PotlatchDeltic Corporation

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Read full terms of disclosure

.

11/15/2025, 04:50 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?

Select from:

☑ English

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

Select from:

☑ USD

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

PotlatchDeltic Corporation (Nasdaq: PCH) is a leading timberland real estate investment trust (REIT) with operations in nine states. At the end of 2024, PotlatchDeltic owned 2.1 million acres of timberland, six sawmills and an industrial grade plywood mill, a residential and commercial real estate development business, and a rural timberland sales program. PotlatchDeltic was founded in 1903 and has a long legacy of excellence in timberland management and wood products manufacturing. Our operations are organized into three business segments: Timberlands, Wood Products, and Real Estate. The Timberlands segment manages our forests in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Our high-quality timberlands are working forests, managed on a sustainable basis using long-term and short-term harvest plans that optimize harvest schedules, incorporating best forest management practices. All of our timberlands are certified to the SFI® Forest Management standards and 70 percent of our combined timberlands in Arkansas and Louisiana are also certified to the FSC® Forest Management standards. Timberland management practices are conducted in accordance with regulatory and certification requirements that seek to protect water quality, wildlife habitat, and other ecosystem values. The Wood Products segment manufactures and sells lumber, industrial plywood, and residual products at seven facilities located in Arkansas, Idaho, Michigan, and Minnesota with lumber capacity of 1.2 billion board feet. PotlatchDeltic is committed to responsible procurement of raw materials, and we use both SFI Fiber Sourcing and FSC Chain of Custody programs to assure that the wood we purchase originates from responsible sources. All of our wood products facilities are certified to SFI I Fiber Sourcing standard. SFI Fiber Sourcing is designed to ensure that wood purchased from uncertified lands is legally and responsibly sourced and requires measures to use best management practices, utilize trained logging professionals and foresters and verify that the measures are

effective. In addition, our Gwinn, Michigan and Warren and Waldo, Arkansas mills are also FSC Chain of Custody certified. The FSC Chain of Custody means we track the path of our products, ensuring that FSC certified material is identified and that non-FSC certified wood meets the FSC Controlled Wood standard and does not come from undesirable sources. We continually invest in our wood products facilities, including projects to maximize recovery and reduce environmental impact. Nearly 100 percent of the logs processed at our wood products facilities are utilized, resulting in lumber, industrial plywood, or wood residuals. Wood residuals are used internally in our boilers for steam energy, with the remainder sold for a wide range of end uses. The Real Estate segment focuses on two activities: the sale of rural land and real estate development and subdivision activity. We sell rural land that is not strategic to our core timberland operations, or that has higher values for recreational, conservation, commercial or residential purposes. We continually assess the highest value and best use of our timberlands through periodic stratification assessments on our timberlands, and also as new timberlands are acquired. This assessment also includes identifying land that may be better suited for Natural Climate Solutions (NCS) activities such as forest carbon offsets, carbon capture and storage projects, and selling or leasing timberlands to third parties for renewable energy projects such as solar power generation facilities. Real estate development consists of the development and sale of residential lots and commercial sites at two master-planned communities in Arkansas. We deliver a range of sustainable economic, social, and environmental values for our stakeholders and strive to do our part to help the planet for future generations. Our sustainably managed forests play a critical role in mitigating climate change and promoting biodiversity, while our wood products store carbon until the end of their use and eventual decay. Our mission is to grow and produce the resources that build a foundation for our lives and improve the communities where we live, work, and play. Our values are safety, inclusion and respect, integrity, operational excellence, community, and environmental stewardship. We execute our mission through the lens of our strategy across four pillars: Forests, Planet, People, and Performance. In 2024, annual revenues were approximately 1.1 billion. At the end of 2024 we employed 1,383 personnel across our businesses, all in the United States. Our head office is located in Spokane, Washington. More information about PotlatchDeltic is available at www.PotlatchDeltic.com and in our 2024 Corporate Responsibility (CR) Report.
[Fixed row]

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2024

(1.4.2) Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.4.3) Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.4.4) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 1 emissions data for

Select from:
☑ 2 years

(1.4.5) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 2 emissions data for

Select from:
☑ 2 years

(1.4.6) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 3 emissions data for

Select from:
☑ 2 years
[Fixed row]

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?

1062076000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US7376301039

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

737630103

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

Nasdaq: PCH

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

54930084YA8UJOTXDM59

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

[Add row]

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

Select all that apply
☑ United States of America

(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure?

Production

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Value chain (including own land)

Processing/ Manufacturing

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Produced and sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Production

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

9473791

(1.22.8) Did you convert the total commodity volume from another unit to metric tons?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Short ton

(1.22.10) Provide details of the methods, conversion factors used and the total commodity volume in the original unit

1 short ton = 0.907185 metric tons

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Hardwood logs

☑ Softwood logs

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 21-30%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 81-90%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.19) Please explain

Our timber harvest in 2024 was 7.64 million U.S. tons. Approximately 6.2 million tons, or 81 percent of the harvest was sold to third-parties for a wide range of uses including wood products, paper and packaging or other uses. PotlatchDeltic utilizes timber in the manufacture of wood products at our 7 facilities. In 2024, approximately 1.5 million U.S. tons or 35 percent of the timber used at our facilities was sourced from our own timberlands. An additional 2.8 million U.S. tons or 65 percent of the timber used at our facilities was sourced from external sources. Wood costs, including harvest costs, were approximately 68 percent of our total costs fiber, goods, and services, of $768 million in 2024.
[Fixed row]

(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders not relevant, and not included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Contractors in our timberland supply chain include harvesting operators, log haulers, silviculture and road contractors. The fiber from these harvests flow both to our wood products facilities and to other wood products and pulp, paper, and packaging producers. Our wood products facilities manufacture lumber and plywood used in residential construction and industrial plywood applications. Our wood products supply chain includes purchased goods, the use of contractors for maintenance and other electrical or general work, and the purchase of utilities including water, electricity, and natural gas. Our downstream supply chain includes distribution to wholesalers, distributors and ultimately to consumers for their use. We have complete oversight of the management of our own timberlands and thus control the qualifications and performance of our contractors. One hundred percent of our timberlands are certified to the SFI or FSC standard, or both. We require that only qualified logging professionals, as defined by SFI, harvest our trees and thus have confidence that all operations on our own lands meet certification standards. This performance is verified through annual third-party audits for both SFI and FSC. The raw materials for our lumber and plywood mills include logs from our own company lands, from other private industrial and family-owned landowners, and from public agency landowners. No matter where these logs originate, we commit and monitor that they are sourced in a manner that protects the values these forests provide. Some of the logs we use come from land that is certified to either SFI or FSC standards including our own ownership, other industrial landowners that have chosen to be certified, and some state and county agency lands. Both SFI and FSC have systems in place to ensure responsible procurement occurs when purchasing fiber from non-certified lands. We use both SFI Fiber Sourcing and FSC Chain of Custody programs to assure our customers and stakeholders that the wood we purchase to make our products originates from responsible sources. All seven of our manufacturing facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard, which provides structure to how we purchase fiber from both certified and non-certified forestland. In 2024, 100 percent of the timber consumption at all of our wood products facilities was SFI Fiber Sourcing certified (52% of timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was FSC Chain of Custody certified).
[Fixed row]

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

Plastics have not been mapped in our value chain because of the small amounts used in our business. Plastic is used for a portion of our lumber wrap that we do not believe to be material.
[Fixed row]

(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?

Timber products

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

[Fixed row]

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

PotlatchDeltic's short-term time horizon focuses on issues impacting the company within the next year. These are typically operating plans that are established and budgeted for the year or plans surrounding events that are likely to occur. Examples of short-term planning include sustainable forest management annual plans. forest certification audits, meeting environmental regulatory requirements, replanting previously harvested areas, energy reduction initiatives and work towards our corporate responsibility goals and net-zero initiatives.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

2

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

PotlatchDeltic's medium-term time horizon incorporates the short-term and long-term planning surrounding multi-year initiatives or events that are possible to occur. This time horizon will typically include operational goals, targets, or responses to changing policies or regulations. An example of a medium-term planning horizon includes waste reduction initiatives, water usage and monitoring, operational or climate-related capital projects, and the development of natural climate solutions opportunities.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.2) Is your long-term time horizon open ended?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

50

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

PotlatchDeltic's long-term time horizon incorporates the short and medium-term planning into longer term plans that consider our mission, goals, and challenges. Examples of long-term planning include our sustainable forest management plans, our climate risk and opportunity analysis, our 2030 GHG reduction targets, our 2050 net-zero GHG goal, and the development of natural climate solutions opportunities.
[Fixed row]

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) third-party certification

Other

☑ Internal company methods
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Other, please specify :NCASI Scenario Analysis CPAT tool

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought
☑ Tornado
☑ Wildfires
☑ Heat waves
☑ Cold wave/frost
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress
☑ Soil erosion
☑ Water stress
☑ Soil degradation
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional climate-related risks and opportunities to our company. PotlatchDeltic utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify, assess, and mitigate significant risks facing the Company. Specific risks related to environmental issues, human rights, and climate change are identified, assessed, and mitigated where feasible. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors and senior management have primary responsibility for the oversight of risks facing the Company. The Internal Audit Director facilitates the formal enterprise-wide risk assessment process. Business unit

and function leaders are interviewed annually to update identify and evaluate key environmental financial and business risks. A risk management committee is responsible for completing the annual enterprise risk assessment process. The risk assessment process includes evaluating the risk universe emerging risks and risk attributes that include likelihood impact velocity and mitigation control strength. The Chief Financial Officer presents the results of the annual ERM process to the Audit Committee each year. This includes discussion of top risks and current mitigation measures. Business leads also incorporate risks and mitigation measures into their strategic plans annually. In addition, our Environmental Compliance Management System (EMS) and corporate responsibility (CR) review conducted annually at the business unit level evaluate business CR risks and opportunities including climate-related risks and opportunities. The CR Management Committee identifies and reviews climate-related risks across our business units. Risks are prioritized based on environmental and financial impact. Our climate risk management framework includes the use of scenario analysis in line with TCFD. We conduct climate change risk assessments to evaluate risks and opportunities including the potential physical impacts that changes in atmospheric CO2 temperature and precipitation could have on our timberlands under various GHG scenarios. The analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) that represent prescribed pathways for anthropogenic human caused GHG emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. We have evaluated four RCPs including a highly unlikely high consequence scenario RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. All our forests are certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI). SFI standards include the SFI Climate Smart Forestry Objective, which requires SFI-certified organizations to ensure forest management activities address climate change adaptation and mitigation measures. We are independently audited annually to certify that we are meeting SFI requirements. We identify risks as climate issues evolve, and we leverage expertise from trusted consultants and research organizations including the National Council on Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI). We stay informed about developments concerning climate-related policies, regulations, emissions standards, and reporting requirements and regularly assess whether such developments may have a material effect on our operations. Our natural climate solutions team evaluates potential opportunities arising from climate change initiatives including solar leases, carbon capture storage, and carbon offsets.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) third-party certification

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Scenario analysis

☑ Other, please specify :NCASI Scenario Analysis CPAT Tool

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Tornado

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Wildfires
☑ Heat waves
☑ Cold wave/frost
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical
☑ Heat stress
☑ Soil erosion
☑ Water stress
☑ Soil degradation
☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability

Policy
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

Market
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation
☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)
☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Technology
☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies
☑ Other technology, please specify :Bicircular bioeconomic transition

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional forest-related risks and opportunities to our company. PotlatchDeltic utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify, assess, and mitigate significant risks facing the Company. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors and senior management have primary responsibility for the oversight of risks facing the Company. The Internal Audit Director facilitates the formal enterprise-wide risk assessment process. Business unit and function leaders are interviewed annually to update identify and evaluate key environmental financial and business risks. A risk management committee comprised of members of senior leadership and chaired by the Chief Financial Officer is responsible for completing the annual enterprise risk assessment process. The risk assessment process includes evaluating the risk universe emerging risks and risk attributes that include likelihood impact velocity and mitigation control strength. The Chief Financial Officer presents the results of the annual ERM process to the Audit Committee each year. This includes discussion of top risks and current mitigation measures. Business leads also incorporate risks and mitigation measures into their strategic plans annually. Specific risks related to environmental issues and climate change are identified, assessed, and mitigated where feasible as part of our ERM process. In addition, our Environmental Compliance Management System (EMS) and corporate responsibility (CR) review conducted annually at the business unit level evaluate business CR risks and opportunities including forest-related risks and opportunities. Timberlands are managed using 50-year management plans based on harvest schedule models which optimize long-term harvesting and forest management operations and project sustainable harvest volumes. Foresters prepare five-year plans for silviculture work and harvest based on the results of the harvest schedule. Forest management professionals monitor conditions in the forests utilizing advanced mapping functionality and on-the-ground monitoring and inspections to implement sustainable forest management including biodiversity, conservation, best management practices, and water quality protection. Third-party forest certifications reflect the rigor of our environmental management system (EMS), which is based

on an ongoing continual improvement process and includes annual review by senior management. We conduct annual climate-change risk assessments to identify risks and opportunities from climate change and the impact on forests. We evaluate the potential physical impacts that changes in atmospheric CO2, temperature, and precipitation could have on our timberlands under various greenhouse gas (GHG) scenarios utilizing guidance from the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and using the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT). The analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). Our wood products facilities are committed to responsible sourcing of timber and in 2024, 100% of the fiber consumption at all our wood products facilities was certified according to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) standard.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Other enterprise risk management, please specify :SFI and FSC

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) third-party certification

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

☑ Other, please specify :NCASI Scenario Analysis CPAT Tool

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Drought

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Chronic physical

☑ Soil erosion

☑ Water stress

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Declining water quality

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights
☑ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)
☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities
☑ Indigenous peoples
☑ Water utilities at a local level

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional water-related risks and opportunities to our company. PotlatchDeltic utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify, assess, and mitigate significant risks facing the Company. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors and senior management have primary responsibility for the oversight of risks facing the Company. The Internal Audit Director facilitates the formal enterprise-wide risk assessment process. Business unit and function leaders are interviewed annually to update identify and evaluate key environmental financial and business risks. A risk management committee comprised of members of senior leadership and chaired by the Chief Financial Officer is responsible for completing the annual enterprise risk assessment process. The risk assessment process includes evaluating the risk universe emerging risks and risk attributes that include likelihood impact velocity and mitigation control strength. The Chief Financial Officer presents the results of the annual ERM process to the Audit Committee each year. This includes discussion of top risks and current mitigation measures. Business leads also incorporate risks and mitigation measures into their strategic plans annually. Specific risks related to environmental issues and climate change are identified, assessed, and mitigated where feasible as part of our ERM process. In addition, our Environmental Compliance Management System (EMS) and corporate responsibility (CR) review conducted annually at the business unit level evaluate business CR risks and opportunities, including water-related risks and opportunities. Our third-party certifications through the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) help ensure that we are taking all precautions to protect water quality and manage associated risks. The role of water quality best management practices (BMPs) is to conserve and protect water quality by minimizing sediment through the filtering ability of natural vegetation and erosion control measures adjacent to water bodies. BMPs include practices such as leaving streamside management zones (SMZs) during harvest, properly designing and constructing logging roads, and using logging methods and equipment that protect water quality. The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling, especially at the log deck. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) is the permitting program that covers discharges of both wastewater and stormwater in the United States. The NPDES permits have parameter limits and benchmarks for pollutants such as zinc, chemical oxygen demand (COD) and total suspended solids (TSS). The wastewater permitting program allows for only certain types of discharges, establishes monitoring requirements, and sets discharge limitations. Wastewater permits have set monitoring regimes that include weekly, quarterly, semi-annual, and/or annual sampling for various parameters.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) third-party certification

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Other, please specify :NCASI Scenario Analysis CPAT Tool

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Tornado
☑ Wildfires
☑ Heat waves
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

Chronic physical
☑ Soil erosion
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Declining ecosystem services
☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation

Market
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

Reputation
☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

☑ Other reputation, please specify :Part of solution to climate change through natural climate solutions.

Technology

☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and biodiversity-related risks and opportunities to our company. PotlatchDeltic utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify, assess, and mitigate significant risks facing the Company. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors and senior management have primary responsibility for the oversight of risks facing the Company. The Internal Audit Director facilitates the formal enterprise-wide risk assessment process. Business unit and function leaders are interviewed annually to update identify and evaluate key environmental financial and business risks. A risk management committee comprised of members of senior leadership and chaired by the Chief Financial Officer is responsible for completing the annual enterprise risk assessment process. The risk assessment process includes evaluating the risk universe emerging risks and risk attributes that include likelihood impact velocity and mitigation control strength. The Chief Financial Officer presents the results of the annual ERM process to the Audit Committee each year. This includes discussion of top risks and current mitigation measures. Business leads also incorporate risks and mitigation measures into their strategic plans annually. Specific risks related to environmental issues and climate change are identified, assessed, and mitigated where feasible as part of our ERM process. In addition, our Environmental

Compliance Management System (EMS) and corporate responsibility (CR) review conducted annually at the business unit level evaluate business CR risks and opportunities, including biodiversity-related risks and opportunities. Our commitment to conserving biodiversity on our forest lands is based on this recognition that well-managed working forest lands provide a broad range of habitats for aquatic, avian, and terrestrial biodiversity. Four main components comprise our approach to assessing dependency- and impact- related biodiversity risks to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity: (1) landscape-level management; (2) stand-level diversity; (3) protection of ecologically unique sites or species; and (4) research. We provide habitat diversity at the landscape level by utilizing stand size and age class adjacency restrictions for final harvest, identifying streamside management zones, maintaining a diversity of cover types, and replanting native species. We achieve stand-level diversity that enhances habitat for a variety of wildlife species through site-specific forest management including planning, implementation, and evaluation. We protect ecologically unique sites or species by identifying sites with species or communities that are unique, rare, or listed as federally threatened or endangered through exchange of data with state natural heritage programs, NatureServe, state wildlife agencies, and by internal discovery. Site locations are then mapped and included in our Land Resource Manager system. We actively participate in and fund research with NCASI, universities, and fish and wildlife organizations to understand habitat and biodiversity response to forest management and then integrate research findings into our management. In addition, we actively advocate for laws and regulations that protect fish and wildlife and promote practical approaches that recognize the benefits of working forest lands.
[Add row]

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?

(2.2.7.1) Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

PotlatchDeltic utilizes an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the Company, including risks related to a range of corporate responsibility topics. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors and senior management have primary responsibility for the oversight of risks facing the Company. Certain material risks facing our business are discussed in our annual report on Form 10-K under Part I - Item 1A. Risk Factors. The Risk Committee, comprised of senior managers of the Company, conducts an annual risk assessment process, which includes evaluating the risk universe, emerging risks, and the risk attributes of likelihood, impact, velocity, and mitigation control strength. Risks are mapped into a matrix which identifies the significant risk areas for internal focus. The Risk Committee Chair meets with the Audit Committee to discuss key inherent risks the ERM process has identified, current mitigation measures, and the resulting residual risks. This meeting also provides the Audit Committee an opportunity to share its key risk areas of concern. The full Board of Directors also reviews the results of the ERM process. As business leaders prepare their strategic plans for the year, they incorporate risks and mitigation measures into their plans, as appropriate. Specific risks related to environmental issues and climate change are identified, assessed, and mitigated where feasible as part of our ERM process. In addition, our Environmental Management System (EMS) and Corporate Responsibility review, which are conducted annually at the business unit level evaluates business risks and opportunities, including climate-related risks and opportunities. The Corporate Responsibility Management Committee identifies and reviews climate-related risks across our business units and prioritizes them based on environmental and financial impact. PotlatchDeltic will continue to enhance its ERM framework for our businesses to identify and seek to mitigate emerging or shifting risks and opportunities.
[Fixed row]

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

(2.3.2) Value chain stages where priority locations have been identified

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

☑ Areas of importance for ecosystem service provision

Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities

☑ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to forests

☑ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to water

☑ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to biodiversity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We identify priority areas in our value chain as areas where and around which we operate our wood products facilities and own timberlands. Our wood products facilities utilize an environmental compliance management system (CMS) to establish best practices, practices and procedures to strive for 100 percent environmental compliance with federal, state, and local regulations governing air emissions, water discharge, and waste disposal. The CMS provides a standard framework to promote reliable environmental compliance in alignment with our Environmental, Health, and Safety Policy. The CMS also includes processes for the establishment and execution of annual Wood Products Division and facility-specific objectives and targets intended to drive continual improvement in environmental performance and regulatory compliance reliability. Our Timberlands Division utilizes a comprehensive environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on continual

improvement in achieving our sustainable forest management objectives. The EMS includes training foresters and contractors, and prescribing, monitoring, and inspecting forest management practices in all our operations. The implementation of our EMS ensures that we conduct all our activities to meet or exceed federal, state, and local statutes and regulations for conservation of wildlife and biological diversity and protection of water, fish, and endangered species. In addition, the EMS ensures that we achieve and maintain third-party certifications for all our timberlands under either the Forest Stewardship Council or the Sustainable Forestry Initiative standards. Our EMS also covers log sourcing for our wood products facilities from responsible third-party sources under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Fiber Sourcing standard and, where applicable, the FSC Chain of Custody standard. We protect ecologically unique sites or species by identifying sites with species or communities that are unique, rare, or listed as federally threatened or endangered through exchange of data with state natural heritage programs, NatureServe, state wildlife agencies, and by internal discovery. Site locations are then mapped and included in our Land Resource Manager system.

(2.3.5) Will you be disclosing a list/spatial map of priority locations?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

(2.3.6) Provide a list and/or spatial map of priority locations

PCH_CR_Report_2024_Timberlands and Mill Locations.pdf
[Fixed row]

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

15

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Impact ranges determined. See application note.

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Our annual risk assessment process includes evaluating the attributes of likelihood, impact and velocity of identified risks to determine an inherent risk score and the mitigating control strength of these risks to determine a residual risk ranking of the identified risks. These risks include financial, operational and strategic risks. This analysis is developed and evaluated by the Risk Management Committee comprised of members of senior leadership and chaired by the Chief Financial Officer. The Chair periodically reviews the substantive risks and the steps being taken to mitigate and monitor those risks with the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors. For Enterprise Risk Management purposes Business Segment level impact scales are as follows (score / impact description / impact $ amount): · 5 / Catastrophic / over $350 million · 4 / Major / between $75 million - $350 million · 3 / Moderate / between $15 million - $75 million · 2 / Minor / between $1.5 million - $15 million · 1 / Negligible / under $1.5 million

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 11-20

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

PotlatchDeltic utilizes an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the Company, including risks related to a range of corporate responsibility topics. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors and senior management have primary responsibility for the oversight of risks facing the Company. Certain material risks facing our business are discussed in our annual report on Form 10-K under Part I - Item 1A. Risk Factors. The Risk Committee, comprised of senior managers of the Company, conducts an annual risk assessment process, which includes evaluating the risk universe, emerging risks, and the risk attributes of likelihood, impact, velocity, and mitigation control strength. Risks are mapped into a matrix which identifies the significant risk areas for internal focus. The Risk Committee Chair meets with the Audit Committee to discuss key inherent risks the ERM process has identified, current mitigation measures, and the resulting residual risks. This meeting also provides the Audit Committee an opportunity to share its key risk areas of concern. The full Board of Directors also reviews the results of the ERM process. As business leaders prepare their strategic plans for the year, they incorporate risks and mitigation measures into their plans, as appropriate. Specific risks related to environmental issues and climate change are identified, assessed, and mitigated where feasible as part of our ERM process. In addition, our Environmental Management System (EMS) and Corporate Responsibility review, which are conducted annually at the business unit level evaluates business risks and opportunities, including climate-related risks and opportunities.
[Add row]

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health?

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

Through our Environmental Management Systems (EMS) our timberlands and wood products segments have processes that determine potential pollutants. These processes are driven by certifications and regulations that protect water quality. In our Timberlands we practice best management practices (BMPs) to conserve and protect water quality by minimizing sediment through the filtering ability of natural vegetation and erosion control measures adjacent to water bodies. BMPs include practices such as leaving streamside management zones (SMZs) during harvest, properly designing and constructing logging roads, and using logging methods and equipment that protect water quality. In addition to SMZs, proper design and construction of logging roads and use of logging methods and equipment that protect water quality are key components of our BMP implementation program in our Environmental Management System. Objectives include preventing surface water from flowing directly into a stream, keeping debris away from drainage zones, and minimizing sediment. Sediment is minimized for harvesting operations through BMPs that are designed to disconnect surface flow in areas where equipment may have exposed soil. Disconnecting is accomplished by building small earthen diversions or placing treetops or "slash" where water may flow, moving it off exposed soils, slowing the runoff, and causing the water to filter into the forest floor, which traps sediment. In our Wood Products business discharges of water are monitored under two permit programs. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) is the permitting program that covers discharges of both wastewater and stormwater in the United States. The wastewater permitting program allows for only certain types of discharges, establishes monitoring requirements, and sets discharge limitations. The NPDES permits have parameter limits and benchmarks for pollutants such as zinc, chemical oxygen demand (COD), and total suspended solids (TSS). Wastewater permits have set monitoring regimes that include weekly, quarterly, semi-annual, and/or annual sampling for various parameters. Stormwater monitoring occurs when a qualifying precipitation event that results in runoff occurs. Sampling is conducted by our on-site environmental Team Members or by qualified environmental consultants. As required, we submit the data to the appropriate regulatory agency within a timeline defined in the permit.
[Fixed row]

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities.

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other physical pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Our timberlands follow federal and state regulations for water quality and abide by state best management practices (BMPs) to conserve and protect water quality by minimizing sediment through the filtering ability of natural vegetation and erosion control measures adjacent to water bodies.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Best management practices (BMPs) include practices such as leaving streamside management zones (SMZs) during harvest, properly designing and constructing logging roads, and using logging methods and equipment that protect water quality. In addition to SMZs, proper design and construction of logging roads and use of logging methods and equipment that protect water quality are key components of our BMP implementation program in our Environmental Management System. Objectives include preventing surface water from flowing directly into a stream, keeping debris away from drainage zones, and minimizing sediment. Sediment is minimized for harvesting operations through BMPs that are designed to disconnect surface flow in areas where equipment may have exposed soil. Disconnecting is accomplished by building small earthen diversions or placing treetops or "slash" where water may flow, moving it off exposed soils, slowing the runoff, and causing the water to filter into the forest floor, which traps sediment. The effectiveness of water quality BMPs implemented during harvesting, road building and site preparation has been the focus of numerous scientific studies. The results repeatedly show that the BMPs protect water quality and provide for healthy aquatic habitats supporting fish, aquatic insects, and mussels and clean water for human use and consumption.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. It is used principally for watering log decks, saw cooling, make-up water at the boilers for steam production, and fire protection. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling. We have permit programs that monitor discharges of wastewater and stormwater. The permits have parameter limits and benchmarks for pollutants such as zinc, chemical oxygen demand (COD), and total suspended solids (TSS).

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Water recycling

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) is the permitting program that covers discharges of both wastewater and stormwater in the United States. PotlatchDeltic has NPDES wastewater discharge permits at our St. Maries, Waldo, Warren, and Ola manufacturing facilities because these facilities occasionally discharge to surface water. The stormwater permitting program establishes monitoring requirements and discharge benchmarks for stormwater to protect water quality. The NPDES permits have parameter limits and benchmarks for pollutants such as zinc, chemical oxygen demand (COD), and total suspended solids (TSS). Wastewater permits have set monitoring regimes that include weekly, quarterly, semi-annual, and/or annual sampling for various parameters. Stormwater monitoring occurs when a qualifying precipitation event that results in runoff occurs. Sampling is conducted by our on-site environmental Team Members or by qualified environmental consultants. As required, we submit the data to the appropriate regulatory agency within a timeline defined in the permit. NPDES permits can have additional immediate notification requirements if a limit is exceeded, and the stormwater permits have requirements to develop corrective actions if a benchmark is exceeded. The stormwater program also requires additional routine site inspections to confirm proper function of stormwater controls.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

We use very small amounts of plastic in our business to wrap some lumber for transport.
[Fixed row]

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The possibility of emerging international, federal, and state-level initiatives and proposals surrounding climate issues are on the rise. These potential regulations can impact our business if they require the regulation and/or the taxation of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases to ensure the reduction of carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Changes in machinery, monitoring devices, and procedures to meet these requirements at our wood products facilities can come at a high cost that can impact our business. Tax and other incentives to meet these requirements may also be a possibility, and would likely help us meet any new requirements. In addition, the combustion of biomass for energy could potentially be regulated as a greenhouse gas emission. Wood residuals are burned in our boilers to produce energy. The

greenhouse gas emissions from the boilers produce biogenic emissions because the carbon emitted is part of the biogenic cycle rather than an increase in total carbon in the atmosphere from burning fossil fuels. Any potential carbon price might not include this assumption, and price our biomass emissions as the same as fossil fuel emissions. A carbon tax and the inclusion of biomass emissions in a carbon tax would have a financial impact to our company.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs are included in our overall government relations efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

PotlatchDeltic's business can be impacted by federal, state, and local public policy. Our Public Affairs team works with management to actively engage in the political process through public policy and legislative advocacy on issues that have the potential to impact our company and our industry. We interact with national, state, and local elected officials and their staff through meetings. We often work together with industry associations or coalitions in these efforts to highlight issues of importance. Our involvement can range from writing letters in support of or opposition to legislation, educating legislators and their staff on an issue, or participating in rulemaking regarding proposed regulatory changes. We are committed to conducting these activities in an accountable and transparent manner. We work within several national or state industry associations to direct lobbying outreach and participate in several coalitions and advisory boards. The topics we have been engaged in vary from state issues to broader national matters. Some issues are resolved in a short timeframe while others can evolve over many years. Some of these associations may have interactions with federal or state government officials. We mitigate the potential risk of new or changing regulations through our robust timberland management and environmental management system. In addition, we have ongoing contact with regulators and policy makers either directly or through our industry associations that includes discussions on the potential impacts of proposed rules or changes. Senior management and the Risk Management Committee review potential regulatory risks on a regular basis.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Changing weather patterns and over-mature, decadent timber that is not actively managed on federal forests have increased wildfire risk in the Pacific Northwest. Fires can start due to lightning strikes or from human impacts but are more likely to be minimized on working forests due to active monitoring and forest management that reduces fuel loads. However, some of our timberland ownership in Idaho is adjacent or checkerboard to federal forests, increasing the risk of the spread of wildfire to our timberlands. Fires could burn growing or mature timber and impact future harvest levels. Our U.S. South timberlands do not face fire as a substantive financial risk due to ownership patterns, ease of access and wetter conditions with higher humidity. Forest fires impact our timberlands because we must restart the

forest life cycle starting with salvage and reforestation which can be costly and time-consuming. Forest fires can also have a detrimental effect on markets by impacting their ability to reliably source fiber.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

We assume substantially all risk of loss to the standing timber we own from fire and other hazards because insuring for such losses is not practicable. General liability insurance is maintained where practical. Consequently, a reduction in our timber inventory from such events could adversely affect our financial results and cash flows. Disruptions in harvesting activity can also impact log deliveries to our wood products facilities and to our customers which has a direct impact on our revenues. Forest fires and other natural disasters can limit and disrupt our ability to harvest because either the standing timber is too damaged to be salvaged or there is no longer any standing timber. Salvage operations can take a significant amount of time to ensure safety and be very costly. Salvaged areas will also need to undergo site prep and reforestation much earlier than they were planned and may require more expensive treatments. Stands that have experienced forest fires or stress from natural disasters also require additional evaluation because they pose a greater risk of insect and disease damage. These risks are embedded into our environmental management system, business unit reporting frameworks, and the executive management enterprise risk management process.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Improve fire management systems in sourcing regions

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Fire management is part of our timberlands management and government relations efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As soon as fires are spotted on our property or on neighboring property our foresters work as fast as they can with local, state, and federal agencies to locate and stop the spread of the fire. When the site is deemed safe foresters will evaluate it to determine the appropriate action to take, including whether there can be a salvage cut or if the stand has experienced too much damage. The site will then be evaluated for the best plan for reforestation and be built into the reforestation timeline. Sites will continue to be monitored after a fire event to ensure that they do not experience insect infestations or diseases due to the stressors that they have endured. We have partnered with the United States Forest Service (USFS) on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to mitigate our fire risk. We worked with the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) on dialogue with the USFS regarding opportunities to enhance wildfire response capabilities. Through NAFO, we worked on a MOU, which was signed in early 2023, creating a partnership to enhance cooperation between private working forest owners and public land managers during wildfires. The partnership between USFS and NAFO members allows private resources to fight fires in areas of adjacent ownership with National Forest System lands. The MOU is a first-of-its-kind firefighting partnership. During 2024, we worked, along with NAFO and our peers, to build on the fire suppression MOU through the development and signature of a second MOU with USFS. The second MOU seeks to mitigate wildfire risk through cross-boundary fuel break planning, construction, and maintenance. The MOU provides the framework for coordinating public and private fire mitigation strategies by enabling the construction of National Environmental Policy Act ready fuel breaks on National Forest System lands as an extension to fuel breaks on adjacent privately owned forests.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We are subject to a wide range of general and industry-specific laws and regulations relating to the protection of the environment, including those governing stormwater and surface water management. The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. It is used principally for watering log decks, saw cooling, make-up water at the boilers for steam production, and fire protection. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling. Substantial changes to environmental laws and regulations that could affect our need for water could lead to significant operating and capital expenditures.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased capital expenditures

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

We have incurred, and we expect to continue to incur, significant capital, operating and other expenditures to comply with applicable environmental laws and regulations. We also have incurred and could incur in the future substantial costs, such as civil or criminal fines, sanctions and enforcement actions (including orders limiting our operations or requiring installation of pollution control equipment or other remedial actions), cleanup and closure costs, and third-party claims for property damage and personal injury as a result of violations of, or liabilities under, environmental laws and regulations on properties we currently own or have owned in the past. Because environmental regulations are constantly evolving, we will continue to incur costs to maintain compliance with those laws and our compliance costs could increase materially. In addition, stormwater, and surface water management regulations may present liabilities and are subject to change. Future compliance with existing and new laws, regulations, environmental permits, and other requirements may disrupt our business operations, increase potential liabilities, and require significant expenditures.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

PotlatchDeltic's business can be impacted by international and U.S. federal, state, and local public policy. Our Public Affairs team works with management to actively engage in the political process through public policy and legislative advocacy on issues that have the potential to impact our Company and the industries in which we operate. We regularly meet with national, state, and local elected officials and their staff. We often work together with industry associations or coalitions in these efforts to highlight issues of importance. Our involvement can range from writing letters in support of, or opposition to, proposed legislation, educating legislators and their staff on an issue, or participating in rulemaking regarding proposed regulatory changes. We are committed to conducting these activities in an accountable and transparent manner.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Temperature variability

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Scientific research supports that emissions of greenhouse gases continue to alter the composition of the global atmosphere in ways that are affecting and are expected to continue affecting global temperatures and climate. Rising temperatures and increased CO2 levels create both risks and opportunities to our timberlands. Increased temperature and CO2 can lead to higher forest productivity in some regions, whereas in others the impacts may be limited. Rising temperatures or drought in some regions could impact operating conditions in our timberlands for our employees or contractors, impacting harvesting. Changing weather patterns and climatic conditions from rising temperatures could add to the unpredictability and frequency of natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, hailstorms, wildfires, snow, ice storms, the spread of disease, and insect infestations. Any of these natural disasters could affect our timberlands, timber growth rates, productivity of our timberlands, our harvest operations, and our wood products manufacturing, or cause variations in the cost of raw materials. We evaluate the impact that all of these different factors can have to tree health and productivity and adjust the selection of seedling genetics and silviculture practices to mitigate climate and environmental impacts.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Our revenues and cash flows are primarily from our timberland and wood products businesses. The ability to access our timberlands is critical to sustainably manage our forests, conduct annual harvest plans, and complete silviculture and planting work. Disruptions in access, inclement weather, or insects and disease could impact our financial performance. Sustainable management planning and work we do in our forests, including best management practices and third-party certification of SFI® and FSC® helps to mitigate the potential risk of rising mean temperatures. These risks are embedded into our environmental management system, business unit reporting frameworks, and the executive management enterprise risk management process. We utilize native tree species and tree genetics that are the result of tree breeding and testing programs that select trees with the best ability to survive, grow and resist disease. Our silviculture practices including species and genetic selection, genetic deployment, planting density, competition and invasive species control, and maintenance of optimal tree density and spacing throughout the growth cycle improve resiliency and reduce climate risk. Our sustainable harvest planning and scheduling utilizes forest inventory data that are continually updated and growth models that are frequently calibrated to the growth and mortality on our timberlands that may change and evolve in response to slowly changing temperature, precipitation patterns and CO2 levels. Our environmental best practices are part of our environmental management system and have been embedded in a continuous improvement cycle that includes site specific prescriptions, inspections during implementation, summarization of implementation and effectiveness, identification of trends and opportunities for improvement, adjustments to best practices, training and redeployment. We take steps to mitigate the substantive financial or strategic risk of climate change, including rising mean temperatures through our timberland management and operational policies and practices described in the primary response section. These functions have been built into our business processes. As we identify additional physical and transitional risks during climate scenario analysis, we will build additional functionality into our business processes.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Agricultural practices

☑ Species management and/or recovery

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Increased CO2 concentrations coupled with gradual warming and largely unchanged precipitation patterns are supportive of productive forests. Higher atmospheric CO2 concentration and atmospheric nitrogen deposition can lead to multiple effects from CO2 enrichment resulting in productivity gains for timberlands. In response to elevated CO2, trees use water more efficiently, which increases growth efficiency and reduces water loss. Downscaled RCP 2.6, 4.5, 6.0, and 8.5 projections for northern Idaho indicate annual climatic conditions will be well suited for Douglas-fir growth and productivity through the 2100 decade. Increased frequency, duration, or intensity of droughts in Idaho may increase wildfire risk and increase variability in annual planting success and could result in increased casualty losses or higher forest management expenses. Loblolly Pine accounts for approximately 70% of our Gulf South forest inventory. The species grows best in full sun or partial shade and prefers acidic soil. It is moderately drought resistant. Downscaled RCP 2.6, 4.5, 6.0, and 8.5 projections for the region indicate annual climatic conditions are projected to be well suited for growth and productivity through the 2040-2049 decade, which provides a full growing cycle. Loblolly pine accounts for approximately 86% of our Southeast forest inventory. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 suggests that the species will remain within its historic range through 2100. There is little to no change in projected site productivity in this part of the species' range. PotlatchDeltic owns two sawmills in the Lake States. Red pine accounts for approximately 75% of the log volume at the two sawmills. The analysis for red pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 in 2090- 2099 project favorable productivity for red pine.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Other chronic physical risk, please specify :Rising mean temperatures.

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Scientific research supports that emissions of greenhouse gases continue to alter the composition of the global atmosphere in ways that are affecting and are expected to continue affecting global temperatures and climate. Rising temperatures and increased CO2 levels create both risks and opportunities to our timberlands. Increased temperature and CO2 can lead to higher forest productivity in some regions, whereas in others the impacts may be limited. Rising temperatures or drought in some regions could impact operating conditions in our timberlands for our employees or contractors, impacting harvesting. Changing weather patterns and climatic conditions from rising temperatures could add to the unpredictability and frequency of natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, hailstorms, wildfires, snow, ice storms, the spread of disease, and insect infestations. Any of these natural disasters could affect our timberlands, timber growth rates, productivity of our timberlands, our harvest operations, wood products manufacturing, or cause variations in the cost of raw materials. We evaluate the impact that all of these different factors can have to tree health and productivity and adjust the selection of seedling genetics and silviculture practices to mitigate climate and environmental impacts. We utilize native tree species and tree genetics that are the result of tree breeding and testing programs that select trees with the best ability to survive, grow and resist disease.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Our revenues and cash flows are primarily from our timberland and wood products businesses. The ability to access our timberlands is critical to sustainably manage our forests, conduct annual harvest plans, and complete silviculture and planting work. Disruptions in access, inclement weather, or insects and disease could impact our financial performance. Sustainable management planning and the work we do in our forests, including best management practices and third-party certification of SFI and FSC helps to mitigate the potential risk of rising mean temperatures. These risks are embedded into our environmental management system, business unit reporting frameworks, and the executive management enterprise risk management process.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We utilize native tree species and tree genetics that are the result of tree breeding and testing programs that select trees with the best ability to survive, grow and resist disease. Our silviculture practices including species and genetic selection, genetic deployment, planting density, competition and invasive species control, and maintenance of optimal tree density and spacing throughout the growth cycle improve resiliency and reduce climate risk. Our sustainable harvest planning and scheduling utilizes forest inventory data that are continually updated and growth models that are frequently calibrated to the growth and mortality on our timberlands that may change and evolve in response to slowly changing temperature, precipitation patterns and CO2 levels. Our environmental best practices are part of our environmental management system and have been embedded in a continuous improvement cycle that includes site specific prescriptions, inspections during implementation, summarization of implementation and effectiveness, identification of trends and opportunities for improvement, adjustments to best practices, training and redeployment. In addition, we conduct ongoing climate scenario risk and opportunity analyses and are evaluating the potential impacts of climate change including rising mean temperatures, changing precipitation patterns and increased CO2 levels for each of our geographic regions including potential mitigation strategies.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Other policy risk, please specify :Regulatory Uncertainty

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our timberlands are subject to a wide range of legislation, regulations and requirements at the national, state and local levels. We manage our timberlands with these requirements through robust environmental management systems and forest management planning. Enactment of new environmental laws or regulations, or changes in existing laws or regulations, could have a direct impact on our operations. Changes in regulations relating to air, wildlife, and water quality can impact timberland management and increase harvesting restrictions. Legislation or policy surrounding climate change could impact timber or wood products demand or the use of wood residuals. Our SFI and FSC certifications also demonstrate that we are abiding by state and federal legislation. Examples of state and federal regulations that we follow are state best management practices (BMPs) that guide landowners and managers on how to protect water quality and other threats that could be a result of harvest and planting activities, state and federal threatened and endangered species, laws protecting indigenous peoples and human rights, and laws regarding company reporting and ethics. We continue to monitor and participate where possible when new legislation is introduced at the local, state, and federal levels. We actively monitor legislation related to climate change and carbon markets and the impact that it can have on our business.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Our revenues and cash flows are primarily from our timberland and wood products businesses. The ability to continue to harvest from our timberlands on a sustainable basis is critical to our planning, businesses and financial results. Changes to policy or regulations can disrupt markets, impact investments, and alter the volume of harvest from our timberlands for internal use at our wood products facilities and to external customers. Disruptions to the supply of logs to our wood product facilities can impact revenues and margins. New regulations or changes in the method of their enforcement may require significant expenditures by us or may also adversely affect our timberland management, harvesting activities and manufacturing operations. Climate change and greenhouse gas regulations can have a significant impact on the manufacturing side of our business by requiring additional equipment for monitoring and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which typically come at an increased cost. These risks are embedded into our environmental management system, business unit reporting frameworks, and the executive management enterprise risk management process.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with regulators/policy makers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

PotlatchDeltic's business can be impacted by federal, state, and local public policy. Our Public Affairs team works with management to actively engage in the political process through public policy and legislative advocacy on issues that have the potential to impact our company and our industry. We interact with national, state, and local elected officials and their staff through meetings. We often work together with industry associations or coalitions in these efforts to highlight issues of importance.

Our involvement can range from writing letters in support of or opposition to legislation, educating legislators and their staff on an issue, or participating in rulemaking regarding proposed regulatory changes. We are committed to conducting these activities in an accountable and transparent manner. PotlatchDeltic works within several national or state industry associations to direct lobbying outreach and participates in several coalitions and advisory boards. The topics we have been engaged in vary from state issues to broader national matters. Some issues are resolved in a short timeframe while others can evolve over many years. Some of these associations may have interactions with federal or state government officials. We mitigate the potential risk of new or changing regulations through our robust timberland management and environmental management system. In addition, we have ongoing contact with regulators and policy makers either directly or through our industry associations that includes discussions on the potential impacts of proposed rules or changes. Senior management reviews potential regulatory risks on a regular basis.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :St. Joe River in Northern Idaho and the Sparta Aquifer in Arkansas.

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our St. Maries, Idaho wood products facility consists of a lumber mill and a plywood mill and is located on the St. Joe River. A significant part of the river is protected by the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System and has areas that are designated as recreational areas. Water withdrawal at this facility is 92% surface water and 8% municipal water. Water is relatively abundant at most of our manufacturing locations. Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren, and Waldo, however, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. In 2024, total water sourced at Warren was 6% from municipal water and 94% from groundwater; however, municipal water supplied to Warren is partially sourced from the Sparta Aquifer. Total water for Waldo in 2024 was sourced 82% from groundwater and 18% from municipal water. Municipal water supplied to Waldo is surface water sourced from Lake Columbia.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Fines, penalties or enforcement orders

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Our operating results and cash flows will be materially affected by the availability of water. Facilities that withdraw water from critical groundwater areas are most likely to be impacted. Disruptions or the inability to access water could have significant financial impact if they cause disruptions to production or cause temporary or permanent facility closures.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. It is used principally for watering log decks, saw cooling, make-up water at the boilers for steam production, and fire protection. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling, especially at the log deck. The water that is discharged is sent to settling ponds for solids removal prior to being released. Water loss across the facilities is mostly due to evaporation from log watering activities

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk8

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Other market risk, please specify :Cyclicality of Markets

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The financial performance of our operations is affected by the cyclical nature of our business. A variety of factors affect prices and demand for timber, including changes in economic conditions, the level of domestic new construction and repair and remodeling activity, foreign demand, interest rates, credit availability, population growth, weather conditions and pest infestation, as well as changes in timber supply. All of these factors can vary by region, timber type, and species. On a local level, supplies can fluctuate depending upon factors such as changes in weather conditions and harvest strategies of local timberland owners, as well as occasionally high timber salvage efforts due to events such as pest infestations or fires. We may be susceptible to adverse economic and other developments in the regions where we own timberlands, including industry slowdowns, mill closures and curtailments, business layoffs or downsizing, relocations of businesses, changes in demographics, increases in real estate and other taxes and increased regulation, any of which could have a material adverse effect on us.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Change in revenue mix and sources

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Our operating results and cash flows will be materially affected by the cyclical supply and demand for timber. In addition, significant structural changes in market demand, or prolonged oversupply of timber in an area can impact timberland values. Some customers and wood products facilities place preference and price incentives on certified wood. As a result losing certification can have a financial impact on the business if customers no longer accept our logs or will only take them at a reduced price. There are also costs associated with maintaining certifications both through subscription fees as well as compliance costs.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Other diversification, please specify :Market Monitoring and Customer Engagement

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

These risks are embedded into our operations, business unit reporting frameworks, and the executive management enterprise risk management process.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We mitigate the potential risk of market volatility and impacts through comprehensive monitoring of local conditions and regional and national market trends. In addition, we have ongoing engagement with our customers to understand local market conditions and continually evaluate new market opportunities. We utilize internal and external specialists in forecasting broader trends. We work collaboratively with the certification bodies, other forest industry companies, and other forest-related organizations to help ensure that we, and the industry, are compliant and committed to sustainability.
[Add row]

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ 100%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Our financial results and cash flows depend significantly on our continued ability to harvest timber at adequate levels. From time to time, our timber harvest levels and sales have been and in the future may be limited due to curtailment and closures, regulatory requirements associated with the protection of wildlife and water resources, and weather events and conditions impacting our ability to access our timberlands. Future timber harvest levels may also be affected by our ability to timely and effectively replant harvested areas as a result of other factors, including insufficient or excessive precipitation, damage by fire, pest infestation, disease and natural disasters, and significant regional or local weather events such as ice storms, windstorms, tornadoes, hurricanes and floods. Changes in global climate conditions could intensify one or more of these factors. Although damage from such natural causes is usually localized, affecting only a limited percentage of our timber, there can be no assurance that any damage affecting our timberlands will be limited. Disease, severe weather conditions and other natural disasters can also reduce seedling survival rates, impact timber growth cycles and productivity of the timberlands. All of these factors that can disrupt our ability to manage our timberlands also have an impact on our wood products facilities, as well as our ability to supply other wood products facilities. However, our timberlands are positioned to be part of the solution to climate change and transition opportunities may exist through natural climate solutions, which could increase revenues and cash flows.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

As a primarily timberlands and wood products company, forests are a vital part of our business. Anything that could impact the growth through the harvesting processes of forestlands would have a detrimental impact on our company. In our supply chain, we grow and harvest timber to be transformed into a range of products, from lumber to paper products to fuel sources. Our wood products facilities also depend on our own timberlands and other surrounding timberlands. Our financial results and cash flows depend significantly on our continued ability to harvest timber at adequate levels. From time to time, our timber harvest levels and sales have been and in the future may be limited due to availability of contract loggers, mill quotas, curtailment and closures, regulatory requirements associated with the protection of wildlife and water resources, and weather events and conditions impacting our ability to access our timberlands. Future timber harvest levels may also be affected by our ability to timely and effectively replant harvested areas as a result of other factors, including availability of contractors, U.S. immigration policies, insufficient or excessive precipitation, damage by fire, pest infestation, disease and natural disasters, and significant regional or local weather events such as ice storms, windstorms, tornadoes, hurricanes and floods. Changes in global climate conditions could intensify one or more of these factors. Although damage from such natural causes is usually localized, affecting only a limited percentage of our timber, there can be no assurance that any damage affecting our timberlands will be limited. Disease, severe weather conditions and other natural disasters can also reduce seedling survival rates, impact timber growth cycles and productivity of the timberlands which could affect harvesting levels and delivery of logs.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Water is a very important factor in our business. Forests and surrounding ecosystems depend on water for survival and our wood products facilities depend on water for production. Changes to water quality and quantity as well as changes to water-related laws and regulations could have a substantial impact on our business. Impacts to water quality and quantity could impact the growth of trees on our timberlands. Changes to laws and regulations could impact our harvesting abilities on our timberlands and water availability at our wood products facilities. The Clean Water Act in the United States is an example of a federal regulation that has the potential to impact harvesting and forestry road building activities. If we are restricted from harvesting on a significant portion of our timberlands for a prolonged period of time we could suffer materially adverse effects to our results of operations and cash flows.
[Add row]

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :St. Joe River

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

2

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our St. Maries lumber and plywood facility are located on the St. Joe River. Increased regulations surrounding availability or discharge into the river basin could increase costs.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States Virgin Islands
☑ Other, please specify :Sparta Aquifer

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

2

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Water is relatively abundant at most of our locations. Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren, and Waldo, however, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. In 2024, total water sourced at Warren was 6% from municipal water and 94% from groundwater; however, municipal water supplied to Warren is partially sourced from the Sparta Aquifer. Total water for Waldo in 2024 was sourced 82% from groundwater and 18% from municipal water. Municipal water supplied to Waldo is surface water sourced from Lake Columbia.
[Add row]

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*PotlatchDeltic was not subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations in the reporting year.*

[Fixed row]

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Forests

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(3.6.3) Please explain

Opportunities may exist, but we have not identified any that have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business at this time.
[Fixed row]

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Expansion into new markets

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Sustainably managed working forests can play a significant role in providing solutions to climate change. Our forests can participate in net-zero strategies through Improved Forest Management carbon projects in voluntary markets which generate high-quality and high-integrity stable climate benefits. Solar energy and energy storage opportunities are growing rapidly, driven by commercial and utility procurement, and supported by policy and incentive programs. Our real estate solar leases or sales can support the renewable clean energy transition. Some of our lands provide opportunities to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide through the development of geological carbon capture and sequestration through our subsurface pore space ownership rights. Markets utilizing biomass sourced from sustainably managed forests could expand as new biobased products emerge to support the development of a circular bioeconomy. These can expand market demand for fiber, residual wood fiber from wood products, and lower-value trees, which otherwise could go to waste, as a source of feedstock in bioenergy facilities to produce sustainable aviation fuel or other renewable energy alternatives. Other emerging technologies utilizing wood fiber for bioplastics could offer transformative solutions towards a bio-based circular carbon economy. Net-zero transition commitments combined with circularity-oriented policies could drive growth of biobased materials for end uses such as food packaging or biofuels.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

The development of carbon offsets and other natural climate solutions could create additional revenue and cash flow streams. Additional fiber demand could strengthen fiber markets and timberland valuations.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We continuously look at and evaluate new markets as they arise parallel to the wood products and timberlands industries. Each project is evaluated on its return and how it fits into the core business. We evaluate projects related to solar energy, mitigation banking, carbon capture and storage, carbon offsets, and bio-based products, and will continue to as opportunities arise. We recently established a role with direct responsibilities to develop natural climate solution strategies. Our Public Affairs team works with our industry associations and engages in direct conversations to promote policies and legislation that support the growth of natural climate solutions markets. Within the spectrum of natural climate solutions markets, solar opportunities have led the way, and our inventory of solar option contracts now represents 38,000 acres, or approximately 2% of our entire timberland holdings, with an estimated value of approximately $475 million on a net present value basis. Certain areas of our timberland in Southern Arkansas feature geological formations that offer promising prospects for subsurface leases for lithium deposits, crucial for battery production. We have also identified potential valuable prospects in carbon capture and storage, as well as bioenergy and biofuels. Forest carbon credit opportunities continue to grow, and we continue to evaluate bringing a carbon project to market that adheres to core carbon principles.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Building with wood and mass timber stores carbon for the long-term. We are a top 10 producer of lumber in the United States. Carbon from harvested wood remains in wood products until the end of their use. When wood-based products are used in place of fossil fuel-intensive products like steel, concrete, or plastic, there is a permanent benefit to our atmosphere. For example, researchers have found that the CO2 intensity of lumber production is about 20% less than that of fabricated metal products, less than 50% that of iron and steel, and less than 25% than that of cement. By building with wood, we are storing additional carbon in everyday products and buildings. We believe traditional and innovative wood products markets could continue to grow as part of the solution to climate change. The emerging momentum for mass timber in tall buildings exemplifies how innovation in wood products can provide opportunities. Developers and architects are attracted to the ability to incorporate the sustainability and carbon capture benefits of mass timber, its advantages, and its aesthetic appeal in non-residential and multifamily

buildings. Policies and incentives that encourage greater use of wood-based products in buildings or in building materials are also expected to increase, including emphasis on green building certification.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Increased demand for certified wood products could create additional revenue and cash flow streams. Additional fiber demand could strengthen fiber markets and timberland valuations.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our Public Affairs team works with our industry associations and engages in direct conversations to promote policies and legislation that support the growth of building with wood. For example, we are promoting policy that supports the growth of mass timber and that supports mass timber education for architects and builders. We advocate for new uses of wood products, such as government-funded construction and rural infrastructure projects. We support organizations that are driving improvements in the research in the use of mass timber and the development of a wood products Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) for life cycle inventory. These actions are included in our existing operating budgets.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Building with wood and mass timber stores carbon for the long-term. We are a top 10 producer of lumber in the United States. Carbon from harvested wood remains in wood products until the end of their use. When wood-based products are used in place of fossil fuel-intensive products like steel, concrete, or plastic, there is a permanent benefit to our atmosphere. For example, researchers have found that the CO2 intensity of lumber production is about 20% less than that of fabricated metal products, less than 50% than that of iron and steel, and less than 25% than that of cement. By building with wood, we are storing additional carbon in everyday products and buildings. We believe traditional and innovative wood products markets could continue to grow as part of the solution to climate change. The emerging momentum for mass timber in tall buildings exemplifies how innovation in wood products can provide opportunities. Developers and architects are attracted to the ability to incorporate the sustainability and carbon capture benefits of mass timber, its advantages, and its aesthetic appeal in non-residential and multifamily buildings. Policies and incentives that encourage greater use of wood-based products in buildings or in building materials are also expected to increase, including emphasis on green building certification.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Increased demand for certified wood products could create additional revenue and cash flow streams. Additional fiber demand could strengthen fiber markets and timberland valuations.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our Public Affairs team works with our industry associations and engages in direct conversations to promote policies and legislation that support the growth of building with wood. For example, we are promoting policy that supports the growth of mass timber and that supports mass timber education for architects and builders. We advocate for new uses of wood products, such as government-funded construction and rural infrastructure projects. We support organizations that are driving improvements in the research in the use of mass timber and the development of a wood products Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) for life cycle inventory. These actions are included in our existing operating budgets.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Expansion into new markets

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Sustainably managed working forests can play a significant role in providing solutions to climate change. Our forests can participate in net-zero strategies through Improved Forest Management (IFM) carbon projects in voluntary markets which generate high-quality and high-integrity stable climate benefits. Solar energy and energy storage opportunities are growing rapidly, driven by commercial and utility procurement, and supported by policy and incentive programs. Our real estate solar leases or sales can support the renewable clean energy transition. Some of our lands provide opportunities to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide through the development of geological carbon capture and sequestration through our subsurface pore space ownership rights. Markets utilizing biomass sourced from sustainably managed forests could expand as new biobased products emerge to support the development of a circular bioeconomy. These can expand market demand for residual wood fiber from wood products, and lower-value trees, which otherwise could go to waste, as a source of feedstock in bioenergy facilities to produce sustainable aviation fuel or other renewable energy alternatives. Other emerging technologies utilizing wood fiber for bioplastics could offer transformative solutions towards a bio-based circular carbon economy. Net-zero transition commitments combined with circularity-oriented policies could drive growth of biobased materials for end uses such as food packaging or biofuels.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

The development of carbon offsets and other natural climate solutions could create additional revenue and cash flow streams. Additional fiber demand could strengthen fiber markets and timberland valuations.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We continuously look at and evaluate new markets as they arise parallel to the wood products and timberlands industries. Each project is evaluated on its return and how it fits into the core business. We evaluate projects related to solar energy, mitigation banking, carbon capture and storage, carbon offsets, and bio-based products, and will continue to as opportunities arise. We recently established a role with direct responsibilities to develop natural climate solution strategies. Our Public Affairs team works with our industry associations and engages in direct conversations to promote policies and legislation that support the growth of natural climate solutions markets. Within the spectrum of natural climate solutions markets, solar opportunities have led the way, and our inventory of solar option contracts now represents 2738,000 acres, or over 1approximately 2% of our entire timberland holdings, with an estimated value of approximately $300 475 million on a net present value basis. Certain areas of our timberland in Southern Arkansas feature geological formations that offer promising prospects for subsurface leases for lithium deposits, crucial for battery production. We have also identified potential valuable prospects in carbon capture and storage, as well as bioenergy and biofuels. Forest carbon credit opportunities continue to grow, and we continue to evaluate bringing a carbon project to market that adheres to core carbon principles (CCP).

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Other markets opportunity, please specify :Increased Forest Productivity and Timberland Valuation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Overall, increased CO2 concentrations coupled with gradual warming and largely unchanged precipitation patterns are supportive of productive forests. Higher atmospheric CO2 concentration and atmospheric nitrogen deposition can lead to multiple effects from CO2 enrichment resulting in productivity gains for timberlands. In response to elevated CO2, trees use water more efficiently, which increases growth efficiency and reduces water loss. This could provide an opportunity for higher growth conditions for timberlands in certain locations. In addition, natural climate solutions could increase demand for biomass from forests and offer new potential revenues or cash flow streams. These factors could increase timberland valuations.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased value of fixed assets

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Higher growth rates could increase available sustainable annual harvests and increase revenue and cash flow streams. Increased harvests could provide opportunities for wood product facility modernizations or additional capacity or support the growth of fiber sales to natural climate solutions markets, which if completed could increase revenues and cash flows.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our foresters manage our timberlands on a sustainable basis and utilize forest management techniques to improve productivity. In addition, we have a long and continuing commitment to investing in and utilizing research regarding forest management. We actively participate in and fund research with the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, universities, and other research organizations.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp6

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets
☑ Other markets opportunity, please specify :Increased Forest Productivity and Timberland Valuation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Overall, increased CO2 concentrations coupled with gradual warming and largely unchanged precipitation patterns are supportive of productive forests. Higher atmospheric CO2 concentration and atmospheric nitrogen deposition can lead to multiple effects from CO2 enrichment resulting in productivity gains for timberlands. In response to elevated CO2, trees use water more efficiently, which increases growth efficiency and reduces water loss. This could provide an opportunity for higher growth conditions for timberlands in certain locations. In addition, natural climate solutions could increase demand for biomass on forests and offer new potential revenues or cash flow streams. These factors could increase timberland valuations.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased value of fixed assets

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Higher growth rates could increase available sustainable annual harvests and increase revenue and cash flow streams. Increased harvests could provide opportunities for wood product facility modernizations or additional capacity or support the growth of fiber sales to natural climate solutions markets, which if completed could increase revenues and cash flows.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost not calculated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our foresters manage our timberlands on a sustainable basis and utilize forest management techniques to improve productivity. In addition, we have a long and continuing commitment to investing in and utilizing research regarding forest management. We actively participate in and fund research with the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, universities, and other research organizations.
[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

As a primarily timberlands and wood products company, climate change risks and opportunities are significant for our business. Our Timberlands business accounts for approximately 27% of our revenue generated, our Wood Products business accounts for approximately 57% of our revenue generated, and out Real Estate business accounts for approximately 16% of our revenue generated. Climate-related opportunities can have a positive impact on all parts of our business.

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1062076000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

As a primarily timberlands and wood products company, climate change risks and opportunities are significant for our business. Our Timberlands business accounts for approximately 27% of our revenue generated, our Wood Products business accounts for approximately 57% of our revenue generated, and out Real Estate business accounts for approximately 16% of our revenue generated. Climate-related opportunities can have a positive impact on all parts of our business.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.1.3) Types of directors your board or equivalent is comprised of

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

It is the objective of the Board that its membership be composed of highly qualified and dedicated individuals with diverse skills, professional experience, perspectives, age, race and gender. Director candidates are selected for their character, judgment, diversity of experience, business acumen and the ability to act on behalf of stockholders. They should be able to provide insights and practical wisdom based on their experience and expertise. Each Director must be committed to enhancing stockholder value and must have sufficient time to effectively carry out his or her duties as a Director. Accordingly, the Board is committed to actively seeking out diverse candidates, including women and individuals from minority groups, to include in the pool from which new director nominees are selected.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Corporate-Governance-Guidelines-Feb-7-2025-002-a2e5f4.pdf
[Fixed row]

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.

Climate change

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
☑ Board-level committee
☑ Other, please specify :Board Members

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Individual role descriptions
☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Corporate Governance Guidelines

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:
☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply
☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Because our business is primarily focused on timberlands and wood products, the structure of the Board leadership aligns with responsibility for timberland and wood products climate-related issues. Our full Board, which is comprised of nine members, is ultimately responsible for and makes decisions focused on climate-related issues, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. In that regard, the full Board makes decisions focused on the sustainable management of our forests, the responsible procurement of timber, and the manufacturing of wood products, including climate-related issues. The Board oversees the company's business including the company's strategy, corporate responsibility (CR) matters, including our environmental management, social responsibility, health and safety program performance, and corporate governance policies and practices, climate-related risks and opportunities, greenhouse gas reduction commitments, and other matters. Examples of climate-related issues evaluated in 2024 included the Board review of our Net-Zero Roadmap, carbon removals, Scope 1, 2, and 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, our GHG reduction commitments for 2030 and our goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. The Board has three standing committees that, with the full Board, oversee the management of our business by our President and CEO and other members of our senior management team. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing governance matters, including the composition of the Board, and our overall compliance with applicable environmental laws and operating permits. The Audit Committee is responsible for overseeing financial reporting, risk management (including climate-related risks), legal and regulatory compliance activities, carbon accounting, CR-related audit matters, and other matters. The Executive Compensation and Personnel Policies Committee oversees our executive compensation and benefits programs and other related matters. The Vice-President Public Affairs and Chief Sustainability Officer provides senior leadership, including the President and CEO, with regular updates on CR strategy and analysis, including on climate-related matters. We utilize an Enterprise Risk Management framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the Company, including risks related to a range of CR topics. Our third-party certifications from the Sustainable Forest Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council help identify and minimize environmental issues and are overseen by the management team and Board.

Forests

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Board-level committee

☑ Other, please specify :Board Members

(4.1.2.2) Positions’ accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Other, please specify :Overseeing governance matters and corporate responsibility reporting

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Because our business is primarily focused on timberlands and wood products, the structure of the Board leadership aligns with responsibility for timberland and wood products climate-related issues. Our full Board, which is comprised of nine members, is ultimately responsible for and makes decisions focused on climate-related issues, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. In that regard, the full Board makes decisions focused on the sustainable management of our forests, the responsible procurement of timber, and the manufacturing of wood products, including climate-related issues. The Board oversees the company's business including the company's strategy, corporate responsibility (CR) matters, including our environmental management, social responsibility, health and safety program performance, and corporate governance policies and practices, climate-related risks and opportunities, greenhouse gas reduction commitments, and other matters. Examples of climate-related issues evaluated in 2024 included the Board review of our Net-Zero Roadmap, carbon removals, Scope 1, 2, and 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, our GHG reduction commitments for 2030 and our goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. The Board has three standing committees that, with the full Board, oversee the management of our business by our President and CEO and other members of our senior management team. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing governance matters, including the composition of the Board, and our overall compliance with applicable environmental laws and operating permits. The Audit Committee is responsible for overseeing financial reporting, risk management (including climate-related risks), legal and regulatory compliance activities, carbon accounting, CR-related audit matters, and other matters. The Executive Compensation and Personnel Policies Committee oversees our executive compensation and benefits programs and other related matters. The Vice-President Public Affairs and Chief Sustainability Officer provides senior leadership, including the President and CEO, with regular updates on CR strategy and analysis, including on climate-related matters. We utilize an Enterprise Risk Management framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the Company, including risks related to a range of CR topics. Our third-party certifications from the Sustainable Forest Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council help identify and minimize environmental issues and are overseen by the management team and Board.

Water

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Board-level committee

☑ Other, please specify :Board Members

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Other, please specify **:Overseeing governance matters and corporate responsibility reporting**

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Because our business is primarily focused on timberlands and wood products, the structure of the Board leadership aligns with responsibility for timberland and wood products climate-related issues. Our full Board, which is comprised of nine members, is ultimately responsible for and makes decisions focused on climate-related issues, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. In that regard, the full Board makes decisions focused on the sustainable management of our forests, the responsible procurement of timber, and the manufacturing of wood products, including climate-related issues. The Board oversees the company's business including the company's strategy, corporate responsibility (CR) matters, including our environmental management, social responsibility, health and safety program performance, and corporate governance policies and practices, climate-related risks and opportunities, greenhouse gas reduction commitments, and other matters. Examples of climate-related issues evaluated in 2024 included the Board review of our Net-Zero Roadmap, carbon removals, Scope 1, 2, and 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, our GHG reduction commitments for 2030 and our goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. The Board has three standing committees that, with the full Board, oversee the management of our business by our President and CEO and other members of our senior management team. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing governance matters,

including the composition of the Board, and our overall compliance with applicable environmental laws and operating permits. The Audit Committee is responsible for overseeing financial reporting, risk management (including climate-related risks), legal and regulatory compliance activities, carbon accounting, CR-related audit matters, and other matters. The Executive Compensation and Personnel Policies Committee oversees our executive compensation and benefits programs and other related matters. The Vice-President Public Affairs and Chief Sustainability Officer provides senior leadership, including the President and CEO, with regular updates on CR strategy and analysis, including on climate-related matters. We utilize an Enterprise Risk Management framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the Company, including risks related to a range of CR topics. Our third-party certifications from the Sustainable Forest Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council help identify and minimize environmental issues and are overseen by the management team and Board.

Biodiversity

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Board-level committee

☑ Other, please specify :Board Members

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Other, please specify :Overseeing governance matters and corporate responsibility

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Because our business is primarily focused on timberlands and wood products, the structure of the Board leadership aligns with responsibility for timberland and wood products climate-related issues. Our full Board, which is comprised of nine members, is ultimately responsible for and makes decisions focused on climate-related issues, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. In that regard, the full Board makes decisions focused on the sustainable management of our forests, the responsible procurement of timber, and the manufacturing of wood products, including climate-related issues. The Board oversees the company's business including the company's strategy, corporate responsibility (CR) matters, including our environmental management, social responsibility, health and safety program performance, and corporate governance policies and practices, climate-related risks and opportunities, greenhouse gas reduction commitments, and other matters. Examples of climate-related issues evaluated in 2024 included the Board review of our Net-Zero Roadmap, carbon removals, Scope 1, 2, and 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, our GHG reduction commitments for 2030 and our goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. The Board has three standing committees that, with the full Board, oversee the management of our business by our President and CEO and other members of our senior management team. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing governance matters, including the composition of the Board, and our overall compliance with applicable environmental laws and operating permits. The Audit Committee is responsible for overseeing financial reporting, risk management (including climate-related risks), legal and regulatory compliance activities, carbon accounting, CR-related audit matters, and other matters. The Executive Compensation and Personnel Policies Committee oversees our executive compensation and benefits programs and other related matters. The Vice-President Public Affairs and Chief Sustainability Officer provides senior leadership, including the President and CEO, with regular updates on CR strategy and analysis, including on climate-related matters. We utilize an Enterprise Risk Management framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the Company, including risks related to a range of CR topics. Our third-party certifications from the Sustainable Forest Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council help identify and minimize environmental issues and are overseen by the management team and Board.
[Fixed row]

(4.2) Does your organization’s board have competency on environmental issues?

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Additional training

☑ Course certificate (relating to environmental issues), please specify :Climate Leadership Certificate from Diligent Institute

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

[Fixed row]

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:*

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
	☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The President and CEO has responsibility for climate-related issues and for managing Board agendas so that the Board is kept informed of climate-related issues. Our full Board is responsible for oversight of climate risks and opportunities, our climate strategy, climate targets, and other climate-related issues. The Board meets at least four times a year.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Because our business is primarily focused on timberlands and wood products, the structure of the Board leadership aligns with responsibility for timberland and wood products climate-related issues. Our full Board, which is comprised of nine members, makes decisions focused on the sustainable management of our forests, water quality, biodiversity, the responsible procurement of timber, and the manufacturing of wood products, including climate-related issues. The Board oversees the company's business including the company's strategy, corporate responsibility (CR) matters, including our environmental management, social responsibility, health and safety program performance, and corporate governance policies and practices, climate-related risks and opportunities, greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction commitments, and other matters. Examples of climate-related issues evaluated in 2024 included the Board review of our carbon removals, Scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG emissions, our GHG reduction commitments for 2030 and our goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. Our full Board is ultimately responsible for and makes decisions focused on climate-related issues, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. The Board has three standing committees that with the full Board oversee the management of our company. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing governance matters, including the function and operation of the Board, and our overall compliance with applicable environmental laws and operating permits. The Audit Committee is responsible for overseeing financial reporting, risk management (including climate-related risks), legal and regulatory compliance activities, carbon accounting, CR-related audit matters, and other matters. The Executive Compensation and Personnel Policies Committee oversees our executive compensation and benefits programs and other matters.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The President and CEO has responsibility for water-related issues related to our timberlands and wood products divisions and for managing Board agendas so that the Board is kept informed of water-related issues. Our full Board is ultimately responsible for oversight of the sustainable management of our forests including water features and the responsible use of water at our wood products facilities, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. The Board meets at least four times a year.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The President and CEO has responsibility for biodiversity-related issues related to our timberlands and for managing Board agendas so that the Board is kept informed of biodiversity-related issues. Our full Board is ultimately responsible for oversight of the sustainable management of our forests including biodiversity management, although day to day management of these issues is handled by members of our management team and their Team Members. The Board meets at least four times a year.
[Add row]

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?

Climate change

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

As a leading timberland real estate investment trust (i.e., a REIT), responsible and sustainable management of our forests and minimizing our environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, in wood products are core parts of our business. Compensation includes a base salary and annual cash and non-cash incentives. In 2024, the annual cash incentive program included both financial and non-financial goals. Non-financial goals include a range of operational and corporate responsibility goals, which account for 20% of the award opportunity. These goals include making progress towards our 2030 greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Forests

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

As a leading timberland real estate investment trust (i.e., a REIT), responsible and sustainable management of our forests and minimizing our environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, in wood products are core parts of our business. Compensation includes a base salary and annual cash and non-cash incentives. In 2024, the annual cash incentive program included both financial and non-financial goals. Non-financial goals include a range of operational and corporate responsibility goals, which account for 20% of the award opportunity. These goals include making progress towards our 2030 greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Water

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

As a leading timberland real estate investment trust (i.e., a REIT), responsible and sustainable management of our forests and minimizing our environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, in wood products are core parts of our business. Compensation includes a base salary and annual cash and non-cash incentives. In 2024, the annual cash incentive program included both financial and non-financial goals. Non-financial goals include a range of operational and

corporate responsibility goals, which account for 20% of the award opportunity. These goals include making progress towards our 2030 greenhouse gas reduction targets.
[Fixed row]

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In determining the annual incentive payment for the CEO consideration is given to performance against financial, operational, and strategic goals. In 2024, these goals included, among others:1) safety goals; 2) environmental goals for our wood products division; 3) third-party certification and environmental goals for timberlands; 4) strategy goals regarding natural climate solutions and growth opportunities; and 5) continued progress in corporate responsibility matters including reporting.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

We have integrated corporate responsibility and climate-related goals into our annual incentive plan for eligible employees. Corporate responsibility is prominent in Company-level goals established by the Board and we further formalize corporate responsibility goals with the adoption of a scorecard component of our annual bonus program. The corporate responsibility and climate goals include energy reduction, greenhouse gas reduction, carbon record reporting, and analysis of climate risks and opportunities. In addition, we are developing or evaluating natural climate solutions business opportunities including solar, carbon capture and storage, and carbon offsets.

Forests

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In determining the annual incentive payment for the CEO consideration is given to performance against financial, operational, and strategic goals. In 2024, these goals included, among others:1) safety goals; 2) third-party certification and environmental goals for timberlands including forest certification; 3) strategy goals regarding natural climate solutions and growth opportunities; 4) continued progress in corporate responsibility matters including reporting; and 5) progress towards our greenhouse gas reduction targets.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Our performance as a company depends on our ability to successfully manage forest-related issues. Our executives' pay is determined by our company's ability to meet specific business targets including CR goals that include forest-related targets. In addition, factors for the assessment of individual performance for certain executives include (i) attaining zero violations of State Forest Practices Act standards (either voluntary or by statute) or Federal standards, including the Endangered Species Act, and/or (ii) maintaining our Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) and Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) certifications.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In determining the annual incentive payment for the CEO consideration is given to performance against financial, operational, and strategic goals. In 2024, these goals included, among others:1) environmental goals for wood products; 2) third-party certification and environmental goals for timberlands; and 3) continued progress in corporate responsibility matters.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Our performance as a company depends on our ability to successfully manage water-related issues. Our executives' pay is determined by our company's ability to meet specific business targets including CR goals that include water-related targets. In addition, factors for the assessment of individual performance for certain executives include (i) attaining zero violations of State Forest Practices Act standards (either voluntary or by statute) or Federal standards, (ii) maintaining our FSC® and SFI® certifications, and/or (iii) maintaining water permit parameters.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In determining the annual incentive payment for the executive team consideration is given to performance against performance expectations in the area of environmental stewardship, among others. In 2024, these goals included delivering on our corporate sustainability reporting goals, making progress towards our 2030 greenhouse gas reduction and net-zero targets, maintaining forest management certifications with no nonconformance reports, and reducing waste and energy consumption in our wood products division.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

We integrate Corporate Responsibility (CR) and climate into our annual incentive plan eligible employee goals and pay. CR is prominent in Company-level goals established by the Board and we further formalized CR goals with a scorecard component of our annual bonus program. The CR and climate goals include energy reduction, greenhouse gas reduction, carbon record reporting, and analysis of climate risks and opportunities. In addition, we are developing natural climate solutions business opportunities, including solar, carbon capture and storage, and carbon offsets.

Forests

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In determining the annual incentive payment for the executive team consideration is given to performance against performance expectations in the area of environmental stewardship, among others. In 2024, these goals included delivering on our corporate sustainability reporting goals, making progress towards our 2030 greenhouse gas reduction and net-zero targets, maintaining forest management certifications with no nonconformance reports, and reducing waste and energy consumption in our wood products division.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Our performance as a company depends on our ability to successfully manage forest-related issues. Our executives' pay is determined by our company's ability to meet specific business targets including CR goals that include forest-related targets. In addition, factors for the assessment of individual performance for certain executives include (i) attaining zero violations of state Forest Practices Act standards (either voluntary or by statute) or Federal standards, including the Endangered Species Act, and/or (ii) maintaining our FSC® and SFI® certifications.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In determining the annual incentive payment for the executive team consideration is given to performance against performance expectations in the area of environmental stewardship, among others. In 2024, these goals included delivering on our corporate sustainability reporting goals, maintaining forest management certifications including water requirements with no nonconformance reports, and reducing waste and energy consumption in our wood products division.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Our performance as a company depends on our ability to successfully manage water-related issues. Our executives' pay is determined by our company's ability to meet specific business targets including CR goals that include water-related targets. In addition, factors for the assessment of individual performance for certain executives include (i) attaining zero violations of state Forest Practices Act standards (either voluntary or by statute) or Federal standards, (ii) maintaining our FSC® and SFI® certifications, and/or (iii) maintaining water permit parameters.
[Add row]

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water
☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

PotlatchDeltic is committed to sustainable forest management and has a long legacy of excellence in forest management which is delineated in our Forest Stewardship Policy. This includes planning forest management on a sustainable basis using 50-year, 5-year and annual plans, reforesting harvested areas, protecting water quality and riparian zones, promoting biodiversity and wildlife habitat, conserving high conservation value areas, and protecting at-risk species. We commit to follow best forest management practices which provide guidelines on how to accomplish the objectives. We are committed to producing wood products from responsibly sourced raw materials including logs from our own company lands, from other private industrial and family landowners, and public agencies. SFI and FSC have standards in place to promote practices with direct climate benefits and ensuring forests remain healthy. SFI and FSC have systems in place to promote responsible procurement when purchasing fiber from non-certified lands. We use both SFI Fiber Sourcing and FSC Chain of Custody programs to ensure that the wood we purchase originates from responsible sources. SFI Fiber Sourcing is designed to ensure that wood purchased from uncertified lands is legally and responsibly sourced and requires measures to promote reforestation, protect water quality, promote conservation of biodiversity, utilize trained logging professionals and foresters, and verify that the measures are effective.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

☑ Other environmental commitment, please specify :Zero Net Deforestation

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of biodiversity-related performance standards

☑ Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

☑ Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

PCH-Forest-Stewardship-Policy.pdf
[Add row]

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

(4.10.1) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

☑ Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member

☑ Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC)

☑ Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

(4.10.3) Describe your organization's role within each framework or initiative

We are SFI Forest Management and Fiber Sourcing certified and FSC Forest Management and Chain of custody Custody certified. Our third-party forest certification reflects the rigor of our environmental management system, which is based on an ongoing continual improvement process. We report our corporate responsibility performance informed by and referencing frameworks such as the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), and the Programme for the endorsement Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC).
[Fixed row]

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?

(4.11.1) External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

☑ Yes, we engaged indirectly through, and/or provided financial or in-kind support to a trade association or other intermediary organization or individual whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation

(4.11.2) Indicate whether your organization has a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

PotlatchDeltic - Corporate Responsibility - Public Policy and Advocacy.pdf

(4.11.5) Indicate whether your organization is registered on a transparency register

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply

☑ Mandatory government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

Idaho lobbyist reporting website (https://sunshine.voteidaho.gov), industry code "Natural Resources, Timber/Logging/Forest". U.S. House Lobbying Disclosure website (https://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/lookup.asp), House ID 393570000, Senate ID 318436-12.

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

PotlatchDeltic's business can be impacted by international and U.S. federal, state, and local public policy. Our Public Affairs team works with management to actively engage in the political process through public policy and legislative advocacy on issues that have the potential to impact our Company and the industries in which we operate. We regularly meet with national, state, and local elected officials and their staff. We often work together with industry associations or coalitions in these efforts to highlight issues of importance. Our involvement can range from writing letters in support of, or opposition to, proposed legislation, educating legislators and their staff on an issue, or participating in rulemaking regarding proposed regulatory changes. We are committed to conducting these activities in an accountable and transparent manner. Our Public Affairs team regularly reports internally to our Executive Management team on lobbying activities to ensure alignment with our mission and values, and pillars and goals. Material advocacy communications such as letters of support and participation in regulatory rulemaking are subject to internal legal review. When working with our trade associations and lobbying on related policy issues, we monitor and align our actions with the Paris Agreement. If

there are any misalignments between our views and the trade associations, they are handled through our Vice President of Public Affairs and Chief Sustainability Officer to ensure our actions remain aligned with the Paris Agreement and our environmental objectives.
[Fixed row]

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

USDA Farm Bill

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Other
☑ Other, please specify :1) Continuation of existing Wood Innovation Grant program; 2) Codification of direction to U.S. Forest Service Forest Inventory & Analysis program to include accounting of forest carbon; and 3) Codification at USFS for carbon tracking tool

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:
☑ National

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(4.11.1.6) Your organization’s position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Support with no exceptions

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Other, please specify **:Working within our industry associations on environmental and climate policies, advocacy strategies, and advocating for the issues with policy makers and regulators.**

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

0

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

We work with our associations to emphasize that natural climate solutions provide a significant opportunity to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and to develop markets for wood products and bioenergy through incentives. The Farm Bill policy recommendations also included: 1) Support use of forest and wood products data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), such as the Forest Inventory & Analysis program (FIA) to provide tools that calculate above and below-ground forest carbon stocks. 2) Develop an online platform to provide measurement, monitoring, verification, and reportion of data regarding carbon emissions, sequestration, storage, and related atmospheric impacts of forest management and wood products. 3) Continue to authorize funding for the existing USDA’s Wood Innovation Grant program (WIG) and reduce the funding match requirement to 50%. 4) Create a Wood Building Education Accelerator Grant program to promote development of curriculum that supports education of design and building with wood products in innovative way. 5) Create a Rural Infrastructure and Building pilot program to incentivize construction of public buildings in rural communities that utilize innovative wood products.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

[Add row]

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year.

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :National Alliance of Forest Owners

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) is a national advocacy organization committed to advancing federal policies that ensure working forests provide clean air, clean water, wildlife habitat and jobs through sustainable practices and strong markets. NAFO member companies own and manage more than 43 million acres of private working forests – forests that are managed to provide a steady supply of timber. NAFO's membership also includes state and national associations representing tens of millions of additional acres. Member companies, including PotlatchDeltic, work through task groups, committees, and the board on developing advocacy tools and responses to a range of issues including climate change, markets, wildlife, and working forests. Our position is consistent with the work undertaken by NAFO.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

228470

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

During 2024 we worked with NAFO to advance three core priorities: 1. Climate Change: Worked towards the development of a Forest & Wood Carbon Data Platform within the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). In addition, we advocated for carbon data-focused Farm Bill priorities, including modernizing the Forest Inventory &

Analysis program to provide foundational carbon data and securing long-term congressional support for the Data Platform. 2. Wildlife Conservation: The Wildlife Conservation Initiative (WCI) continues to open new doors with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and state wildlife agencies. NAFO finalized the first Working Forests for Wildlife agreement with the USFWS, a groundbreaking tool to provide vital information on listed species in exchange for take protection on certified lands. The first agreement covers three bat species. 3. Workforce: NAFO led the development of shared principles to align supply chain partners on strengthening logging and hauling capacity. The agreement provides NAFO members a template for company action and coordination with supply chain partners and helps to underpin programmatic federal policy.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :UN Sustainable Development Goal 15- Life on Land

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :American Wood Council

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

American Wood Council (AWC) is the nationally recognized technical authority and advocate for the sustainable wood building products industry in the codes, standards, legislative, regulatory, and climate policy arenas. AWC partners in the development of sound policies, codes, and regulations that allow for the appropriate and responsible manufacture and use of wood products in the built environment. AWC is a leader in developing engineering data, technology, and standards for wood products. They are committed to ensuring their safe and efficient application, and educating about wood design, green building policy, and resiliency. AWC maintains an active presence on behalf of industry interests and advocates for balanced policies that impact wood products. The emerging momentum for mass timber in tall buildings exemplifies how innovation in wood products and the work of AWC can provide opportunities to support climate change initiatives. Developers and architects are attracted to the ability to incorporate the sustainability and carbon capture benefits of mass timber, its advantages, and its aesthetic appeal in non-residential and multifamily buildings. Our position is consistent with the work undertaken by AWC.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

34136

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

During 2024, AWC worked to position U.S. wood products as a sustainable solution to address the environmental impact of the built environment. This included data driven efforts to demonstrate the low embodied carbon nature of wood products, releasing the industry's first regional environmental product declarations for softwood lumber and work in data collection, analysis, and transparency. AWC's codes and standards teams worked on a series of initiatives in the Group A International Code Council code cycle and actively represented the industry across a wide range of building standards. AWC continued to use research-proven data to demonstrate the resiliency and safety of wood construction, including recent rounds of WUI fire tests and shear wall testing. AWC also made new updates to the Heights and Areas Calculator that include a California-specific tab and the mass timber construction types. AWC continued to make significant progress in encouraging greater use of mass timber construction in the federal government.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :GHG Protocol and UN SDG 6- Clean Water and Sanitation

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Research organization

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

National Council on Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI)

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI) is an independent research organization organized to serve the forest products industry as a center of excellence providing unbiased, scientific research and technical information necessary to achieve the industry's environmental and sustainability goals. NCASI has approximately 80 U.S. member companies, which represent more than 90% of the paper and paperboard produced, nearly 70% of the wood panels produced, and more than half of institutional ownership of timberland acreage in the United States. Member companies, including PotlatchDeltic, vote on research opportunities or initiatives that are valuable to the industry. We utilize the research done by NCASI directly for operations strategy and environmental reporting and may leverage it through our industry associations for advocacy.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

104830

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

Research undertaken by NCASI can include topics such as emissions management, sustainable forestry, third-party certification, forest environmental management, value chain impacts of activities, water quality, forest watersheds, climate change impacts on forests, and nature and mitigation strategies. Funding supports the development of a wide range of materials including publications, presentations, handbooks, fact sheets, and tools and calculators. These are utilized by us directly and with other sector industry associations for environmental and other reporting and as tools to guide environmental policy, regulations, and education.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :UN Sustainable Development Goal 15 - Life on Land

Row 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :International Sustainable Forestry Coalition

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The International Sustainable Forestry Coalition (ISFC) brings together many of the world's leading forestry companies to work collectively to help solve some of the globe's greatest environmental challenges. ISFC's mission is to see forests and forestry become central to the global transition to a sustainable and growing circular bioeconomy. Two principal objectives guide the policy work of the ISFC: 1. Accelerate the transition to a nature positive circular bioeconomy where timber, wood fiber and biomass play an increased role in society. This requires a clear narrative around how we can sustainably increase feedstock supply, as well as increasing demand, and supporting the innovation needed to ultimately replace a significant proportion of petrochemical based materials, high embodied energy materials and non-decomposing materials in society. 2. Create a holistic natural capital asset class where the forestry sector continues to manage for sustainable renewable materials, but also for climate solutions, nature positive outcomes, freshwater regulation and other societal benefits on a commercial basis, increasing and diversifying revenues and asset values and attracting substantial new capital investment to the sector. PotlatchDeltic aligns with these objectives and ISFC's view that sustainable forest management is integral for climate, nature, social justice, and bio-circular economy transitions.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

41666

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

During 2024, ISFC completed an international survey on nature measures to identify the frameworks used by ISFC companies to report on climate, nature, and biodiversity. The analysis provided a foundation for an ISFC project to develop a framework for the global sector to report on natural capital consistently using the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures. ISFC also began the research to implement a project to develop consistent approaches to natural capital reporting in a standardized and uniform way. Educational outreach regarding the role of sustainably managed forests and natural capital in climate change initiatives were held at New York Climate Week, London Climate Week, Conferences of the Parties (Climate and Biodiversity Conferences of the Parties) and conferences.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :UN Sustainable Development Goal 15 - Life on Land

[Add row]

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization’s response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

☑ Other, please specify :SASB and UN SDGs

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Commodity volumes
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Public policy engagement
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Water pollution indicators

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Pages 3-29 All information can also be found on our Corporate Responsibility Website: https://www.potlatchdeltic.com/corporate-responsibility#rowThree

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

PCH_CR_Report_2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

All information can also be found on our Corporate Responsibility Website: https://www.potlatchdeltic.com/corporate-responsibility#rowThree
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization’s scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios
☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for four RCP scenarios. The RCP 2.6 pathway assumes rapid reductions in emissions with broad global participation and would result in about 1.5C to 2C of warming by 2100 relative to pre-industrial levels. Warming occurs by decade 2040-2049 and no additional warming occurs through 2100. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

☑ 2090

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) GHG emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. Following TCFD guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. RCP 8.5 was included as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario. We used the NCASI Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for the four RCP scenarios. The RCP 2.6 pathway assumes rapid reductions in emissions with broad global participation and would result in about 1.5°C to 2°C of warming by 2100 relative to pre-industrial levels. Warming occurs by decade 2040-2049 and no additional warming occurs through 2100. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following TCFD guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 8.5 as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario since the probability of this scenario is broadly considered implausible given the global climate policies and reduction initiatives already implemented.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2070
☑ 2080
☑ 2090
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. RCP 8.5 was included as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for the four RCP scenarios. The RCP 2.6 pathway assumes rapid reductions in emissions with broad global participation and would result in about 1.5C to 2C of warming by 2100 relative to pre-industrial levels. Warming occurs by decade 2040-2049 and no additional warming occurs through 2100. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 8.5 as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario since the probability of this scenario is broadly considered implausible given the global climate policies and reduction initiatives already implemented.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2070
☑ 2080
☑ 2090
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for four RCP scenarios. RCP 4.5 assumes emissions peak around 2080 and then remain level through 2100 with global temperature projected to rise 2.5C to 3C by 2100 relative to preindustrial levels. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 6.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2070
☑ 2080
☑ 2090
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for four RCP scenarios. RCP 6.0 stabilizes warming by 2100 by reducing GHG emissions and applying new technologies and would result in about 3C to 3.5C of warming by 2100 relative to pre-industrial levels with the higher warming occurring from 2060 to 2100. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2070

☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2080
☑ 2090
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for our RCP scenarios. RCP 8.5 assumes little effort to reduce emissions resulting in a failure to curb radiative forcing by 2100 and would result in about 5C rise in global temperature by 2100 relative to pre-industrial temperatures. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

☑ 2090

☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) GHG greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. RCP 8.5 was included as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario. We used the NCASI National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for the four RCP scenarios. RCP 4.5 assumes emissions peak around 2080 and then remain level through 2100 with global temperature projected to rise 2.5C to 3C by 2100 relative to preindustrial levels. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 6.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

☑ 2090

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. RCP 8.5 was included as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for the four RCP scenarios. RCP 6.0 stabilizes warming by 2100 by reducing GHG emissions and applying new technologies and would result in about 3C to 3.5C of warming by 2100 relative to pre-industrial levels with the higher warming occurring from 2060 to 2100. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

☑ 2090

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the

resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. RCP 8.5 was included as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for the four RCP scenarios. RCP 8.5 assumes little effort to reduce emissions resulting in a failure to curb radiative forcing by 2100 and would result in about 5C rise in global temperature by 2100 relative to pre-industrial temperatures. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential climate change impacts on our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

☑ 2090

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes

spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for four RCP scenarios. RCP 4.5 assumes emissions peak around 2080 and then remain level through 2100 with global temperature projected to rise 2.5C to 3C by 2100 relative to preindustrial levels. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. In addition, we address the general biological response for timberlands arising from higher CO2 levels in the atmosphere. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential water impacts in our forests and incorporate them into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 6.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2070
☑ 2080
☑ 2090
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Consumer attention to impact
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling

the resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for four RCP scenarios. RCP 6.0 stabilizes warming by 2100 by reducing GHG emissions and applying new technologies and would result in about 3C to 3.5C of warming by 2100 relative to pre-industrial levels with the higher warming occurring from 2060 to 2100. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential water impacts in our forests and incorporate this into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050
☑ 2060
☑ 2070
☑ 2080
☑ 2090
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Consumer attention to impact
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario analysis is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a pre-scribed pathway for anthropogenic (human caused) greenhouse gas emissions and land use change and serves as the basis for modeling the

resulting atmospheric CO2 equivalent concentration. Concentrations project the resulting radiative forcing or additional warming that could occur in the lower atmosphere under a given emission pathway. We used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) which utilizes spatially downscaled climate model projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-5) dataset for the period 2000-2099 for our RCP scenarios. RCP 8.5 assumes little effort to reduce emissions resulting in a failure to curb radiative forcing by 2100 and would result in about 5C rise in global temperature by 2100 relative to pre-industrial temperatures. The model projections include temperature and precipitation impacts to 2100 for our identified regions and enable the evaluation of climate boundaries for our primary tree species in each region. We utilize the results of the scenario analyses to evaluate potential water impacts in our forests and incorporate this into our long-term and short-term forest management planning and research.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures guidance, we evaluated four RCPs or sets of potential future scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. We included RCP 2.6, or the 1.6-1.9C scenario, as a baseline scenario. We recognize that global emissions are not currently on track to meet these targets.
[Add row]

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply
☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
☑ Strategy and financial planning
☑ Resilience of business model and strategy
☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

Higher atmospheric CO2 concentration and atmospheric nitrogen deposition can lead to multiple effects from CO2 enrichment resulting in productivity gains for timberlands. In response to elevated CO2, trees use water more efficiently, which increases growth efficiency and reduces water loss. In northern Idaho, the Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) climate boundary analysis for Douglas-fir illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under all Representative Concentration (RCP) scenarios through 2100. In addition, the current range of Douglas-fir in the US extends into Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico suggesting that it can survive in conditions found at latitudes well south of Idaho. The analysis for Douglas-fir productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under various RCP scenarios in 2090-2099 illustrated that conditions remain favorable for Douglas-fir and loss of productivity is not projected. In the Gulf South, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for loblolly pine illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 through 2100. The unlikely RCP 8.5 scenario is inconclusive as no loblolly pine currently exists in those conditions. If there is a greater risk for the species to be out of boundary, we would note this timeframe is three rotations of loblolly pine and breeding for climate-adapted characteristics could likely offset climate impacts. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under various RCP scenarios in 2090-2099 illustrated that RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, and RCP 6.0 suggest no significant change in productivity. The unlikely RCP 8.5 scenario is inconclusive as no loblolly currently exists in those conditions. In the Southeast, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for loblolly pine forecasted that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under all RCP scenarios through 2100. Its climate requirements include humid and hot summers along with a mild winter. Seasonal fluctuations in weather patterns that include the projected warmer winters, modest precipitation increases, and hot, humid summers may prove favorable for many decades under all RCP. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation suggested that the species will remain within its historic range for all RCP through 2100. There is little to no change in projected site productivity in this part of the species' range. In the Lake States procurement region, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for red pine illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be well-suited for its growth under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 through 2100. Precipitation amounts are lower in the western portion of the Bemidji log sourcing area and when coupled with the rising temperature projected under RCP 8.5 red pine's productivity could decrease and conditions for its growth and survival may become unsuitable. The analysis for red pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 in 2090- 2099 projected favorable productivity for red pine. Conditions in the eastern portion of the region closer to Gwinn are most favorable. RCP 8.5 places red pine at the periphery of its range beginning in 2060 and warmer conditions without increases in precipitation may cause decreases in productivity and eventually eliminate its ability to survive. The presence of the Great Lakes are confounding factors in downscaled climate projections. Climate change can present risks to our forests and the ecosystems they are part of. Risks can include severe weather events, changes in insect and disease exposure and response, and increased risk of wildfire. Our forests are managed utilizing climate smart practices that seek to adapt to both climate change risks and opportunities and mitigate risks. These forest management responses include adaptive forest management, increased forest and fire resilience, improved carbon removals and storage, biodiversity conservation, and stream protection. Internal and external research on forest genetics, site classification, and silviculture support development of climate smart forest practices.

Forests

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

Higher atmospheric CO2 concentration and atmospheric nitrogen deposition can lead to multiple effects from CO2 enrichment resulting in productivity gains for timberlands. In response to elevated CO2, trees use water more efficiently, which increases growth efficiency and reduces water loss. In northern Idaho, the Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) climate boundary analysis for Douglas fir illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under all Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) scenarios through 2100. In addition, the current range of Douglas-fir in the U.S. extends into Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico suggesting that it can survive in conditions found at latitudes well south of Idaho. The analysis for Douglas-fir productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under various RCP scenarios in 2090-2099 illustrated that conditions remain favorable for Douglas-fir and loss of productivity is not projected. In the Gulf South, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for loblolly pine illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 through 2100. The unlikely RCP 8.5 scenario is inconclusive as no loblolly pine currently exists in those conditions. If there is a greater risk for the species to be out of boundary, we would note this timeframe is three rotations of loblolly pine and breeding for climate-adapted characteristics could likely offset climate impacts. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under various RCP scenarios in 2090-2099 illustrated that RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, and RCP 6.0 suggest no significant change in productivity. The unlikely RCP 8.5 scenario is inconclusive as no loblolly currently exists in those conditions. In the Southeast, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for loblolly pine forecasted that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under all RCP scenarios through 2100. Its climate requirements include humid and hot summers along with a mild winter. Seasonal fluctuations in weather patterns that include the projected warmer winters, modest precipitation increases, and hot, humid summers may prove favorable for many decades under all RCP. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation suggested that the species will remain within its historic range for all RCP through 2100. There is little to no change in projected site productivity in this part of the species' range. In the Lake States procurement region, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for red pine illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be well-suited for its growth under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 through 2100. Precipitation amounts are lower in the western portion of the Bemidji log sourcing area and when coupled with the rising temperature projected under RCP 8.5 red pine's productivity could decrease and conditions for its growth and survival may become unsuitable. The analysis for red pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 in 2090-2099 projected favorable productivity for red pine. Conditions in the eastern portion of the region closer to Gwinn are most favorable. RCP 8.5 places red pine at the periphery of its range beginning in 2060 and warmer conditions without increases in precipitation may cause decreases in productivity and eventually eliminate its ability to survive. The presence of the Great Lakes are confounding factors in downscaled climate projections. Climate change can present risks to our forests and the ecosystems they are part of. Risks can include severe weather events, changes in insect and disease exposure and response, and increased risk of wildfire. Our forests are managed utilizing climate smart practices that seek to adapt to both climate change risks and opportunities and mitigate risks. These forest management responses include adaptive forest management, increased forest and fire resilience, improved carbon removals and storage, biodiversity conservation, and stream protection. Internal and external research on forest genetics, site classification, and silviculture support development of climate smart forest practices.

Water

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

Higher atmospheric CO2 concentration and atmospheric nitrogen deposition can lead to multiple effects from CO2 enrichment resulting in productivity gains for timberlands. In response to elevated CO2, trees use water more efficiently, which increases growth efficiency and reduces water loss. In northern Idaho, the Climate Projection Analysis Tool (CPAT) climate boundary analysis for Douglas fir illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under all Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) scenarios through 2100. In addition, the current range of Douglas-fir in the US extends into Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico suggesting that it can survive in conditions found at latitudes well south of Idaho. The analysis for Douglas-fir productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under various RCP scenarios in 2090-2099 illustrated that conditions remain favorable for Douglas-fir and loss of productivity is not projected. In the Gulf South, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for loblolly pine illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 through 2100. The unlikely RCP 8.5 scenario is inconclusive as no loblolly pine currently exists in those conditions. If there is a greater risk for the species to be out of boundary, we would note this timeframe is three rotations of loblolly pine and breeding for climate-adapted characteristics could likely offset climate impacts. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under various RCP scenarios in 2090-2099 illustrated that RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, and RCP 6.0 suggest no significant change in productivity. The unlikely RCP 8.5 scenario is inconclusive as no loblolly currently exists in those conditions. In the Southeast, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for loblolly pine forecasted that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be suitable for its growth under all RCP scenarios through 2100. Its climate requirements include humid and hot summers along with a mild winter. Seasonal fluctuations in weather patterns that include the projected warmer winters, modest precipitation increases, and hot, humid summers may prove favorable for many decades under all RCP. The analysis for loblolly pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation suggested that the species will remain within its historic range for all RCP through 2100. There is little to no change in projected site productivity in this part of the species' range. In the Lake States procurement region, the CPAT climate boundary analysis for red pine illustrated that the projected range of temperature and precipitation will be well-suited for its growth under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 through 2100. Precipitation amounts are lower in the western portion of the Bemidji log sourcing area and when coupled with the rising temperature projected under RCP 8.5 red pine's productivity could decrease and conditions for its growth and survival may become unsuitable. The analysis for red pine productivity arising from a combination of temperature and precipitation under RCP scenarios 2.6, 4.5, and 6.0 in 2090-2099 projected favorable productivity for red pine. Conditions in the eastern portion of the region closer to Gwinn are most favorable. RCP 8.5 places red pine at the periphery of its range beginning in 2060 and warmer conditions without increases in precipitation may cause decreases in

productivity and eventually eliminate its ability to survive. The presence of the Great Lakes are confounding factors in downscaled climate projections. As climate projection models improve our ability to assess productivity and suitability for survival will increase. Climate change can present risks to our forests and the ecosystems they are part of. Risks can include severe weather events, changes in insect and disease exposure and response, and increased risk of wildfire. Our forests are managed utilizing climate smart practices that seek to adapt to both climate change risks and opportunities and mitigate risks. These forest management responses include adaptive forest management, increased forest and fire resilience, improved carbon removals and storage, biodiversity conservation, and stream protection. Internal and external research on forest genetics, site classification, and silviculture support development of climate smart forest practices.
[Fixed row]

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Currently, timber harvesting and hauling and the mobile equipment utilized at our wood products facilities relies on the operation of fossil-fueled heavy equipment. There are in most instances no workable alternatives available for timber harvesting and hauling that would meet the requirements for temperature, load, and remote locations in which we operate. We are working towards shifting the mobile equipment in our wood products facilities to non-fossil fuel sources in our net-zero roadmap as technological capability improves and costs make the switch feasible.

(5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

We have established a number of climate and environmental goals under our four pillars: forests, planet, people, performance. We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target and have committed to a goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. We have published our net-zero roadmap which outlines the commitment and timing for Scope 1 and 2 emissions. We commit to reporting annually on the progress towards the goals within our four pillars, including our GHG emissions and progress towards our GHG reduction targets. The net-zero roadmap and our other climate transition goals are approved by our senior management and the Board of Directors.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ Annually

(5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions of 42% from a 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with non-FLAG (Forests, Land and Agriculture) Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5C compared to preindustrial levels. FLAG removals guidance has not been finalized; however, we estimate that over 99% of our Scope 1 & Scope 2 emissions are non-FLAG. Reduction plans include the elimination of woody residuals storage, a shift to electric forklifts where practical, and use of renewable energy credits. Target coverage covers Scope 1 and Scope 2 non-FLAG emissions, and we are not seeking any exclusions at this time.

(5.2.11) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

Our Target for reducing Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by 42% will be achieved by making our own internal energy choices and by progress made by utility providers to increase the amount of renewable energy used in our purchased electricity. We are currently working with utility companies on energy reduction projects that can help us achieve our target. Our emissions reduction strategy integrates greenhouse gas considerations into capital planning and prioritizes the use of carbon-neutral biomass energy when possible. We continue to implement energy saving projects, such as the use of electric forklifts, and aim to continue to seek out additional projects that will allow us to replace fossil fuel consumption.

(5.2.12) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

PCH_CR_Report_2024_GHG Reduction Initiatives.pdf

(5.2.13) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(5.2.14) Explain how the other environmental issues are considered in your climate transition plan

As a timberlands and wood products company forests are an integral part of our business. We are committed to managing forests sustainably in a way that also protects water quality and quantity as well as biodiversity. We consider forests, water, and biodiversity issues in our climate transition plans because adverse effects to any of them could have detrimental impacts to our business.
[Fixed row]

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?

(5.3.1) Environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy and/or financial planning

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

(5.3.2) Business areas where environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Associated risks with climate change, such as catastrophic storms, increased temperatures, variable precipitation, and wildfire are considered when developing and carrying out planning and management activities for our wood products and timberlands business. We are taking action and working with other organizations to increase the recognition of wood products as a climate solution strategy and to increase the demand for wood products. The growing popularity of mass timber as a building product for use in tall buildings exemplifies how innovation in wood products can provide opportunities. Developers and architects are attracted to the ability to incorporate the sustainability and carbon capture benefits of mass timber, its advantages, and its aesthetic appeal in non-residential and multifamily buildings. Markets utilizing biomass sourced from sustainably managed forests could expand as new bio-based products emerge ranging from bioplastics to biofuel. These could expand market demand for fiber and for residual wood fiber remaining from wood product manufacturing, a portion of which otherwise could go to waste.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Our enterprise risk management analysis and our greenhouse gas Scope 3 emission analysis focus on our supply chain and helped inform of us of categories of high emissions of which we may not have been previously aware. The results of this analysis have helped us identify areas of high emissions and look at ways to reduce emissions within our supply chain. We participate in third-party sustainability certifications for our forests to protect biodiversity and water quality. Leveraging decades of management experience and working closely with scientific research organizations, we manage our timberlands while considering how climate change could create potential risks and opportunities. We are a leader in forest stewardship and sustainability and our timberlands are working forests where we take appropriate measures to protect biological diversity, water quality, and other ecosystem values. We recognize that some areas need to be conserved and species at risk need to be protected on the lands that we manage. Our timberlands provide unique environmental, cultural, historical and recreational value. We manage timberlands following regulatory requirements and with best management practices that protect water quality and biodiversity. We use a comprehensive timberland environmental management system (EMS) that focuses on continual improvement with rigorous third-party auditing and certification of our practices under SFI® forest management standard or FSC® forest management standard.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Climate related risks and opportunities are considered in the planning of capital projects that impact our operations. Our wood products division considers opportunities for: decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing energy consumption, and increased utilization of biomass as an energy source. Our timberlands division considers climate-related risks and opportunities when it comes to growth rates, silviculture practices, and tree genetics.
[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply
☑ Revenues
☑ Direct costs
☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

We use an enterprise risk management framework to identify, assess and mitigate significant risks facing the company, including risks related to a range of corporate responsibility topics. Our long-term financial plans are influenced by our forest management plans and how wood flows can affect our wood products business. We create long-term management plans to optimize harvests for each of our timber stands for a 50 year time horizon. The harvest model we use checks every possible stand activity and combination over the planning horizon and produces a detailed stand-by-stand harvest schedule that maximizes net present value based on starting stand structure, yields, product prices, management choices, and harvest constraints. We evaluate climate risks and opportunities and the impacts that they can have on our business as an additional revenue source and also additional costs. We are exploring new markets that could have an impact on our revenues such as leasing our timberland for solar development, carbon offset markets, emerging technology such as biofuels and bioplastics, and the demand for mass timber. We also evaluate the risks associated with climate change that can impact our business from the timberlands and wood products perspectives, especially costs related to land management activities and seedling genetics, and costs associated with decreasing greenhouse gas emissions and reducing energy consumption. We incorporate climate risks and opportunities into our capital projects to further our goal to become a more sustainable business and to ensure we abide by current and future climate related policies.
[Add row]

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :2024 Annual Report on Form 10-K provides financial data on our timberlands segment. Our forest management and certification is aligned with climate smart forestry initiatives.

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ CAPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

24795000

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

24

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

24

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

24

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

The CAPEX allocated annually to our timberlands segment for sustainable timberland management practices, including climate smart forestry, supports our climate transition. Climate smart forestry practices are encompassed in the objectives of our Sustainable Forestry Initiative® and Forest Stewardship Council® practices, goals, and certification.
[Add row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.2) Anticipated forward trend for CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.3) Water-related OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.4) Anticipated forward trend for OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

PotlatchDeltic does not currently calculate CAPEX or OPEX for water-related items.
[Fixed row]

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Carbon

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon.

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive low-carbon investment

☑ Conduct cost-benefit analysis

☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

☑ Setting and/or achieving of climate-related policies and targets

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

☑ Other, please specify **:Evaluate voluntary and compliance carbon market opportunities to increase carbon storage on our land base.**

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme

☑ Cost of required measures to achieve climate-related targets

☑ Price with substantive impact on business decisions

☑ Price/cost of voluntary carbon offset credits

☑ Scenario analysis

(5.10.1.4) Calculation methodology and assumptions made in determining the price

We track the price of carbon in the voluntary market using several carbon credit reporting services. This data is used to determine an estimated price for carbon credits in the voluntary and compliance markets.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2
☑ Scope 3, Category 1 - Purchased goods and services
Scope 1 or 2)
☑ Scope 3, Category 10 - Processing of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 12 - End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 4 - Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 9 - Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 3 - Fuel- and energy-related activities (not included in

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:
☑ Differentiated

(5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

Pricing is differentiated by the objective: voluntary, compliance and target setting.

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:
☑ Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

We expect carbon prices to increase over time. Significant commitments to net-zero or to reducing greenhouse gas emissions have been made, yet available abatement technologies and investments are lagging. At the same time, substantial work has been done to increase confidence in the carbon markets. As a result, we expect the demand for carbon offsets will grow. With supply of high quality credits being limited, the price of offsets should increase. In addition, residual emissions will need to be offset to reach reduction targets.

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

12

(5.10.1.11) Maximum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

100

(5.10.1.12) Business decision-making processes the internal price is applied to

Select all that apply

☑ Operations

☑ Opportunity management

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Other, please specify :Target setting analysis.

(5.10.1.13) Internal price is mandatory within business decision-making processes

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify :Mandatory for carbon offset projects.

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

100

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

Our methodology uses a range of carbon pricing from $12 to $100/ ton CO2e. Using a range, we evaluate strategic options for carbon offsets we could produce from our timberlands. We also use carbon pricing assumptions to determine strategic options for investments required to meet our net-zero commitments. We monitor the value of high-quality credits in the voluntary market and compliance markets to make operational decisions.
[Add row]

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Forests ☑ Water
Smallholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply*
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Forests
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water

[Fixed row]

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?

Forests

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

All of the contractors in our timberland operations can have a substantive impact on the environment. Contractors and suppliers working in our timberlands must be on our approved contractor list and our foresters track their environmental performance. To continue working with us, timberland contractors and suppliers must complete our current sustainable forest guideline training and follow all local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Contractors and subcontractors are audited annually.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

468

Water

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Contractors in our timberland operations can have a substantive impact on water quality. Contractors working in our timberlands must follow best management practices that include protecting water quality. Timberland contractors must be on our approved contractor list, complete our current sustainable forest guideline training and follow all local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Contractors and suppliers are audited annually and monitored by foresters.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

468
[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to forests

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Other, please specify :Third-party certification

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Healthy sustainable timberlands play a vital role in our business and in the quality of life for the communities in which we operate. We require all of our contractors/suppliers in our timberlands to follow and implement all applicable forestry regulations and best management practices and to comply with all federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations. These contractors and suppliers must be on our approved contractor list and our foresters track their environmental performance. Before working on our land, contractors must meet strict training and certification requirements. We have developed a multi-step vetting process to ensure that every contractor is well-prepared for sustainable operations. This process begins with state-recognized logger training programs, followed by company-led environmental and safety sessions and annual refresher courses. Contractors participate in ongoing education tailored to the specific challenges of the landscapes they operate in and must demonstrate adherence to best management practices for water quality, wildlife conservation and soil protection. Regular site inspections reinforce these standards, ensuring that every contractor remains aligned with the company's commitment to sustainability. Internal and third-party audits are conducted and any non-compliance issues by contractors/suppliers are required to be remediated. Ongoing non-compliance can lead to removal from the approved contractor list.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to water

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Other, please specify :Third-party certification

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Healthy sustainable timberlands play a vital role in our business and in the quality of life for the communities in which we operate. We require all of our contractors/suppliers in our timberlands to follow and implement all applicable forestry regulations and best management practices and to comply with all federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations. These contractors and suppliers must be on our approved contractor list and our foresters track their environmental performance. Before working on our land, contractors must meet strict training and certification requirements. PotlatchDeltic has developed a multi-step vetting process to ensure that every contractor is well-prepared for sustainable operations. This process begins with state-recognized logger training programs, followed by company-led environmental and safety sessions and annual refresher courses. Contractors participate in ongoing education tailored to the specific challenges of the landscapes they operate in and must demonstrate adherence to best management practices for water quality, wildlife conservation and soil protection. Regular site inspections reinforce these standards, ensuring that every contractor remains aligned with the company's commitment to sustainability. Internal and third-party audits are conducted and any non-compliance issues by contractors/suppliers are required to be remediated. Ongoing non-compliance can lead to removal from the approved contractor list.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

Forests

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

All of our suppliers and contractors are required to comply with our internal practices and meet all applicable environmental rules, regulations and laws. We are third-party certified to standards including the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI). These certifications are based on criteria that include forest management planning, prompt reforestation, protection of water quality and quantity, wildlife habitat management, protection of species at risk, efficient use of fiber resources, Indigenous peoples' rights, climate-smart forestry, fire resilience, forest research, forest education, and community outreach. Suppliers and contractors working in our timberlands must be on our approved contractor list, be trained annually, and our foresters track their environmental performance. The raw materials for lumber and plywood include logs from our own company lands, logs from other external sources. No matter where these logs originate, we commit that they are sourced in a manner that protects the values these forests provide. For example, all seven of our wood products manufacturing facilities are certified to the SFI standard. This standard is designed to extend the positive reach of sustainable forestry information and practices to landowners on such topics as forest regeneration, forestry best management practices for water quality, wildlife and biodiversity, use of professional logging contractors, and avoiding controversial sources.

Water

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

All of our suppliers and contractors are required to comply with our internal practices and meet all applicable environmental rules, regulations and laws. We are third-party certified to standards including the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI). These certifications are based on criteria that include forest management planning, prompt reforestation, protection of water quality and quantity, wildlife habitat management, protection of species at risk, efficient use of fiber resources, Indigenous peoples' rights, climate-smart forestry, fire resilience, forest research, forest education, and community outreach. Suppliers and contractors working in our timberlands must be on our approved contractor list, be trained annually, and our foresters track their environmental performance. The raw materials for lumber and plywood include logs from our own company lands, logs from other external sources. No matter where these logs originate, we commit that they are sourced in a manner that protects the values these forests provide. For example, all seven of our wood products manufacturing facilities are certified to the SFI standard. This standard is designed to extend the positive reach of sustainable forestry information and practices to landowners on such topics as forest regeneration, forestry best management practices for water quality, wildlife and biodiversity, use of professional logging contractors, and avoiding controversial sources.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC) requirements for our timberland contractors/suppliers.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Certification
☑ Fines and penalties
☑ First-party verification
☑ On-site third-party audit
☑ Geospatial monitoring tool
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating
☑ Ground-based monitoring system
☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct (Supplier Code) and Human Rights Policy outline the expectations we have of our suppliers and contractors. As part of our standard contract terms, key contractors are required to comply with our best management practices and federal and state laws. Contractors are provided with our Supplier Code and asked to verify that they have read and comply with its requirements. Contractors and subcontractors working in our timberlands must be on our approved contractor list and our foresters track their performance. Where improvements need to be made, we work with them on continual improvement practices. They are trained annually on a wide range of measures including forestry best management practices, threatened and endangered species, and safety policies. To continue working with us, timberland contractors and suppliers must demonstrate good safety records, have current training, and maintain all required insurance. As a part of our SFI certifications and FSC certifications we ensure that all contractors are trained and knowledgeable of the standards.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) requirements for our timberland contractors/suppliers.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification
☑ First-party verification
☑ On-site third-party audit
☑ Geospatial monitoring tool
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating
☑ Ground-based monitoring system
☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct (Supplier Code) and Human Rights Policy outline the expectations we have of our suppliers and contractors. As part of our standard contract terms, key contractors are required to comply with our best management practices and federal and state laws. Contractors are provided with our Supplier Code and asked to verify that they have read and comply with its requirements. Contractors and subcontractors working in our timberlands must be on our approved contractor list and our foresters track their performance. Where improvements need to be made, we work with them on continual improvement practices. They are trained annually on a wide range of measures including forestry best management practices, threatened and endangered species, and safety policies. To continue working with us, timberland contractors and suppliers must demonstrate good safety records, have current training, and maintain all required insurance. As a part of our SFI certifications and FSC certifications we ensure that all contractors are trained and knowledgeable of the standards.
[Add row]

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable forest management with protection of water quality and conservation of wildlife habitat.

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building
☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact
☑ Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones
☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

We engage with our timberlands contractors to ensure they understand the requirements of our forest management best management practices and federal and state environmental laws. This engagement includes annual environmental management system training focused on measures to follow forest management plans, protect soil quality, conserve wildlife habitat and protect streams and rivers. We also require that contractors maintain the continuing education requirements that each SFI State Implementation Committee requires for maintaining Pro Logger training. We maintain an open dialogue with contractors, respond to questions and provide detailed information on questions of compliance and improving implementation and effectiveness of best management practices. Foresters monitor activities on an ongoing basis while harvests or other activities are active to ensure compliance, and compliance is further supported by annual internal and external audits. Areas of non-compliance or where improvements can be made are addressed immediately with contractors. The logging companies that work in our timberlands are often run by individuals with decades of experience working in forests, with significant investment in equipment to handle different types of terrain, weather and a range of log sizes. These crews have expertise in understanding harvest prescriptions and best management practices, including protecting streamside management zones and water crossings, and minimizing soil disturbance.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Third-Party Certification and meeting our best management practices and federal and state environmental laws.

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable forest management and protection of water quality and wildlife habitat.

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to make credible renewable energy usage claims

☑ Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones

☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

We engage with our timberlands contractors to ensure they understand the requirements of our forest management best management practices and federal and state environmental laws. This engagement includes annual environmental management system training focused on measures to follow forest management plans, protect soil quality, conserve wildlife habitat and protect streams and rivers. We also require that contractors maintain the continuing education requirements that each SFI State Implementation Committee requires for maintaining Pro Logger training. We maintain an open dialogue with contractors, respond to questions and provide detailed information on questions of compliance and improving implementation and effectiveness of best management practices. Foresters monitor activities on an ongoing basis while harvests or other activities are active to ensure compliance, and compliance is further supported by annual internal and external audits. Areas of non-compliance or where improvements can be made are addressed immediately with contractors. The logging companies that work in our timberlands are often run by individuals with decades of experience working in forests, with significant investment in equipment to handle different types of terrain, weather and a range of log sizes. These crews have expertise in understanding harvest prescriptions and best management practices, including protecting streamside management zones and water crossings, and minimizing soil disturbance.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Third-party Certification and meeting best management practices and federal and state environmental laws.

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building
☑ Develop or distribute upstream value chain mapping tool
☑ Support smallholders to adhere to regenerative agriculture principles
☑ Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

1106

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our Procurement foresters and contractors work directly with small landowners and we are active supporters of SFI State Implementation Committees that emphasize and work collaboratively to provide resources to landowners. Our work with SFI State Implementation Committees includes developing and disseminating educational materials to help landowners successfully reforest, protect water quality and conserve wildlife habitat. Providing education and assistance to small landowners is important because they are an important and vital source for our wood supply. The committees also fund logger training and ensure that continuing education is relevant and available to contractors. Our procurement foresters work directly with landowners throughout the harvest cycle, including purchase of timber, execution of harvests, best management practice use, and assistance with reforestation.
[Add row]

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

☑ Other education/information sharing, please specify :Share information about our corporate responsibility and climate initiatives including our net zero targets.

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

☑ Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

We regularly engage with a broad range of stakeholders including investors and analysts. This helps us to understand, prioritize, and manage our impacts as an organization and our opportunities towards systemic change. Meaningful stakeholder engagement is also a critical part of our corporate responsibility strategy, promoting increased knowledge and awareness of corporate responsibility issues, inviting feedback on insights and trends, and nurturing trust and collaboration. Investors and analysts are interested in climate-related issues including our carbon record, our climate risks and opportunities, and our greenhouse gas initiatives and targets. We distribute information about our climate change-related goals through our financial reporting, corporate website, Corporate Responsibility Report, social

media, and through public third-party questionnaires. We also engage directly with several investors through 1-1 meetings, conference calls, and presentations and through our materiality assessment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our stakeholder engagement accomplishes three principal objectives: 1) to share information; 2) to promote meaningful dialogue; and 3) to build and maintain sustainable relationships. During 2024, we published climate-related information and analysis on our website, in our 2024 Corporate Responsibility Report, in our financial reporting, in third-party questionnaires, and on social media. This information included the carbon stored in our forests, our carbon accounting record, our Scope 1, Scope 2 and Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, and our net-zero target. It also included our analysis of climate-related risks and opportunities. This information was available to all of our investors and analysts. We also seek meaningful dialogue with stakeholders, listening to their concerns and opinions, to continuously improve our business and our communications. During 2024, members of executive management met with shareholders owning approximately 60% of outstanding active institutional ownership. These engagements included in-person meetings and video and telephone conference calls covering a wide range of topics including corporate responsibility and climate change-related matters.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

We regularly engage with a broad range of stakeholders including investors and analysts. This helps us to understand, prioritize, and manage our impacts as an organization and our opportunities towards systemic change. Meaningful stakeholder engagement is also a critical part of our corporate responsibility strategy, promoting increased knowledge and awareness of corporate responsibility issues, inviting feedback on insights and trends, and nurturing trust and collaboration. Investors and analysts are interested in forest-related issues including our forest management planning and practices, our protection of water quality, our conservation of biodiversity and our third-party certification of our timberlands. We distribute information about our forest-related initiatives through our financial reporting, corporate website, Corporate Responsibility Report, social media, and through public third-party questionnaires. We also engage directly with several investors through 1-1 meetings, conference calls, and presentations and through our materiality assessment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our stakeholder engagement accomplishes three principal objectives: 1) to share information; 2) to promote meaningful dialogue; and 3) to build and maintain sustainable relationships. During 2024, we published information on our approach to sustainable forest management and our best management practices on our website, in our 2024 Corporate Responsibility Report, in our financial reporting, in third-party questionnaires, and on social media. This information included our long-term strategic harvest scheduling, our use of best management practices to protect water quality and conserve wildlife, our commitment to conservation, our approach to responsible sourcing and working with contractors in our forests, and our internal and external audit processes. In addition, the results of our third-party forest audits under the SFI standard and Forest Stewardship Council are on our website. This information was available to all of our investors and analysts. We also seek meaningful dialogue with stakeholders, listening to their concerns and opinions, to continuously improve our business and our communications. During 2024, members of executive management met with shareholders owning approximately 60% of outstanding active institutional ownership. These engagements included in-person meetings and video and telephone conference calls covering a wide range of topics including corporate responsibility and forest-related matters.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

We regularly engage with a broad range of stakeholders including investors and analysts. This helps us to understand, prioritize, and manage our impacts as an organization and our opportunities towards systemic change. Meaningful stakeholder engagement is also a critical part of our corporate responsibility strategy, promoting increased knowledge and awareness of corporate responsibility issues, inviting feedback on insights and trends, and nurturing trust and collaboration. Investors and analysts are interested in water-related issues including our use of best management practices and streamside management zones and our third-party certification of our timberlands. We distribute information about our water-related initiatives through our financial reporting, corporate website, Corporate Responsibility Report, social media, and through public third-party questionnaires. We also engage directly with several investors through 1-1 meetings, conference calls, and presentations and through our materiality assessment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our stakeholder engagement accomplishes three principal objectives: 1) to share information; 2) to promote meaningful dialogue; and 3) to build and maintain sustainable relationships. During 2024, we published information on our approach to protect water quality through best management practices on our website, in our 2024 Corporate Responsibility Report, in our financial reporting, in third-party questionnaires, and on social media. This information included our measures to minimize soil erosion and protect water quality through streamside management zones, our approach to working with contractors in our forests, and our internal and external audit processes. In addition, the results of our third-party forest audits under the SFI standard and Forest Stewardship Council are on our website. This information was available to all of our investors and analysts. We also seek meaningful dialogue with stakeholders, listening to their concerns and opinions, to continuously improve our business and our communications. During 2024, members of executive management met with shareholders owning approximately 60% of outstanding active institutional ownership. These engagements included in-person meetings and video and telephone conference calls covering a wide range of topics including corporate responsibility and water-related matters.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

We regularly engage with a broad range of stakeholders including our customers. This helps us to understand, prioritize, and manage our impacts as an organization and our opportunities towards systemic change. Meaningful stakeholder engagement is also a critical part of our corporate responsibility strategy, promoting increased knowledge and awareness of corporate responsibility issues, inviting feedback on insights and trends, and nurturing trust and collaboration. Customers are interested in forest-related issues including our forest management practices, third-party certification of our timberlands, our responsible sourcing practices, and how we work with our contractors. We distribute information about our forest-related initiatives through our financial reporting, corporate website, Corporate Responsibility Report, social media, and through public third-party questionnaires. We also engage directly with several customers through meetings, conference calls, and through our materiality assessment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our stakeholder engagement accomplishes three principal objectives: 1) to share information; 2) to promote meaningful dialogue; and 3) to build and maintain sustainable relationships. During 2024, we published information on our approach to sustainable forest management and our best management practices on our website, in our 2024 Corporate Responsibility Report, in our financial reporting, in third-party questionnaires, and on social media. This information included our commitment to sustainable forest management, our approach to responsible sourcing and working with contractors in our forests, and our internal and external audit processes. In addition, the results of our third-party forest audits under the SFI standard and Forest Stewardship Council are on our website. This information was available to all of our customers. We also seek meaningful dialogue with stakeholders, listening to their concerns and opinions, to continuously improve our business and our communications. During 2024, we met with customers through in-person meetings and video and telephone conference calls.
[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Equity share

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

We utilize a comprehensive carbon and greenhouse gas (GHG) accounting methodology that tracks removal of carbon from the atmosphere, storage in standing trees, storage in end products, and GHG emissions from forest management, harvesting, hauling, and manufacturing. Scope 1 emissions are GHG emissions that are emitted directly from our activities in our corporate offices, our timberlands, our wood products facilities, and our real estate operations. For our wood products division these emissions are emitted from stationary sources and associated control devices (boilers, kilns, dryers, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)), mobile sources (fork trucks, log yard equipment, company-owned vehicles), long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills, and the methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O) emissions from biomass combustion. Scope 2 emissions are GHG emissions associated with the production of the grid electricity used at our facilities and offices. For the electricity used onsite, there are emissions offsite associated with the production of that electricity. These emissions vary depending on the method of production of the electricity, with fossil fuels having high emission factors and renewable sources having low emission factors. Emission factors for electricity production vary by region and source of the grid electricity. Scope 3 emissions are the GHG emissions associated with our upstream and downstream value chain. To consistently calculate Scope 3 emissions, we used the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement's Scope 3 Screening Tool. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions with an estimated 80% accuracy. Using fiber flows, we use the Screening Tool to calculate Scope 3 emissions for categories 1 (Purchased Goods and Services), 3 (Fuel-Energy-Related Activities), 4 (Upstream Transportation), 9 (Downstream Transportation), 10 (Processing of Sold Products), and 12 (End-of-Life for Sold Products).

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Forests are vital to our business as a timberlands and wood products company. Long-term strategic harvest scheduling starts with the detailed inventory of our timberlands. The forest planning and inventory team oversees independent and audited annual timber cruising of tracts to measure timber growth, which is used to update standing timber inventory volumes. Standing inventory measurements are completed over an approximately five-year cycle in the South and a ten-year cycle in Idaho. The estimated total volume of standing merchantable timber inventory is updated annually. Standing merchantable inventory means that the tree being measured has met the size, quality, and other characteristics of the regional market. The annual update reflects additions of young timber that has met minimum diameter requirements, growth of existing merchantable timber inventory, decreases of timber due to harvests, wildfire, or insects and disease, and the impact of acquisitions and divestitures. Timberlands are managed using 50-year strategic management plans based on harvest schedule models. Timber inventory data are utilized in growth-and-yield models, which optimize long-term harvesting and forest management operations and project sustainable harvest volumes over the 50-year time horizon. The harvest schedule is performed every two years, alternating between the regions. Within the strategic harvest schedule model, timberlands are organized into stands by common characteristics such as age and forest management prescriptions. Each stand carries a specific soil productivity designation called site index, which is based on the height of the dominant trees at a specific age. The higher the height of the dominant tree, the higher the site index on that stand. Site index also enables the inventory model to capture the expected impact of silvicultural improvements such as advanced genetics or fertilization.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. It is used principally for watering log decks, saw cooling, make-up water at the boilers for steam production, and fire protection. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling, especially at the log deck. The water that is discharged is sent to settling ponds for solids removal prior to being released. Water loss across the facilities is mostly due to evaporation from log watering activities. Discharges of water are monitored under two permit programs. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) is the permitting program that covers discharges of both wastewater and stormwater in the United States. The wastewater permitting program allows for only certain types of discharges, establishes monitoring requirements, and sets discharge limitations. PotlatchDeltic has NPDES wastewater discharge permits at our St. Maries, Waldo, Warren, and Ola manufacturing facilities because these facilities occasionally discharge to surface water. The stormwater permitting program establishes monitoring requirements and discharge benchmarks for stormwater to protect water quality. The NPDES permits have parameter limits and benchmarks for pollutants such as zinc, chemical oxygen demand, and total suspended solids. Wastewater permits have set monitoring regimes that include weekly, quarterly, semi-annual, and/or annual sampling for various parameters. Stormwater monitoring occurs when a qualifying precipitation event that results in runoff occurs. Sampling is conducted by our on-site environmental Team Members or by qualified environmental consultants. As required, we submit the data to the appropriate regulatory agency within a timeline defined in the permit. NPDES permits can have additional immediate notification requirements if a limit is exceeded, and the stormwater permits have requirements to take corrective actions if a benchmark is exceeded. The stormwater permit also requires additional routine site inspections

to confirm proper function of stormwater controls. Periodic internal audits are conducted to assess whether the required inspections, corrective action planning, and reporting are being performed.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Minimal plastics are used in our business. We utilize small amounts of plastic for wrapping lumber at select mills.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Biodiversity impacts and mitigation activities are part of our timberlands business. Our commitment to conserving biodiversity on our forest lands is based on the recognition that well-managed working forest lands provide a broad range of habitats for aquatic, avian, and terrestrial biodiversity. Four main components comprise our approach to assessing dependency- and impact- related biodiversity risks to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity: (1) landscape-level management; (2) stand-level diversity; (3) protection of ecologically unique sites or species; and (4) research. We also assess biodiversity as part of our environmental management at our wood products facilities. PotlatchDeltic wood products facilities have procedures and programs in place to comply with all applicable environmental laws and regulations. An environmental compliance management system establishes best practices, programs, and procedures that strive for 100% compliance with federal, state, and local regulations governing air emissions, water discharges, and waste disposal.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

☑ Other, please specify :Our approach is consistent with the methodology used by some of our peers and we continue to utilize the best available information.

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

PotlatchDeltic reports on both location and market-based Scope 2 emissions because we have the data available for both, however, we use the Scope 2 market-based figure in our goals and targets because we believe it is a more precise metric.
[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that are emitted directly from our activities in our timberlands, our wood products facilities, and real estate operations. These emissions are emitted from stationary sources and associated control devices (boilers, kilns, dryers, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)), mobile sources (fork trucks, log yard equipment, company-owned vehicles), long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills, and the methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) emissions from biomass combustion. To consistently calculate Scope 1 emissions, we use the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) tool. This approach is consistent with methodology and emission factors guidance from the International Panel on Climate Change, and it reflects widely accepted protocols such as the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. This tool calculates CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O emissions from wood products manufacturing facilities and their ancillary operations. Over 99% of our Scope 1 emissions are from our wood products facilities with less than 0.1% from timberlands and real estate. This base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with CatchMark Timber Trust which was completed on September 14, 2022. The GHG Protocol requires previous years GHG calculations to be amended to estimate the impacts of s significant event such as a merger.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

61000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A location-based method reflects the average emissions intensity of grids on which energy consumption occurs (using grid-average emissions factor data). Location-based Scope 2 emissions are calculated with regional emission factors. While our location-based Scope 2 emissions show a higher emissions quantity, the market-based approach is a more precise approach since it is using the emission factors with our specific electricity providers. This base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with CatchMark Timber Trust which was completed on September 14, 2022. The GHG Protocol requires previous years greenhouse gas calculations to be amended to estimate the impacts of a significant event, such as a merger.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A market-based method reflects emissions from electricity that companies have purposefully chosen. This method would include any type of contract with a utility and can include renewable energy credits or other energy attribute certificates. Market-based Scope 2 emissions are calculated with utility-specific emission factors. Our market-based Scope 2 emissions results in a lower emissions calculation because our electricity provider in Arkansas has a much lower emission rate for electricity production than the region's average emission rate. We have three facilities in Arkansas, so this results in a lower market-based Scope 2 emissions calculation. This base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with CatchMark Timber Trust which was completed on September 14, 2022. The GGH Protocol requires previous years GHG calculations to be amended to estimate the impacts of s significant event such as a merger.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes purchased fiber to produce our wood products and accounts for approximately 7% of all our Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business. We purchase machines or upgrade equipment at our wood products facilities. However, independent studies indicate that capital goods are not a significant source of emissions at wood products mills. A general review of emissions associated with the purchase of capital goods supports this assumption at this time. In addition, we do not own or operate the majority of machines used on our timberlands and do not include those emissions in this category.

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate these emissions based on the fossil fuel consumed in our operations. The majority of fuel we consume is natural gas, diesel fuel, and a small amount of gasoline. We calculate the emissions using well-to-tank and transmission and distribution emissions factors from the Environmental Protection Agency. Scope 3 category 3 emissions account for approximately 1% of our total Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

79000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emissions from the transportation of logs from both our timberlands and from externally purchased logs to our wood products facilities are included in this category. We also include the distribution of our final products from our mills to our customers. Overall, this accounts for approximately 3% of our total Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business. The majority of materials that could become waste from our operations are wood residuals which are either utilized for energy production (via biomass boilers) or used for other products by our downstream customers. Emissions from biomass combustion are a renewable source of energy and are reported separately as biogenic emissions. Emissions from materials to downstream customers are calculated in category 10 of our Scope 3 inventory. We do have some long-term storage of woody debris at our sawmills, which is reported as part of our Scope 1 emissions. The relatively small amount of waste sent offsite to landfills did not represent a material amount of Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business. We reviewed emissions from business travel utilizing travel expenses from our accounting data in 2021. The analysis included air travel, hotels, rental car mileage, and mileage reimbursement (for mileage driven in private vehicles for business purposes). This did not result in a significant amount of Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our employees' commuting using typical commuting habits from the U.S. Census Bureau data and used Environmental Protection Agency emission factors to calculate these emissions. This value is not significant to our business operations. We employed 1,383 personnel at the end of 2024; each employee would have to drive an unrealistic commuting distance for this amount to be significant

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business. Although we lease mobile equipment for use at our mills, the fuel used in that equipment is captured in Scope 1 emissions. We do not operate other leased assets that are a significant source of emissions.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

160000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emissions from the transportation of our logs after the final point of sale are included in our category 9 emissions. These include transportation of our logs from our timberlands to other mills and by-products sold by our wood products facilities to third parties for further processing. We apply average distances at different scales for different product types based on data we collect from our businesses and from publicly available estimates. For the logs we sell to external mills, we apply regional distances. For by-products we apply a national distance specific to our own operations.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emissions produced by the processing of our products are the largest part of our Scope 3 emissions. These products include lumber, plywood, logs, residual chips, and other by-products.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business. No emissions result from the use or operation of our sold wood products. Separately, we account for carbon stored in our wood products as part of our removals.

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

End of life emissions are calculated using Environmental Protection Agency emissions factors. Data show that when a wood product is in use, it retains the original carbon stored. Data exist for each product that estimates the average fraction that remains in use when transferred to a landfill over 100 years. For wood products in a landfill under anaerobic conditions, the carbon remains stored, but there are associated methane emissions which may or may not be captured by the landfill.

Emissions associated with the small quantity of products that are recycled or combusted within a 100-year timeframe are also included. We use this timeframe to remain consistent with our storage calculations and due to lack of reliable data beyond 100 years.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business. We lease our land for recreation, and we also lease some mineral rights. The leased land is included in our net change of carbon in our timberlands and so is not applicable to our Scope 3 emissions inventory. Activities on leased land are not the asset leased and so are not in this category. Recreation does not account for a significant quantity of emissions, and a preliminary quantification of mineral rights activity showed that it is an insignificant amount of Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category does not apply to us since we do not operate franchises.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category does not apply to us.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not significant to our business
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Reporting year	*45000*	*Date input [must be between [11/19/2015 - 11/19/2024]*	*The Scope 1 emissions data represents the entire PotlatchDeltic organization using an operational control boundary.*
Past year 1	*41000*	*12/31/2023*	*The Scope 1 emissions data represents the entire PotlatchDeltic organization using an operational control boundary.*
Past year 2	*37000*	*12/31/2022*	*The Scope 1 emissions data represents the entire PotlatchDeltic organization using an operational control boundary.*

[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55000

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38000

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our market-based Scope 2 emissions result in lower emissions than our location-based emissions because our electricity provider in Arkansas has a much lower emission rate for electricity production than the Arkansas state average emissions rate. We have three manufacturing facilities in Arkansas, so this results in a lower market-based Scope 2 emissions calculation.

Past year 1

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

59000

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36000

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our market-based Scope 2 emissions result in lower emissions than our location-based emissions because our electricity provider in Arkansas has a much lower emission rate for electricity production than the Arkansas state average emissions rate. We have three manufacturing facilities in Arkansas, so this results in a lower market-based Scope 2 emissions calculation.

Past year 2

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

61000

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43000

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our market-based Scope 2 emissions result in lower emissions than our location-based emissions because our electricity provider in Arkansas has a much lower emission rate for electricity production than the Arkansas state average emissions rate. We have three facilities in Arkansas, so this results in a lower market-based Scope 2 emissions calculation.
[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

200000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes all upstream emissions created by the inputs to production, cradle to gate utilizing an average data calculation method. These inputs include all wood raw materials purchased by our wood products facilities from external sources, forestry operations conducted by third-party contractors on our land, and additional nonfiber, non-fuel raw materials used during the manufacturing of wood products at our facilities.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business. We purchase new equipment and upgrade equipment as needed in our wood products facilities. Using independent life-cycle assessments of wood products mills, emissions from the purchase of capital goods are not a significant source of emissions. In addition, the majority of machinery used in our timberlands, is owned and operated by third-parties, so we do not include those emissions in our category 2 calculations. The emissions from capital goods have also been treated as insignificant.

Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

7000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We calculate these emissions based on the fossil fuel consumed in our operations. The majority of the fossil fuel we consume is natural gas, diesel fuel, and a small amount of gasoline. We calculate the emissions using well-to-tank and transmission and distribution emissions factors from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

80000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from the transportation of logs from both our timberlands and from externally purchased logs to our wood products facilities are included in this category. We also include the distribution of our final products from our mills to our customers. Overall, this accounts for approximately 3% of our total Scope 3 emissions.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business. The majority of materials that could become waste from our operations are wood residuals which are either utilized for energy production (via biomass boilers) or used for other products by our downstream customers. Emissions from biomass combustion are a renewable source of energy and get reported separately as biogenic emissions. Emissions from materials to downstream customers get calculated in category 10 of our Scope 3 inventory. We do have some long-term storage of woody debris onsite, which is reported as part of our Scope 1 emissions. The relatively small amount of waste sent offsite to landfills did not represent a material amount of Scope 3 emissions.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business. We reviewed emissions from business travel utilizing travel expenses from our accounting data in 2021. The analysis included air travel, hotels, rental car mileage, and mileage reimbursement (for mileage driven in private vehicles for business purposes). This did not result in a significant amount of Scope 3 emissions. Our business travel in our operations has not changed materially since 2021, so the amount of Scope 3 emissions in this category is still considered insignificant.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We estimated our employees' commuting using typical commuting habits from U.S. Census Bureau data and used Environmental Protection Agency emission factors to calculate these emissions. This value is not significant to our business operations. We have 1,383 employees as of the end of 2024; each employee would have to drive an unrealistic commuting distance for this value to be significant.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business. Although we lease mobile equipment for use at our mills, the fuel used in that equipment is captured in Scope 1 emissions. We do not operate other leased assets that are a significant source of emissions.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from the transportation of our logs after the final point of sale are included in our category 9 emissions. These include transportation of our logs from our timberlands to other mills and by-products sold by our wood products facilities to third parties for further processing. We apply average distances at different scales for different product types based on data we collect from our businesses and from publicly available estimates. For the logs we sell to external mills, we apply regional distances. For by-products we apply a national distance specific to our own operations.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions produced by the processing of our products are the largest part of our Scope 3 emissions. This includes lumber, plywood, logs, residual chips, and other byproducts.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category is not significant to our business. No emissions result from the use or operation of our sold wood products. Separately, we account for carbon stored in our wood products as part of our removals.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1400000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

End of life emissions are calculated using Environmental Protection Agency emissions factors. Data shows that when a wood product is in use, it retains the original carbon stored. Data exists for each product that estimates the average fraction that remains in use when transferred to a landfill over 100 years. For wood products in a landfill under anaerobic conditions, the carbon remains stored, but there are associated methane emissions which may or may not be captured by the landfill. Emissions associated with the small quantity of products that are recycled or combusted within a 100-year timeframe are also included. We use this timeframe to remain consistent with our storage calculations and due to lack of reliable data beyond 100 years.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business. We lease our land for recreation, and we also lease some mineral rights. The leased land is included in our net change of carbon in our forests and so are not applicable to our Scope 3 emissions inventory. Activities on leased land are not the asset leased and so are not in this category. Recreation does not account for a significant quantity of emissions, and a preliminary quantification of mineral rights activity showed that it is an insignificant amount of Scope 3 emissions.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category does not apply to us.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value not significant to our business.
[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2023

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

16000

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

83000

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

No additional comments.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

17000

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

62000

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

140000

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

1400000

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

No additional comments.
[Fixed row]

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material changes in renewable energy consumption.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material changes in other emissions reduction activities.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No divestments of assets that contribute a significant amount of GHG emissions in the reporting year.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No acquisitions of assets that contribute a significant amount of GHG emissions in the reporting year.

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No mergers in the reporting year.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

7.8

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Scope 1 emissions increased from 2023 to 2024 primarily due to a full year of output from the direct-fired kiln burner installed in 2023 at our Ola, Arkansas facility, as well as increases in output from the boiler and natural gas kiln at our Gwinn, Michigan facility due to increased production at that facility.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes in methodology in the reporting year.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes to boundary in reporting year.

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes to physical operation conditions that impacted emissions in the reporting year.

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

9000000

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Empirical models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Removal values are for whole trees. Atmospheric removals are computed using MBG tools, which is provided by Mason Bruce & Girard, Inc. MBG tools utilize empirical models, such as the U.S. Forest Service Forest Vegetation Simulator, as well as field measurement data to quantify annual carbon sequestration as a result of photosynthesis.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

3000000

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Empirical models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

These emissions are related to all wood fiber flows that result from annual operations on our timberlands. This includes Scope 1, 2, and 3 of silviculture, harvest, and processing of all wood that stems from lands controlled by PotlatchDeltic. Emissions factor and translation values validated by the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Empirical models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Not applicable to our business.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Empirical models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Not applicable to our business.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

500000

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Empirical models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Combustion-related release of biomass-derived CO2 using market-based Scope 2 emissions

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Empirical models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Not applicable to our business.
[Fixed row]

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Timber products

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3300000

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

Our greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and removals are associated with timber as both a timber supplier and as a wood products manufacturer. Our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions include our GHG emissions from our facilities as well as GHG emissions from purchased electricity. Our Scope 3 emissions include certain GHG emissions from upstream and downstream sources.
[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

317000

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

300

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

19

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
United States of America	*45000*	*55000*	*38000*

[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By facility

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Timberlands*	*12*
Row 2	*Wood Products*	*45000*

[Add row]

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Waldo, Arkansas

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1800

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

33.329699

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.304981

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Gwinn, Michigan

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13500

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

46.330194

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-87.390567

Row 3

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Warren, Arkansas

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3150

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

33.617852

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-92.079229

Row 4

(7.17.2.1) Facility

St. Maries, Idaho

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15750

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

47.32189

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-116.583266

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Bemidji, Minnesota

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3150

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

47.387623

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-94.753656

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ola, Arkansas

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7650

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

35.025833

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.212516
[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions.

Select from:
☑ Emissions disaggregated by category (advised by the GHG Protocol)

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:
☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

☑ Total

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

45000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Process-based models

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Scope 1 emissions are greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that are emitted directly from our activities in our timberlands, our wood products facilities, and real estate operations. These emissions are emitted from stationary sources and associated control devices (boilers, kilns, dryers, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)), mobile sources (fork trucks, log yard equipment, company-owned vehicles), long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills, and the methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) emissions from biomass combustion. To consistently calculate Scope 1 emissions, we use the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) tool. This approach is consistent with methodology and emission factors consistent with guidance from the International Panel on Climate Change, and it reflects widely accepted protocols such as the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. This tool calculates CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O emissions from wood products manufacturing facilities and their related operations.
[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By facility

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Timberlands*	*90*	*66*
Row 2	*Wood Products*	*54900*	*37900*

[Add row]

(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

	Facility	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Ola, Arkansas*	*7900*	*2900*
Row 2	*Warren, Arkansas*	*9600*	*3500*
Row 3	*Waldo, Arkansas*	*8700*	*3200*
Row 4	*Gwinn, Michigan*	*12000*	*9000*
Row 5	*St. Maries, Idaho*	*10900*	*11900*
Row 6	*Bemidji, Minnesota*	*5800*	*7400*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

45000

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55000

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38000

(7.22.4) Please explain

Emissions are calculated for our entire business.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

There are no other entities in our reporting.
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:
☑ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

138889

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

138889.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1444444

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1444444.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1500000

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1500000.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1500000

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1583333

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

3083333.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1512075

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

1512075

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We report direct CO2 emissions associated with the combustion of biomass fuel, including wood and waste, separately from the scopes. The CH4 and N2O emissions are included in our Scope 1 GHG emissions. The biomass fuel consists of wood residuals produced during our processing of logs into wood products and is procured from third-party certified sustainably managed forests. This means it is carbon neutral. This process is unique to the biogenic carbon cycle and this warrants a different approach than other fuels. We use factors from the Environmental Protection Agency to calculate emissions from biomass combustion. We use both the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) Fiber Sourcing Standard and Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) Chain of Custody/Controlled Wood programs to assure our customers and stakeholders that the wood we purchase to make our products originates from responsible sources. All seven of our wood products manufacturing facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard. In 2024, 100% of the timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard. Our Gwinn, Michigan, and Warren and Waldo, Arkansas facilities are also FSC Chain of Custody certified. In 2024, 52% of timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was FSC Chain of Custody certified, and 100% of the timber consumption at our Gwinn, Warren, and Waldo facilities was FSC Chain of Custody certified. In 2024, 37% of timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was FSC Controlled Wood certified.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not applicable. We do not consume biomass that is considered "other".

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not applicable. We do not consume other renewable fuels.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not applicable. We do not consume coal.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

37070

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We consume diesel fuel, gasoline, and kerosene at our wood products facilities and in our timberland operations.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

97789

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We consume liquid propane gas and natural gas at our wood products facilities.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not Applicable. We do not consume other non-renewable fuels in our operations.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1646934

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

PotlatchDeltic uses a variety of fuel sources that depend on regional availability and cost efficiency. We look for opportunities tor educe the use of fossil fuels in our operations and transition to lower carbon intensive fuel sources.
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1500000

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1500000

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

1500000

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1500000

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ None (no active purchases of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling)

(7.30.14.10) Comment

There were no zero or near-zero emission factors applicable in 2024.
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1500000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

138889

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1444444

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3083333.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.07

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

83000

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Thousand Board Feet (MBF)

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

1200000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

17

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

Scope 1 emissions increased from 2023 to 2024 primarily due to a full year of output from the direct-fired kiln burner installed in 2023 at our Ola, Arkansas facility, as well as increases in output from the boiler and natural gas kiln at our Gwinn, Michigan facility. Partnering with our Arkansas utility provider, Entergy, we were able to secure alternative emissions credits and renewable energy credits to offset the forecasted emissions of the new burner as part of our Scope 2 reduction efforts. Over 99% of our Scope 1 emissions are from our wood products facilities with less than 0.1% from Timberlands and Real Estate. Within Wood Products Scope 1 emissions, our Gwinn, Michigan wood products facility accounts for 30% of GHG emissions with higher emissions the result of the use of natural gas to fire a boiler and a direct-fired kiln. Our facility at St. Maries, Idaho has higher GHG emissions as a result of the facility being consisting of both a sawmill and a plywood mill, long-term wood residuals storage, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO) for pollution control.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

9

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Million Gigajoules

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

MBF of production

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

1

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Reducing energy consumption and utilizing renewable sources are integral to our goals. We continually evaluate our operations and planned projects to emphasize conservation and the use of renewable energy. The sources of energy consumed at each mill vary depending on equipment configuration. The goal is to maximize the use of renewable fuels such as our wood residuals, within the physical equipment constraints while minimizing other environmental impacts. Residual wood from lumber production is utilized in boilers to produce steam energy to dry wood in the kilns and to provide thermal energy. Purchased electricity is used to run process equipment and for heating and cooling. Other fossil fuels (mostly diesel) are predominantly used in mobile equipment with one facility also having a natural gas-fired boiler and direct-fired kiln and another facility using propane to fuel pollution control equipment. We have established a goal to reduce energy consumption at our manufacturing facilities by 10% (unit basis) by 2030 from 2021 levels. In 2024, we reduced our energy consumption by 1%. Our Warren, Arkansas wood products facility surpassed our energy consumption reduction target with a 7.7% reduction.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

1.21

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

kilograms of waste generated directed to landfill.

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

MBF of production

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

8

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

We recognize the need to manage waste throughout our facilities and aim to reduce the amount of waste that we create, repurposing or recycling it whenever possible to avoid landfills. Wood residuals account for approximately 99% of the waste left over after converting green logs into finished lumber. Wood residuals are either used internally for energy or sold as products for a variety of uses. Land application of wood ash from our biomass boilers diverts an additional 1% of waste from landfills. Wood ash is generated from burning wood residuals as fuel in the boilers. In many of our locations, wood ash is land applied for soil amendment as a soil liming substitute in agricultural and silvicultural applications. The remainder of our wastes principally consist of a range of non-hazardous wastes which are either reused, recycled, or sent to landfills. Each facility has recycling and waste reduction programs.
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

36000

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

43000

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

79000.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

45820.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

45000

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

38000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

83000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-12.06

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions of 42% from a 2021 baseline. We have also committed to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. We estimate that over 99% of our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are associated with our wood products

facilities. This reduction target is in accordance with initiatives to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5C compared to pre-industrial levels. Target coverage covers Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, and we are not seeking any exclusions at this time.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To reduce our Scope 1 and Scope 2 combined emissions by 42% from our 2021 baseline by 2030 and to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Within our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, reduction plans include the elimination of wood residual piles, a shift to electrify mobile equipment, the conversion of the natural gas boiler and direct-fired burner at our Gwinn, Michigan facility, the conversion of our natural gas kiln burner at our Ola, Arkansas facility, and grid greening initiatives by our utility providers. Carbon neutralization would be used to offset GHG emissions that cannot be eliminated. Progress in 2024 included the testing of electric mobile equipment at some of our facilities and the evaluation of alternatives to reduce a wood residual pile. Our baseline emissions were recalculated to take into consideration emissions from a direct-fired kiln burner installed in 2023 at our Ola, Arkansas facility, as well as increases in output from the boiler and natural gas kiln at our Gwinn, Michigan facility.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

17000.0

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

79000

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

160000

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3046000.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3046000.000

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.44) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

100.0

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

2284500.000

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

200000

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7000

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

80000

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

190000

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1300000

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1400000

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3177000.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3177000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-17.20

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our Scope 3 target includes 100% of the six Scope 3 categories that are relevant to our business. The additional nine Scope 3 categories are immaterial for the purpose of our greenhouse gas emission targets. We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 3 emissions of 25% from a 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with IPCC keeping global temperature increases to less than 1.5°C compared to pre-industrial levels. We estimate that approximately 45% of our Scope 3 emissions are non-FLAG. The current draft target coverage includes Scope 3 emissions from both land-related and non-land related sources from categories 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 12.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To reduce our Scope 3 emissions by 25% from our 2021 baseline by 2030.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 3 emissions of 25% from a 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with initiatives to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5°C compared to pre-industrial levels.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

01/01/2022

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

☑ Abs2

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We are committed to reducing our Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions and working with our value chain on indirect Scope 3 emission reductions. We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions of 42% from our 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with initiatives to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5°C compared to preindustrial levels. We have also committed to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. We estimate that over 99% of our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are associated with our wood products facilities. Within our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, reduction plans include the elimination of wood residual piles, a shift to electrify mobile equipment, the conversion of the natural gas boiler and direct-fired burner at our Gwinn, Michigan facility and the conversion of our natural gas kiln burner at our Ola, Arkansas facility, and grid greening initiatives by our utility providers. Carbon neutralization would be used to offset greenhouse gas emissions that cannot be eliminated. We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 3 emissions of 25% from a 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with initiatives to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5°C compared to pre-industrial levels.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

To achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for beyond value chain mitigation

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

Within our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, reduction plans include the elimination of wood residual piles, a shift to electrify mobile equipment, the conversion of the natural gas boiler and direct-fired burner at our Gwinn, Michigan facility and the conversion of our natural gas kiln burner at our Ola, Arkansas facility, and grid greening initiatives by our utility providers. Carbon neutralization would be used to offset greenhouse gas emissions that cannot be eliminated. We have established a 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target for our Scope 3 emissions of 25% from a 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with initiatives to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5°C compared to pre-industrial levels.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

On our Corporate Responsibility website and in our annual Corporate Responsibility report we summarize our carbon footprint, including carbon storage and removals in our timberlands and wood products businesses, as well as our Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions according to the GHG Protocol. We have published our Net-Zero Roadmap to show our reduction targets and to document our growth towards our net-zero goals. We have established a 2030 GHG emissions reduction target for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions of 42% from our 2021 baseline. This reduction target is in accordance with initiatives to keep global temperature increases to less than 1.5C compared to preindustrial levels. We have also committed to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2050. We report our GHG emissions annually through our Corporate Responsibility reporting to measure progress against our targets. We expect to help meet our reduction goals we by shifting 30% of mobile equipment to electrical by 2030 and 100% by 2050, reducing our woody debris pile GHG emissions by 100% by 2030, converting kiln drying energy to biomass, carbon compensation, and working with utility providers on grid greening. We have carbon and climate teams within our business units that review GHG reduction alternatives and technologies as we work to reach our reduction targets.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*1*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*0*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*3*	*7000*
Implemented	*0*	*0*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity
☑ Other, please specify :Waste Recovery

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

At our Bemidji, Minnesota wood products facility we have completed the construction of a noise berm around the facility. The noise berm was constructed utilizing waste that would normally be disposed of. The beneficial material reuse reduces the amount of landfilled waste at the facility and provides a more aesthetic perimeter. At our St. Maries, Idaho facility we are currently investigating a project to remove/repurpose a woody debris pile.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

0

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Our reduction plans include a shift to electrify mobile equipment at our wood products facilities. Our St. Maries, Idaho facility has received electric forklifts that Team Members are working to incorporate into our operations. We are also exploring using biodiesel mixes. We are continuing to explore the benefits and functionality of hybrid equipment.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity

☑ Product/component/material reuse

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

0

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ >25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Our reduction plans include the conversion of the natural gas boiler and direct-fired burner at our Gwinn, Michigan facility and the conversion of our natural gas kiln burner at our Ola, Arkansas facility to biomass.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Other, please specify :Energy Efficiency- Grid Greening

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

2000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Our reduction plans include taking advantage of grid greening initiatives by our utility providers.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Partnering with governments on technology development

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We continue to leverage the support and expertise found through government and utility-sponsored programs, as well as the experience of other companies within and outside of our industry. We engage with multi-stakeholder organizations that are committed to research contributing to emission reductions.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We closely monitor regulatory requirements related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. Implementing control technologies at our wood products facilities to comply with air quality regulations, which has also had the effect of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We engage with our employees on our sustainability goals and the roles that they can play to help achieve those goals. We utilize external social media and an internal social media application to educate team members, share company information, and highlight employee stories. Carbon and climate topics are discussed on these platforms to help inform and engage employees. Regular Corporate Responsibility presentations are given to working groups throughout the business to help engage employees and educate them on our progress and targets. We also have carbon and climate teams within the business units that meet regularly to review GHG reduction alternatives and technologies.
[Add row]

(7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.67.1) Specify the agricultural or forest management practice(s) implemented on your own land with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits and provide a corresponding emissions figure, if known.

Row 1

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Fire control

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

We implement practices with direct climate benefits to help our forests remain vigorous and healthy and manage our forests to increase fire resilience and reduce the potential damage of wildfires. We are third-party certified to the SFI Forest Management Standard which also requires us to limit susceptibility of forests to undesirable impacts of wildfire and to raise community awareness of fire benefits, risks, and minimization measures. Wildfire mitigation practices include installing and maintaining a series of dip ponds across our ownership, maintaining our road infrastructure for access, and participating in fire protection districts or cooperative agreements with state, federal and private timberland owners. During periods of high fire danger, we may prohibit campfires, close access on our timberlands, adjust harvest schedules to late evening/early mornings and post individuals on site following logging activities to monitor for potential fire outbreaks. Our agreements with logging and silviculture contractors require them to have specific firefighting resources such as water, water pumps and hand tools on site. Prescribed burning is an important tool in forest management to remove post-logging woody debris known as slash. Slash is managed through installation of fire breaks, mechanical piling and pile burning. Approvals for burning the remaining slash are obtained through the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group. Our Southern timberlands are less susceptible to wildfires than our Northern timberlands because they are in areas that have relatively high humidity. Our Southern harvesting operations result in less slash at final harvest and the slash deteriorates more rapidly. In the South, the terrain allows slash to be mechanically spread back into the tract returning nutrients to the soil. These practices not only help ensure our timberlands are available for future harvest, but also reduce potential environmental impacts that can come from wildfires. In 2023, the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the US Forest Service, creating a partnership to enhance cooperation during wildfires. The partnership allows private resources to fight fires in areas of adjacent public ownership. A second MOU was signed in 2024 to mitigate wildfire risk through cross-boundary fuel break planning, construction, and maintenance.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

No estimate for CO2 savings provided, as there has been no analysis to measure this.

Row 2

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

We are committed to the reforestation of our timberlands and implement several practices with direct climate benefits, such as ensuring forests remain vigorous and healthy by promptly reforesting harvested areas. In 2024 we harvested 3.9% of our total timberlands acres and replanted approximately 28.5 million seedlings on over 58 thousand acres. As part of our Forest Stewardship Policy, we are committed to reforest harvested areas by planting or planned natural regeneration The primary goal of our reforestation program is to utilize the best planting stock possible that is selectively bred to achieve superior disease resistance, produce excellent form, exhibit high growth rates and be well-adapted to the local climate and growing conditions. Reforesting an area is the culmination of an 18-month process that involves planning, preparation, and the growing of seedlings in the nursery. We have been involved with tree improvement programs for the last sixty years. We operate seed farms in our Idaho timberlands and collaborate with other companies, universities, and consortiums to develop the best-suited tree genetics in for all geographic regions. Our foresters monitor and track the growth of reforested timber stands by conducting physical stand exams, as well as by using modern tools such as

drones, LiDAR, satellite imagery, and Geographic Information System (GIS) technology. The new inventory data is synthesized along with information about operational activities into the long-term harvest scheduling model.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

No estimate for CO2 savings provided, as there has been no analysis to measure this.

Row 3

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Practices to increase wood production and forest productivity

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Our forest management plans are designed to help increase soil productivity and to maintain the sustainable management of our forests. We implement a number of practices to improve soil productivity and site indexes such as site-specific silviculture plans, the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs), and improved seedling genetics. We also manage our timberlands using long-term strategic management plans, five-year and annual management plans, and growth and yield models. We use these plans and models to maximize the productivity of our forests and manage them sustainably.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

200000

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Management of our forests for timber has resulted in our removal of a total of 0.2 million metric tons of CO2e in 2024.

Row 4

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Biodiversity considerations

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Our commitment to conserving biodiversity on our forest lands is based on the recognition that well managed working forest lands provide a broad range of habitats for aquatic, avian and terrestrial biodiversity. Four main components compromise our approach to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity: 1) landscape level management, 2) stand level diversity, 3) protection of ecologically unique sites or species, and 4) research. We provide habitat diversity at the landscape level by utilizing stand size and age class adjacency restrictions for final harvest, streamside management zones, maintaining a diversity of cover types, and replanting native species. The managed landscape provides a mixture of forest structure, age classes, and cover types, intermingled with less intensively managed riparian areas and imbedded conservation of unique sites. Diverse working landscapes provide abundant habitat for large ungulates such as deer, elk and moose and a wide diversity of birds such as red-bellied woodpeckers, prairie warblers and wild turkey. We achieve stand level diversity that enhances habitat for a variety of wildlife species through site-specific forest management including planning, implementation and evaluation. Stand level diversity techniques include retaining leave areas, retention of den trees or snags, retention of slash piles, utilizing irregularly shaped openings and protection of non-forested areas such as glades, meadows and non-forested wetlands. We identify sites with species or communities that are unique, rare, or listed as federally threatened or endangered through exchange of data with state natural heritage programs, NatureServe, state wildlife agencies and by internal discovery. Site locations are then mapped and included in our Land Resource

Manager system. Foresters use this proprietary, real-time information when preparing detailed harvest plans to ensure these unique features are incorporated into our management plans. We have a long and continuing commitment to investigating and utilizing research to improve biodiversity conservation and environmental protection.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

No estimate for CO2 savings provided, as there has been no analysis to measure this.

Row 5

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Forest Management

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Our forest management plans include long term strategic harvest schedules as well as five-year and annual management plans. Long-term strategic harvest schedules use the starting forest inventory of each timber stand and then incorporates forest management activities such as site preparation, planting, thinning, fertilization, and harvest. Areas that have harvest restrictions are identified, such as streamside management zones, so that the model does not include them for harvest actions. Timberlands are managed using 50-year strategic management plans based on harvest schedule models. Timber inventory data are utilized in growth-and-yield models, which optimize long-term harvesting and forest management operations and project sustainable harvest volumes over the 50-year time

horizon. The harvest schedule is performed every two years, alternating between the Southern region and Idaho each year. We prepare five-year tactical plans of tracts for silviculture work and harvest based on the results of the harvest schedule. Our foresters select the timing of treatments and harvest based on timber type, growth stage, markets, road access, weather conditions, and operability of the site. Our foresters also monitor the growth of the timber stands by conducting physical stand exams, as well as by using modern tools such as drones, satellite imagery and GIS technology. New inventory data is synthesized along with information about operational activities into the long-term harvest scheduling model. The estimated total volume of standing merchantable timber inventory is updated annually. The annual update reflects additions of young timber that has met minimum diameter requirements, growth of existing merchantable timber inventory, decreases of timber due to harvests, wildfire, or insects and disease, and the impact of acquisitions and divestitures.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

No estimate for CO2 savings provided, as there has been no analysis to measure this.

Row 6

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Pest, disease and weed management practices

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

We are committed to protecting our timberlands from pests, disease, and invasive species by working to manage and promote healthy sustainable forests. Forest vigor and resilience is maintained through planning and implementation of forest management activities which include planting locally adapted species that are selectively bred to thrive in the location hey are planted, judiciously controlling stocking density to ensure full site occupancy without becoming overstocked, maintaining optimum stocking levels as trees grow, controlling competing vegetation, utilizing harvest patterns to avoid large extents of single age classes, and actively monitoring insect, disease, and animal damage levels. Through our reforestation program we utilize the best planting stock possible that is selectively bred to achieve superior disease resistance. Maintaining forest health through preventive measures is by far the most practical strategy to minimize losses from insects and disease and it is uncommon for us to need to use insecticides, fungicides or other direct insect and disease control measures. Our foresters monitor the growth of timber stands by conducting physical stand exams, as well as by using modern tools such as LiDAR satellite imagery and GIS technology to monitor for pests, disease, and invasive species.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

No estimate for CO2 savings provided, as there has been no analysis to measure this.

Row 7

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Practices to increase wood production and forest productivity

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Our forest management plans are designed to help increase soil productivity and to maintain the sustainable management of our forests. We implement a number of practices to improve soil productivity and site indexes such as site-specific silviculture plans, the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs), and improved seedling genetics. We also manage our timberlands using long-term strategic management plans, five-year and annual management plans, and growth and yield models. We use these plans and models to maximize the productivity of our forests and manage them sustainably.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

3300000

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Management of our forests for timber and use of logs for lumber has resulted in our storing a total of 3.3 million metric tons of CO2e in 2024.
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

All of the contractors who work in our timberlands and those who provide timber to our wood products facilities from our sourcing regions are required to complete training on forest management practices that include protecting water quality, protecting soil quality, improving carbon stocks, wildlife management, and other including climate-related information.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

As part of the procurement process, best management practices are shared. As part of our certification process with third-party standards and for our internal audits, we require that best management practices are implemented.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comment.

Row 2

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Fire control

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Wildfires can occur because of lightning or human causes. While human causes are the source of over 87% of total fires, lightning accounts for over 54% of total acres burned. The U.S. West has seen an increase in fire size and frequency, driven by drought, high levels of federal or non-working forest ownership, and more remote acreage. In the U.S. South, weather, ownership, and access typically enable a more effective wildfire response. As climate change increases the risk of wildfire, mitigation measures and coordination across ownerships become increasingly important. Wildfire behavior can be influenced by weather, amount of readily combustible fuels, lack of moisture, and topography, and when the conditions are right, can increase fire severity and damage to the environment. The strongest mitigation tool for wildfire risk is to reduce the amount of fuel that is readily available in the understory, midstory, and overstory through thinning, prescribed fire, maintained fuel breaks, and strategically placed landscape-level fuels treatments. These timberland management treatments have also been proven to improve forest health and biodiversity benefits. In addition, a forest with age-class diversity changes the fuels and provides natural landscape breaks through younger stands. Forest management keeps our fuel loads at a more acceptable level and reduces the amount of dead and dying trees. We meet or exceed minimum requirements for hazard disposal after logging. We have installed and maintain a series of dip ponds across our ownership and maintain our road infrastructure for access. Foresters and logging contractors are trained to assist as necessary. Contractors are required to have water pumpers on site, and we inspect our operations as peak fire season approaches for compliance with our contract specifications regarding fire equipment. We are also a member of the Clearwater-Potlatch Timber Protection Association in Idaho, which gives us a more direct voice in our fire protection.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

We train foresters and contractors. We participate in associations that are focused on fire protection. We work with federal and state agencies to coordinate fire response. Through the National Alliance of Forest Owners ("NAFO"), we worked on a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU"), which was signed in 2023, creating a partnership to enhance cooperation between private working forest owners and public land managers during wildfires. The partnership between U.S. Forest Service and NAFO members allows private resources to fight fire in areas of adjacent ownership with National Forest System lands. The MOU is a first-of-its-kind fire-fighting partnership. A second MOU was signed in early 2024 and seeks to mitigate wildfire risk through cross-boundary fuel break planning, construction, and maintenance.

The MOU provides the framework for coordinating public and private fire mitigation strategies by enabling the construction of National Environmental Policy Act-ready fuel breaks on National Forest System lands as an extension to fuel breaks on adjacent privately owned forests.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comment.
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69) Do you know if any of the management practices implemented on your own land disclosed in 7.67.1 have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response.

Row 1

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Forests are diverse ecological systems with habitats for plants, animals, and other organisms. Active forest management is a valuable tool for creating and maintaining a wide range of biodiversity benefits, enabling forests to stay healthy and productive. Across a landscape, a mosaic of forest ages from recently harvested to mature can be maintained – these forests in turn support long-term viability of wildlife species, plants, and biodiversity. At a broader scale, managed forests can provide habitat connectivity and help maintain and enlarge intact forested areas. Our commitment to conserving biodiversity on our forest lands is based on this recognition that well managed working forest lands provide a broad range of habitats for aquatic, avian, and terrestrial biodiversity. Four main components make up our approach to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity: (1) landscape level management; (2) stand-level diversity; (3) protection of ecologically unique sites or species; and (4) research. PotlatchDeltic has a long and continuing commitment to invest in and utilizing research to improve biodiversity conservation and environmental protection. In addition, we actively advocate for laws and regulations that protect fish and wildlife and promote practical approaches that recognize the benefits of working forest lands. PotlatchDeltic recognizes that some of its lands need to be conserved as forestland in perpetuity. We realize this goal through land partnerships, conservation land sales, and conservation easements. We work with a wide range of stakeholders for conservation, including states, cities, counties, water authorities, and environmental organizations including The Conservation Fund, The Nature Conservancy, and the Trust for Public Land. In addition, we commit to the protection of species at-risk and have entered into habitat conservation agreements to protect endangered species.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

We provide habitat diversity at the landscape level by utilizing stand size and age class adjacency restrictions for final harvest, utilizing streamside management zones, maintaining a diversity of cover types, and replanting native species. The managed landscape provides a mixture of forest structure, forest age classes, and

cover types, intermingled with less intensively managed riparian areas and embedded conservation of unique sites. We protect streams and aquatic life using best management practices, we design, maintain and limit access on forest roads, and we identify and map unique habitats. PotlatchDeltic utilizes a comprehensive timberland environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on continual improvement in achieving our sustainable forest management objectives. The EMS includes training foresters and contractors, and prescribing, monitoring, and inspecting forest management practices in all our operations. It also includes tracking and incorporating stakeholder feedback on our environmental performance. We conduct internal inspections of EMS implementation, and we typically have implementation rates averaging 95% or greater. The EMS includes monthly regional reporting and annual Timberland business unit reviews of environmental performance indicators. We have 12 species designated as globally critically imperiled, 29 species designated as globally imperiled, 9 species listed as federally endangered, and 6 species listed as federally threatened animal or plant species on or adjacent to our land base. Ten of the foregoing species have a dual federal designation. All the species and the areas where they occur are mapped in our geographic information system and their habitats conserved during forest management. Most of the species are aquatic and are protected by implementation of best management practices. Overall, we own 75,067 acres of timberland that have protected conservation easement status. Of this, 16,081 acres are within a conservation easement in Arkansas with the Nature Conservancy and the Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission and Arkansas Game and Fish Commission that sets these lands apart in perpetuity. This is known as the Moro Big Pine Wildlife Management and Natural Area and has a habitat conservation plan for red-cockaded woodpecker.

Row 2

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

☑ Water

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Our timberland management practices are driven by our objectives for sustainable timberland production and for environmental protection. Utilizing our decades of timberland management expertise, we have developed internal best management practices (BMPs) that include regulatory and certification frameworks and provide a

consistent, tested means of implementing environmental protection. Our timberland management requirements are used as a proactive approach to maintain the health of forest soil, protect water quality and aquatic habitat, and promote biodiversity. Our foresters implement BMPs during all phases of forest management and across all our timberlands. We require that all contractors implement applicable BMPs during forest management activities on our lands and in our mill supply chains. The BMPs are evaluated in formal studies, field tested, revised, and adapted over time to continually improve their effectiveness. Soil productivity is protected by minimizing soil erosion and safeguarding the uppermost organic layer during forest management. Through planning and experience, we have learned how to protect site productivity during harvesting when using large machinery to cut and move trees to log landings, which are areas where logs are delimbed, sorted, and loaded onto trucks for transport to mills. We have incorporated soil protection measures into our environmental management system for harvesting that include limiting logging on soils with poor soil drainage during wet weather and using specialized equipment and logging techniques to spread out the weight of the equipment to minimize soil compaction and maintain site productivity. The role of water quality BMPs is to conserve and protect water quality by minimizing sediment through the filtering ability of natural vegetation and erosion control measures adjacent to water bodies. BMPs include practices such as leaving streamside management zones (SMZs) during harvest, properly designing and constructing logging roads, and using logging methods and equipment that protect water quality. SMZs are unharvested or lightly harvested buffers that run along the length of streams and are designed to capture runoff and sediment. The SMZs provide significant other benefits, including stabilizing the banks of streams and acting as a source of food for aquatic organisms.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

PotlatchDeltic utilizes a comprehensive timberland environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on continual improvement in achieving our sustainable forest management objectives. The EMS includes training foresters and contractors, and prescribing, monitoring, and inspecting forest management practices in all our operations. It also includes tracking and incorporating stakeholder feedback on our environmental performance. We conduct internal inspections of EMS implementation, and we typically have implementation rates averaging 95% or greater. The EMS includes monthly regional reporting and annual Timberland business unit reviews of environmental performance indicators. Our third-party forest certification using the SFI standard or FSC standards reflects the rigor of our environmental management system, which is based on a continual improvement process. Practices are adjusted and improved, whether that be in threatened and endangered species management, forest productivity, water quality, or climate change mitigation. In addition to third-party certification, we conduct annual internal audits on all our timberlands. Timberlands added through mergers or acquisitions in 2022 were promptly added to our internal environmental management system and were also certified according to the SFI standard or the FSC standard as appropriate.
[Add row]

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity
☑ Soil
☑ Water
☑ Yield
☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable Forest Management

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Timberlands are managed using 50-year strategic management plans based on harvest schedule models. Timber inventory data are utilized in growth and yield models, which optimize long-term harvesting and forest management operations and project sustainable harvest volumes over the 50-year time horizon. The harvest schedule is remodeled every two years, alternating between the South and Idaho each year. Foresters prepare five-year tactical plans of tracts for silviculture work and harvest based on the strategic management plan. Tracts are then moved into annual operating plans and site-specific prescriptions are developed for each forest operation.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Replanting promptly after harvest is a critical part of what we do to manage our forests sustainably. We utilize native, improved, locally adapted planting stock and monitor seedling survival to ensure well-stocked stands. Sustainable forest management is a holistic approach to stewardship of our lands to provide environmental, social, and economic benefits and to enable these benefits to be available for future generations. Planning and science is at the heart of our sustainable forest management. Foresters prepare tactical plans for silviculture work and harvest based on the results of the harvest schedule that include enhancing wildlife habitat, protecting water quality, protecting special sites, and increasing forest productivity. They inspect logging activity under our environmental management system to ensure environmental protections are implemented and site-specific prescriptions for the tract being harvested are followed. The continuous cycle of planting, growing, and harvesting keeps lands in sustainable forest use and maximizes our forests' ability to provide clean air and water, and conserve biodiversity.
[Add row]

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other, please specify :Wood Products- Lumber and Plywood

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

We produce wood products that store carbon for the entirety of their use. During the lifecycle of a wood product, as long as it is in use, such as lumber used to frame a house, or plywood used as paneling for a RV, carbon stays in that product and out of the atmosphere. As a wood product decomposes, decays, or burns some of that carbon will be released back into the atmosphere. Because the amount of carbon stored in wood products is not permanent, we have to account for reversals over time using an accounting method called dynamic accounting. Dynamic accounting applies a removal credit for only the portion that remains stored in the product over time and allows us to measure the full climate impact of our activities that take place in one year and their future impacts.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

57

[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

Timber products

(8.2.1) Disclosure volume (metric tons)

9473791

(8.2.2) Volume type

Select all that apply

☑ Produced

☑ Sourced

(8.2.3) Produced volume (metric tons)

6939869

(8.2.4) Sourced volume (metric tons)

2533922
[Fixed row]

(8.3) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that is used to produce your disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina

(8.3.5) Land type

Select from:
☑ Managed natural forests

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

833718

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

6927263

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

100

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply

☑ SFI Forest Management standard

(8.3.11) Attach a list of production facility names and locations (optional)

PCH 2024 Mill and Timber Map.pdf

Timber products

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Arkansas and Louisiana

(8.3.5) Land type

Select from:

☑ Managed natural forests

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

253285

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

6927263

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

30

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply

☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.3.11) Attach a list of production facility names and locations (optional)

PCH 2024 Mill and Timber Map.pdf
[Add row]

(8.4) Indicate if any of the land you own, manage and/or control was not used to produce your disclosed commodities in the reporting year.

Select from:
☑ Some of the land we own, manage and/or control is not used for production

(8.4.1) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that was not used to produce your disclosed commodities in the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

30409

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

100

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

At the end of 2024, PotlatchDeltic held 30,409 hectares (75,143 acres) of timberland with protected conservation status within the 849,840 hectares (2.1 million acres) of timberland we own and manage. This includes 6,508 hectares (16,081 acres) within a conservation easement in Arkansas managed under a habitat conservation plan with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to implement conservation measures for the red-cockaded woodpecker and a 1,758 hectare (4,344 acre) Wildlife Management Area conservation easement located in Long and McIntosh counties in Georgia. A small number of acres is also set aside for leases by third-parties, rights of way easements, and mineral interests.

Row 2

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:

☑ Other land type, please specify :Real estate development for master-plan community.

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

37

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

37

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

In addition to our 849,840 hectares (2.1 million acres) of timberlands, PotlatchDeltic has a small real estate development business. Our real estate development business in Arkansas includes a 6,800 acre master plan community in Little Rock. In 2024, 92 acres (37 hectares) were developed or sold. Approximately 37% of the master plan acreage is set aside as permanent greenbelt acres.
[Add row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Arkansas

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1891000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Ola, Waldo, and Warren wood products facilities source timber from Arkansas. Of the timber sourced from Arkansas, 41% was sourced internally from our own timberlands, and 59% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Idaho

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

814000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Saint Maries Complex wood products facility sources timber from Idaho. Of the timber sourced from Idaho, 67% was sourced internally from our own timberlands, and 33% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Michigan

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

397000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji and Gwinn wood products facilities source timber from Michigan. Of the timber sourced form Michigan, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Minnesota

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

407000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji wood products facility sources timber from Minnesota. Of the timber sourced form Minnesota, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Louisiana

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

127000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Waldo and Warren wood products facilities source timber from Louisiana. Of the timber sourced from Louisiana, 6% was sourced internally from our own timberlands, and 94% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Washington

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

12000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Saint Maries Complex wood products facility sources timber from Washington. Of the timber sourced form Washington, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Wisconsin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

214000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji and Gwinn wood products facilitates source timber from Wisconsin. Of the timber sourced form Wisconsin, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Canada

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Manitoba

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji wood products facility sources timber from Manitoba, Canada. Of the timber sourced form Manitoba, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Canada

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Ontario

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji and Gwinn wood products facilities source timber from Ontario, Canada. Of the timber sourced form Ontario, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Oklahoma

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

4000

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Single contracted producer

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Ola wood products facility sources timber from Oklahoma. Of the timber sourced form Oklahoma, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private, state, or federal sources.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Montana

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

135

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Single contracted producer

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Sourced Volume Suppliers 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Saint Maries Complex wood products facility sources timber from Montana. Of the timber sourced form Montana, 100% was supplied externally.
[Add row]

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Timber products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Timber products

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

PotlatchDeltic defines deforestation as the permanent conversion of forests into agricultural production consistent with the European Union Deforestation Regulation (EUDR). Through our Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) and Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) certifications,, we are committed and verified to be deforestation and/or conversion free. All our timberlands are reforested through planting or natural reforestation in accordance with these standards. In 2024, 6,927,263 metric tons

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ No cutoff date

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:
☑ No target date
[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:
☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business division

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:
☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification
☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ SFI Forest Management standard

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2002

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2002

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

PotlatchDeltic is committed to the sustainable management of our timberlands. Sustainable management includes balancing the growth of the forest with the amount of timber harvested, so we can sustainably maintain our forests with annual harvests in perpetuity. Sustainable management includes balancing the growth of the forest with the amount of timber harvested, so we can sustainably maintain our forests with annual harvests in perpetuity. Third-party certification confirms that science-based stakeholder developed forest management practices and continual improvement are occurring on all of our timberlands. We have maintained SFI certification on all of our owned timberlands since achieving certification in 2002, including 2024. We have certified newly acquired lands under the SFI standard promptly following acquisition. Third-party certification of our forest management practices under the SFI standard ensures we are meeting the requirements of the standard. SFI is an independent non-profit sustainability organization that collaborates on forest initiatives with the forest sector, conservation groups, academia, local communities, Indigenous peoples, and educators. SFI recognizes that forestland owners have a responsibility for stewardship through reforestation and the management, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees. However, SFI also requires a much broader involvement in areas such as research, community outreach, education, and climate change.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

PotlatchDeltic is certified to the SFI Forest Management Standard on 100% of its timberlands. To meet certification standards, our forest management practices are reviewed through an annual third-party surveillance audit, and full recertification audits every five years. PotlatchDeltic utilizes a comprehensive timberland environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on continual improvement in achieving our sustainable forest management objectives. The EMS includes training foresters and contractors, and prescribing, monitoring, and inspecting forest management practices in all our operations. It also includes tracking and incorporating stakeholder feedback on our environmental performance. We conduct internal inspections of EMS implementation. The implementation of our EMS ensures that we conduct all our activities to meet or exceed federal, state, and local statutes and regulations for conservation of wildlife and biological diversity and protection of water, fish, and endangered species. In addition, the EMS ensures that we achieve and maintain third-party certifications for all our timberlands. Our third-party forest certification also reflects the rigor of our EMS, which is based on an ongoing continual improvement process. As new information is discovered, practices are adjusted and improved, whether that be in threatened and endangered species management, forest productivity, water quality or climate change. Forest certification challenges us to think long term, and to invest with research organizations to study and improve the industry's technical knowledge. In addition, it encourages us to engage with the communities and stakeholders who are connected to us through our timberlands and all they have to offer. Our 2024 surveillance audits required to be certified to the SFI standard were in Arkansas, Louisiana, and South Carolina and resulted in successful recertification with no non-conformances. We received one Notable Practice in Arkansas for our red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) management on our Moro Big Pine Wildlife Management area for the implementation of forest management practices that are designed to provide habitat over the long term and that has currently achieved our full RCW population target.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Values are given as a percent.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :SFI Fiber Sourcing

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2002

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2002

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

PotlatchDeltic is committed to producing wood products from responsibly sourced raw materials including logs from our own company lands, from other private industrial and family landowners, and public agencies. We commit that our logs are sourced in a manner that protects the other values the forests provide. Some of

the logs we use come from land that is certified to either SFI, FSC, or American Tree Farm System standards. This includes our own ownership, other industrial landowners and family tree farms that have chosen to be certified, and state and county agency lands. The Sustainable Forestry Initiative system in place are designed to ensure responsible procurement when purchasing fiber from non-certified lands. We certify our entire Wood Products supply chain to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard at all locations. The SFI Fiber Sourcing is designed to ensure that wood purchased from uncertified lands is legally and responsibly sourced and requires measures to promote reforestation, protect water quality, promote conservation of biodiversity, utilize trained logging professionals and foresters, and verify that the measures are effective.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

All seven of our wood products manufacturing facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard, which provides structure to how we, as an SFI Program Participant, purchase fiber from both certified and non-certified forestland. This standard is designed to extend the positive reach of sustainable forestry information and practices to landowners on such topics as forest regeneration, forestry best management practices for water quality, wildlife and biodiversity, use of professional logging contractors, and avoiding controversial sources, such as illegal logging. We have traceability systems at all wood products manufacturing facilities based on our procedures that ensure compliance with the SFI standard. Our procedures are designed to ensure that our sourcing is from legal and responsible sources with emphasis on uncertified sources. In 2024, we tracked over 99% of all log purchases to section, township, and range, with the only exception being two remote concentration yards where we know state and county of origin, and wood received from small suppliers like farmers and ranchers. In every case, we have a system to assess the risk that logs could be acquired from illegal logging sources. This system includes communications with suppliers, contract documentation, and maintenance of records. We identify and address any significant risks. In 2024, 100% of the fiber consumption at all our wood products facilities was certified according to the SFI standard. Our risk assessment procedures, plan implementation and results are evaluated in internal and third-party audits. We did not identify any issues with illegal sourcing in 2024. In addition, we have policies and procedures designed to promote compliance with all applicable SFI Fiber Sourcing requirements and to extend legal compliance throughout our supply chain. Our procedures are internally and externally audited and we did not identify any material issues with legal compliance in 2024. All our sourcing in 2024 was verified to be from legal, responsible sources and over 98% was produced by trained logging contractors.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Values are given as a percent.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2005

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2005

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

PotlatchDeltic is committed to the sustainable management of our timberlands. Third-party certification confirms that science-based stakeholder-developed forest management practices and continual improvement are occurring on all of our timberlands. PotlatchDeltic set a goal for 100% of its timberlands in our Warren and Waldo operating units in Arkansas and Louisiana to become certified to Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) forest management standards by 2007. We met this goal in 2005 and have maintained certification on this ownership since achieving certification, including 2024. Newly acquired lands in these operating units are certified to the standards promptly following acquisition. FSC's mission is to promote environmentally sound, socially beneficial, and economically prosperous management of the world's forests. In the United States, the FSC standard is based on principles, criteria, and indicators that include compliance with laws, observance of Indigenous rights, conservation of biological diversity and high conservation value forests, water quality protection, community relations and workers' rights. Third-party certification of our forest management practices under FSC standards ensures we meet requirements.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

PotlatchDeltic is certified to the FSC Forest Management Standard on 100% of its timberlands in its Warren and Waldo operating units in Arkansas, which constitutes 70% of its total Arkansas timberlands ownership. To meet certification standards, our forest management practices are reviewed through an annual third-party surveillance audit, and full recertification audits every five years. PotlatchDeltic utilizes a comprehensive timberland environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on continual improvement in achieving our sustainable forest management objectives. The EMS includes training foresters and contractors, and prescribing, monitoring, and inspecting forest management practices in all our operations. It also includes tracking and incorporating stakeholder feedback on our environmental performance. We conduct internal inspections of EMS implementation. The implementation of our EMS ensures that we conduct all our activities to meet or exceed federal, state, and local statutes and regulations for conservation of wildlife and biological diversity and protection of water, fish, and endangered species. In addition, the EMS ensures that we achieve and maintain third-party certification for our timberlands. Our third-party forest certification also reflects the rigor of our EMS, which is based on an ongoing continual improvement process. As new information is discovered, practices are adjusted and improved, whether that be in threatened and endangered species management, forest productivity, water quality or climate change. Forest certification challenges us to think long term, and to invest with research organizations to study and improve the industry's technical knowledge. In addition, it encourages us to engage with the communities and stakeholders who are connected to us through our timberlands and all they have to offer. Our decision to dual-certify some of our timberlands according to the FSC standard reflects the specifications of some of our customers who produce paper and packaging that are sold to international consumers who prefer FSC product certification. Our 2024 FSC Audit found one minor non-conformance for not including the FSC trademark on our Forest Stewardship Policy.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Values are given as a percent.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Controlled Wood certification

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2005

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2005

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

PotlatchDeltic is committed to producing wood products from responsibly sourced raw materials including logs from our own company lands, from other private industrial and family landowners, and public agencies. We commit that our logs are sourced in a manner that protects the other values the forests provide. Some of the logs we use come from land that is certified to either SFI, FSC, or American Tree Farm System standards. This includes our own ownership, other industrial landowners and family tree farms that have chosen to be certified, and state and county agency lands. Forest Stewardship Council has systems in place designed to responsible procurement when purchasing fiber from non-certified lands. We use FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) programs to ensure that the wood we purchase to make our products originates from responsible sources. Our Wood Products locations that have a reliable source of FSC Forest Management certified logs and a market for FSC certified mill residuals are FSC CoC certified. Our Gwinn, Michigan, and Warren and Waldo, Arkansas, mills are also FSC CoC certified (in addition to being certified to the SFI standard for fiber sourcing). We track the path from the forest through the supply chain. In addition, FSC certification requires that wood that is procured from land not FSC-certified falls under the FSC Controlled Wood standard. The Controlled Wood standard requires that the non-certified wood we purchase does not come from undesirable sources. We set and achieved different goals for our Warren (2005) Gwinn (2007), and Waldo (2019), mills' supply chain to become certified, and we achieved FSC Chain of Custody and Controlled Wood certification for these locations and continue to maintain it.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

We track the path of our products from the forest through the supply chain, ensuring that FSC-certified material is distinguished from non-certified material throughout that chain. In addition, FSC Chain of Custody certification includes an FSC Controlled Wood standard for wood that is procured from land that is not FSC certified. The FSC Controlled Wood standard requires that the non-certified wood we purchase does not come from undesirable sources. FSC considers all the following undesirable sources: illegally harvested forests; forests that were harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights; forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities; natural forests that were converted to non-forest uses; and forests with genetically modified trees. In 2024, 38% of timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was FSC Controlled Wood certified.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Values are given as a percent.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 5

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:
☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business division

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:
☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification
☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ FSC Chain-of-Custody certification (any type)

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2005

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2005

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

PotlatchDeltic is committed to producing wood products from responsibly sourced raw materials including logs from our own company lands, from other private industrial and family landowners, and public agencies. We commit that logs are sourced in a manner that protects the other values the forests provide. We use FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) programs to ensure that the wood we purchase to make our products originates from responsible sources. Our Wood Products locations that have a reliable source of FSC Forest Management certified logs and a market for FSC certified mill residuals are FSC CoC certified. Our Gwinn, Michigan, and Warren and Waldo, Arkansas, mills are FSC CoC certified (in addition to being certified to the SFI standard for fiber sourcing). We track the path from the forest through the supply chain. In addition, FSC certification requires that wood that is procured from land not FSC-certified falls under the FSC Controlled Wood standard. The FSC Controlled Wood standard requires that the non-certified wood we purchase does not come from undesirable sources. We set and achieved different goals for our Warren (2005) Gwinn (2007), and Waldo (2019) mills' supply chain to become certified, and we achieved FSC Chain of Custody and Controlled Wood certification for these locations and continue to maintain it.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

We use the FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) program to assure our customers and stakeholders that the wood we purchase to make our products originates from responsible sources. Our Gwinn, Michigan, and Warren and Waldo, Arkansas facilities are FSC CoC certified. We track the path of our products from the forest through the supply chain, ensuring that FSC-certified material is distinguished from non-certified material throughout that chain. In 2024, 52% of timber consumption at all our wood products manufacturing facilities was FSC CoC certified, and 100% of the timber consumption at our Gwinn, Warren, and Waldo facilities was FSC CoC certified.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Values are given as a percent.
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Timber products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Supplier engagement/communication

☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

We source timber from both internal and external sources. We have traceability systems at all wood products facilities based on procedures required by the SFI standard. These procedures are designed to ensure that our sourcing is from legal and responsible sources with emphasis on uncertified sources. We track over 99% of all log purchases to section, township and range with the only exception being two remote concentration yards where data is only available to the state and county of origin, and wood received from small suppliers like farmers and ranchers, where such data is not available. In every case we have a system to assess the risk that logs could be acquired from illegal logging sources that includes communications with suppliers, contract documentation, and maintenance of records. We identify and address any significant risks. Our risk assessment procedures, implementation and results are evaluated in internal audits and via third party audits and we have not identified any issues with illegal sourcing. In addition, we have policies and procedures to comply with all applicable laws and to ensure legal compliance throughout our supply chain. Our procedures for ensuring legal compliance are internally audited and audited by a third party and we have not identified any material issues with legal compliance. All our sourcing is verified to be from legal, responsible sources and over 98% is produced by logging contractors who are trained in sourcing timber legally and responsibly.
[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

100

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

0

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

100

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

100

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

100

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify :SFI Forest Management

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.1.3) Comment

PotlatchDeltic is certified to the SFI standard for forest management on 100% of its timberlands. To meet certification standards, our forest management practices are reviewed through an annual third-party surveillance audit, and full recertification audits every five years.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

PotlatchDeltic - SFI FM - Final Certificate.pdf

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify :SFI Fiber Sourcing

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.1.3) Comment

PotlatchDeltic is certified to the SFI standard for forest management on 100% of its timberlands. To meet certification standards, our forest management practices are reviewed through an annual third-party surveillance audit, and full recertification audits every five years.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

PotlatchDeltic - SFI FS - Final Certificate.pdf

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

30

(8.9.1.3) Comment

PotlatchDeltic is also certified on 70% of our combined timberlands in Arkansas and Louisiana to FSC Forest Management standards, which is 30% of our total timberlands.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

PCH FSC FM-FinalCertificate.pdf

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ FSC Chain-of-Custody certification (any type)

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

52

(8.9.1.3) Comment

In 2024, 52% of timber consumption at all our wood products manufacturing facilities was FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) certified, and 100% of the timber consumption at our Gwinn, Warren, and Waldo facilities was FSC CoC certified

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

PotlatchDeltic - FSC COC - Final Certificate.pdf

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Controlled Wood

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

37

(8.9.1.3) Comment

In 2024, 37% of timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was FSC Controlled Wood certified.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

PotlatchDeltic - FSC COC - Final Certificate.pdf
[Add row]

(8.9.3) Provide details of production unit monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.3.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

100.00

(8.9.3.2) Production unit monitoring approach

Select all that apply

☑ Ground-based monitoring system

(8.9.3.3) Description of production unit monitoring approach

We conduct a due diligence procedure to reduce the risk of sourcing from converted lands. The due diligence system is subject to annual internal and external auditing. Through our certification to the SFI standard we evaluate the growth-to-drain ratio of our timberlands annually to ensure sustainable harvests. In addition,

trained loggers are utilized and contract requirements with suppliers are in place to not deliver wood from conversion sites. Contractors are required to maintain compliance with best management practices and promote and provide education and outreach to landowners for reforestation, wildlife, water and fish conservation, maintenance of site productivity, control of invasive species, protection of special sites and forests with exceptional conservation value, and reduction of wildfire risk.

(8.9.3.4) DF/DCF status verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.3.5) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ First party

☑ Third party

(8.9.3.6) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit and is verified as DF/DCF

100

(8.9.3.7) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

Our procedures for ensuring chain of custody legal compliance are internally and externally audited. Suppliers that are in non-compliance are provided information and then re-evaluated for compliance in a subsequent audit. If compliance is not adequate, they are no longer allowed to be our supplier. Loggers are required to undergo training to ensure certification to the SFI standard and compliance with state best management practices (BMPs). We have maintained certification to the SFI forest management standard on 100% of our managed timberlands and have maintained certification to the SFI fiber sourcing standard on 100% of our procured wood fiber. Internal and external audits found no non-compliances in 2024. When internal harvests are completed stands go through a close out process to ensure that all BMPs and requirements for complying with the SFI standard are met, and any infractions are immediately resolved before the harvested can be considered completed. We are also certified to the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management Standard, FSC surveillance audits are conducted annually with a full re-certification every five years. Our 2024 FSC Audit found one minor non-conformance for not including the FSC trademark on our Forest Stewardship Policy. Our Gwinn, Michigan, and Warren and Waldo, Arkansas facilities are also FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) certified. We track the path of our products from the forest through the supply chain, ensuring that FSC-certified material is distinguished from non-certified material. In addition, FSC CoC certification includes an FSC Controlled Wood standard for wood that is procured from land that is not FSC certified. The FSC Controlled Wood standard requires that the non-certified wood we purchase does not come from undesirable sources. FSC considers all the following undesirable sources: illegally harvested forests; forests that were harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights; forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities; natural forests that were converted to non-forest uses; and forests with genetically modified trees. In 2024, 52% of timber consumption at all our wood products manufacturing facilities was FSC CoC certified, and 100% of the timber

consumption at our Gwinn, Warren, and Waldo facilities was FSC CoC certified. In 2024, 37% of timber consumption at all our wood products facilities was procured under the FSC Controlled Wood standard.

(8.9.3.8) Attachment of verification (optional)

PCH SFI and FSC Certificates.pdf
[Fixed row]

(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

100.00

(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion

Select all that apply
☑ Ground-based monitoring

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

All of PotlatchDeltic's wood products facilities are certified to the SFI standard for fiber sourcing and three wood products facilities are certified to the FSC Chain of Custody/Controlled Wood Standard. The SFI standard for fiber sourcing requires the development of a due diligence system (DDS) to manage the risk of sourcing fiber from controversial sources, one of which is forest conversion. We have conducted a risk assessment that follows the steps and indicators provided in the PEFC ST 2002:2020 Standard for Chain of Custody (CoC), which classifies risk as “Significant” or “Negligible.” Similarly, the FSC CoC Standard requires a Due Diligence System according to the requirements for Sourcing FSC Controlled Wood (CW) Standard (FSC-STD-40-005 Vthree-1). Our wood products facilities are audited annually.

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

Our Waldo wood products facility sources wood from Arkansas and Louisiana. Our Warren wood products facility sources wood from Arkansas and Louisiana. Our Ola wood products facility sources wood from Arkansas and Oklahoma. Our Saint Maries wood products facility sources wood from Idaho and Washington. Our Bemidji wood products facility sources wood from Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Manitoba, Canada, and Ontario, Canada. Our Gwinn wood products facility sources wood from Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ontario, Canada.

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.4.7) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ First party

☑ Third party

(8.9.4.8) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through sourcing area monitoring and is verified as DF/DCF

100

(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

All PotlatchDeltic's wood products facilities are certified to the SFI standard for fiber sourcing and three wood products facilities are certified to the FSC Chain of Custody/Controlled Wood Standard. The SFI standard for fiber sourcing requires the development of a due diligence system (DDS) to manage the risk of sourcing fiber from controversial sources, one of which is forest conversion. We have conducted a risk assessment that follows the steps and indicators provided in the PEFC ST 2002:2020 Standard for Chain of Custody (CoC), which classifies risk as “Significant” or “Negligible.” Similarly, the FSC Chain of Custody Standard requires a Due Diligence System (DDS) according to the requirements for Sourcing FSC Controlled Wood (CW) Standard (FSC-STD-40-005 Vthree-1). FSC Controlled Wood establishes minimum legal, environmental, and social requirements for non-certified fiber that can be mixed in with FSC certified fiber. The DDS classifies the risk of conversion as either “Specified,” in which case further control measures must be implemented, or “Low.” If a procurement zone’s risk of conversion is considered “Low,” the organization can proceed without further control measures.

(8.9.4.10) Attachment of verification (optional)

PCH SFI and FSC Certificates.pdf

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

We have developed a DDS that follows the steps and indicators provided in the PEFC ST 2002:2020 Standard for Chain of Custody (CoC)., which classifies risk as "Significant" or "Negligible" and the risk for conversion for the procurement zones for all of our wood products facilities is "Negligible." We have also conducted a Due Diligence System according to the requirements for Sourcing FSC Controlled Wood Standard (FSC-STD-40-005 Vthree-1) and the risk for conversion in the procurement zones for the three wood products facilities that are FSC Chain of Custody certified is "Low."

(8.9.4.12) Attachment indicating risk classification for each sourcing area (optional)

CDP NA.docx
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.

Timber products

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint on the land we own, manage or control

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ During the reporting period

☑ During the last 5 years

(8.10.1.5) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint in the reporting period (hectares)

26

(8.10.1.7) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint during the last five years (hectares)

9

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

At the end of 2024, PotlatchDeltic owned 849,840 hectares (2.1 million acres) of timberlands in the United States, excluding acreage under long-term leases. 100% of the timberlands are certified to the SFI standard for forest management and 70% of our Arkansas and Louisiana timberlands acreage (or 36% of the total) are also certified to FSC Forest Management standards. Our monitoring and tracking cover 100% of our owned and leased lands, approximately 23 acres (9 hectares) were converted through our Real Estate division in 2022; in 2024, 140 acres (57 hectares) were developed or sold; of the 140 acres, 129 acres (52 hectares) were residential developments and approximately 49% (63 acres/26 hectares) of the acreage was set aside as permanent greenbelt acres.

Timber products

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :For Chain of Custody certification we are required to report the risk of potential sourcing from deforestation and/or conversion sources within our procurement area

(8.10.1.8) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since other specified point (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We commit to no conversion on our own lands as part of certification to the SFI standard and the FSC standard, and to not utilizing wood from converted lands in our procurement program through FSC Controlled Wood standard at our Warren, Waldo and Gwinn mills. Timber sourced from our timberlands that are certified to the SFI and/or FSC standards accounts for 30-40% of our mill consumption on an annual basis. As part of our internal audit process for fiber sourcing, we note land use after harvest (e.g., natural regeneration, planting, conversion) and have not confirmed any trends of land use conversion in our procurement regions. All our timberlands are certified, and we reforest all harvested timberlands. We do not convert certified timberlands to other land uses. In addition, through our certifications to the SFI standard and the FSC standard we are committed and verified to be deforestation and/or conversion free. All of our mill sourcing regions were evaluated by FSC US for land use conversion risk as part of the FSC US controlled wood risk assessment completed in 2018 and we participated in the FSC US risk assessment process. All of our procurement areas are considered “low risk” for conversion based on that assessment.
[Add row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

☑ Yes, from both suppliers and owned/managed/controlled land

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☑ Labor rights

☑ Third parties' rights

☑ Environmental protection

☑ Human rights protected under international law

☑ Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations

☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting

☑ The principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ First party audits

☑ Third party audits

☑ Ground-based monitoring

☑ Supplier self-declaration

☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial monitoring

(8.14.5) Please explain

Our Corporate Conduct and Ethics Code (Ethics Code), Supplier Code of Conduct (Supplier Code), and Human rights Policy reaffirms our continuing commitment to act with integrity and outline the expectations we have for our suppliers, contractors, and employees. It outlines our responsibilities to all our stakeholders, guides our decision-making, and outlines the minimum business standards we apply across our value chain. We work to instill the concepts of our Ethics Code in every Team Member. All Team Members acknowledge their review of the Ethics Code at the time of their onboarding. Additionally, certain Team Members, including management, supervisors, and procurement leads, are required to complete an annual review of the Ethics Code, including an attestation of their compliance. We also expect our suppliers and contractors to uphold the same legal and ethical standards and have established these requirements in our Supplier Code. As part of our standard contract terms and operating procedures, key contractors in our timberlands and wood products facilities are provided with our Supplier Code and asked to verify that they have read and comply with its components. Our third-party certifications require us to comply with all applicable local and federal laws and regulations as well as Indigenous rights, conservation of biological diversity and high conservation value forests, water quality protection, community relations, worker's rights, and others. We have a comprehensive GIS and remote sensing system that is used to track and monitor our entire ownership. Within our land

management system, we track all harvest and forest management activities. We gather this information by utilizing LiDAR and satellite imagery, as well as foresters managing and making observations on the ground. We comply with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Risk of fires
☑ Risk of water stress
☑ Access to new markets
☑ Risk of biodiversity loss
☑ Commodity sourcing footprint
☑ Risk of supplier non-compliance in area
☑ Organization has operational presence in area
☑ Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems
☑ Ability to contribute to/ build on existing landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
☑ Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems
☑ Opportunity to participate in new markets or financing mechanisms for the agricultural sector

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

We prioritize jurisdictions where our timberlands and wood products facilities are located as well as national organizations that have an impact of our industry as a whole. We regularly engage with a broad range of stakeholders including investors and analysts, Team Members, communities, customers, government representatives, Indigenous peoples, industry associations, non-governmental organizations, research organizations, and suppliers. We collaborate with our industry through state and national trade associations and research organizations to prioritize the importance of issues and locations.
[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Moro Big Pine

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Arkansas

(8.15.2.5) Attach public information about the initiative (optional)

Moro Big Pine Website.pdf

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

6799

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

1995

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Forest fires monitored and prevented

Governance

☑ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for biodiversity, habitat fragmentation and/or threats to IUCN Red List species in priority areas

☑ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national government

☑ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

Moro Big Pine is managed in collaboration with Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, and the Nature Conservancy.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

We are actively restoring and managing a 6,799-hectare pine flatwoods site located in southern Arkansas known as Moro Big Pine Wildlife Management Area and Natural Area (Moro Big Pine). Moro Big Pine is managed in partnership with the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, and The Nature Conservancy. The conservation partners hold a perpetual conservation easement focused on restoring and maintaining a fire-maintained pine ecosystem with intervening natural hardwoods. Moro Big Pine supports a growing population of federally listed endangered red-cockaded woodpeckers (RCWs) managed according to a Habitat Conservation Plan approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Forest management is focused on restoring and managing the natural stands of loblolly and shortleaf pine native to the flatwoods site. Active management is used to restore natural fire regimes, thin overstocked stands and open the canopy.

The RCW has benefited from the forest and habitat management and installation of cavity inserts for nesting and roosting. Twenty years of habitat management and translocation of RCWs to improve population viability has resulted in the population on Moro Big Pine growing from 24 adult birds with 9 potential breeding groups to the 2024 population of 92 adults with 33 active cluster sites with 31 potential breeding groups. The population also includes two single bird clusters that we believe are highly likely to become a potential breeding group.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

Row 2

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ2

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Mica Creek

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Idaho

(8.15.2.5) Attach public information about the initiative (optional)

PotlatchDeltic -Mica Creek.pdf

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

2700

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

1990

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Adequate water availability, water quality or access to WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) services

Governance

☑ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation

☑ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ National government

☑ Sub-national government

☑ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

The Mica Creek Experimental Watershed was established in collaboration with the US Forest Service and Idaho Department of Lands. We collaborate with the University of Idaho to continue the collection of data on water flow, sedimentation, fish stock, and other key environmental conditions in the watershed.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

In 1990, with help from the U.S. Forest Service and the Idaho Department of Lands, we established the Mica Creek Experimental Watershed — an area southeast of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, comprising the 6,672-acre catchments of Mica Creek, a tributary of the St. Joe River. While the watershed has been the site of numerous research projects over the years, we created this "living laboratory" for one main reason: to conduct a multi-decade study of the effects of modern forest best management practices on stream water quality and aquatic life. Over the course of the study, we have worked with scientists from the University of Idaho and other academic institutions to collect data on the effects of tree harvesting, road building, and other practices. The results of the research conducted in the study have been published in independent, peer-reviewed academic journals such as Forest Science and presented at scientific conferences. The results show that forest

management that adheres to contemporary best management practices has little to no adverse effect on streams' aquatic life. Further, stream flows generally increase modestly following tree harvests. In our leadership roles serving on the Idaho Forest Practices Act Committee we work to incorporate the results of the Mica Creek research into effective and efficient Forest Practices Act rules. Stream temperature in fish-bearing streams within summer. Measurable suspended sediment increases in the first levels. In collaboration with the University of Idaho, we also continue to collect data on water flow, sedimentation, fish, and other key environmental conditions in the Mica Creek watershed. The watershed is now being managed as a working forest – the forestlands that we harvest, replant, and manage for sustainable production of timber. The research and monitoring that are being conducted now provides an ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of contemporary best management practices.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

Row 3

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ3

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Wildlife Conservation Initiative

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina

(8.15.2.5) Attach public information about the initiative (optional)

Wildlife Conservation Initiative Webpage.pdf

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ No, other reason, please specify :WCI projects and surveys cover significant and changing areas of our land base.

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2016

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Increased and/or maintained protected areas

☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for biodiversity, habitat fragmentation and/or threats to IUCN Red List species in priority areas

☑ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ National government

☑ NGO and/or civil society

☑ Other, please specify :Local forest and rural associations

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

The Wildlife Conservation Initiative (WCI) is a voluntary, collaborative partnership between the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) to create a trusted, durable relationship to implement science-based conservation for at-risk species. The underlying concept is recognition of the wildlife conservation benefits to at-risk species through active forest management in working forests, implementation of on-the-ground practices to conserve species, and use of third-party forest certification to provide assurances to the USFWS.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is collectively monitored using a shared external framework, please specify :National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement Inc. (NCASI)

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

PotlatchDeltic was a leader with other landowners of the WCI in Arkansas and the Lake States. We initiated the first meeting with the USFWS's Arkansas Field Office to introduce the concept of third-party forest certification to the field office. In the Lake States, we led WCI efforts with the USFWS to design and expand the WCI partnership in the region. The initiative resulted in the USFWS recognizing the benefits of managed forest lands and best management practice (BMP) implementation in the USFWS's Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing evaluations. In 2023 a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed formalizing the WCI as a collaborative conservation partnership focused on proactive and voluntary conservation. The MOU promotes cooperation and collaboration and creates

consistency as a USFWS agency-wide initiative. Under the MOU, PotlatchDeltic, other NAFO members, and USFWS are developing conservation agreements to provide for research and species monitoring to increase the understanding of the conservation value of active forest management on common, at-risk, threatened, and endangered species. In October 2024, NAFO and USFWS signed the Working Forests for Wildlife Program (WFFW), commonly referred to as the Bat Agreement. This landmark voluntary conservation framework expands research and conservation efforts for at-risk bat species, including the northern long-eared bat (NLEB), tri-colored bat (TCB), and little brown bat (LBB). Under the agreement, landowners enrolled in the WFFW program receive regulatory predictability and protection from incidental take, mitigating risk while ensuring compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In exchange, landowners provide USFWS with access to essential species data, enabling more effective research and habitat management.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Add row]

(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.

Row 1

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, and we are able/willing to disclose volume data

(8.15.3.3) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

73

Row 2

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ2

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:
☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, and we are able/willing to disclose volume data

(8.15.3.3) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

27
[Add row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Please specify :State level- Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and South Carolina

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Multi-partnerships or stakeholder initiatives - PotlatchDeltic works within several national and state forestry and wood products industry associations. The topics we have been engaged in vary from state issues to broader national matters. Our forestry focused initiative involvement includes membership and active involvement in the state forestry associations in the states where we operate. Our state involvement supports sustainable forestry practices, programs, and policies for landowners and forest business owners. Key national organizations we are members of and actively participate in include: the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), where we serve on the board and committees; National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) a national advocacy organization committed to advancing federal policies that ensure our working forests provide clean air, clean water, wildlife habitat and jobs through sustainable practices and strong markets, where we serve on the board and committees; The National Council on Air and Stream Improvement Inc. (NCASI) where we serve on the Board and committees; and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative

(SFI), where we serve on committees. PotlatchDeltic works with several university/industry groups that provide us with access to a wide range of research programs that support our forest management.
[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:
☑ Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply
☑ Improvement of water availability and quality
☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

The Townsend Conservation Easement is a relatively natural area which contains aquatic communities in which several species of fish, plants, and other wildlife ecosystems exist, contains wetland habitats that support nesting areas for protected species, has significant recreational, forest, and education values, and contains areas integral to the Altamaha River watershed. The Altamaha River watershed is the third largest watershed on the eastern seaboard of the United States. It contains important terrestrial, riverine, and estuarine systems, consists of significantly important natural areas, and the conservation easement provides an important buffer to these areas. This conservation easement was created for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing water quality, protecting the wildlife habitat, natural, scenic, forest, recreational, and open space values. The conservation easement is 1,758 hectares and located in Long and McIntosh counties in coastal Georgia.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2006

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

1758

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

1758

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

31.383035

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-81.405141

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

0

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The purpose of the Townsend Conservation easement is to protect "conservation value" defined in the contract as the "natural, scenic, forest, recreational and open space values of the protected property: including wildlife and wildlife habitat for indigenous and migratory species, native flora and fauna and the ecological processes that support them; upland and lowland forest communities; protected animal species and other plant, plant communities, and animals; air and water quality including major watershed areas and riparian and aquatic habitats." The Townsend Conservation Easement prevents fragmentation and/or conversion of of existing open spaces and forested areas. We do not have the total investment over the project period.

Row 2

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

We are actively restoring and managing a 6,507-hectare pine flatwoods site located in the West Gulf Coastal Plain physiographic province in southern Arkansas known as Moro Big Pine Wildlife Management Area and Natural Area (hereafter, Moro Big Pine). Moro Big Pine is managed by PotlatchDeltic in collaboration with Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, and the Nature Conservancy. The company holds title to the land and the conservation partners hold a perpetual conservation easement focused on restoring and maintaining a fire-maintained pine ecosystem with intervening natural hardwoods occupying the riparian forest along streams and rivers. The easement also provides for public access and the area is used for hunting, hiking and observation of nature. Moro Big Pine also supports a growing population of federally listed endangered red-cockaded woodpeckers that is managed according to a Habitat Conservation Plan approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Forest management on Moro Big Pine is focused on restoring and managing the natural stands of loblolly and shortleaf pine native to the flatwoods site. Historically these stands had frequent fire that maintained pine-dominated sub climax conditions with open canopies and rich herbaceous ground cover with limited hardwood brush or mid-story. PotlatchDeltic has applied active management to restore natural fire regimes, thin overstocked stands and open the canopy. The company has reintroduced a cycle of frequent prescribed burning resulting in 60,728 acres of burning since 2003. Forest thinning and improvement harvests have covered 14,036 acres over the same period. The restoration of open, mature pine forests with lush herbaceous understory has largely been completed and ongoing management is targeted at maintaining these conditions over the long term.The red-cockaded woodpecker population has benefited from the forest management, habitat management and installation of cavity inserts that are used for nesting and roosting.

Annual monitoring of the population reveals it has grown from 24 adult birds with 9 potential breeding groups to the 2024 population of 92 adults with 33 active cluster sites with 31 potential breeding groups. The population also includes two single bird clusters that undoubtedly aspires to become a potential breeding group.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2006.0

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

6507

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

6507

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

33.408

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-94.475

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

0

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The reporting of measured outcomes by PotlatchDeltic and our contractors is completed annually and includes status and reproductive monitoring of red-cockaded woodpecker, habitat and natural area condition, summary of acreage prescribed burned, and harvest acreage, volume and conditions, and the amount of carbon sequestered and stored above baseline. The results for red-cockaded woodpecker have been excellent and are described in the previous section as are the amount of burning, restoration harvesting and habitat management. The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission collects information on abundance of focal species including wild turkey, bobwhite quail and ground nesting songbirds. They also collect harvest data on white-tailed deer and wild turkey. Moro Big Pine is one of the most productive wildlife areas for public use and game harvest rates per acre. A meeting of the company, conservation easement holder partners, and local stakeholders is held annually. Updates on forest management completed, red-cockaded woodpecker monitoring, recreational use and game harvest are provided. A field tour is held in conjunction with the annual meeting and on-the-ground conditions are observed and discussed. Collaboration and discussion results in adjustments to management to achieve and maintain the easement goals. The Moro Big Pine Partnership has created a strong public-private conservation effort that is expanding to private lands in the vicinity. Management of the area has been lauded by the conservation partners and recreational users and satisfaction with the easement conditions is high. We do not have the total investment over the period of the project.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Row 1

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Business activities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

We do not track water usage in our corporate offices or in our real estate business. Our wood products facilities use little water and we can track withdrawal and provide information; however consumption data is not feasible due to inability to measure the periodic small quantities released. Corporate office is leased and we do not operational control.

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Data is not available

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not available

Select from:

☑ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. It is used principally for watering log decks, saw cooling, make-up water at the boilers for steam production, and fire protection. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling, especially at the log deck. The water that is discharged is sent to settling ponds for solids removal prior to being released. Water loss across the facilities is mostly due to evaporation from log watering activities. Our wood products facilities use little water and we can track withdrawal and provide information; however consumption data is not feasible due to inability to measure the periodic small quantities released. The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) found that approximately 88% of the water used at U.S. forest products facilities gets treated and reintegrated into the surface water cycle. Approximately 11% of the water used in our wood products facilities is returned to the atmospheric water cycle through evaporation and the remaining water (less than 1%) is contained within finished products and residuals.
[Add row]

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals are measured using flow meters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We monitor water withdrawals at all of our wood products facilities. Water withdrawal is monitored using flow meters at intake or discharge sources. Water withdrawal is monitored for all sources (freshwater sources, groundwater sources, and municipal sources) to determine the total water withdrawal volumes.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Total water withdrawals are measured using flow meters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal sources include municipal water sources, groundwater and surface water. Total water withdrawal is generally measured using flow meters for all surface water sources and groundwater. Water withdrawal sources include municipal water sources, groundwater and surface water. Total water withdrawal is generally measured using flow meters for all surface water sources and groundwater. Approximately 44% of our 2024 water withdrawals were surface water, 41% was groundwater, and the remaining 15% was municipal groundwater

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We do not currently monitor the quality of water withdrawals.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The water used in our wood products facilities is obtained from surface water, groundwater, and municipal sources. It is used principally for watering log decks, saw cooling, make-up water at the boilers for steam production, and fire protection. Water withdrawals are minimized through extensive reuse and recycling, especially at the log deck. The water that is discharged is sent to settling ponds for solids removal prior to being released.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

All water that is discharged from our wood products facilities is sent to settling ponds for solids removal prior to being released.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We currently do not monitor water discharge by treatment method.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We track water discharge quality parameters in order to comply with permits.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits have parameter limits and benchmarks for pollutants such as zinc, chemical oxygen demand, and total suspended solids.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

We currently do not monitor emissions to water.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We do not currently monitor water discharge temperature.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We do not currently monitor water consumption.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Recycled water is based on data from the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water used at our facilities is mostly borrowed water. Our wood products facilities use little water and we can track withdrawal and provide information; however consumption data is not feasible due to inability to measure the periodic small quantities released. The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) found that approximately 88% of the water used at U.S. forest products facilities gets treated and reintegrated into the surface water cycle. Approximately 11% of the water used in our wood products facilities is returned to the atmospheric water cycle through evaporation and the remaining water (less than 1%) is contained within finished products and residuals

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Standard operating procedure.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Clean potable water is available at all of our facilities for washrooms, drinking water, hand washing, and for all other sanitation and health matters.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

864

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We do not currently forecast withdrawals.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We do not currently track water discharges.

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We do not currently monitor water discharges.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We do not currently track or forecast water discharge volumes.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We do not currently track water consumption.

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We do not currently track water consumption.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We do not currently track or forecast water consumption volumes.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

334.4

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Repairs and Upgrades

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We do not currently forecast water withdrawals.

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

38.70

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Water monitoring systems

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren and Waldo, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. In 2024, total water sourced at Warren was 6% from municipal water and 94% from groundwater; however, municipal water supplied to Warren is partially sourced from the Sparta Aquifer. Total water for Waldo in 2024 was sourced 82% from groundwater and 18% from municipal water. Municipal water supplied to Waldo is surface water sourced from Lake Columbia. Decreased withdrawals from areas of stress was primarily the result of repairs to leaking water pipes. The water supply infrastructure at our Warren, Arkansas wood products facility was identified as a major opportunity for improvement, and work on repairs and upgrades are ongoing.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

382.9

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Fresh water withdrawals did not change significantly

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our fresh surface water withdrawals, including withdrawals from rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes stayed about the same in comparison to the previous reporting year.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We do not utilize brackish surface water/seawater.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

352.1

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Reductions are likely due to the cumulative effects of several conservation efforts, especially at our Waldo, Arkansas and Warren, Arkansas wood products facilities to reduce impacts on the Sparta Aquifer.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We do not currently utilize non-renewable groundwater.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We do not utilize produced/entrained water.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

129

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our St. Maries wood products complex and Waldo wood products facility both saw significant reductions in municipal water usage. In 2024 our St. Maries Complex optimized their water management in the logyard in 2024, resulting in less water withdrawals from the St. Joe River vs. 2023.
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

2

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:
☑ 26-50

(9.3.4) Please explain

Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren and Waldo, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. In 2024, total water sourced at Warren was 6% from municipal water and 94% from groundwater; however, municipal water supplied to Warren is partially sourced from the Sparta Aquifer. Total water for Waldo in 2024 was sourced 82% from groundwater and 18% from municipal water. Municipal water supplied to Waldo is surface water sourced from Lake Columbia. Decreased withdrawals from areas of stress was primarily the result of repairs to leaking water pipes. The water supply infrastructure at our Warren, Arkansas wood products facility was identified as a major opportunity for improvement, and work on repairs and upgrades are ongoing.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.4) Please explain

No upstream facilities in our value chain have been identified with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, or opportunities.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Waldo, Arkansas

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

We do not currently track water discharge volumes.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Sparta Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.329699

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-93.304981

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

107.3

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

107.3

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

107

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our Waldo wood products facility saw a significant reduction in municipal water usage in 2024.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Warren, Arkansas

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

We do not currently track water discharge volumes.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :Sparta Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.617852

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-92.079229

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

227

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

212.5

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

14.5

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

227

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our Warren wood products facility had a significant reduction in water usage from the aquifer. This is a result of improved water management onsite and ensuring leaks get detected and fixed quickly.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently third-party verify water accounting data.
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

1062076000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

1229254.63

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

We work to reduce our water withdrawals through implementing reuse and recycling efforts, preserving and monitoring water quality, and improving infrastructure.
[Fixed row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*PotlatchDeltic's wood products do not contain any hazardous substances.*

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.14.4) Please explain

PotlatchDeltic's wood products are not currently classified as low water impact and we do not currently have plans to address this in the next two years.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?

(9.15.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

We work to reduce our water withdrawals through implementing reuse and recycling efforts, preserving and monitoring water quality, and improving infrastructure. [Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water protection

☑ Land/water management

☑ Species management

☑ Law & policy

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ State and benefit indicators

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

We do not have any activities located in or near legally protected areas.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

We do not have any activities located in or near UNESCO World Heritage sites.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

We do not have any activities located in or near UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

We do not have any activities located in or near Ramsar sites.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

We have three sites that are classified as Key Biodiversity Areas; Moro Big Pine, Mica Creek Experimental Watershed, and the Townsend Conservation Easement.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

We work with the Wildlife Conservation Initiative (WCI), a voluntary, collaborative partnership between the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) to create a trusted, durable relationship to implement science-based conservation for at-risk species.
[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Moro Big Pine

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

6508

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Twenty years of habitat management and translocation of federally endangered red-cockaded woodpeckers (RCWs) to improve population viability has resulted in the population on Moro Big Pine growing from 24 adult birds with 9 potential breeding groups to the 2024 population of 92 adults with 31 potential breeding groups. The population also includes two additional single bird groups that may become a potential breeding group. The RCW population on Moro Big Pine is now large enough that we are working together with the Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission to translocate sub-adults from Moro to other small RCW populations in Arkansas to increase their genetic diversity.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

PotlatchDeltic’s forest management and timber harvesting activities in and around the Moro Big Pine are managed for sustainable timber production using best management practices that protect environmental quality, maintain contiguous forest cover, and support wildlife habitat, with all operations planned to avoid negative impacts on the biodiversity within Moro Big Pine. The endangered red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW), whose nesting and foraging habitats depend on mature pine forests with open canopies and herbaceous ground cover requires management that ensures these habitats will be available on a continuous basis. PotlatchDeltic partnered with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1995 to develop a habitat conservation plan (HCP) for the RCW, which was recently updated and embedded in a 16,121-acre conservation easement now held by the State of Arkansas. Biologists from Wire Grass Ecological Associates conduct annual population surveys and band all RCW nestlings, while researchers use “video peepers” to monitor nesting cavities. Forest management in Moro Big Pine is focused on restoring native loblolly and shortleaf pine stands through thinning, prescribed burning, and improvement harvests—and these forest management activities are planned and implemented so that nesting and foraging habitat is perpetually maintained. PotlatchDeltic has reintroduced frequent fire regimes, conducted 60,728 acres of prescribed burns since 2003, and completed 14,036 acres of thinning and improvement harvests to restore open-canopy conditions. These efforts have largely completed the restoration of RCW habitat, and ongoing management is designed to maintain these conditions.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Mica Creek

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

2700

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

In 1990, with help from the U.S. Forest Service and the Idaho Department of Lands, we established the Mica Creek Experimental Watershed — an area southeast of Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, comprising the 6,672-acre catchments of Mica Creek, a tributary of the St. Joe River. The Mica Creek Watershed contains small areas of old growth forest predominated by western red cedar with some trees approaching 1,000 years old. While the watershed has been the site of numerous research projects over the years, we created this “living laboratory” for one main reason: to conduct a multi-decade study of the effects of modern forest best management practices on stream water quality and aquatic life. Over the course of the study, we have worked with scientists from the University of Idaho and other academic institutions to collect data on the effects of tree harvesting, road building, and other practices. The results of that research are published in independent, peer-reviewed academic journals such as Forest Science and presented at scientific conferences. In our leadership roles serving on the Idaho Forest Practices Act Committee we work to incorporate the results of the Mica Creek research into effective and efficient Forest Practices Act rules. The conclusions to date are encouraging. They show that forest management that adheres to contemporary best management practices has little to no adverse effect on streams aquatic life.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

PotlatchDeltic owns and manages most of the lands adjacent to the Mica Creek Study area. The working lands adjacent to Mica are managed for sustainable timber production and provide contiguous forest cover. The surrounding lands are fully supportive of the Mica Creek watershed and contribute positively to the environmental conditions and research findings. Our management of adjacent lands is planned and implemented to avoid negative impacts to Mica. The old growth forest within Mica is protected and the remainder of the watershed is being managed as a working forest – the forestlands that we harvest, replant, and manage for sustainable production of timber. The research and monitoring that are being conducted now provides an ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of contemporary best management practices. The findings from the first 25 years of research comparing treated versus control stands have been summarized and published in numerous scientific journals. In collaboration with the University of Idaho, we continue to collect data on water flow, sediment, fish, and other key environmental conditions in the Mica Creek watershed

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Townsend Conservation Easement

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1758

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

The Townsend Conservation Easement is a natural area which contains aquatic communities in which several species of fish, plants, and other wildlife ecosystems exist, contains wetland habitats that support nesting areas for protected species, has significant recreational, forest, and education values, and contains areas integral to the Altamaha River watershed. The Altamaha River watershed is the third largest watershed on the eastern seaboard of the United States. It contains important terrestrial, riverine, and estuarine systems, consists of significantly important natural areas, and the conservation easement provides an important buffer to these areas. This conservation easement was created for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing water quality, protecting the wildlife habitat, natural, scenic, forest, recreational, and open space values. The conservation easement is 1,758 hectares and located in Long and McIntosh counties in coastal Georgia.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

The purpose of the Townsend Conservation easement is to protect the conservation values defined in the contract as the "natural, scenic, forest, recreational and open space values of the protected property: including wildlife and wildlife habitat for indigenous and migratory species, native flora and fauna and the ecological processes that support them; upland and lowland forest communities; protected animal species and other plant, plant communities, and animals; air and water quality including major watershed areas and riparian and aquatic habitats." The Townsend Conservation Easement prevents fragmentation and/or land use conversion of existing open spaces and forested areas. PotlatchDeltic owns land adjacent to Townsend that is sustainably managed working forests. Management of adjacent lands is fully supportive of the conservation values on the Townsend conservation easement. Our management of adjacent lands is planned and implemented to avoid negative impacts to Townsend.
[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party	Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party	Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*We have not pursued third-party certification at this time.*

[Fixed row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

(13.2.1) Additional information

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS As used in the accompanying PotlatchDeltic Corporation 2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire (the "Questionnaire"), the term "PotlatchDeltic" and such terms as "the Company," "the corporation," "our," "its," "we," "management," and "us" may refer to PotlatchDeltic Corporation and one or more of PotlatchDeltic's consolidated subsidiaries or affiliates or to all of them taken as a whole. All of these terms are used for convenience only and are not intended as a precise description of any of the separate companies, each of which manages its own affairs. CAUTIONARY STATEMENT REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING INFORMATION The Questionnaire contains, in addition to historical information, certain forward-looking statements within the meaning of the federal securities laws. Words such as "achieve," "aim," "annual," "aspire," "believe," "can," "commitment," "continue," "could," "design," "each year," "ensure," "estimate," "expect," "future," "initiative," "goal," "may," "mission," "objective," "opportunity," "periodic," "perpetuity," "plan," "potential," "project," "regularly," "seek," "should," "strive," "target," "will," "would," and similar expressions are intended to identify such forward-looking statements. Statements and assumptions with respect to achievement of goals and objectives; anticipated actions to meet goals and objectives; allocation of resources; planned, encouraged, or anticipated actions; planned performance of technology; or other efforts are also examples of forward-looking statements. Among the forward-looking statements in the Questionnaire are statements about our strategies regarding forest management and annual harvest numbers; the effect of best management practices on our timberlands, water, biodiversity, air, and climate; potential conservation or solar outcomes for real estate transactions; future environmental management and compliance; wildlife

conservation; energy consumption and reduction; management of air emissions, water pollutants, and wastes; estimates of the amount of CO2e removed and sequestered by our forests; estimated greenhouse gas emissions; anticipated climate risks and opportunities; ability to ensure employee and supplier adherence to applicable policies and law; maintenance of third-party certifications; our ability to foresee and mitigate all risks to our business; our ability to meet our corporate responsibility targets and goals and succeed with our initiatives, including those relating to greenhouse gas reductions, energy efficiency efforts and emission reduction goals; and similar matters. These forward-looking statements reflect management's current views regarding future events based on estimates and assumptions and are therefore subject to known and unknown risks, uncertainties, and other factors, some of which are beyond our control, and are not guarantees of future conduct or policy. The actual conduct of our activities, including the development, implementation or continuation of any program, policy or initiative discussed in the Questionnaire may differ materially in the future. Many of the standards and metrics used in preparing the Questionnaire continue to evolve and are based on management assumptions believed to be reasonable at the time of preparation but should not be considered guarantees. Actual results could differ materially from our historical results or those expressed or implied by forward-looking statements contained in the Questionnaire due to factors such as: the availability of funding for the programs described in the Questionnaire; our ability to achieve our targets, goals and objectives; changes in our priorities as well as changes in the priorities of our investors, customers and suppliers; the amount of our future investments; the accuracy of our estimates and assumptions; acquisitions and divestitures; the future effect of legislation, rulemaking and changes in policy or best management practices; changes in production and production capacity in the forest products industry; the competitive environment; the ability to attract and retain personnel and suppliers with technical skills and other capabilities; technological developments; the willingness of suppliers to adopt and comply with our programs; the impact of cyber or other security threats or other disruptions to our business; changes in requirements for third-party certification of our timberlands, logs, and lumber; the potential disruption or interruption of the Company's operations due to accidents, political events, civil unrest, severe weather, floods, fires, cyber threats, disease outbreaks, or other human health threats beyond the Company's control; and global economic, business, political, and climate conditions. These are only some of the factors that may affect the forward-looking statements contained in the Questionnaire. For further information regarding risks and uncertainties associated with our business, please refer to our U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) filings, including our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2024, our 2025 Proxy Statement, and our 2025 Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which can be obtained at the Company's website, www.potlatchdeltic.com. The forward-looking statements in the Questionnaire are intended to be subject to the safe harbor protection provided by federal securities laws. Forward-looking statements contained in the Questionnaire present our views only as of the date of the Questionnaire. Except as required under applicable law, we do not intend to issue updates concerning any future revisions of our views to reflect events or circumstances occurring after the date of the Questionnaire. Nothing in the Questionnaire is incorporated by reference or shall be deemed to be incorporated by reference into the documents that we have filed or will file with the SEC. NOTICE REGARDING CERTAIN TRADEMARKS SFI marks are registered marks owned by the Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Inc. Forest Stewardship Council and FSC are registered marks owned by The Forest Stewardship Council and are used pursuant to license codes FSC-C005430 and FSC-C102909.

(13.2.2) Attachment (optional)

PCH Forward Looking Statement.docx
[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

378 Vice President Public Affairs and Chief Sustainability Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:
☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute