing?*

You will immediately play the lead role in designing, developing, and executing a strategic communications plan for AFRC. You will manage AFRC's [website](#), [blog](#), social media, monthly [newsletters](#), press releases, internal communications with AFRC members and staff, and external communications and relationships with the press. You will be working directly with AFRC's President/CEO and senior staff to share the compelling stories of the forest products industry and help build a coalition of advocates for responsible, sustainable use of our public forests.

*What are the minimum requirements?*

We are looking for someone with passion, commitment to our cause, self-motivation, and high energy. But, you should also have a bachelor's degree in Communications or a Communications-related field and three years of work experience that demonstrates the experience and skills to perform the duties of this position. Strong writing, editing, and public speaking skills are a must. Expertise in social media platforms and Word Press are critical. And, while not required, familiarity with and a personal connection to public forest management issues and/or natural resources will give you a leg up.

*How do I apply?*

If you are interested, apply immediately – this job opening won't last long! We are currently accepting applications and are looking to fill the new position as soon as possible. To apply, please send a 1) cover letter, 2) resume and 3) writing sample showcasing your communication skills to [info@amforest.org](mailto:info@amforest.org).