

Division of Forestry Timber Sales and Appeals on BIFs and FLUPs issued 2011-2021

Timber Sales include those >10 acres or 500,000 Board Feet (those requiring a BIF and FLUP)

Sale Name [BIF or FLUP appealed]	Date BIF/FLUP issued	Appellant(s)	appeal points	outcome
Baby Brown/Glacier Side [BIF]	3/12/2015	Lynn Canal Conservation, Cascadia Wildlands, Greenpeace	Appellants' central assertion was that DOF's BIF for the Baby Brown timber sale improperly and unreasonably applied the relevant statutory criteria for review of a timber sale and consequently erroneously concluded the sale was in the best interest of the State. Specifically, they claimed three areas of review feature defective analysis and erroneous conclusions: the economic interests of Alaska and Alaskans, the environmental interests of Alaskans, and the scenic interests of Alaskans.	Appeal denied and BIF affirmed without modification or remand.
Baby Brown/Glacier Side [FLUP]	2/27/2017	Lynn Canal Conservation	Lynn Canal Conservation claimed that the Division of Forestry bypassed its own commercial timber sale planning procedures by offering the Baby Brown timber sale for bid prior to completing all the FLUPs, when the BIF stated that they would all be completed before the sale.	Baby Brown Timber Sale FLUP rescinded and sale canceled. Did not affect the BIF.
Vallenar Bay Timber Sale [BIF]	5/4/2015	Cascadia Wildlands, Greenpeace, Center for Biological Diversity, The Boat Company, Greater SE Alaska Cons. Community, Mike Salle	Appellant's central assertion was that DOF's BIF for the Vallenar Bay timber sale erroneously concluded the sale was in the best interest of the State because it did not, based on the best available information, rationally make or explain its decision that the sale would not cause significant impairment to natural resources. Specifically, they claimed four areas of the BIF process feature defects and erroneous conclusions: that the forest management plan and forest inventory is inadequate, that the statutory and constitutional sustained yield requirement is unmet, that the environmental best interest of Alaskans is not protected, and that the decision maker had not adequately reviewed the record.	BIF was affirmed in part and remanded in part for precise determination of the applicable annual allowable cut for the SSF and modification, if necessary, of the acreage of the Vallenar Bay timber sale. This re-examination of the allowable cut will require the finalization of the Forest Inventory and the SSFMP. No other alteration to the BIF was necessary: BIF was otherwise affirmed without modification.

Sale Name [BIF or FLUP appealed]	Date BIF/FLUP issued	Appellant(s)	appeal points	outcome
Edna Bay Parlay. [BIF]	10/29/2015	Cascadia Wildlands, Greenpeace, Center for Biological Diversity, The Boat Company, Greater SE Alaska Cons. Community		BIF withdrawn pending completion of SSE inventory and Southeast State Forest Management Plan.
Coffman Cove Timber Sale [BIF]	8/30/2016	Cheryl Fecko	The appellant's concern was for potential impacts of timber harvest on the municipal watershed, as well as subsistence and habitat concerns, and buffers along the scenic byway.	Reconsideration was not granted.
Edna Bay Parlay [reissued BIF]. Appeal 1.	3/4/2017	Cascadia Wildlands, Center for Biological Diversity, Greater SE Alaska Cons. Community	The appellants assert that DOF's BIF for the Edna Bay timber sale did not adequately address impacts of logging on habitat, wind damage risks, cumulative impacts on wildlife, and timber economics. The appellants further alleged that the BIF establishes an unlawful process for the timber sale. The appellants raised the following questions in their request for reconsideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether Units in Section 33 and 34 provide "important" and likely "critical" habitat for deer. • Whether the BIF adequately considered important factors related to black bear denning habitat or made allowance for this important habitat feature. 	BIF was affirmed with the deletion of the area in Section 34 that was outside the SESF from the proposed harvest units.
Edna Bay Parlay [reissued BIF].. Appeal 2.	3/4/2017	City of Edna Bay	City of Edna Bay requested DOF to remove the old growth timber area slated for harvest located on the south side of the 34 acre ILMA. The reason for the request was not due to the nature of the timber, but instead due to wind effects of the logging in the area and an effort to maintain a view shed buffer to the residents of Edna Bay.	BIF was affirmed with the deletion of the area in Section 34 that was outside the SESF from the proposed harvest units.

Sale Name [BIF or FLUP appealed]	Date BIF/FLUP issued	Appellant(s)	appeal points	outcome
Bay View [BIF]. Appeal 1.	5/7/2020	City of Thorne Bay	City of Thorne Bay raised three primary issues: (1) the impact of the harvest on the natural aesthetics and viewshed, thus affecting the local economy in Thorne Bay; (2) the location, grade, and standards of the access roads; and (3) the format of the sale.	BIF was affirmed and the Request for Reconsideration was denied on the merits.
Bay View [BIF]. Appeal 2.	5/7/2020	Viking Lumber Company	The appellant wanted the sale to be offered as a negotiated sale specifically to Viking, not as a typical Request for Proposal process that would allow other mills to bid on the sale.	Request for Reconsideration denied.