



Rayonier Inc.

CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

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](#)

Contents

C1. Introduction.....	10
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?	10
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.	10
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.	10
(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....	11
(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?	11
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.	12
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?	12
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.	14
(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?	14
(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.	15
(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?	17
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?	21
(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?	22
C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities	24
(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?	24
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?	25
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?	26
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.	26
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?	44
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?	45
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?	46
(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?	49

(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.	50
---	----

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 53

(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?	53
(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.	53
(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.	73
(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?	77
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?	79
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?	79
(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?	80
(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.	80
(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.	98

C4. Governance 101

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?	101
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?	101
(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.	102
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?	108
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?	110
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	110
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?	117
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	118
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?	121
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.	121
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?	126

(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?	126
(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?	128
(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.	132
(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?	144
(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.	144

C5. Business strategy..... 147

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?	147
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.	148
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.	180
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?	183
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?	186
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.	187
(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.	190
(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?	191
(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.	191
(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?	193
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?	194
(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon.	195
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?	198
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?	199
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?	201
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?	203
(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.	204
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.	212

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity.....	218
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.	220
(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.	224
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?	226
C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach	227
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.....	227
C7. Environmental performance - Climate change	229
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?	229
(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?.....	229
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?	229
(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?....	230
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.	231
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.	231
(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 excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?	232
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.	232
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO ₂ e?	241
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO ₂ e?	243
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.	245
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.	255
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.	260
(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?	260
(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.	260
(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?	266
(7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain?	267
(7.12.2) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO ₂	267

(7.12.3) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.	267
(7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years?	271
(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?	271
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type?	272
(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).	272
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.	275
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	276
(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.	276
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.	276
(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?	277
(7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions.	277
(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.	277
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	280
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.	280
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.	280
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?	281
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.	281
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?	283
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	284
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?	284
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.	284
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.	285
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.	287
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.	288
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.	292
(7.30.14) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.	294

(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.	295
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.	296
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?	299
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.	299
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?	309
(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).	309
(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.	312
(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.	312
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?	313
(7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit?	313
(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.	313
(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?	318
(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.	318
(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?	320
(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?	321
(7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response.	321
(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?	325
(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.	326
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?	327
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?	327
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.	327
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?	329

C8. Environmental performance - Forests 330

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?	330
--	-----

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.	330
(8.3) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that is used to produce your disclosed commodities.	331
(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.	334
(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.	334
(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.	336
(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?	345
(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.	346
(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.	347
(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.	355
(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.	356
(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. .	357
(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.	358
(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.	360
(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.	361
(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.	363
(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.	364
(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.	366
(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?	367
(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.	367
(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to increase sustainable land use during the reporting year.	368
(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.	390
(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?	393
(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.	393

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?	395
(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).	395
C9. Environmental performance - Water security	408
(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?	408
(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.	408
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?	409
(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?	417
(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.	420
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.	421
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.	424
(9.2.9) Indicate the highest level to which your wastewater is treated (either by your organization or a third party) before being discharged to the environment.	426
(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.	428
(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?	429
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.	429
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?	430
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?	430
(9.15) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.	431
(9.15.1) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.	432
C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity	439
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	439
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?	439
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?	440
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.	442
C13. Further information & sign off	457
(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?	457

(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. 457

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. 457

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub to facilitate collective action in priority basins. 458

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

Rayonier is a land resources real estate investment trust (REIT) with a portfolio comprising over four million acres in the U.S. South and U.S. Northwest. The company is focused on managing its timberlands on a sustainable basis while optimizing its overall portfolio value by delivering land to its highest and best use. Rayonier also operates six sawmills, an industrial-grade plywood mill, residential and commercial real estate developments, and a rural land sales program. On January 30, 2026, we completed our merger with PotlatchDeltic Corporation ("PotlatchDeltic") in a merger of-equals transaction. Where possible, our CDP response reflects the combined business. Rayonier is committed to corporate responsibility, third-party forest certification, and supporting climate change mitigation through its land-based solutions business and greenhouse gas reduction commitments. Sustainability of all of our timberlands is certified by the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) with 60% of our Arkansas and Louisiana timberlands also certified under the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC). All programs are comprehensive systems of environmental principles, objectives, and performance measures that combine the perpetual growing and harvesting of trees with the protection of wildlife, plants, and soil and water quality. Rayonier is committed to responsible procurement of raw materials, and we use the SFI Fiber Sourcing Chain of Custody program to assure that the wood we purchase originates from responsible sources. The company's shares are publicly traded on the NYSE under the symbol RYN. More information about the company is available at rayonier.com.

[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

12/31/2025

(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?

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

(1.5.1) Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?

Select from:

☒ No

(1.5.2) How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?

Our reporting boundary is the same as used in financial statements but where possible, information has been consolidated to reflect the merger of PotlatchDeltic and Rayonier. Financial information, such as revenues, reflects publicly available information which includes full year 2025 for Rayonier and first nine months for PotlatchDeltic.

[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:

☒ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

RYN

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

0335068

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

001265263

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)

16888000

(1.22.8) Of the total commodity volume, state how much is post-consumer recycled content (metric tons)

0

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.22.10) Original unit

Select all that apply

☒ Short ton

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

1 short ton = 0.907185 metric ton

(1.22.12) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Hardwood logs

☒ Softwood logs

(1.22.13) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ 31-40%

(1.22.14) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ 81-90%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.22.20) Please explain

A significant portion of our revenues are derived from forestry-related and wood products-related operations. Our combined timber harvest in 2025 was approximately 15.3 million U.S. tons. Approximately 10 percent of the harvest were used in our wood products facilities. An additional 3.3 million tons of sawlogs were purchased by our mills from external sources. This total is converted to metric tons by multiplying against a conversion factor of 0.907185 metric tons/ton.

[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

Farmed seafood / 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

Wild-capture seafood

(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 relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

We leverage our in-house financial records to understand the flow of activities, processes, and value creation within our organization. We have mapped our tier 1 suppliers, including where they operate through these financial pathways, which have corresponding geolocation attributes in our geographic information system (GIS). We know but have not yet mapped our tier 2 suppliers. We plan to understand where our tier 2 suppliers operate, and the relationships between them and our direct suppliers in the next two years to determine their materiality in our reporting. We map our tier 1 suppliers emissions based on acres completed or machine hours worked for silviculture, miles driven for transportation, and tons harvested and loaded onto trucks for harvesting. We believe tier 1 supplier coverage is full since our calculations tie back to our financial reporting and GIS systems.

[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 1 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

Select from:

☒ All supplier tiers known have been mapped for this sourced commodity

[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)

10

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

Rayonier grows a long-rotation crop with average harvest ages 25 - 40 years spread across over more than 4 million acres, therefore short-term horizon of 2030 aligned with The Climate Pledge fits our strategic silvicultural planning horizons. We break down our short-term 2030 emission reduction targets into annual key results that if met will deliver our 2030 goal.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

11

(2.1.3) To (years)

20

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

Rayonier grows a long-rotation crop with average harvest ages 25 - 40 years spread across over 4 million acres, therefore medium-term horizon of 2040 aligned with The Climate Pledge fits our strategic silvicultural planning horizons as it takes 11 - 20 years for us to see the interim to final results of changes in forest management to increase carbon stocks and for the useful life of machine replacements of our contractors. Given our lifecycle analysis of machine replacements, we believe it is better to wait until the end of the machine's useful life before replacing it due to the embodied emissions of manufacturing a new machine is almost always greater than the operational efficiencies of reduced fuel consumption for machines not able to be connected to the electric grid. We monitor for step-changing technology advances with our tier 2 suppliers of machinery to our contractors.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

21

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

Select from:

☒ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

100

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

Given our long-rotations, Rayonier's long-term strategic sustainability plans use a 21 - 100-year harvest schedule planning horizon. This enhances sustainability and adaptation of new forest management practices between rotations are achieved through multiple timber crop rotations.

[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

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.

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Tornado
- ☒ Heat wave
- ☒ Wildfires
- ☒ Cold wave/frost

Chronic physical

- ☒ Heat stress
- ☒ Soil erosion
- ☒ Water stress
- ☒ Soil degradation
- ☒ Temperature variability
- ☒ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy

- ☒ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☒ Changes to national legislation
- ☒ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
- ☒ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
- ☒ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits

- ☒ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon
- ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- ☒ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

- ☒ 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)

- ☒ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

Market

- ☒ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

- ☒ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders
- ☒ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g., GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress, excessive bycatch)

Technology

- ☒ Lack of access to data or monitoring systems
- ☒ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

- ☒ Exposure to sanctions and litigation

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | ☒ Indigenous peoples |
| ☒ Investors | |
| ☒ Suppliers | |

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional climate-related risks and opportunities to our company. Rayonier utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify and assess significant risks facing the Company. The internal risk management team annually evaluates the climate opportunities,

dependencies, risks, and potential impacts, and summarizes these opportunities and risks in a report to senior management and the Board of Directors. 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. Land-Based Solutions team evaluates potential opportunities arising from climate change initiatives including solar installations, carbon capture storage, and carbon offsets. Rayonier periodically completes a materiality assessment based on dialogs with our stakeholders, considering the topics they find important and how management views each of these topics impact to our business and long-term value creation. These results are integrated into our enterprise risk management process. This materiality assessment is approved by our Senior Leadership Team and published in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We have also mapped material sustainability topics, commitments, and relevant metrics to the UN SDGs to assess our alignment with the priorities of policymakers and other stakeholders.

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

(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.

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Drought | ☒ Disease or pests |
| ☒ Tornado | ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice) |
| ☒ Heat wave | ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water) |

- ☑ Wildfires
- ☑ Cold wave/frost

Chronic physical

- ☑ Heat stress
- ☑ Soil erosion
- ☑ Water stress
- ☑ Soil degradation
- ☑ Temperature variability
- ☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy

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

Market

- ☑ Changing customer behavior
- ☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

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, excessive bycatch)

Technology

- ☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies
- ☑ Other technology risk, please specify :Technology commercializing the circular bioeconomy.

Liability

- ☑ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

- ☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

- ☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- ☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability
- ☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | ☒ Indigenous peoples |
| ☒ Investors | |
| ☒ Suppliers | |

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional climate-related risks and opportunities to our company. Rayonier utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify and assess significant risks facing the Company. The internal risk management team annually evaluates the climate opportunities, dependencies, risks, and potential impacts, and summarizes these opportunities and risks in a report to senior management and the Board of Directors. Timberlands are managed using long-term management plans based on harvest schedule models which optimize long-term harvesting and forest management operations and project sustainable harvest volumes. Foresters prepare 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. All our timberlands are certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and 60% of our Arkansas and Louisiana forests are certified to the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). We are independently audited annually to certify that we are meeting SFI or FSC requirements. Our environmental management system (EMS) is based on an ongoing improvement process. We conduct 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 2025, 100% of the fiber consumption at all our wood products facilities was certified according to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) fiber sourcing standard. Rayonier periodically completes a materiality assessment based on dialogs with our stakeholders, considering the topics they find important and how management views each of these topics impact to our business and long-term value creation. These results are integrated into our enterprise risk management process. This materiality assessment is approved by our Senior Leadership Team and published in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We have also mapped material sustainability topics, commitments, and relevant metrics to the UN SDGs to assess our alignment with the priorities of policymakers and other stakeholders.

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 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

Commercially/publicly available tools

- ☒ Other commercially/publicly available tools, please specify :Publicly available data such as PRISM, in cooperation with NCASI

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.

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- ☒ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon
- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Chronic physical

- ☒ Soil erosion
- ☒ Soil degradation
- ☒ Groundwater depletion
- ☒ Declining ecosystem services
- ☒ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- ☒ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☒ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy

- ☒ Increased pricing of water
- ☒ Changes to national legislation
- ☒ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permits
- ☒ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

- ☒ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
- ☒ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
- ☒ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits

- ☒ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

Reputation

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

Technology

- ☒ Lack of access to data or monitoring systems

Liability

- ☒ Exposure to sanctions and litigation
- ☒ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | ☒ Indigenous peoples |
| ☒ Investors | ☒ Water utilities at a local level |
| ☒ Suppliers | |

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional climate-related risks and opportunities to our company. Rayonier utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify and assess significant risks facing the Company. Our third-party certifications through the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) assist us in taking 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 5

(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

☒ Opportunities

(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 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

Commercially/publicly available tools

- ☒ LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Databases

- ☒ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards, please specify :NatureServe

Other

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

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Drought | ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice) |
| ☒ Tornado | ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water) |
| ☒ Heat wave | |

- ☑ Wildfires
- ☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

Chronic physical

- ☑ Soil erosion
- ☑ Temperature variability
- ☑ Declining ecosystem services
- ☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- ☑ Change in land/freshwater/ocean use
- ☑ 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

- ☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

Reputation

- ☑ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders
- ☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g., GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress, excessive bycatch)
- ☑ Other reputation risk, please specify :Reputation as part of the solution to climate change through Land-Based Solutions impacted.

Technology

- ☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

- ☑ Exposure to sanctions and litigation
- ☑ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | ☒ Indigenous peoples |
| ☒ Investors | |
| ☒ Suppliers | |

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

We evaluate a range of physical, regulatory, and transitional climate-related risks and opportunities to our company. Rayonier utilizes an enterprise risk management (ERM) framework to identify and assess significant risks facing the Company. The internal risk management team annually evaluates the biodiversity-related dependencies, risks, and potential impacts, and summarizes these risks in a report to senior management. Our third-party certifications through the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) help assist us in taking precautions to protect biodiversity and manage associated risks. 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 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 management 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 through 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

Interconnections between risks and dependencies are assessed in a number of ways. For example, internal research by the company has reviewed and synthesized the most recent data on the regional risks and impacts of climate change on our forests located in the United States. The physical risks and the transition risks of climate change, and the opportunities are summarized annually in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We use the UN SDGs as a framework to identify the interdependencies among sustainability topics, map those to the relevant SDGs, and develop key performance indicators for each topic identified. This is published annually in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We also follow the SASB and TCFD standards and metrics focused on our forest management governance and practices, including metrics and targets. We conduct a materiality assessment to scope the major sustainability issues and their impact on our business outcomes and importance to external stakeholders. We annually assess changes in the biodiversity of our forests using the Cover Type Diversity Index (CTDI) and monitor the year-over-year changes to determine if biodiversity is stable, and we are maintaining the diverse habitats needed by the species that inhabit our forests.

[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

☒ Downstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☒ Areas important for biodiversity

☒ Areas of high ecosystem integrity

- ☒ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water
- ☒ 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

Rayonier uses its GIS based land management system to track each stand of trees on our land base. This spatial database documents the forest properties in each area and their relationship with other forests across the landscape. We use internal data on forest species and cover type, geology, and soils to identify potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species. We also work with NatureServe to determine critical habitats for threatened and endangered species across the entire United States to determine critical habitats near our forests. Rayonier develops site specific management guidelines for the priority locations that are identified. These management guidelines are shared with our contractors to enhance the effectiveness of the conservation management activities across the landscape and our estate. These guidelines establish the appropriate forest management practices needed to protect habitat for critical species, including the use of permanent or temporal management buffers to protect these priority areas.

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

Select from:

- ☒ No, we have a list/geospatial map of priority locations, but we will not be disclosing it

[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:

☒ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☒ 1-10

(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

Rayonier has a formal enterprise risk management procedure that is prepared annually and reviewed by senior leadership and the Board of Directors. The Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Committee completes an annual assessment of the company's enterprise-wide risks, including environmental risks. The Committee identifies value drivers that are key to meeting strategic objectives and determined related risks, and reviews whether the responses to those risks are adequate. Management continues to focus on the effectiveness of risk mitigation and assessment of whether changes in strategy, operations, or the external environment justify changes to our listing of material risks. To complete the risk assessment, business segment leaders are asked to review the value drivers and related risks identified in the previous year, identify any new risks, rate residual impact and likelihood, and review the risk response. Business unit leaders are also asked to provide information on current events or forces of change that have impacted or could impact risk. The ERM Committee reviews the assessments from the business segments and evaluates the risk response, and impact and likelihood ratings. Risks are assigned a score according to the combination of impact and likelihood ratings. After determining a score, risks are categorized as Tier I, Tier II, and Watch List. While the risk score is the primary factor in determining top risks, other qualitative factors such as forces of change and the speed at which such forces could have an impact are also used in the evaluation. Tier I and II risks are those with the highest risk score and the greatest potential to impact the company's profitability, operations, and shareholder value. Watch List risks have lower scores, but could emerge over time into higher level risks, and require periodic research, analysis, and monitoring.

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

Rayonier has a business development team that analyzes current operations and new business opportunities for the company. We also periodically engage consultants to help us identify and assess new business opportunities. Rayonier has conducted a detailed analysis of the business opportunities associated with

climate change. As part of this process, we identified several emerging areas where Rayonier is well positioned to capture added value for our shareholders. These include renewable energy, including wind and solar, carbon capture and storage, and carbon credits and offsets in the voluntary market.
[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) Details of policies and processes in place to identify and classify potential water pollutants

Through our environmental management systems our businesses 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:

☒ Pesticides

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Rayonier applies fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides as part of our ongoing forest management activities, and in our seedling nursery and seed orchards that have the potential to affect water quality.

(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

☒ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☒ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

Rayonier minimizes these impacts by selecting safe commercially-available pesticides, using trained and licensed professionals for all applications, following all regulations on the product labels, and following best management practices (BMPs) in all applications. BMPs include identifying all streams and water bodies in the area where these pesticides will be applied and establishing buffers along these water ways. We also conduct internal and third-party audits of our pesticide

applications to confirm that we are following all regulations and internal guidelines. Through research, Rayonier has determined application below manufactured recommended rates is sufficient to control identified competition. Employees and contractors are trained in spill response measures and spill kits are maintained on all sites and with field personnel. We measure compliance against Rayonier procedures for each project.

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

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

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

- ☒ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) 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.

[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?

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Forests	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Water	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[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

Chronic physical

☒ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

(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

Temperatures are predicted to increase in the United States. This could result in changes to which species are best suited for certain regions, as reflected by species' climate boundaries and productivity.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Decreased revenues due to reduced 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

☒ 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:

☒ 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

Climate change could impact species suitability in our working forest regions or procurement areas. A change in species' climate boundary and productivity could reduce our inventory and our sustainable yield, thereby adversely affecting our financial results and cash flows.

(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

Costs are included in our forest management practices.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our approach implements Climate Smart Forestry adaptation strategies through sustainable forest management and adaptive management approaches that are incorporated into our forest certification objectives. We support research on tree genetics, forest health, conservation, productivity, and sustainable management. 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 include natural regeneration, 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 to improve resiliency and reduce climate risk. Our sustainable harvest planning and scheduling utilizes forest inventory data that is regularly 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 an ongoing 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 evaluate 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:

☒ Risk1

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☒ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Disease or pests

(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

Forest health can come under increasing threat from insects and disease because of climate change stressors.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Decreased revenues due to reduced 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

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ 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

Insects and disease can result in reduced tree productivity, increased tree mortality, or structural damage to trees. The volume and value of timber that can be harvested from our timberlands may be reduced by insects and disease and could reduce our timber inventory and our sustainable yield, thereby adversely affecting our financial results and cash flows. The loss of species can also impact nature through habitat loss. In addition, weakened forests are less resilient and can be more susceptible to wildfire.

(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

Nature based solutions, restoration and conservation

☒ Promotion of sustainable forest management, including financial incentives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs are included in our forest management practices.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We mitigate insect and disease risks through Climate Smart Forestry measures and by actively managing forests to maintain their health and vigor. 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, 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.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☒ Groundwater depletion

(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 :Sparta Aquifer; St. Joe River

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

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. Water is relatively abundant at most of our manufacturing locations. 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. Increased regulations surrounding water withdrawal, consumption, or discharge for the St. Maries mills could increase capital expenditure requirements. Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren, and Waldo, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. Increased regulations surrounding water withdrawal, consumption, or discharge could increase capital expenditure requirements.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased compliance 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

☒ Long-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-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 could 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

Costs 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.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☒ Increased severity of extreme weather events

(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

Hurricanes are a risk to our forests located near the coast in the U.S. South. Forests and wood products facilities can also be impacted by heatwaves, tornadoes, droughts, flooding, windstorms and other severe weather events. Changing weather patterns and climatic conditions from rising temperatures could add to the unpredictability and frequency of natural disasters.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased compliance 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

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ 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

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. The ability to access our timberlands is critical to sustainably manage our forests, conduct annual harvest plans, and complete silviculture and planting work. Our revenues and cash flows are primarily from our timberland and wood products businesses. Disruptions in access or inclement weather could impact our financial performance.

(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

Policies and plans

☒ Develop a climate transition plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs are included in our forest management practices.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our adaptation is through Climate Smart Forestry strategies. In hurricane-prone regions, silvicultural techniques may reduce risk exposure. Infrastructure investments to maintain access roads and drainage systems are key to allowing crews to respond quickly in the aftermath of extreme weather. After extreme weather, crews launch salvage operations to recover merchantable timber before market viability declines. Promptly removing damaged wood not only reduces economic loss but also can help prevent outbreaks of pests that thrive in storm-damaged forests.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☒ 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

Wildfires could become more common across the United States because of climate change. 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 in 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 have historically had a lower 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:

☒ Decreased asset value or asset useful life leading to write-offs, asset impairment or early retirement of existing assets

(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

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ Likely

(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

The volume and value of timber that can be harvested from our timberlands may be reduced by wildfires and could reduce our timber inventory and our sustainable yield, thereby adversely affecting our revenues and cash flows. We assume substantially all risk of loss to the standing timber we own from fire and other hazards because insuring such losses is not practicable. A reduction in our timber inventory from such events could adversely affect our revenues 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 conduct safely 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.

(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

Nature based solutions, restoration and conservation

☒ Promotion of sustainable forest management, including financial incentives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs are included in our forest management practices.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We can implement heightened measures to prevent fires, minimize damage from fires and to protect our timberlands from loss. This can include reducing the amount of fuel that is readily available through thinning, prescribed fire, maintained fuel breaks, and strategically placed landscape-level fuels treatments. We also support efforts to improve the forest health in unmanaged lands such as Good Neighbor Authority or Idaho Shared Stewardship. We engage in policy solutions to review and update federal wildfire suppression and support agreements to improving interagency coordination and alignment around wildfire suppression. 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. We worked with the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) on dialogue with the United States Forest Service (USFS) regarding opportunities to enhance wildfire response capabilities. Through NAFO, we encouraged cooperation between private working forest owners and public land managers during wildfires. This allows private resources to fight fires in areas of adjacent ownership with National Forest System lands. It also seeks to mitigate wildfire risk through cross-boundary fuel break planning, construction, and maintenance.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☒ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

- ☒ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(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 businesses are subject to various forest management, environmental, land management, health, and safety laws, regulations, and requirements. Increased emphasis on climate change could result in new or additional requirements.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Increased compliance 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
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ 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 working forests could see expanded forest management requirements or best practices that impact our costs or harvest levels. More stringent air emissions or water monitoring or effluent quality regulations could be put into effect that could require additional capital equipment at our wood products facilities to meet requirements. Real estate development could experience changes in policy or regulatory requirements or could see increased requirements for integrated sustainability planning. In addition, our opportunities in land-based solutions could be negatively impacted by policy changes such as moratoriums on carbon capture and storage, wood fiber eligibility in renewable fuels, or shifts in legislation away from supporting the transition to a circular bioeconomy.

(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

Policies and plans

☒ Participation in environmental collaborative industry frameworks, initiatives and/or commitments

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs are included in our environmental and public affairs efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We advocate for regulatory and policy measures that support working forests, forest products, and the role they can play as part of the solution to climate change. We work through our industry associations to assess and respond to policy changes and educate policy makers and the public on our issues.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☒ Changing customer behavior

(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

Traditional biomass-based or wood products markets may be impacted by shifts in consumer preferences and the economic impact of changes in climate policies.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Price instability for both sawtimber and pulpwood markets.

(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
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ 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

Declining paper demand, trade, and global market pressures could continue to result in downstream capacity closures in U.S. pulp and paper facilities. The closures, combined with an ongoing shift away from virgin fiber, could reduce demand for pulpwood and wood residuals, impacting fiber supply chains. Growth to drain ratios in some markets could deteriorate, resulting in suppressed timber pricing.

(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

- ☒ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs are included in our business plans.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Hauling costs limit the impact of mill closures to short distances. We monitor market conditions and growth-to-drain ratios in our markets and maintain relationships with our customers. We evaluate new market opportunities for pulpwood, low-value wood, or wood residuals.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk4

(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

Greenhouse gas reporting requirements could become more stringent. Progress on reduction initiatives could be linked to markets or face penalties. 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 drive 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

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ 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:

☒ 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

Carbon taxes could be introduced to set a price that emitters pay per ton of GHG emissions to encourage companies to reduce their emissions. A tax could increase costs or result in capital investment in our wood products facilities to accelerate greenhouse gas reduction strategies. Carbon border adjustments or carbon tariffs could also be placed on goods entering a country or region, impacting the global market for commodity goods. Changes in machinery, monitoring devices, and

procedures to meet these requirements at our wood products facilities can come at a high cost that can negatively impact our business. 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 the same as fossil fuel emissions. A carbon tax or the inclusion of biomass emissions in a carbon tax would have a financial impact on 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 public affairs efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We work towards our GHG emission reduction targets and net-zero commitments and report our Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 emissions annually. We advocate for regulatory and policy measures that support working forests, forest products, and the role they can play as part of the solution to climate change. We work through our industry associations to assess and respond to policy changes and educate policy makers and the public on our issues.

[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)

1126000000

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

Select from:

☒ 81-90%

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

1126000000

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

Select from:

☒ 81-90%

(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)

1126000000

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

Select from:

☒ 81-90%

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

1126000000

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

Select from:

☒ 81-90%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Forests are a vital part of our business. Negative impacts on the growth or harvesting of forestlands could have a detrimental effect 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 logs sourced from 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)

502000000

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

Select from:

☒ 31-40%

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

502000000

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

Select from:

☒ 31-40%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

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. Water is relatively abundant at most of our manufacturing locations. 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. Increased regulations surrounding water withdrawal, consumption, or discharge for the St. Maries mills could increase capex requirements. Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren, and Waldo, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. Increased regulations surrounding water withdrawal, consumption, or discharge could increase capex requirements.

[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

(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:

☒ 1-10%

(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 of America

☒ 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:

☒ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Two of our Arkansas facilities, Warren, and Waldo, however, are in critical groundwater areas due to reliance on the Sparta Aquifer. In 2025, total water sourced at Warren was 4% from municipal water and 96% from groundwater; however, municipal water supplied to Warren is partially sourced from the Sparta Aquifer. Total water for Waldo in 2025 was sourced 85% from groundwater and 15% 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	None.

[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?

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Forests	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[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

☒ 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

Consumer and builder preference for wood products could increase, recognizing its role as a climate solution that stores carbon and has lower embodied carbon emissions, when sourced from sustainably managed forests, relative to other substitute materials. Policies, standards, and incentives could be put in place that encourage greater use of domestic wood supply or increased wood-based products in buildings or in building materials.

(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

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-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-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

Demand for wood products could expand through increased housing, federal procurement, infrastructure, and the use of mass timber or engineered wood products. Increased demand could support wood products manufacturing capacity expansion and higher timber pricing.

(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

Costs would be dependent on opportunities to increase capacity.

(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.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity

☒ 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. Markets utilizing biomass sourced from sustainably managed forests could expand as new biobased products emerge to support the development of a biobased circular economy, particularly if supported by net-zero transition commitments and circularity-oriented policies. These can expand market demand for fiber, residual wood fiber from wood products, and lower-value trees as a source of feedstock in bioenergy facilities, to produce sustainable aviation fuel, or biochar production. Other emerging technologies utilizing wood fiber for bioplastics could offer transformative solutions.

(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

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-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-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

The development of land-based solutions could create additional revenue and cash flow streams. Additional fiber demand could strengthen fiber markets and timberland valuations. The development of new biomass markets could expand demand for pulpwood, thinnings, and low-value wood and support timber pricing. In addition, the use of residual wood fiber such as chips, sawdust, and shavings from wood product manufacturing could expand markets for these materials, that may otherwise be waste.

(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

Costs are part of our Land Based Solutions and Public Affairs efforts.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We look at and evaluate new markets as they arise parallel to our wood products and timberlands businesses. Each project is evaluated on its return and how it fits into the core business. Our Land-Based Solutions team evaluates new fiber market opportunities. Our Public Affairs team works with our industry associations and engages in direct conversations to promote policies, legislation, and community outreach that supports the growth of natural climate solutions markets.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Capital flow and financing

☒ Payment for ecosystem services (other than REDD+)

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☒ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☒ All river basins within selected countries/areas

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Growing interest in nature-based solutions and natural capital could attract investors and enable ecosystem services monetization if markets develop. Rayonier sustainable forest management uses forest management practices to protect water quality in the streams and rivers where our forests occur. We manage the watersheds that supply potable water to several cities and towns in our ownership areas. We anticipate that there may be a likelihood of receiving payment for water in the future as part of the development of natural capital markets.

(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

☒ 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

(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

Payment for ecosystem services such as water is an emerging practice. It is possible that payments for ecosystem services such as water will become more common in the future as climate change impacts water availability to society. Rayonier anticipates that these payments for ecosystem services could have an impact on our financial position, financial performance, and cash flows in the long term.

(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

Costs would be part of our forest management business.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The sustainable forest management practices currently used by Rayonier are part of our climate smart forestry program and enable us to continue to produce ecosystem services such as water from our forests in a changing climate. Natural capital opportunities surrounding ecosystem services could increase, and we continue to evaluate potential projects as standards and markets develop. Our Land-Based Solutions team evaluates interest from stakeholders in nature and natural capital opportunities. Our Sustainability team also continues to work with global industry associations and standards to strengthen nature reporting and natural capital markets.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☒ Ability to diversify business activities

(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

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 storage through our subsurface pore space ownership rights. 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.

(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

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ Likely (66–100%)

(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

The leasing or sale of land for land-based solutions such as solar or carbon capture storage could create additional revenue and cash flow streams.

(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

Costs would be part of our current business.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We look at and evaluate new markets as they arise parallel to our wood products and timberlands businesses. Each project is evaluated on its return and how it fits into the core business. Our Land-Based Solutions team evaluates emerging interest from stakeholders in new land use opportunities. Our Public Affairs team works with our industry associations and engages in direct conversations to promote policies, legislation, and community outreach that supports the growth of land-based solutions markets.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☒ Other resilience opportunity, please specify :Increased productivity from improved tree growth conditions

(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.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☒ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

(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

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Low

(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 potential for increased productivity on managed loblolly pine could lead to changes in silvicultural practices including shorter rotations and increased revenue and cash flow streams. Opportunities may exist for increased wood products capacity or access to new markets in areas benefiting from higher growth. 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

Costs would be part of our current businesses.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Rayonier's climate smart forestry practices enable us to maintain and improve the productivity of our forests in a changing climate allowing us to recognize potential additional revenue from increased volume production. 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:

☒ Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity

☒ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☒ Increased resilience to impacts of climate change

(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

Climate change that increases forest productivity can also lessen insect and disease risks and make trees more resilient. Environmental stresses including drought stress can be reduced by higher CO2 concentrations, higher atmospheric nitrogen deposition and higher leaf litter decomposition rates. The net impact to forests can be a reduction in frequency and severity of insect and disease outbreaks.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- ☒ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

(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
☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Low

(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 potential for reduced tree mortality from insects and disease can increase yields and harvests, resulting in higher 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

Costs would be part of our current business.

(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. Our tree improvement programs are ongoing and therefore genetic selections take place in the current, climate change effected environmental conditions. To the extent a changing climate is exerting selective pressure on genetic tests, the best climate adapted performers are expressing themselves and are reflected in our genetic selections (tree improvement program).

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp3

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Not applicable

☒ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Capital flow and financing

☒ Payment for ecosystem services (other than REDD+)

(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

Growing interest in nature-based solutions and natural capital could attract investors and enable ecosystem services monetization if markets develop.

(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

☒ 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:

☒ Low

(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

Our expertise in sustainably managing forests and associated ecosystems positions us to provide mitigation projects that deliver successful long-term nature-positive contributions. These could result in additional revenue streams.

(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

Costs would be part of our current business.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Nature credit and natural capital opportunities surrounding ecosystem services could increase, and we continue to evaluate potential projects as standards and markets develop. Our Land-Based Solutions team evaluates interest from stakeholders in nature and natural capital opportunities. Our Sustainability team also continues to work with global industry associations and standards to strengthen nature reporting and natural capital markets.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp4

(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.

(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

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-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:

☒ Medium-low

(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

Our expertise in sustainably managing forests and associated ecosystems positions us to provide high-quality carbon offset projects. These could result in additional revenue streams.

(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

Costs would be part of our current business.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Forest carbon credit opportunities could increase, and we continue to evaluate bringing a carbon project to market that adheres to core carbon principles. Our Land-Based Solutions team evaluates interest from stakeholders in carbon offset opportunities. Our Sustainability team also continues to work with global industry associations and standards to strengthen carbon markets.

[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)

1126000000

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

Select from:

☒ 81-90%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Our Land Resources and Wood Products business could benefit from the expansion of existing markets or the development of new market opportunities as a result of our position as a potential solution to climate change.

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)

624000000

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

Select from:

☒ 41-50%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Our Land Resources business could benefit from higher productivity in our forests or the development of new market opportunities as a result of our position as a potential solution to climate change.

Water

(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)

0

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Our Land Resources business could benefit from the development of new market opportunities if efforts to monetize natural capital and our ecosystem services, including water, are successful.
[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:

☒ More frequently than 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:

☒ No

[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

- ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- ☒ Board-level committee
- ☒ Other, please specify :Board Chair and 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

- ☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charter

(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
- ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ 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
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ 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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Senior management, including the Senior Vice President and Chief Sustainability Officer, has regularly communicated with the Board as it has worked to establish emissions reduction targets in conjunction with becoming a signatory to The Climate Pledge, as well as collaborating with the Board on the development of climate-related disclosures. Furthermore, senior management communicates with the Board on environmental-related risks as part of our ERM process. The Enterprise Risk

Management Committee is responsible for identifying and assessing the material risks facing the company and providing periodic reports regarding such risks to the Audit Committee for review and evaluation of mitigation strategies.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- ☒ Board-level committee
- ☒ Other, please specify :Board Chair and 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

- ☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charter

(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 public policy engagement |
| ☒ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis | ☒ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities |
| ☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives |
| ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures |

- ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ 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
- ☒ 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

Senior management regularly communicates with the Board on topics related to its forests – including harvest activity, budget considerations, third-party certifications, and portfolio management decisions. Furthermore, senior management communicates with the Board on environmental-related risks as part of our ERM process. The Enterprise Risk Management Committee is responsible for identifying and assessing the material risks facing the company and providing periodic reports regarding such risks to the Audit Committee for review and evaluation of mitigation strategies.

Water

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- ☒ Board-level committee
- ☒ Other, please specify :Board Chair and 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

- ☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charter

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

Select from:

- ☒ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
- ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- ☒ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☒ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- ☒ 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

Senior management, including the Senior Vice President and Chief Sustainability Officer, has periodically communicated with the Board as it has taken steps to address water-related considerations, as well as communicate on the topic through our Corporate Responsibility Report. The Board is also informed of the continued management of our timberlands to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) forest certification standards. For example, as it relates to water, the SFI 2022 Forest Management Standard includes an objective related to the protection and maintenance of water resources.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

- ☒ Board-level committee
- ☒ Other, please specify :Board Chair and 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

- ☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charter

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

Select from:

- ☒ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- ☒ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Senior management, including the Senior Vice President and Chief Sustainability Officer, has periodically communicated with the Board as it has taken steps to address biodiversity-related considerations, as well as communicate on the topic through our Corporate Responsibility Report. The Board is also informed of the continued management of our timberlands to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) forest certification standards. For example, as it relates to biodiversity, the SFI 2022 Forest Management Standard includes an objective to maintain or advance the conservation of biological diversity.

[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

Academic

- ☒ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Scott Jones has a Masters of Forestry from Duke University

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

Academic

- ☒ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Scott Jones has a Masters of Forestry from Duke University

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

- ☒ 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

Academic

☒ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Scott Jones has a Masters of Forestry from Duke University

[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: ☒ 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 Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(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

Engagement

- ☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☑ Developing a climate transition plan
- ☑ Implementing a climate transition plan
- ☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis issues
- ☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental

(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

Our Senior Vice President & Chief Sustainability Officer provides updates to the full Board on environmental and sustainability topics relevant to the company. This position reports to the CEO (who is a member of the Board). Updates are typically provided to the full Board as part of regularly scheduled Board meetings, but additional updates on matters related to sustainability are communicated more frequently as needed to a subgroup of the Board.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(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

Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a climate transition plan
- ☒ Implementing a climate transition plan
- ☒ Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☒ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

(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

Our Senior Vice President & Chief Sustainability Officer provides updates to the full Board on environmental and sustainability topics relevant to the company. This position reports to the CEO (who is a member of the Board). Updates are typically provided to the full Board as part of regularly scheduled Board meetings, but additional updates on matters related to sustainability are communicated more frequently as needed to a subgroup of the Board.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(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

Engagement

- ☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☑ Developing a climate transition plan
- ☑ Implementing a climate transition plan
- ☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis issues
- ☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental

(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:

- ☒ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Our Senior Vice President & Chief Sustainability Officer provides updates to the full Board on environmental and sustainability topics relevant to the company. This position reports to the CEO (who is a member of the Board). Updates are typically provided to the full Board as part of regularly scheduled Board meetings, but additional updates on matters related to sustainability are communicated more frequently as needed to a subgroup of the Board.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(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

Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a climate transition plan
- ☒ Implementing a climate transition plan
- ☒ Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☒ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

(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

Our Senior Vice President & Chief Sustainability Officer provides updates to the full Board on environmental and sustainability topics relevant to the company. This position reports to the CEO (who is a member of the Board). Updates are typically provided to the full Board as part of regularly scheduled Board meetings, but additional updates on matters related to sustainability are communicated more frequently as needed to a subgroup of the Board.

[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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

The program incentivizes management to continue to track emissions, take actions to reduce Rayonier's emissions, and regularly report on the company's progress towards achieving its net-zero goals. The full Board reviews Rayonier's annual Corporate Responsibility Report that documents Rayonier's carbon footprint including carbon storage and sequestration in our forests, long-term carbon stored in the products produced from the timber we harvest from our forests, and the Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions from our business operations. These reviews also address emerging opportunities associated with our land-based solutions, which have objectives and results that are being evaluated by the Board. Except for the CEO, Board members do not participate in the annual bonus program and are only compensated by annual cash retainers and restricted stock awards.

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

5

(4.5.3) Please explain

The program incentivizes management to track Rayonier's sustainable climate smart forestry practices. The oversight of the Board on our forestry operations and environmental practices includes discussion and review at Board meetings, as well as onsite visits to our forests. A Board committee that includes Board members with expertise in forestry reviews our forest inventory program, sustainable allowable harvest levels, and our compliance with environmental regulations. The full Board reviews Rayonier's annual Corporate Responsibility and Sustainability Reports. The Board also reviews the company's long-term harvest plan, current and future economic and market conditions, and evolving environmental issues and accompanying regulations. Except for the CEO, Board members do not participate in the annual bonus program and are only compensated by annual cash retainers and restricted stock awards.

Water

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

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years

(4.5.3) Please explain

The program incentivizes management to continue to maintain the company's third-party certifications, which include water-related objectives. The results of these efforts are publicly disclosed in the audit reports from SFI and FSC and in our annual Corporate Responsibility Report. The oversight of the Board on our environmental practices includes discussion and review at Board meetings, as well as onsite visits to our forests in the U.S. Except for the CEO, Board members do not participate in the annual bonus program and are only compensated by annual cash retainers and restricted stock awards.

[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

☒ 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

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

Strategy and financial planning

☒ Board approval of climate transition plan

☒ Increased proportion of revenue from low environmental impact products or services

Resource use and efficiency

☒ Energy efficiency improvement

(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

Under the Rayonier Non-Equity Incentive Plan, we provide cash compensation in the form of an annual bonus incentive designed to reward executives based on the company's financial performance against key budgeted financial metrics and the attainment of identified strategic initiatives. The annual bonus program provides for a target bonus award opportunity for each executive expressed as a percentage of base salary. Key strategic initiatives include achieving net-zero carbon emissions by 2040 consistent with our commitment to The Climate Pledge. We have annual key results for projects that are tied to accomplishing interim targets that lead to our goal of net zero carbon emissions by 2040. These key results are a part of the annual bonus program. Except for the CEO, Board members do not participate in the annual bonus program and are only compensated by annual cash retainers and restricted stock awards.

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

The program incentivizes management to continue to track emissions, take actions to reduce Rayonier's emissions, and regularly report on the company's progress towards achieving its net-zero goals. The full Board reviews Rayonier's annual Corporate Responsibility Report that documents Rayonier's carbon footprint including carbon storage and sequestration in our forests, long-term carbon stored in the products produced from the timber we harvest from our forests, and the Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions from our business operations. Examples of issues discussed by management and reviewed by the Board are climate change and the company's implementation of climate smart forestry practices, the carbon footprint of our business including storage and sequestration in our forests and Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions from our forest operations, and science-based emissions reductions and net-zero targets Rayonier has made under The Climate Pledge to meet the Paris Agreement. These reviews also address emerging opportunities associated with our land-based solutions, which have objectives and results that are being evaluated by the Board.

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

Strategy and financial planning

☒ Increased proportion of revenue from low environmental impact products or services

(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

Under the Rayonier Non-Equity Incentive Plan, we provide cash compensation in the form of an annual bonus incentive designed to reward executives based on the company's financial performance against key budgeted financial metrics and the attainment of identified strategic initiatives. The annual bonus program provides for a target bonus award opportunity for each executive expressed as a percentage of base salary. Key strategic initiatives include achieving a 20% increase in productivity by 2030 through market driven precision forestry and climate smart forestry practices. We have annual key results for projects that tie to accomplishing this goal. These key results are a part of the annual bonus program. Except for the CEO, Board members do not participate in the annual bonus program and are only compensated by annual cash retainers and restricted stock awards.

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

The program incentivizes management to track Rayonier's sustainable climate smart forestry practices. The oversight of the Board on our forestry operations and environmental practices includes discussion and review at Board meetings, as well as onsite visits to our forests. A Board committee that includes Board members with special expertise in forestry reviews our forest inventory program, sustainable allowable harvest levels, and our compliance with environmental regulations. The full Board reviews Rayonier's annual Corporate Responsibility Reports. The Board also reviews the company's long-term harvest plan, current and future economic and market conditions, and evolving environmental issues and accompanying regulations. Examples of issues are climate change and implementation of climate smart forestry practices, the carbon footprint of our business including storage and sequestration in our forests, emerging EU Deforestation regulations, Carbon Boarder Adjustment Mechanisms (CBAM), and the status of global markets for forest products and how those markets impact Rayonier.

[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

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

This policy applies to Rayonier and its subsidiaries.

(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

Climate-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Forests-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat

Water-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
- ☒ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes
- ☒ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities
- ☒ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

Social commitments

- ☒ Other social commitment, please specify :Commitment to community involvement and social responsibility, respect for Indigenous rights, and to maintaining an ongoing dialogue and building relationships with Indigenous peoples.

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

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 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

- ☒ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

We contractually require our tier 1 suppliers to adhere to Rayonier's environmental policies regarding forests, water, and biodiversity, as well as federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- ☒ Commitment to no trade of CITES listed species
- ☒ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas
- ☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- ☒ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- ☒ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species

- ☒ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
- ☒ Commitment to engage in integrated, multi-stakeholder landscape (including river basin) initiatives to promote shared sustainability goals

Forests-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat
- ☒ Commitment to the use of the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach

Water-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances
- ☒ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
- ☒ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities
- ☒ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

Social commitments

- ☒ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Additional references/Descriptions

- ☒ Description of biodiversity-related performance standards
- ☒ Description of grievance/whistleblower mechanism to monitor non-compliance with the environmental policy and raise/address/escalate any other greenwashing concerns

(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 Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- ☒ Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- ☒ Not publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

(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

- ☒ The Climate Pledge
- ☒ Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
- ☒ Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)
- ☒ Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member
- ☒ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
- ☒ Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC)

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

We are dedicated to meeting the highest standards of sustainable forestry established by the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®), Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®), and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification™ (PEFC™). Our commercial timberlands are managed to these certification standards, and our compliance is periodically evaluated through independent third-party audits. We are a signatory to The Climate Pledge. We have developed science-based targets in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway to achieve a 42% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions and a 25% reduction in our Scope 3 cradle-to-gate emissions by 2030 from our 2020 baseline. We have committed to achieving net-zero emissions across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 cradle-to-gate emissions by 2040. We report our corporate responsibility initiatives, approaches, and data annually with reference to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI).

[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

Yes

- ☒ 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:

- ☒ No, and we do not plan to have one in the next two years

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, my organization is registered

(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

Florida Lobbyist Registration website (<https://floridalobbyist.gov>) (Industry Code: 115310 Forestry services). Georgia Lobbyist Reporting System website (<https://lobbyist.ethics.ga.gov/#/index>). Idaho Lobbyist Reporting System website (<https://sos.idaho.gov/lobbyist-information/>). U.S. House Lobbying Disclosure website maintained by the U.S. House Office of the Clerk (<https://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/lookup.asp>). (Registration ID 38674, House ID 386740012).

(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

Rayonier participates in the policymaking process. Our work to shape public policy helps us maintain our license to operate—to plant and nurture healthy, abundant, and sustainable working forests for the benefit of current and future generations. The issues we focus on—such as forests as a natural climate solution, wood innovation in building products, collaborative conservation on threatened and endangered species issues, and tax and trade policy—are generally nonpartisan issues. We are fortunate to have positive, constructive relationships with policymakers and their staff on both sides of the aisle. Our industry’s collective efforts to educate elected officials about the contributions of private working forests have proven to be a unifying influence in an otherwise highly polarized political environment.
[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

☒ Regular meetings

☒ Ad-hoc meetings

☒ Responding to consultations

☒ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

☒ 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.

(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 reporting 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 ways. 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

Row 2

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

European Union Deforestation regulation (EUDR)

(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

Low-impact production and innovation

☒ Sustainable production and consumption

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

Select from:

☒ Global

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

Select from:

☒ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

Helped secure European Commission designation of the U.S. as a low-risk country for deforestation, ensuring the appropriate level of compliance obligations for U.S. forest owners and forest product manufacturers.

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

Select all that apply

☒ Ad-hoc meetings

☒ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

(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 our forests are certified and managed sustainably.

(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

☒ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☒ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :FSC and SFI

[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 (NAFO)

(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 44 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 Rayonier, 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. NAFO and Rayonier strongly align on keeping forests as forests and using them as natural climate solutions to combat and resist climate change. Rayonier representatives participate in working groups that promote these positions.

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

300000

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

This funding is used to support the activities of the National Alliance of Forest Owners who advocate on behalf of forest landowners on relevant federal policy, including environmental regulations that potentially affect forest landowners.

(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 :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

Global

- ☒ Other global trade association, please specify :International Sustainable Forestry Coalition (ISFC)

(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 several of the world's leading forestry companies. ISFC's purpose is to advance the role of sustainable forest management by strengthening the economic, societal, and environmental value of forests and forest products through acting as a credible, coordinated voice in policy, advocacy, standards, and frameworks, while contributing to the transition towards a circular bioeconomy. Three key priorities guide the work of the ISFC: 1. Climate. (Ensure carbon accounting and crediting standards appropriately include forest carbon emissions, removals, and product storage/substitution. Articulate the role of sustainably managed forests and forest products in climate resilience). 2. Nature. (Promote forest management as a tool for nature positive outcomes. Support development of natural capital accounting frameworks). and 3. Economy. (Communicate the role of sustainable forestry in delivering shared economic and societal value. Protect and expand access to markets for products/services from sustainably managed forests).

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

57000

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

This funding is used to influence environmental policy, laws, regulations, frameworks, and standards at the international level that affect forest products companies globally.

(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

Row 3

(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 (AWC)

(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 contributes to 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)

34000

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

This funding is used to influence environmental policy, laws, regulations, frameworks, and standards in the U.S. that affect wood products. AWC works 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 updated regional environmental product declarations for softwood lumber and work in data collection, analysis, and transparency.

(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

Row 4

(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 Rayonier, 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)

95000

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

This funding is part of Rayonier's R&D efforts to better understand and mitigate potential environmental impacts of our forest management practices. 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

- ☒ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
☒ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

Row 5

(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 :Forest Resources Association Inc. (FRA)

(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 Forest Resources Association (FRA) and Rayonier strongly align on keeping forests as forests and using them as natural climate solutions to combat and resist climate change. FRA advocates for forest owners and associated harvesting and manufacturing entities at the national level by representing the interests of the industry and communicating the value of working forests for the economy as well as the environment. Rayonier representatives participate in working groups that promote these positions.

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

35000

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

This funding is used to support the activities of the Forest Resource Association who advocate on behalf of forest landowners on relevant federal policy, including environmental regulations that potentially affect forest landowners.

(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

Row 6

(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:

- ☒ Independent consultant

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

Rayonier has contracted with Huguley Consulting, LLC in Washington D.C. to assist with our engagement on policy issues at the federal level in the United States.

(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

Huguley Consulting, LLC provides advice and guidance in the U.S. federal policy and advocacy space. We work closely with this organization to understand the implications of policy decisions and influence those that affect our company.

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

133000

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

This funding is used to help Rayonier effectively coordinate our advocacy efforts at the federal level in support of the work of our industry trade associations.

(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
- [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 voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.2) Is your publication in line with a standard or framework?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(4.12.1.3) Standard or framework the publication is in line with

Select all that apply

- ☒ GRI
- ☒ TCFD
- ☒ Other, please specify :SASB

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Forests
- ☒ Water
- ☒ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

- ☒ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Strategy | ☒ Value chain engagement |
| ☒ Governance | ☒ Forest-related targets |
| ☒ Commodity volumes | ☒ Dependencies & Impacts |
| ☒ Risks & Opportunities | ☒ Biodiversity indicators |
| ☒ Water-related targets | ☒ Public policy engagement |
| ☒ Climate-related targets | ☒ Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics |
| ☒ Water accounting figures | |
| ☒ Water pollution indicators | |
| ☒ Greenhouse gas emissions figures | |
| ☒ Content of environmental policies | |

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

2025 Corporate Responsibility Report. pages 1-77

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

(4.12.1.9) Comment

Information is also available on our website. <https://www.rayonier.com/corp-responsibility>
[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) 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 | ☒ Chronic physical |
| ☒ Market | |
| ☒ Liability | |
| ☒ Reputation | |
| ☒ Acute physical | |

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ 2030 | ☒ 2080 |
| ☒ 2040 | ☒ 2090 |
| ☒ 2050 | ☒ 2100 |
| ☒ 2060 | |
| ☒ 2070 | |

(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
- ☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
- ☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

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 prescribed 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. Rayonier has evaluated and reported on the physical and transition risks of climate change as part of our environmental risk management that is summarized in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We view the short-term risk under the low emissions scenario as low in the short and medium term and low in the long term.

(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. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Forests scenarios

☒ Bespoke forests scenario

(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

☒ Chronic physical

- ☒ Liability
- ☒ Reputation
- ☒ Acute physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(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
- ☒ Number of ecosystems impacted
- ☒ 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
- ☒ 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)
- ✓ Level of action (from local to global)
- ✓ 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

Rayonier uses a variety of tools including public process models such as 3PG, proprietary forest growth and yield models, econometric analyses, and market forecasts to assess the impact of changes in climate and associated regional or global economic activity to judge the impacts on our forests. These forward-looking models utilize assumptions from IPCC reports on climate change to determine how forest growth and yield will be affected and the associated ecosystem services provided by our forests. Rayonier conducts economic forecasts that include how our forests will be affected by climate change and are also driven by assumptions built into econometric models. All these assumptions have associated levels of uncertainty that are quantified and included in our economic analyses and forecasts, most commonly through adjustments in the discount rate used in discounted cash flow analyses. The alternative scenarios evaluated provide a range of outcomes that are used to guide our business decisions, including decisions on timberland acquisitions and dispositions and capital allocation to forest management activities.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway. We use the 1.5°C pathway as a baseline scenario, however we recognize that other emissions reduction pathways are viable alternatives and thus include the 2.6, 4.5, 6.0 and 8.5 representative concentration pathways in our analyses to bracket the potential alternatives.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☒ Customized publicly available water scenario, please specify :Rayonier used the fundamental relationship between water yield and rainfall, PET, and storage ($WY=R-PET-Storage$) to estimate the impact of climate change and forest management on water availability and water yield in forests we manage.

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Country/area

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

☒ Liability

☒ Reputation

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(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
- ✓ 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
- ✓ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Rayonier evaluates the projected impacts of climate change based on published reports by the IPCC. These reports provide assumptions on the physical changes in climate and how they affect the forests that we manage based on the multiple climate models evaluated by the IPCC. Scenario SSP1-2.6 assumes that low GHG emissions will decline to net zero around 2025 followed by varying levels of net negative CO2 emissions. Under the SSP1-2.6 emissions scenario, the assumption is that it is highly unlikely that global warming of 2°C is unlikely to be exceeded. This scenario represents a "best case" scenario for minimal climate change impacts. We

use the IPCC standardized "likelihood scale" that assigns specific numerical percentage ranges to describe uncertainty. These range from virtually certain with 99-100% probability to likely certain with 66-100% probability to unlikely certain with 0-33% probability. We also use the IPCC "confidence scale" that is based on the quality and amount of data and the degree of agreement by IPCC, which evaluates the constraints on the scenario. The confidence value ranges from very high confidence with 9 out of 10 chance of being correct to medium confidence with 5 out of 10 chance of being correct to low confidence with 2 out of 10 chance of being correct. Rayonier has evaluated and reported on the physical and transition risks of climate change as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan that is summarized in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We view the short term risk under the low emissions scenario as low in the short and medium term and moderate in the long term. Rayonier uses the assumptions produced by the IPCC to estimate the impacts of climate change on rainfall and temperature. The IPCC also provides estimates of the uncertainties of their estimates. We estimate the predicted impacts of climate change on rainfall and temperature in each of our forests using a geospatial tool provided by NCASI to determine predicted temperature and rainfall changes in our regions that in turn drive our models of water yield based on rainfall, PET, and storage. Our estimates of PET are based on the relationship between leaf area in the forest and PET based on results from a regional study of the impacts of forest management, leaf area, and evapotranspiration on water yield that was published by the University of Florida.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Rayonier has committed to reducing our emissions in accordance with the 1.5°C pathway in the Paris Agreement. We use the 1.5°C pathway as a baseline scenario, however we recognize that other emissions reduction pathways are viable alternatives and thus include the 2.5, 4.5, 6.0, and 8.5 representative concentration pathways in our analyses to bracket the range of potential impacts of different levels of emissions reductions between today and 2050.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) 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

☒ 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 (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a prescribed 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. 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 8.5 assumes little effort to reduce emissions resulting in a failure to curb radiative forcing by 2100 and would result in about 5°C rise in global temperature by 2100 relative to preindustrial temperatures. We are including RCP 8.5 as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario; however, the probability of this scenario is broadly considered implausible given the global climate policies and reduction initiatives already implemented. 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. Rayonier has evaluated the physical and transition risks of climate change as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan that is summarized in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We view the short-term risk under the high emissions SSP5-8.5 as medium and the long-term risk as high.

(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 8.5 as an unlikely high emissions scenario that represents no major mitigation effort or major policy action. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☒ WRI Aqueduct

(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

- ☒ Acute physical
- ☒ Chronic physical
- ☒ Reputation

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 2050
- ☒ 2080

(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
- ☒ 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
- ☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas, developed by the World Resources Institute, uses a robust, peer-reviewed methodology but is subject to key assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints. 1) The Atlas relies exclusively on data that is available at a global level and from trusted sources. Global models cannot capture the nuances of local water management, infrastructure, or specific stakeholder practices. 2) The baseline risk maps are calculated using historical data, spanning decades, to represent long-term trends rather than real-time conditions. 3) Aqueduct uses data from several climate models to assess future risk under different climate scenarios. The level of future water stress depends on which specific climate and socioeconomic scenario unfolds. 4) While the Atlas includes regulatory and reputational indicators, the underlying data, such as public awareness of water issues, is more qualitative and potentially less robust than the quantitative hydrological data.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Water used in our operations is very limited given the natural cycle of groundwater recharge, particularly relative to irrigated agricultural operations. Although Rayonier's water use is limited, we assess water risks across our operations using the Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas published by the World Resources Institute.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) 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:

☒ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ 2030 | ☒ 2080 |
| ☒ 2040 | ☒ 2090 |
| ☒ 2050 | ☒ 2100 |
| ☒ 2060 | |
| ☒ 2070 | |

(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 (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a prescribed 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. 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 2.5°C to 3°C by 2100 relative to pre-industrial 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. Rayonier has evaluated the physical and transition risks of climate change as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan that is summarized in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We view the short-term risk under the SSP2-4.5 as low and the long-term risk as moderate.

(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 4.5 as the intermediate stabilization scenario with moderate mitigation. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 6.0

(5.1.1.2) 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:

☒ 3.0°C - 3.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 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 (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a prescribed 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. 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 6.0 stabilizes warming by 2100 by reducing GHG emissions and applying new technologies and would result in about 3°C to 3.5°C 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. Rayonier has evaluated the physical and transition risks of climate change as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan that is summarized in our Corporate Responsibility Report. We view the short-term risk under the SSP3-6.0 as low and the long-term risk as moderate.

(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 6.0 as a scenario that represents limited mitigation effort and delayed action. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) 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

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

☒ Policy

☒ Market

- ☒ Reputation

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 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 prescribed 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. Rayonier has evaluated and reported on the physical and transition risks of this scenario on our forests as part of our environmental risk management. We view the short-term risk under the low emissions scenario as low in the short and medium term and low in the long term.

(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. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) 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

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

- ☒ Policy
- ☒ Market
- ☒ Reputation

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 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 (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a prescribed 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. 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 2.5°C to 3°C by 2100 relative to pre-industrial 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. Rayonier has evaluated the physical and transition risks of climate

change on our forests as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan. We view the short-term risk under the SSP2-4.5 as low and the long-term risk as moderate.

(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 4.5 as the intermediate stabilization scenario with moderate mitigation. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 6.0

(5.1.1.2) 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

- ☒ Acute physical
- ☒ Chronic physical
- ☒ Policy
- ☒ Market
- ☒ Reputation

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 3.0°C - 3.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 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 (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a prescribed 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. 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 6.0 stabilizes warming by 2100 by reducing GHG emissions and applying new technologies and would result in about 3°C to 3.5°C 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. Rayonier has evaluated the physical and transition risks of climate change on our forests as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan. We view the short-term risk under the SSP3-6.0 as low and the long-term risk as moderate.

(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 6.0 as a scenario that represents limited mitigation effort and delayed action. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) 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

- ☒ Acute physical
- ☒ Chronic physical
- ☒ Policy
- ☒ Market
- ☒ Reputation

(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
- ☒ 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 (IPCC) scenarios called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). An RCP represents a prescribed 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. 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 8.5 assumes little effort to reduce emissions resulting in a failure to curb radiative forcing by 2100 and would result in about 5°C rise in global temperature by 2100 relative to preindustrial temperatures. We are including RCP 8.5 as a highly unlikely high consequence scenario; however, the probability of this scenario is broadly considered implausible given the global climate policies and reduction initiatives already implemented. 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. Rayonier has evaluated the physical and transition risks of climate change on our forests as part of our Environmental Risk Management Plan. We view the short-term risk under the high emissions SSP5-8.5 as medium and the long-term risk as high.

(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 8.5 as an unlikely high emissions scenario that represents no major mitigation effort or major policy action. Rayonier has committed to achieving emissions reduction targets across our Scope 1 and 2 emissions and our Scope 3 emissions in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C pathway. [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
- ☒ Capacity building
- ☒ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

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 Washington, Douglas-fir projected ranges were suitable under RCP 2.6 and RCP 4.5 and inconclusive under 6.0 and 8.5. However, 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 Washington. In the 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 and inconclusive for the unlikely RCP 8.5. The coastal region suggests no change in productivity at RCP 2.6 and was inconclusive for RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and the unlikely RCP 8.5. If an RCP scenario is inconclusive, it is because 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. 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. 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
- ☒ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

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 Washington, Douglas-fir projected ranges were suitable under RCP 2.6 and RCP 4.5 and inconclusive under 6.0 and 8.5. However, 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 Washington. In the 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 and inconclusive for the unlikely RCP 8.5. The coastal region suggests no change in productivity at RCP 2.6 and was inconclusive for RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and the unlikely RCP 8.5. If an RCP scenario is inconclusive, it is because 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. 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. 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
- ☒ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- ☒ Country/area/region

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

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 Washington, Douglas-fir projected ranges were suitable under RCP 2.6 and RCP 4.5 and inconclusive under 6.0 and 8.5. However, 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 Washington. In the 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 and inconclusive for the unlikely RCP 8.5. The coastal region suggests no change in productivity at RCP 2.6 and was inconclusive for RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and the unlikely RCP 8.5. If an RCP scenario is inconclusive, it is because 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. 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. 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

Rayonier's forest management and harvesting is dependent on large forestry equipment such as bulldozers, skidders, feller-bunchers, and off-road trucks. This equipment is powered by diesel engines that burn fossil fuels. There is currently no available replacement with electric/battery power and it is likely a decade or more into the future before there are options available to replace this equipment with alternative engines that do not use fossil fuels. This transition is also hampered by the lack of infrastructure to charging of electric/battery vehicles in the remote locations where forests occur. Many of our forests are miles away from power lines. Portable electric generators that utilize biomass from the forest are under development but are likely also a decade away from widespread availability in our industry. Rayonier is engaging with large equipment manufacturers to speed the transition, but our analysis of the situation indicates the transition will be slow given the life span of forestry equipment is 5 to 10 years. The transition is further hampered because most of the contractors who own the forestry equipment are small entities that may not have the capital to replace their equipment all at once. Currently, 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 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.

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

Select from:

☒ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.11) Description of feedback mechanism

We have established a number of climate and environmental goals under our four pillars: forests, planet, people, practices. We have established a 2030 interim greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target and have committed to The Climate Pledge goal to achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2040. We have published our net-zero roadmap which outlines the commitment 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 Leadership Team and the Board of Directors.

(5.2.12) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☒ Annually

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

Rayonier's science-based emissions reduction targets and our climate transition plan were developed based on data from the IPCC. We used scenario analysis based on the IPCC SSPs and selected the scenario associated with the 1.5°C pathway. Our emissions reduction targets and transition plan are in line with the Paris Agreement and are designed to achieve the desired reductions in emissions to meet the climate change targets in our transition plan by 2100. Rayonier has implemented a more aggressive transition plan by signing The Climate Pledge and is committing to achieving net zero emissions by 2040, well ahead of the SBTi target date. Rayonier has developed a set of emissions reduction plans that are specific to our industry. This includes a mixture of efficiency improvements in our forest management practices along with harvesting and trucking technology developments. We have worked with our university partners in the U.S. to evaluate our timber harvesting practices and worked with our contractors to implement recommended changes to their activities that reduce fuel use and carbon emissions that are part of our transition plan. Within our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, reduction plans also 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. Target coverage covers Scope 1 and Scope 2 non-FLAG emissions, and we are not seeking any exclusions at this time.

(5.2.14) 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.

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

GHG Reduction Initiatives.pdf

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Forests
- ☒ Water
- ☒ Biodiversity

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

We examine the carbon stored in our forests and the annual removals in our forests. In 2025 our total Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions were approximately 6.4 million metric tons CO₂e. Our net removals from the atmosphere from our forests were approximately 1.1 million metric tons CO₂e with an

additional 1.4 million metric tons CO₂e removals attributed to our sourcing from forest sourcing regions. The carbon stored in the forest products made from the wood we harvest was approximately 5.9 million metric tons CO₂e. We also examine the impact of changes in rainfall and temperature on water yield from our forests and use this information to determine changes in water yield across our estate.

(5.2.18) Adaptation-specific objectives included within your climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.2.19) Describe the adaptation objectives included in your climate transition plan or standalone adaptation 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. Adaptive forest management is the key to maintaining productive, healthy, and sustainable forests under changing climate scenarios. Implementing Climate Smart Forestry is a strategic approach that integrates climate change adaptation into forest management practices. Sustainable forest management that adopts these strategies can enhance the carbon storage capacity of forests and improve the resilience of the ecosystem services they provide. Climate Smart Forestry helps mitigate climate change and allows forests to remain healthy and productive. Working forests can continue to be part of the solution to climate change and provide carbon removals as well as storage in the products made from them. Rayonier has identified several key principles that will guide the development of Climate Smart Forestry practices in our working forests. Through continuous development, evaluation, and implementation, these strategies will be refined over the coming decades as we address the risks and opportunities from climate change. Our forest certification standards also incorporate many of these strategies. For example, the SFI Climate Smart Forestry Initiative (SFI CSF Initiative) is advancing the interpretation and implementation of Climate Smart Forestry across our SFI footprint. The SFI CSF Initiative focuses on both enhancing the carbon sink and reducing sources of emissions from the forest sector while achieving co-benefits for biodiversity and wildfire risk reduction. We are also a member of the Climate Smart Land Network, an alliance of landowners and managers working together to address the challenges posed by climate change with Climate Smart solutions. The new FSC standard, effective in 2026, also includes Climate Smart requirements, including the need to assess climate impacts to objectives, provide adaptation strategies, and monitor those strategies for effectiveness.

[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
- ☒ Investment in R&D
- ☒ 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

- ☒ Physical risks
- ☒ Transition 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, land resources and real estate development businesses. 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

- ☒ Physical risks
- ☒ Transition 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 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 improvement with rigorous third-party auditing and certification of our practices under the SFI® forest management standard or the FSC® forest management standard.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Physical risks
- ☒ Transition 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

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

We participate in forestry research programs to track and understand any potential effects from physical climate change related parameters that could affect our forests. We currently don't anticipate any near-term disruptions to our operations.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Physical risks
- ☒ Transition 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 change could cause changes to precipitation and temperature which could change the long-term productivity of our forests in some locations. Higher temperatures could also result in an increase in the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. Damage to our timberlands due to fire, insects or disease, prolonged drought, hurricanes, and other natural disasters, could be significantly worsened by climate change. These changes could negatively affect our forests. This could also negatively impact the availability of logs for our wood products facilities. Climate related risks and opportunities are considered in the planning of capital projects that impact our operations. Our timberlands business considers climate-related risks and opportunities when it comes to growth rates, silviculture practices, and tree genetics. Our wood products business considers opportunities for initiatives including decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing energy consumption, and increased utilization of biomass as an energy source.
[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

- ☒ Physical risks
- ☒ Transition 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. 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 biochar, 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.

[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 :SEC 10K Reports have information on our sustainable forest management, carbon sequestration, wood products, and land-based solutions strategy that is aligned with our climate smart forestry goals and third-party sustainable forestry certifications.

(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)

88500000

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

90

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

90

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2035 (%)

90

(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 timber and wood products businesses for sustainable timberland management practices, including climate smart forestry, and efficient production of lumber and plywood 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.

Row 2

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :SEC 10K Reports have information on our sustainable forest management, carbon sequestration, wood products, and land-based solutions strategy that is aligned with our climate smart forestry goals and third-party sustainable forestry certifications.

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Revenue/Turnover

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

1126000000

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

79

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

80

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2035 (%)

85

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

The revenues generated annually from our timber and wood products businesses for sustainable timberland management practices, including climate smart forestry, land-based solutions, and efficient production of lumber and plywood 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)

-16

(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

Rayonier does not currently calculate CAPEX or OPEX for water. However, a key goal of our forest management practices is to protect water quality. Estimates provided assess combined legacy Rayonier (all of 2025) and legacy PotlatchDeltic (Q1-Q3 2025) overall timber business CAPEX relative to the same periods in 2024.

[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality	Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality	Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality
Carbon	Select from: ☒ Yes		

	Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality	Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality	Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality
Water	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years	Select from: ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	We are working to demonstrate the value of this ecosystem service from our forests.
Other	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years		

[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 markets.**

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

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

- ☒ Differentiated

(5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

The price is differentiated by business unit with U.S. pricing relative to timber values and voluntary and compliance carbon markets.

(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 due to a combination of factors. As more companies and governments commit to reducing their carbon footprint through net-zero or carbon reduction commitments, we expect the demand for carbon offsets to grow approaching 2030 - 2050. This increased demand should push up the price of offsets and, consequently, the overall carbon price particularly as regulated Emission Trading Schemes reduce available units. As easier and cheaper emissions reduction options are exhausted, the remaining options become more expensive leading to higher marginal abatement costs, which are often reflected in carbon prices.

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

25

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

150

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

Select all that apply

☒ Operations

☒ Product and R&D

☒ Risk management

☒ Impact management

☒ Capital expenditure

☒ Opportunity management

☒ Value chain engagement

☒ Public policy engagement

(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

Rayonier conducts detailed scenario analyses of the value of carbon using a range of prices from \$25 to \$150 per metric ton, or higher, to determine the value of carbon in both the compliance markets and the voluntary markets. This helps us understand the potential value of decarbonization efforts and the value of carbon credits that we may produce. The uncertainty in the voluntary carbon market mandates the use of a wide range in the carbon price in the scenarios that we conduct. [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	
Customers	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Forests
Investors and shareholders	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change ☒ Forests ☒ Water

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Other value chain stakeholders	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> ☒ 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

- ☒ Impact on habitats
- ☒ Impact on pollution levels
- ☒ Basin/landscape/marine ecosystem condition
- ☒ Impact on threatened and protected species
- ☒ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets
- ☒ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(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

We define all suppliers to our timber operations as having a substantive impact on the environment as they engage in forest management, timber harvesting, and transportation of forest products on Rayonier land. All contractors are contractually required to comply with Rayonier sustainable forestry guidelines and comply with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations. The work of these contractors and their compliance with the regulations is 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

7394

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/marine ecosystem condition

☒ Dependence on water

☒ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☒ Impact on habitats

☒ 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 suppliers in our operations have a substantive impact on the environment as they engage in forestry, real estate, wood products, and land-based solutions activities. Suppliers are required to comply with water quality regulations that are developed by local, state, and national agencies. These regulations include water quality best management practices and forest practices act requirements. Compliance of these contractors is reviewed internally and by government regulators.

(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

7394

[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

- ☒ Material sourcing
- ☒ Regulatory compliance

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We engage with all suppliers and contractors that perform forest management activities in our forests. The amount of engagement is proportional to the size of the contractors based on the acres treated and the risks associated with their activities. This prioritization process is conducted as part of our internal and external audit program where all contractors are contractually required to comply with our practices to address environmental risks. For our timber harvesting, we only use contractors who have been trained by state forestry associations including impacts on forests, biodiversity, soils, and water and are accredited as master timber harvesters or master loggers. We also conduct annual internal audits and audit and interview suppliers/contractors to improve our performance on sustainable forestry issues. In carrying out our SFI Fiber Sourcing certification for timber delivered to our wood products facilities, our outreach and engagement with suppliers on environmental issues is focused on landowners whose land base is not certified to a sustainable forest management standard.

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

- ☒ Material sourcing
- ☒ Regulatory compliance

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We engage with all suppliers and contractors that perform forest management activities in our forests. The amount of engagement is proportional to the size of the contractors based on the acres treated and the risks associated with their activities. This prioritization process is conducted as part of our internal and external audit program where all contractors are contractually required to comply with our practices to address environmental risks. For our timber harvesting, we only use contractors who have been trained by state forestry associations including impacts on forests, biodiversity, soils, and water and are accredited as master timber harvesters or master loggers. We also conduct annual internal audits and audit and interview suppliers/contractors to improve our performance on sustainable

forestry issues. In carrying out our SFI Fiber Sourcing certification for timber delivered to our wood products facilities, our outreach and engagement with suppliers on environmental issues is focused on landowners whose land base is not certified to a sustainable forest management standard.
[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 suppliers (contractors) who work on forest management activities for Rayonier including harvesting are contractually required to comply with our internal practices and state and federal laws that address environmental risks. We provide training for the suppliers (contractors) who perform these tasks so that they recognize the risks and understand the actions they need to mitigate the risk. These issues are reviewed with each supplier prior to work commencing so that the expectations and requirements are clearly understood. We meet with suppliers throughout the contract period, often weekly or biweekly, to address any issues that occur and fix problems promptly. We also conduct formal internal and external third-party audits of the suppliers work and when a noncompliance issue is identified, we work with the supplier (contractor) to remediate the issue with a specific timeline set for the work to be completed. Performance deposits are held for some contractors, such as those suppliers (contractors) who work for us to harvest timber to address noncompliance with environmental regulations. If a supplier is found in noncompliance and does not remediate the issue, the performance deposit can be used to rectify the situation. If a supplier or contractor demonstrates consistent non-compliant performance, we may also remove them from our supplier or contractor list.

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 suppliers (contractors) who work on forest management activities for Rayonier including harvesting are contractually required to comply with our internal practices and state and federal laws that address environmental risks. We provide training for the suppliers (contractors) who perform these tasks so that they recognize the risks and understand the actions they need to mitigate the risk. These issues are reviewed with each supplier prior to work commencing so that the expectations and requirements are clearly understood. We meet with suppliers throughout the contract period, often weekly or biweekly, to address any issues that occur and fix problems promptly. We also conduct formal internal and external third-party audits of the suppliers work and when a noncompliance issue is identified, we work with the supplier (contractor) to remediate the issue with a specific timeline set for the work to be completed. Performance deposits are held for some contractors, such as those suppliers (contractors) who work for us to harvest timber to address noncompliance with environmental regulations. If a supplier is found in noncompliance and does not remediate the issue, the performance deposit can be used to rectify the situation. If a supplier or contractor demonstrates consistent non-compliant performance, we may also remove them from our supplier or contractor list.

[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 or Forest Stewardship Council requirements as it applies to our forestry operations.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Certification | ☒ Supplier scorecard or rating |
| ☒ Fines and penalties | ☒ Ground-based monitoring system |
| ☒ First-party verification | |
| ☒ On-site third-party audit | |
| ☒ Geospatial monitoring tool | |

(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%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

- ☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- ☒ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- ☒ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- ☒ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

All suppliers (contractors) who work on forest management activities for Rayonier including harvesting are contractually required to comply with our internal practices and state and federal laws that address environmental risks. We provide training for the suppliers (contractors) who perform these tasks so that they recognize the risks and understand the actions they need to mitigate the risk. These issues are reviewed with each supplier prior to work commencing so that the expectations and requirements are clearly understood. We meet with suppliers throughout the contract period, often weekly or biweekly, to address any issues that occur and fix problems promptly. The results of these reviews are documented and recorded in our land management system records for each location. The date and nature of corrective actions are also documented in this system. We also conduct formal internal and external third-party audits of the suppliers work and when a noncompliance issue is identified, we work with the supplier (contractor) to remediate the issue with a specific timeline set for the work to be completed. Performance deposits are held for some contractors, such as those suppliers (contractors) who work for us to harvest timber to address noncompliance with environmental regulations. If a supplier is found in noncompliance and does not remediate the issue, the performance deposit can be used to rectify the situation.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :Sustainable Forestry Initiative or Forest Stewardship Council requirements as it applies to our forestry operations.

(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

(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%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

- ☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- ☒ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- ☒ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- ☒ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

All suppliers (contractors) who work on forest management activities for Rayonier including harvesting are contractually required to comply with our internal practices and state and federal laws that address environmental risks. We provide training for the suppliers (contractors) who perform these tasks so that they recognize the risks and understand the actions they need to mitigate the risk. These issues are reviewed with each supplier prior to work commencing so that the expectations and requirements are clearly understood. We meet with suppliers throughout the contract period, often weekly or biweekly, to address any issues that occur and fix problems promptly. The results of these reviews are documented and recorded in our land management system records for each location. The date and nature of corrective actions are also documented in this system. We also conduct formal internal and external third-party audits of the suppliers work and when a noncompliance issue is identified, we work with the supplier (contractor) to remediate the issue with a specific timeline set for the work to be completed. Performance deposits are held for some contractors, such as those suppliers (contractors) who work for us to harvest timber to address noncompliance with environmental regulations. If a supplier is found in noncompliance and does not remediate the issue, the performance deposit can be used to rectify the situation.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- ☒ Fines and penalties

- ☒ Ground-based monitoring system
- ☒ On-site third-party audit

(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%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

- ☒ None

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- ☒ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- ☒ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- ☒ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

For the very small area of our ownership where we conduct real estate development, we obtain U.S. Army Corp of Engineers construction and wetland permitting that is open to the public when we apply. These permits establish stringent guidelines for our contractors and are monitored internally and externally by the USCOE. They have the ability to issue stop work orders and fines if any aspect violates the Clean Water Act or construction permit. We vet our suppliers for quality of prior jobs, and we work with them to restore any mistakes and train to prevent them in the future.

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :SFI Fiber Sourcing certification

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- ☒ Certification
- ☒ Fines and penalties
- ☒ First-party verification
- ☒ Supplier self-assessment
- ☒ Geospatial monitoring tool
- ☒ Supplier scorecard or rating

(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%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- ☒ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- ☒ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- ☒ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We are committed to responsibly sourcing the raw materials used to make our lumber and plywood. All seven of our wood products 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. We engage with our suppliers to provide sustainable forestry information on reforestation and best management practices. In addition, we participate in SFI Implementation Committees that promote sustainable forestry and logger training programs. All suppliers must meet the SFI definition of a qualified logging professional in order to contract with Rayonier. We share our policy surrounding wood procurement with our raw material suppliers and provide best management practices trends and areas of improvement, as well as notification of at-risk species and biodiversity awareness in the operating areas from which they procure fiber.

[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:

☒ Natural ecosystem restoration and long-term protection

(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
- ☒ Other capacity building activity, please specify :Develop safety plan for each contractor.

Financial incentives

- ☒ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

- ☒ Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

Information collection

- ☒ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

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

Suppliers and contractors in our timberlands are contractually obligated to comply with our corporate policy and state and federal regulations on environmental issues. Rayonier works with each tier 1 supplier to help them understand the requirements in the contracts for forest management activities. Training is provided on how to implement the requirements in the forest. Contractor activities are monitored periodically, up to weekly, to inspect performance, identify any opportunities for improvement, and immediately address any nonconformances. As an example, Rayonier has best management practices workshops held annually in our Pacific Resource Unit where all contractors working in timber harvesting are required to participate free of charge. These workshops are hosted by Rayonier and bring in outside speakers to address sustainable forest management and the role of these suppliers in complying with regulations in the State of Washington. Similar efforts have been made in other states as well for many years. Worker safety is a critical part of sustainable forestry. Safety of both employees and suppliers is a way of life

at Rayonier. We require all forestry contractors to have a Safety Management Plan and offer to work with them to develop and implement a safety plan that is appropriate for their specific company. These plans are reviewed by the Rayonier Safety team, and feedback is provided to each supplier. Rayonier meets with suppliers throughout the year in a variety of formats, ranging from informal tailgate talks in the field to more formal safety workshops. Rayonier recently hosted a series of safety workshops focused on first aid and CPR training for our field contractors across the U.S. that was attended by more than 1000 employees of our tier 1 suppliers. The emphasis on safety has significantly reduced the injury rate of contractors and suppliers working for Rayonier.

(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 :Compliance with best management practices and Sustainable Forestry Initiative and Forest Stewardship Council requirements as it applies to our forestry operations.

(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:

☒ Natural ecosystem restoration and long-term protection

(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 set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Information collection

☒ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

- ☒ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
- ☒ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins
- ☒ 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

Suppliers in our forestry business are contractually obligated to comply with our corporate policy and state and federal regulations on environmental issues. The suppliers are trained on best management practices that protect water quality during ongoing forest management activities including site preparation, planting, and harvesting. This training provides suppliers with the ability to recognize and implement practices needed to protect water resources and an understanding of remediation activities that are required to address water quality issues that may occur. As an example, Rayonier has best management practices workshops held annually in our Pacific Resource Unit where all contractors working in timber harvesting are required to participate free of charge. These workshops are hosted by Rayonier and bring in outside speakers to address sustainable forest management and the role of these suppliers in complying with regulations in the State of Washington. Similar efforts have been made in other states as well for many years.

(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 :Compliance with state mandated environmental regulations that protect water quality as it applies to our forestry operations.

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

- ☒ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- ☒ Natural ecosystem restoration and long-term protection

(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 set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Financial incentives

- ☒ Include long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments

Information collection

- ☒ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

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

Suppliers of logs to our wood products facilities from external sources. As part of our SFI Fiber Sourcing program, we either conduct our own supplier BMP audits or utilize supplier BMP audit results conducted from reliable state or regional audit programs. These audits enable us to understand implementation trends of BMPs across our supply areas. Depending on the results of these audits, we work with our suppliers to provide additional sustainable forestry information and/or with our state SFI Implementation Committees to refine our logger training programs. We also- 1) Provide information on reforestation, biodiversity, wildfire risk, and best management practices to the private forest owners who we purchase wood. 2) We participate in SFI Implementation Committees that work collaboratively to promote sustainable forestry and create or endorse logger training programs. These Committees are made up of other certified companies that operate in the state. Many of these certified companies are our suppliers. 3) Share our Wood Procurement Policy and Supplier Code of Conduct with the loggers, chip suppliers, wood dealers and other raw material suppliers; and 4) Provide assistance and information to the family forest owners who are key to our continued sourcing of raw materials that meet our strict procurement and sustainable forest management policies.

(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 :SFI Fiber Sourcing

(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

☒ Support smallholders to adhere to standards in upstream value chain

☒ Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity

☒ Support smallholders to measure and address their exposure to environmental risk

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

124

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We provide financial support of \$110,000 to the SFI State Implementation Committees of all of the states in which we have major landholdings. These Committees conduct community outreach and education programs including training to smallholders and contractors. The majority of Rayonier tier 1 suppliers engaged in our forest management activities also work for smallholders during the year. We believe this helps to achieve the high compliance rates that are noted by state regulatory

agencies as part of their audits of BMP compliance. An excellent metric is the field surveys of BMP compliance that are conducted by the state forestry agencies each year. These compliance surveys consistently show that compliance with BMPs is above 90%.

Row 2

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☒ Timber products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☒ Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management

☒ Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

40

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Rayonier posts forestry and environmental education videos on our website that are advertised through social media, universities, and state forestry associations. These videos as well as our website are tools for educating smallholders of all kinds both within our communities and across the globe. We co-host an annual Teacher's Tour for one week that educates 30-40 teachers about sustainable forestry and environmental education. Our \$110,000 support of SFI State Implementation Committees referenced in Row 1 also results in financial support of education publications for smallholders and Project Learning Tree in schools.

Row 3

(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

124

(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, conserve wildlife habitat, and protect at-risk species. 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

- ☒ 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%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

- ☒ None

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

Our stakeholders have expressed interest in Rayonier's carbon footprint and our emissions reduction targets that were developed to achieve net-zero emissions by 2040 under The Climate Pledge.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Rayonier has published a detailed Corporate Responsibility Report that includes our carbon record that is available to all stakeholders on our website. This report documents the carbon stored in our forests, the annual removals (sequestration) in our forests, and our Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions. Feedback from our stakeholders is monitored by our Communications team regarding visits to our website and direct feedback from investors and other stakeholders on the value of our carbon reporting.

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- ☒ 100%

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

Our stakeholders have expressed interest in Rayonier's sustainable forest management practices, including our climate smart forestry practices. Each year Rayonier's forest management practices are audited by independent third-party auditors to measure our compliance to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council. The results of these audits are published on the websites of SFI and FSC and are available to all interested stakeholders. Rayonier reaches out to stakeholders for feedback on our performance in areas where we are FSC certified and provides the publicly available summary of our forest management plan for those interested. Rayonier also annually publishes a detailed Corporate Responsibility Report that documents our progress on achieving our sustainability goals. This report is published on our website and is available to all investors, shareholders, and stakeholders.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our Communications and Investor Relations teams address questions from interested stakeholders throughout the year. Our Corporate Responsibility Report is also published on our website, and we engage with stakeholders on the results of this document at meetings with investors and stakeholders throughout the year. Results from our third-party audits of our sustainable forest management practices are publicly available. Rayonier reaches out to stakeholders for feedback on our performance in areas where we are FSC certified and provides the publicly available summary of our forest management plan for those interested. Feedback from our stakeholder outreach in 2025 was positive and was incorporated into our improvement process.

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 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

Rayonier stakeholders have expressed interest in the effects of our forest management practices on water yield and water quality in the forested watersheds we manage. Forested watersheds on Rayonier's forest land provide groundwater recharge and stream flow that provides potable water to individuals and communities. It also provides habitat for aquatic organisms. Rayonier implements best management practices that have been developed to protect water quality during forest management operations and it is important that our stakeholders understand these activities and how they are implemented across the landscape. Regulatory agencies are also interested in our forest management practices and our compliance with regulations designed to protect water quality and aquatic habitat.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The results of our external audits of our compliance with BMPs are reported as part of our SFI and FSC annual audits. The results of these audits are published on the websites of the certifying organizations. The success of these efforts is reflected in the value placed in the data by regulatory agencies as part of their oversight of our forest management practices.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- ☒ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Communities

(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:

- ☒ Unknown

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

Our stakeholders have expressed interest in Rayonier's sustainable forest management practices, including our climate smart forestry practices. Each year Rayonier's forest management practices are audited by independent third-party auditors to measure our compliance to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council. The results of these audits are published on the websites of SFI and FSC and are available to all interested stakeholders. Rayonier reaches out to stakeholders for feedback on our performance in areas where we are FSC certified and provides the publicly available summary of our forest management plan for those interested. Rayonier also annually publishes a detailed Corporate Responsibility Report that documents our progress on achieving our sustainability goals. This report is published on our website and is available to all investors, shareholders, and stakeholders.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our Communications and Investor Relations teams address questions from interested stakeholders throughout the year. Our Corporate Responsibility Report is also published on our website, and we engage with stakeholders on the results of these documents at meetings with investors and stakeholders throughout the year. Results from our third-party audits of our sustainable forest management practices are publicly available. Rayonier reaches out to stakeholders for feedback on our performance in areas where we are FSC certified and provides the publicly available summary of our forest management plan for those interested. Feedback from our stakeholder outreach in 2025 was positive and was incorporated into our improvement process.
[Add row]

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ SMURFIT WESTROCK PUBLIC LIMITED COMPANY

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Traceability and transparency

☒ Other traceability system, please specify :EUDR traceability to demonstrate no deforestation.

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

European Union Deforestation regulations (EUDR) will require Rayonier to confirm no deforestation or agricultural conversion on fiber supplied to Smurfit Westrock. We will provide confirmation and location of fiber supplied to meet fiber traceability requirements.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☒ Increased transparency of upstream/downstream value chain

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :current to ongoing.

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☒ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

We cannot estimate this.
[Add row]

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?

(5.13.1) Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☒ No standardized procedure

(5.13.3) Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives

We have not had a supply chain member engage with us previously on initiatives through CDP. We have engaged with supply chain members that will be required to comply with EUDR to help them meet compliance.
[Fixed 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 believe using "Equity Share" for our climate consolidation approach best reflects our influence over GHG sources and sinks.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

We believe using "Operational Control" for our forest consolidation approach best reflects our influence over sustainable forestry practices. This puts in scope the following major activities: activities surrounding our timberlands and Land-Based solutions within our Land Resources business, activities at our wood products facilities, and activities in our real-estate development business.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

We operate in the forest management and wood products sector, so we handle water-related environmental performance data as a component of forests and wood products related environmental performance data.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

We operate in the forest management and wood products sector, so we handle biodiversity-related environmental performance data as a component of forests-related environmental performance data.

[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?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply

☒ Yes, a merger

(7.1.1.2) Name of organization(s) acquired, divested from, or merged with

PotlatchDeltic Corporation

(7.1.1.3) Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

Rayonier and PotlatchDeltic Corporation completed a merger of equals on January 30, 2026. This report contains descriptions of our combined 2025 initiatives, and references to “Rayonier” or “we” are intended to reflect the combined operations of Rayonier and PotlatchDeltic on a pro forma basis, unless otherwise noted. This report does not include Rayonier’s legacy operations in New Zealand due to the sale of those interests in June 2025.

[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?
	<i>Select all that apply</i> ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scopes recalculated

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2, location-based

☒ Scope 2, market-based

☒ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Scope 3 categories recalculated

Select all that apply

☒ Processing of sold products

☒ Purchased goods and services

☒ Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

- ☒ End of life treatment of sold products
- ☒ Upstream transportation and distribution
- ☒ Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.1.3.4) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

Base year emissions have been retroactively recalculated using the all year approach to reflect the combined historical profiles of Rayonier and PotlatchDeltic, in accordance with the GHG Protocol's requirements for significant structural changes.

(7.1.3.5) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

[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

Rayonier 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 excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?

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)

59000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 GHG emissions originate directly from activities within our corporate, timberlands, and wood products facilities, as well as our real estate operations. This inventory encompasses stationary combustion sources—such as boilers, kilns, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)—as well as mobile equipment and company vehicles. Additionally, we account for emissions from the long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills and the methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) releases from biomass combustion. Our Scope 1 inventory is developed using the NCASI calculation tool, which aligns with the IPCC and Greenhouse Gas Protocol

standards. This tool enables us to consolidate CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O data from across our manufacturing and land-based operations into a single, unified inventory. Our calculations are based on the following:

- For each site, we calculate fossil fuel emissions by applying standardized emission factors to our purchasing records.
- To determine the impact of steam production, we utilize production records to quantify biomass usage; this allows us to account for biogenic CO₂ (reported separately from Scope 1) alongside associated CH₄ and N₂O emissions.
- For sites with long-term residuals storage, we estimate CO₂e emissions by applying a methane generation rate and standardized Global Warming Potentials (GWP) to the total volume of inventory stored onsite. This base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. The GHG Protocol requires previous years GHG calculations to be amended to estimate the impacts of a 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)

62000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated based on purchased electricity and heat. A location-based method reflects the average emissions intensity of grids on which energy consumption occurs (using grid-average emissions factor data). Our calculations are based on the following:

- We consolidate electricity purchasing records from each location to determine site-specific consumption.
- To calculate location-based Scope 2 emissions, we apply regional greenhouse gas emission factors from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID) to each site's consumption.
- We account for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, converting these into CO₂e using standardized GWPs. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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)

44000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

To calculate our market-based Scope 2 emissions, we utilize emission factors from local utilities or apply a zero-emissions factor for sites covered by Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). We account for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, which are then converted to CO₂e using standardized GWPs. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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 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)

235000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) Scope 3 Screening Tool to calculate our value chain impacts. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions conservatively using an 80% confidence estimate. Purchased goods and services accounted for 3.9% of Base Year Scope 3 emissions and includes emissions from professional services, telecommunications services, and wood fiber.

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

Scope 3 emissions associated with the purchase of capital goods has not been recognized as a significant source of emissions in our industry. A general review of the emissions associated with the purchase of capital goods supports this assumption at this time.

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 use the NCASI Scope 3 Screening Tool to calculate our value chain impacts. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions conservatively using an 80% confidence estimate. Fuel- and energy-related activities accounted for 0.3% of Scope 3 emissions and include energy losses from transportation and distribution of purchased energy in Scope 2, and any other utility or fuel information not covered by Scope 1 or Scope 2. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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 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

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the NCASI Scope 3 Screening Tool to calculate our value chain impacts. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions conservatively using an 80% confidence estimate. Upstream transportation and distribution resulted in 1.3% of our calculated Base Year Scope 3 emissions, respectively. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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 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

Most materials that could become waste from our operations are wood residuals, which are either utilized for energy production (via biomass boilers) or for other products by our downstream customers. Emissions from biomass combustion are a renewable source of energy and are reported as biogenic emissions. Emissions from materials sent to downstream customers are calculated in Category 10 of our Scope 3 inventory. Long-term storage of woody debris onsite is accounted for within our Scope 1 emissions as methane 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

An analysis of business travel was conducted using travel expense records to account for airfare, hotel stays, and both rental and reimbursed vehicle mileage. Based on this review, emissions from this category were determined to be insignificant to the overall Scope 3 footprint and below our materiality threshold and are therefore excluded from our 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

An analysis of employees' commuting patterns was conducted using Census Bureau data and EPA emissions factors demonstrating that these emissions are insignificant to overall Scope 3 emissions, are below our materiality threshold, and are therefore excluded from our Scope 3 emissions.

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

Category 8 primarily consists of over-the-road vehicles leased by the company. Other leased assets include land, which does not generate emissions, and buildings, which we include in Scope 2. While we utilize leased mobile equipment at our mills, the associated fuel consumption is accounted for within our Scope 1 emissions, as these operations fall under our direct operational control. Emissions from upstream leased assets are below our materiality threshold and are therefore excluded from our Scope 3 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)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the NCASI Scope 3 Screening Tool to calculate our value chain impacts. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions conservatively using an 80% confidence estimate. This category includes emissions that occur in the reporting year from transportation and distribution of sold products after the point of sale. Downstream transportation and distribution emissions are primarily from the transportation of logs and lumber. We use company data relating to production and transportation as our primary data source for this category. Downstream transportation and distribution resulted in 4.9% of our calculated Base Year Scope 3 emissions, respectively. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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 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)

2797000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the NCASI Scope 3 Screening Tool to calculate our value chain impacts. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions conservatively using an 80% confidence estimate. We calculate the emissions associated with the processing of our logs and wood residuals into products such as lumber, packaging, paper, and plywood by our customers. Biogenic emissions from wood waste generated during the manufacture of the wood products and subsequently burned is determined based on emission factors published by the EPA. These biogenic emissions are considered carbon neutral and are thus reported outside of the Scopes. Category 10 accounted for 46.2% of our Base Year Scope 3 emissions. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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 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)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not applicable to our timber business, as the sawtimber and pulpwood logs we sell, and the products made from them do not generate emissions during their useful lifespan. No emissions result from the use or operation of our wood products sold. Separately, we account for carbon stored in our wood products as part of our removals. This category is not applicable to our real estate business as we only sell land for commercial or residential development. After the sale, the developer subsequently sells to the end user. These activities are not included within our Scope 3 boundary.

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)

2623000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the NCASI Scope 3 Screening Tool to calculate our value chain impacts. This tool calculates Scope 3 emissions conservatively using an 80% confidence estimate. Rayonier calculates the emissions associated with the end-of-life treatment of the forest products manufactured from the logs we sell to customers over a 100-year period. We use the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) data to determine the 100-year average product storage by region and product. We use an exponential decay function to determine the longevity of each product in use based on their half-life. At the end of the useful life, the proportion of the remaining mass of wood that is recycled, burned, or disposed of in a landfill is determined based on data from the USFS. The wood that is recycled remains in use. Emissions from wood that is burned at the end of life is treated as a biogenic emission and reported outside of the Scopes based on an emission factor from U.S. Forest Service data. Emissions from decomposition of wood products that are placed in a landfill are determined using a decay function and emission factor produced by the USFS. End-of-life treatment of sold products accounted for 43.4% of our total Scope 3 base year emissions, covering the environmental impact of product recycling, landfilling, and disposal. The base year value has been recalculated to reflect the merger with PotlatchDeltic. 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 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

We lease or license some of our land for additional uses, such as recreation and renewable energy development. Carbon storage and removals by the forest during the lease period are included in the appropriate category. Emissions associated with our ongoing management of the land during the lease period are included in the appropriate Scope 3 category. Downstream emissions associated with the activity of the lessor are not applicable to our Scope 3 emissions and are therefore excluded.

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 is not applicable to our business, as we do not grant licenses to other entities to sell or distribute our goods or services in return for payments, such as royalties for the use of trademarks and other services.

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 is not applicable to our business as Rayonier does not hold equity or debt investments in other entities.

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

We have no other upstream emissions to report.

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

We have no other downstream emissions to report.

[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

54000

(7.6.3) Methodological details

The Scope 1 emissions data represents the entire Rayonier organization using an operational control boundary. Scope 1 GHG emissions originate directly from activities within our corporate, timberlands, and wood products facilities, as well as our real estate operations. This inventory encompasses stationary combustion sources—such as boilers, kilns, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)—as well as mobile equipment and company vehicles. Additionally, we account for emissions from the long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills and the methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) releases from biomass combustion. Our Scope 1 inventory is developed using the NCASI calculation tool, which aligns with the IPCC and Greenhouse Gas Protocol standards. This tool enables us to consolidate CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O data from across our manufacturing and land-based operations into a single, unified inventory. Our calculations are based on the following:

- For each site, we calculate fossil fuel emissions by applying standardized emission factors to our purchasing records.
- To determine the impact of steam production, we utilize production records to quantify biomass usage; this allows us to account for biogenic CO₂ (reported separately from Scope 1) alongside associated CH₄ and N₂O emissions.
- For sites with long-term residuals storage, we estimate CO₂e emissions by applying a methane generation rate and standardized Global Warming Potentials (GWP) to the total volume of inventory stored onsite.

Past year 1

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

61000

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2024

(7.6.3) Methodological details

The Scope 1 emissions data represents the entire Rayonier organization using an operational control boundary. Scope 1 GHG emissions originate directly from activities within our corporate, timberlands, and wood products facilities, as well as our real estate operations. This inventory encompasses stationary combustion sources—such as boilers, kilns, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)—as well as mobile equipment and company vehicles. Additionally, we account for emissions from the long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills and the methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) releases from biomass combustion. Our Scope 1 inventory is developed using the NCASI calculation tool, which aligns with the IPCC and Greenhouse Gas Protocol standards. This tool enables us to consolidate CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O data from across our manufacturing and land-based operations into a single, unified inventory. Our calculations are based on the following:

- For each site, we calculate fossil fuel emissions by applying standardized emission factors to our purchasing records.
- To determine the impact of steam production, we utilize production records to quantify biomass usage; this allows us to account for biogenic CO₂ (reported separately from Scope 1) alongside associated CH₄ and N₂O emissions.
- For sites with long-term residuals storage, we estimate CO₂e emissions by applying a methane generation rate and standardized Global Warming Potentials (GWP) to the total volume of inventory stored onsite.

each site, we calculate fossil fuel emissions by applying standardized emission factors to our purchasing records. • To determine the impact of steam production, we utilize production records to quantify biomass usage; this allows us to account for biogenic CO₂ (reported separately from Scope 1) alongside associated CH₄ and N₂O emissions. • For sites with long-term residuals storage, we estimate CO₂e emissions by applying a methane generation rate and standardized Global Warming Potentials (GWP) to the total volume of inventory stored onsite.

Past year 2

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

57000

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2023

(7.6.3) Methodological details

The Scope 1 emissions data represents the entire Rayonier organization using an operational control boundary. Scope 1 GHG emissions originate directly from activities within our corporate, timberlands, and wood products facilities, as well as our real estate operations. This inventory encompasses stationary combustion sources—such as boilers, kilns, and a regenerative catalytic oxidizer (RCO)—as well as mobile equipment and company vehicles. Additionally, we account for emissions from the long-term storage of wood residuals at our mills and the methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) releases from biomass combustion. Our Scope 1 inventory is developed using the NCASI calculation tool, which aligns with the IPCC and Greenhouse Gas Protocol standards. This tool enables us to consolidate CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O data from across our manufacturing and land-based operations into a single, unified inventory. Our calculations are based on the following: • For each site, we calculate fossil fuel emissions by applying standardized emission factors to our purchasing records. • To determine the impact of steam production, we utilize production records to quantify biomass usage; this allows us to account for biogenic CO₂ (reported separately from Scope 1) alongside associated CH₄ and N₂O emissions. • For sites with long-term residuals storage, we estimate CO₂e emissions by applying a methane generation rate and standardized Global Warming Potentials (GWP) to the total volume of inventory stored onsite.

[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)

59000

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40000

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated based on purchased electricity and heat. A location-based method reflects the average emissions intensity of grids on which energy consumption occurs (using grid-average emissions factor data). Our calculations are based on the following:

- We consolidate electricity purchasing records from each location to determine site-specific consumption.*
- To calculate location-based Scope 2 emissions, we apply regional greenhouse gas emission factors from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID) to each site's consumption.*
- We account for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, converting these into CO₂e using standardized GWPs.*

To calculate our market-based Scope 2 emissions, we utilize emission factors from local utilities or apply a zero-emissions factor for sites covered by Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). We account for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, which are then converted to CO₂e using standardized GWPs. 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)

56000

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39000

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2024

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated based on purchased electricity and heat. A location-based method reflects the average emissions intensity of grids on which energy consumption occurs (using grid-average emissions factor data). Our calculations are based on the following:

- We consolidate electricity purchasing records from each location to determine site-specific consumption.*
- To calculate location-based Scope 2 emissions, we apply regional greenhouse gas emission factors from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID) to each site's consumption.*
- We account for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, converting these into CO₂e using standardized GWPs.*

To calculate our market-based Scope 2 emissions, we utilize emission factors from local

utilities or apply a zero-emissions factor for sites covered by Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). We account for CO2, CH4, and N2O, which are then converted to CO2e using standardized GWPs. 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)

60000

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

37000

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated based on purchased electricity and heat. A location-based method reflects the average emissions intensity of grids on which energy consumption occurs (using grid-average emissions factor data). Our calculations are based on the following: • We consolidate electricity purchasing records from each location to determine site-specific consumption. • To calculate location-based Scope 2 emissions, we apply regional greenhouse gas emission factors from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)’s Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID) to each site’s consumption. • We account for CO2, CH4, and N2O, converting these into CO2e using standardized GWPs. To calculate our market-based Scope 2 emissions, we utilize emission factors from local utilities or apply a zero-emissions factor for sites covered by Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). We account for CO2, CH4, and N2O, which are then converted to CO2e using standardized GWPs. 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.

[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)

263000

(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

(7.8.6) 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 non-fiber, 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) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) 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)

9000

(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

(7.8.6) 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)

68000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.6) 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.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

We quantify waste generated from our operations based on the count and volume of waste containers at our facilities, which contain mixed municipal solid waste and are assumed to be full at each pickup. Waste emissions are below our materiality threshold and therefore excluded from our Scope 3 emissions.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions associated with business travel include airfare, rental vehicles, ridesharing, and use of personally owned vehicles (POV) for business purposes. We source data relating to business travel from our expense reporting system as our primary data source. Emissions from business travel are below our materiality threshold and are therefore excluded from our Scope 3 emissions.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

We gather commute and work from home data from our employees and use this as our primary data source. Emissions from employees commuting and working from home are below our materiality threshold and are therefore excluded from our Scope 3 emissions.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

Category 8 primarily consists of over-the-road vehicles leased by the company. Other leased assets include land, which does not generate emissions, and buildings, which we include in Scope 2. Emissions from upstream leased assets are below our materiality threshold and are therefore excluded from our Scope 3 emissions.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

350000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.6) 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)

2772000

(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

(7.8.6) 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) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) 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)

2862000

(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

(7.8.6) 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) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

We lease or license some of our land for additional uses, such as recreation and renewable energy development. Carbon storage and removals by the forest during the lease period are included in the appropriate category. Emissions associated with our ongoing management of the land during the lease period are included in the appropriate Scope 3 category. Downstream emissions associated with the activity of the lessor are not applicable to our Scope 3 emissions and are therefore excluded.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category is not applicable to our business, as we do not grant licenses to other entities to sell or distribute our goods or services in return for payments, such as royalties for the use of trademarks and other services.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category is not applicable to our business as Rayonier does not hold equity or debt investments in other entities.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

We have no other upstream emissions to report.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

We have no other downstream emissions to report.

[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

12/31/2024

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO₂e)

247000

(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)

7000

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

80000

(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)

333000

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

2775000

(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)

2737000

(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

2024 Scope 3 category emissions have been retroactively recalculated to reflect the combined historical profiles of Rayonier and PotlatchDeltic, in accordance with the GHG Protocol's requirements for significant structural changes.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2023

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

240000

(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)

343000

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

2828000

(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)

2710000

(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

2023 Scope 3 category emissions have been retroactively recalculated to reflect the combined historical profiles of Rayonier and PotlatchDeltic, in accordance with the GHG Protocol's requirements for significant structural changes.

[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:

☒ Decreased

(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 in the reporting year that had contributed a significant amount of GHG emissions.

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 not accounted for in the reporting year.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Higher production resulted in 2000 metric tons CO2e increase in Scope 1 and 1000 metric tons CO2e increased Scope 2 emissions.

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)

9000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

10

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Emissions from in our timberlands land management including controlled burning decreased.

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

No unidentified changes.

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

No other changes.

[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

(7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain?

	Agriculture, forestry or other land sector activities	Indicate if these activities are only related to forest lands and/or non-productive, non-forest lands	Specify the reason for no significant activities
	Select from: ☒ Yes, in both our direct operations and our upstream/downstream value chain	Select from: ☒ Yes, these activities are only related to forest lands and/or non-productive, non-forest lands	Select from: ☒ No relevant activities related to agricultural lands identified

[Fixed row]

(7.12.2) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

(7.12.2.1) CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)

612000

(7.12.2.2) Comment

In 2025, our operations generated 612,000 metric tons of biogenic CO2. This total includes emissions from energy produced using wood residuals at our manufacturing sites, as well as pile burning activities conducted for forest management. In accordance with standard protocols, these biogenic emissions are reported separately from our Scope 1 total. These emissions are part of the natural carbon cycle, where carbon is sequestered during forest growth and released upon combustion or decay. Unlike fossil fuels, which introduce new geologic carbon into the atmosphere, biogenic emissions from combustion processes at our facilities or forest management practices are part of a circular process and are a recognized alternative to fossil fuel use.

[Fixed row]

(7.12.3) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from land use management

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Empirical models
- ☒ Process-based models
- ☒ Field measurements

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

We measure biogenic removals using a stock-change methodology across a consistent spatial footprint of our entire ownership, which we classify as managed lands. Stock-change is equivalent to forest carbon sequestration minus carbon losses from mortality and harvest and measures the net-change in carbon storage on our land, inclusive of land use decisions, forest management, growth conditions and natural disturbances. As the net change on our lands is negative (we remove more carbon dioxide than we emit) we report 0 for land use management.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

1100000

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Empirical models
- ☒ Process-based models
- ☒ Field measurements

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

We measure biogenic removals using a stock-change methodology across a consistent spatial footprint of our entire ownership, which we classify as managed lands. Stock-change is equivalent to forest carbon sequestration minus carbon losses from mortality and harvest and measures the net-change in carbon storage on our

land, inclusive of land use decisions, forest management, growth conditions and natural disturbances. At year-end, we take these stand level inventory and apply well-documented biomass estimators and species-specific moisture contents to calculate component-based carbon inventories for our land base. The difference between standing carbon at year-end compared to the beginning of the year is the net change for that year. As this question specifically asks about our direct operations, we have entered the net change in our forests (Scope 1), not the portion of net change in our sourcing regions (Scope 3). In 2025, we calculated the net change in our forests (our Scope 1 timberlands value) for two carbon pools: 1) merchantable above-ground portions of trees, and 2) non-merchantable and pre-merchantable above-ground portions of trees. In 2025, the net flux in our forests was an estimated removal of 1,100,000 metric tons of CO₂e in our above-ground standing stock attributed to growth, harvest, and other adjustments.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO₂)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Empirical models
- ☒ Process-based models
- ☒ Field measurements

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

We measure biogenic removals using a stock-change methodology across a consistent spatial footprint of our entire ownership, which we classify as managed lands. Stock-change is equivalent to forest carbon sequestration minus carbon losses from mortality and harvest and measures the net-change in carbon storage on our land, inclusive of land use decisions, forest management, growth conditions and natural disturbances. As the net change on our lands is negative (we remove more carbon dioxide than we emit) we report 0 for land use change.

CO₂ emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO₂)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion in land machinery are not applicable to Rayonier. As part of our GHG inventory, we do not currently use any biofuels in our land machinery since they are not yet available.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

529000

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

We meet more than 40 percent of the energy needs in our manufacturing facilities from renewable biomass, using what would be wood waste from sustainably managed forests and mill residuals to create our own energy. This approach allows us to reduce our reliance on nonrenewable fossil fuels and purchased electricity. In accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting Standard, we report the CO2 emissions associated with the combustion of biomass fuels, such as wood and wood waste, separately from the scopes. This biomass fuel consists of mill residuals with logs sourced from sustainably managed forests and is considered carbon neutral. We do, however, include the CH4 and N2O emissions associated with the combustion of biomass in our Scope 1 GHG emissions.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

83000

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other) are biogenic emissions from controlled burn operations in our timberlands.
[Fixed row]

(7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years?

	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage in the reporting year	Specify the reason for no technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geological storage in the reporting year	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage were accounted for and reported in previous years
	Select from: ☒ No, explanation provided	Select from: ☒ No relevant activities identified	Select from: ☒ No

[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)

6418000

(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 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

(7.15.1) Emissions breakdown by greenhouse gas type

Select from:

☒ Yes, both Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

[Fixed row]

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and Scope 2 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 selected gas)

33000

(7.15.1.3) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

33000

(7.15.1.4) Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

59000

(7.15.1.5) Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

59000

(7.15.1.6) Scope 2 market-based emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

40000

(7.15.1.7) Scope 2 market-based emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

40000

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

530

(7.15.1.3) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

14000

(7.15.1.4) Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

3.9

(7.15.1.5) Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

105

(7.15.1.6) Scope 2 market-based emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

4.2

(7.15.1.7) Scope 2 market-based emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

110

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

33

(7.15.1.3) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

9000

(7.15.1.4) Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

0.54

(7.15.1.5) Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

150

(7.15.1.6) Scope 2 market-based emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

0.62

(7.15.1.7) Scope 2 market-based emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

170

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 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	54000	59000	40000

[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 activity

(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	Land Resources	10000
Row 2	Wood Products	44000

[Add row]

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	Stationary Fuel Combustion	26000
Row 2	Fossil Fuel Mobile Equipment	13000
Row 3	Wood residuals waste	6000
Row 4	Controlled burning	9000

[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:

☒ Mechanical

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

39000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Process-based models

☒ Field measurements

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Includes fossil fuels combustion and mobile equipment at our mills and in timberlands and biomass emissions at our mills to account for methane and nitrous oxide emissions from the combustion of biomass. Emissions factors are sourced from the EPA for fossil fuels combustion and biomass.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☒ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

☒ Non-mechanical

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

6000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Default emissions factor
- ☒ Field measurements

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Includes methane emissions from the decomposition of manufacturing residuals in landfills at our mills. Methane emissions from landfills are calculated using a detailed first order decay approach.

Row 4

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

- ☒ Agriculture/Forestry

(7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

- ☒ Non-mechanical

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

9000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Default emissions factor
- ☒ Field measurements

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Includes controlled burning activities. Controlled burning methodology follows IPCC LULUCF GPG Equation 3.2.20 'Estimation of GHGs Directly Released in Fires.'
[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☒ By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	Purchased electricity for facilities	59000	40000

[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)

54000

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

59000

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40000

(7.22.4) Please explain

All reported emissions are attributable to the consolidated accounting group.

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

Not applicable
[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

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ SMURFIT WESTROCK PUBLIC LIMITED COMPANY

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☒ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

630495

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

640

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Land management activities such as prescribed burning in timberlands for allocated emissions for pulpwood sales. Wood products Scope 1 emissions from fossil fuels in production of lumber and wood residuals.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We utilized a % of Scope 1 emissions from timberlands (pulpwood) and from wood products (residuals) based on volume.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

2025 Corporate Responsibility Report Scope 1 emissions.

[Add row]

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☒ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We have difficulty allocating emissions to customers because we sell more than one type of product to the same customer, usually through several transactions. Additionally, one of the by-products of our wood products manufacturing is used in the production of paper products. Our GHG inventory system does not tie the GHG emissions to the amount of these by-products, presenting a difficulty in measuring our Scope 3 category 10 emissions. We use the NCASI Scope 3 Screening tool to measure our Scope 3 emissions. For customers that also have access to that tool it would be useful to compare assumptions and calculation methods to improve the comparability of Scope 3 GHG emissions.

[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

	Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities
	Select from: ☒ Yes	We would be open to working with our customers to allocate emissions if requested.

[Fixed row]

(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

383331

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

383331.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

160309

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

0

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

160309.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1423828

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1423828.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1423828

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

543640

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

0

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1967468.00
[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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
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) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1423828

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1423828

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

This category includes heat energy from renewable biomass. A significant portion of the energy needs in our manufacturing facilities are met through renewable biomass, utilizing wood waste from sustainably managed forests and mill residuals to produce our own energy. This approach significantly reduces our reliance on nonrenewable fossil fuels.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

We do not consume biomass that is considered "other".

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

We do not consume "other renewable fuels".

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

We do not consume "coal".

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

279299

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

279299

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

This includes liquid fossil fuels used in our manufacturing facilities and Timberlands operations including diesel, gasoline, and kerosene.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

98404

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

98404

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

This includes energy from natural gas across our operations.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5628

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

5628

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

This includes energy from liquid propane gas across our operations.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1807159

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1807159

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

*This is our total.
[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)

1423828

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1423828

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

1423828

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1423828

Steam

(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

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 a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

United States of America

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

160309

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

383331

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1423828

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1967468.00

[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)

94000

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :billion board feet

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

1.2

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

12

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

increased production.
[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

11.4

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Million Gigojoules

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Not applicable.

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

2.7

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Reducing energy consumption and utilizing renewable sources are integral to our goals. We 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.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☒ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

3400

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Metric tonnes CO2-e

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Not applicable.

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

126

(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. Waste diverted to disposal more than doubled from 2024 due to an expansion project at one of our sawmills.
[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

07/18/2024

(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)

59000

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO₂e)

44000

(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)

103000.000

(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)

59740.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

54000

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

40000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

94000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

20.80

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary covers scope 1 and 2 emissions and direct carbon emissions from combustion of biomass. It does not contain any exclusions. It covers the entirety of our emissions from direct operations in our timberlands, manufacturing facilities, and indirect emissions from purchased energy.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We commit to reducing our absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions with a 42% reduction in emissions by 2030.

(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 and the conversion of our natural gas kiln burner at our Ola, Arkansas facility, and grid greening initiatives by our utility providers. Progress to date is the result of a reduction in wood residual piles and energy reduction initiatives.

(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

07/18/2024

(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 1 or 2)

☒ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in

☒ 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

(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)

235000

(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

(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)

298000

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2797000

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2623000

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6049000.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

6049000.000

(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

(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

(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

(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

(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

(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

(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

(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)

4536750.000

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

263000

(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)

9000

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

68000

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

350000

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2772000

(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)

2862000

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6324000.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

6324000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-18.18

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target includes 100% of the categories of Scope 3 emissions that are relevant to our company.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We commit to reducing our absolute Scope 3 emissions by 25% by 2030.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Our Scope 3 reduction target is supported through encouraging sector-wide emissions reductions, working to increase demand for wood products, and seeking new lower emission markets, such as bioenergy, for our pulpwood. We are also encouraging our customers to reduce GHG emissions through coalitions and industry groups.

(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

07/19/2024

(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

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2040

(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

Rayonier has signed The Climate Pledge committing to achieving net-zero emissions across our Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 2040. No exclusions apply.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

These science-based targets are designed to achieve net-zero emissions 10 years sooner than targets established under SBTi and are in line with the 1.5°C pathway of the Paris Agreement. This commitment means we will measure and report greenhouse gas emissions on a regular basis, implement decarbonization strategies across all Scopes in line with the Paris Agreement through real business changes and innovations and neutralize any remaining emissions across all Scopes with additional, quantifiable, real, permanent offsets (or removals) to achieve net-zero annual carbon emissions by 2040.

(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 neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

Rayonier has established science-based targets based on guidelines from IPCC and the Paris Agreement to achieve a 1.5°C pathway. We target a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions of 42% by 2030 and to achieve net-zero emissions across Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2040. This is designed to achieve the Paris Agreement net-zero target needed to achieve a 1.5°C pathway 10 years sooner than the SBTi program. Our target incorporates the powerful carbon removal benefit of our forests and wood products.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Rayonier publishes an annual carbon record in our Corporate Responsibility Report that summarizes our carbon footprint, including removals and storage in our forests, and our Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions following GHG protocol. We have published our emissions reduction targets and document progress toward these goals.

We have also summarized our decarbonization strategy and the steps we plan to take in the short and medium term to achieve our emissions reduction targets. Our carbon and climate teams regularly evaluate our opportunities to reduce GHG emissions.
 [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.

	Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year
	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(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	0	
To be implemented	1	19000
Implementation commenced	3	16000
Implemented	0	0
Not to be implemented	0	

[Fixed 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:

☒ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Within our Scope 1 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. Carbon neutralization would be used to offset greenhouse gas emissions that cannot be eliminated.

[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:

☒ MP1

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☒ Practices to increase wood production and forest productivity

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Rayonier planted over 54 million seedlings during the reporting year. Rayonier reforests its forests after harvest using both natural regeneration and planting based on soil and site conditions. These regeneration practices reestablish healthy, productive forests across our land base. As part of its sustainable forestry practices, Rayonier reforests all of its certified forests by either planting or natural regeneration. Rayonier tracks its reforestation efforts using our GIS based land management system that includes information on every stand across our land base including data on reforestation such as the year planted, the number of seedlings planted, their species, genetic quality, and growth rate through time. We use field inventory data to monitor these stand parameters, including data from inventory plots measured each year. We also use remote sensing data including aerial photography, drones, satellite imagery, and LiDAR to monitor the health and productivity of our forests and evaluate the success of our reforestation efforts.

(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)

1100000

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Rayonier's scope 1 net change in our forests was an estimated 1.1 million metric tons of CO2e carbon removals in 2025.

Row 2

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☒ MP2

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☒ Practices to increase wood production and forest productivity

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

As forests grow, they remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through photosynthesis and store solid carbon in a variety of land-based carbon pools. We account for the net change in carbon storage both in our own forests and in the forests of our sourcing regions as an accurate representation of our overall impact on the concentration of atmospheric carbon dioxide.

(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)

1100000

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Rayonier's scope 1 net change in our forests was an estimated 1.1 million metric tons of CO2e carbon removals in 2025. Our Scope 3 net change in the forests of our sourcing regions was 1.4 million metric tons of CO2e carbon removals.

Row 3

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☒ MP3

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☒ Fire control

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

We implement practices with 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. 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 helps us maintain our timberlands for future harvest but also reduce potential environmental impacts that can come from wildfires. Recently, the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the US Forest Service to enhance cooperation during wildfires. The MOU allows private resources to fight fires in areas of adjacent public ownership. A second MOU was signed 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 4

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☒ MP4

(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 comprise 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 management system. Foresters use this real-time information when preparing detailed harvest plans to include these unique features in our management plans.

(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.
[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

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 topics 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 additional 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. 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, to enhance cooperation between private working forest owners and public land managers during wildfires. The MOU 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 arrangement. 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 additional 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

☒ Soil

☒ Water

☒ Yield

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Rayonier uses climate smart forestry practices to sustainably manage our forests. This includes the forest products and ecosystem services produced by our forests. Using climate smart forestry, we can maintain the growth of our forests and the water, biodiversity, soil quality, and recreation on our forests that benefit society.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Rayonier has an inventory program that monitors growth of our forests each year. This enables us to determine the impacts of climate smart forestry on both the wood products and ecosystem services provided by our forests. We document the changes in biodiversity in our forests annually. We audit our compliance with best management practices to protect soil and water.

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

☒ Biodiversity

☒ Water

☒ Yield

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Rayonier aims to maintain or advance the conservation of biological diversity at the stand- and landscape-level and across a diversity of forest and vegetation cover types and successional stages including the conservation of forest plants and animals, aquatic species, species of concern, threatened and endangered species, forests with exceptional conservation value, old-growth forests, and ecologically important sites.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Rayonier has a multi-faceted approach to promoting the conservation of native biodiversity on our land base. Some ways in which we do this are: we only plant indigenous species; in our hardwood and mixed conifer/hardwood stands we have internal guidelines for maintaining stand characteristics; our riparian/streamside management zones provide a variety of conifer/hardwood species and function as travel corridors for a variety of wildlife species; we limit the size of our harvest openings and employ green-up restrictions; our silvicultural treatments provide for biodiversity through the life of a stand; annually, we review NatureServe for areas on our lands deserving special management; hunting on our land helps manage wildlife populations; thereby preventing overpopulation and habitat degradation; our field staff is required to review biodiversity issues periodically.

Row 3

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☒ MP3

(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

☒ Soil

☒ Water

☒ Yield

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Rayonier aims to limit susceptibility of forests to undesirable impacts of wildfire and to raise community awareness of fire benefits risks and minimization measures.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Rayonier has identified regions with high fire risks and works cooperatively with appropriate management agencies. In addition, Rayonier has developed fire lines which are mapped in our GIS based land management system, has a fire team and tractors for response and contract language requirements, has an extensive road network, a written western regional fire response plan of action, placed helicopter dip ponds in strategic locations within our ownership and identified natural water bodies which can serve as dip sites, conducts thinnings of mid-rotation stands and prescribed early rotation and post-thinning stand release using herbicides. Rayonier maintains and daylight roads throughout its ownership which provide access and act as fire breaks; Rayonier prescribes mid-rotation thinning in stands to reduce density and also releases these thinned stands to reduce understory fuel loads. Rayonier, when and where possible, prescribes broadcast and slash pile burning to reduce fuel loads. Rayonier prescribes an early-release pre-thinning to reduce fuel loads in some portions of its ownership. Rayonier has several fire tractors for response to wildfires either in a stand-alone effort or a coordinated effort with other local, state, and federal response teams. Rayonier has fire response teams in the U.S. South and U.S. Pacific Northwest that participate with local, state, and federal agencies in pre-planning and response to wildfire outbreaks.

Row 4

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☒ MP4

(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
- ☒ Soil
- ☒ Water
- ☒ Yield

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Rayonier aims to enhance long term forest productivity, forest health, and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, afforestation, integrated pest management strategies, minimized chemical use, soil conservation, and protecting forests from damaging agents.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Rayonier's tree improvement program is aimed at increasing the value of our land and timber by increasing genetic gain while managing risks of biotic and abiotic impacts through genetic diversity. In each region, we seek to increase the genetic gain of our plantations through university based cooperative research internal research and production or acquisition of improved genetic material for planting. Research trial information on the performance of various planting stocks is used to select genetic material that is adapted to the eco physiographic region and meet objectives for the region such as improved growth and disease resistance. Participation in the breeding and testing cooperatives at universities grants us access to data and germplasm to produce increasingly superior planting stock families or varieties. Additionally, these cooperatives conduct basic genetics research such as genomics and applied genetic research such as breeding testing and seed orchard research which enhances their programs over time. Rayonier seeks to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents by promoting healthy and productive forest conditions. Specifically, some procedures include cooperating with federal and state agencies along with adjacent property owners in fire suppression efforts investigating excessive damage due to forest diseases or insects and considering such cases for treatment if available and practical and deploying genetically resistant seedlings to forest diseases or insects.

[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 long-term strategic management plans based on harvest schedule models. Timber inventory data is utilized in growth and yield models, which optimize long-term harvesting and forest management operations and project sustainable harvest volumes over the time horizon. The harvest schedule is remodeled every few years. 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 after harvest is a key part of what we do to manage our forests sustainably. We utilize native, improved, locally adapted planting stock and monitor seedling survival to create 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]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☒ No, I am not providing data

(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:

☒ Group of products or services

(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)

CO2 storage

- ☒ Other CO2 storage, please specify :Carbon storage in forest products

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

The carbon storage benefits of our forests continue even after trees are harvested, as carbon can remain stored for many decades within the end-use wood products made from such trees, including lumber, plywood, and engineered wood products. As part of our carbon footprint analysis, our Corporate Responsibility Report estimates our annual harvest volumes by product and destination, as well as the resulting long-term storage benefits by category. This analysis is based on one year of harvest activity and does not reflect the incremental benefit of successive rotation cycles. The sustainable practice of harvesting and replanting trees results in a higher level of carbon sequestration versus just letting the trees grow naturally, primarily due to the storage of carbon in end use wood products.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

- ☒ Other, please specify :IPCC, U.S. Forest Service

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

- ☒ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Using wood as a building material vs concrete as a building material on a per ton concrete basis.

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Wood as a low carbon building material to replace concrete.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☒ Cradle-to-gate + end-of-life stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO₂e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

1

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

IEA data indicates that 1 ton of concrete produces 0.9 metric tonnes of CO₂. Substituting wood, which is a carbon negative product as a building material to replace concrete will avoid approximately 1 tonne of CO₂ emissions per ton of concrete.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

35

[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)

18600000

(8.2.2) Volume type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Produced
- ☒ Sourced

(8.2.3) Produced volume (metric tons)

15300000

(8.2.4) Sourced volume (metric tons)

3300000

[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, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, South Carolina, Texas, Oregon, and Washington

(8.3.5) Land type

Select from:

☒ Managed natural forests

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

1600000

(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)

15300000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.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, Louisiana

(8.3.5) Land type

Select from:

☒ Managed natural forests

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

257000

(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)

2600000

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

60

(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)

RYN List of Locations.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:

☒ Area for infrastructure

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

As of December 31, 2025, legacy Rayonier and legacy PotlatchDeltic held timberlands within our taxable REIT subsidiary that are maintained for infrastructure purposes. This includes roads, landings, right-of-ways etc.

Row 2

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:

☒ Other type of control, please specify :Own land and concessions/lease

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:

☒ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

222473

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

100

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

As of December 31, 2025, legacy Rayonier and legacy PotlatchDeltic held approximately 222,473 hectares (549,744 acres) of timberland with protected conservation status in the U.S. This includes 6,495 hectares (16,049 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, a 22,154 hectares (54,744 acre) conservation easement located in the St. Joe Basin in Idaho, and 14,455 hectares (35,720 acres) of other conservation easements. In addition, we have 179,369 hectares (443, 231 acres) of streamside management zones and other protected acres. We have designated these hectares with long-term protection, which includes environmentally sensitive and conservation easement areas, as well as riparian management zones. These hectares are excluded from harvest, or managed appropriate to their conservation values, and are protected from insects, diseases, wildfires, and invasive species. They are documented in our GIS based land management system so that they are clearly identified and buffered from harvest.

[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

Idaho

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

900000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Saint Maries Complex wood products facility sources timber from Idaho. Of the timber sourced from Idaho, 72% was sourced internally from our own timberlands, and 28% 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

Arkansas

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2400000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Ola, Waldo, and Warren wood products facilities source timber from Arkansas. Of the timber sourced from Arkansas, 35% was sourced internally from our own timberlands, and 65% 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)

560000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji and Gwinn wood products facilities source timber from Michigan. Of the timber sourced from 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)

460000

(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)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji wood products facility sources timber from Minnesota. Of the timber sourced from 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

Oklahoma

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

700

(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)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Ola wood products facility sources timber from Oklahoma. Of the timber sourced from 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

Louisiana

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

224000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Waldo and Warren wood products facilities source timber from Louisiana. Of the timber sourced from Louisiana, 1% was sourced internally from our own timberlands, and 99% 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)

4600

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Saint Maries Complex wood products facility sources timber from Washington. Of the timber sourced from 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)

216000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji and Gwinn wood products facilities source timber from Wisconsin. Of the timber sourced from 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

Canada

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

4100

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Bemidji and Gwinn wood products facilities source timber from Canada. Of the timber sourced from Canada, 100% was sourced externally. Externally sourced timber can be from private or provincial 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)

45000

(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)

RYN List of Locations.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

Our Saint Maries Complex wood products facility sources timber from Montana. Of the timber sourced from 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?

	Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target	Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target
Timber products	Yes ☒ Yes, we have a no-deforestation 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"

Rayonier defines "deforestation" as the permanent conversion of forests that we own into production of agriculture commodities in accordance with the EU Deforestation Regulations. Through our Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) and Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) certifications, Rayonier is committed and verified to be deforestation and/or conversion free. Our certified timberlands are reforested in accordance with these standards.

(8.7.1.3) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.1.4) Cutoff date

Select from:

☒ No cutoff date

(8.7.1.7) 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:

☒ Forests target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7.1

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

01/01/2020

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

01/01/2026

(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

Global environmental treaty/ initiative/ framework

☒ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Rayonier 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 timberlands 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, including 2025. 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

Rayonier 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. We utilize a timberland environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on 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 audits of EMS implementation. The implementation of our EMS supports our efforts 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 supports the achievement and maintenance of third-party certifications for our timberlands. Our third-party forest certification also reflects the rigor of our EMS, which is based on an ongoing 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.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Further details of forest certification are documented in our annual 10K and in our Sustainability Report. Values are in percent.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Forests target 2

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7.1

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

01/02/2002

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

01/01/2003

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

01/01/2026

(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

Global environmental treaty/ initiative/ framework

☒ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Rayonier 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 SFI Fiber Sourcing system is 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 require 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 comply with the SFI standard. Our procedures are designed to procure fiber from legal and responsible sources with emphasis on uncertified sources. In 2025, we tracked log purchases to section, township, and range. 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 significant risks. In 2025, 100% of the fiber consumption at all our wood products facilities was certified according to the SFI Fiber Sourcing 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 2025. 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 2025. All our sourcing in 2025 was verified to be from legal, responsible sources and over 99% was produced by trained logging contractors.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Further details of forest certification are documented in our annual 10K and in our Sustainability Report. Values are in percent.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Forests target 3

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7.1

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

01/02/2005

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

01/01/2006

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

01/01/2026

(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

Global environmental treaty/ initiative/ framework

☒ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Rayonier is committed to the sustainable management of our timberlands. Third-party certification confirms that science-based stakeholder-developed forest management practices and regular improvement are occurring on all of our timberlands. Legacy PotlatchDeltic set a goal for 100% of its timberlands in the Warren and Waldo operating units in Arkansas and Louisiana to become certified to Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) forest management standards by 2007. This goal was met in 2005, and certification has been maintained, including 2025. 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 implements these requirements.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Rayonier is certified to the FSC Forest Management Standard on 100% of its timberlands in its Warren and Waldo operating units in Arkansas, which constitutes 60% of its total Arkansas and Louisiana 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. We utilize a timberland environmental management system (EMS) which focuses on improvement in achieving our sustainable forest management objectives. The EMS includes training foresters and contractors, and prescribing, monitoring, and inspecting forest management practices in 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 supports our efforts 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 supports the achievement and maintenance of third-party certification for our timberlands. Our third-party forest certification also reflects our EMS, which is based on an ongoing 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.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Further details of forest certification are documented in our annual 10K and in our Sustainability Report. Values are in 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 Fiber Sourcing standard. These procedures are designed to procure fiber from legal and responsible sources with emphasis on uncertified sources. 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 significant risks. Our risk assessment procedures, implementation and results are evaluated in internal audits and via third party audits and we have not identified issues with illegal sourcing. In addition, we have policies and procedures to comply with applicable laws and to require legal compliance throughout our supply chain. Our procedures regarding 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 99% 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

(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

Rayonier 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

Rayonier_Forest_Management SFI.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

All of Rayonier's wood products facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing Standard. The SFI Fiber Sourcing Standard 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 conduct an annual risk assessment that follows the steps and indicators provided in the PEFC ST2002:2020 standard for chain of custody (COC), which classifies risk as significant or negligible.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

Rayonier_SFI_Fiber_Sourcing.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

17

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Rayonier is also certified on 60% of our combined timberlands in Arkansas and Louisiana to FSC Forest Management standards, which is 17% of our total timberlands.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

(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 maintain 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 maintaining 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 for 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. When internal harvests are completed stands go through a close out process to demonstrate that all BMPs and requirements for complying with the SFI standard are met, and any infractions are immediately resolved before the harvest 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.

(8.9.3.8) Attachment of verification (optional)

Rayonier_SFI_Fiber_Sourcing.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 Rayonier's wood products facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard. The SFI Fiber Sourcing standard 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 conduct an annual 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."

(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, Washington, and Montana. 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

(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

All Rayonier's wood products facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard. The SFI Fiber Sourcing standard 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 conduct an annual 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."

(8.9.4.10) Attachment of verification (optional)

Rayonier_Forest_Management SFI.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."

(8.9.4.12) Attachment indicating risk classification for each sourcing area (optional)

Rayonier_SFI_Fiber_Sourcing.pdf
[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)

0

(8.10.1.7) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint during the last five years (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

100% of our managed forests are certified to the SFI Forest management standard. Since 2015, the SFI Forest Management Standard has prohibited deforestation and forest degradation through multiple requirements in the Standard. The SFI Board reconfirmed its commitment to no deforestation and no forest degradation on March 20, 2024, by explicitly prohibiting certification to the SFI 2022 Forest Management Standard on lands that are deforested and on practices that are causing forest degradation after December 31, 2020.

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 SFI Fiber Sourcing 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 certified lands as part of certification to the SFI forest management standard and the FSC forest management standard, and to not utilizing wood from converted lands in our procurement program through contracts with customers that adhere to the FSC Controlled Wood standard. Timber sourced from our timberlands that are certified to the SFI and/or FSC standards accounts for approximately 30% 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 Rayonier's wood products facilities are certified to the SFI Fiber Sourcing standard. The SFI Fiber Sourcing standard 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 conduct an annual risk assessment that meets the SFI Fiber Sourcing Standard. 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
- ☒ Land use 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

The performance of our employees and our suppliers (contractors) who perform any harvesting and forest management work on our property is regularly evaluated to determine our compliance with our sustainable forest management standards, which includes compliance with Rayonier policies and local, state, and federal regulations and laws. This includes our compliance with our sustainable forestry principles and practices under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and

Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI). Rayonier has a comprehensive GIS based land management system which tracks every stand on our estate. Forest harvesting and forest management activities are recorded on a stand-by-stand basis in our land management system. This data is obtained by field observations of our foresters, temporary and permanent forest inventory plots, and remote sensing tools including drones, aerial photography, satellite imagery, and LiDAR. We measure inventory plots annually across our estate. This GIS based data is used to monitor our forests through time to assist us in our compliance with policies and regulations. Our compliance with policies, laws, and regulations are annually audited internally by our sustainable forestry team and by independent third-party auditors to verify compliance. The results of these third-party audits are publicly available. We also monitor compliance with worker protection standards such as those from OSHA in the U.S. for employees and contractors. Our compliance is monitored internally and by state and federal agencies. The results of our compliance with worker protection standards are reported and publicly available.

[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
- ☒ Risk of human rights issues
- ☒ Commodity sourcing footprint
- ☒ Stakeholder/investor request
- ☒ Risk of supplier non-compliance in area
- ☒ Organization has operational presence in area
- ☒ Opportunity for increased human well-being 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

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Our regional operating units collaborate with the local, state, and national agencies in each region. The priorities for landscape/jurisdiction engagement are determined collaboratively based on the specific issues and conditions in each region. This may include regional collaboration on salmon habitat restoration in Washington, gopher tortoise management in Florida, or red cockaded woodpecker management in Arkansas. The nature of the collaboration is determined by the local conditions so that the potential for success is enhanced. We also collaborate with other forestry organizations through state and national trade associations and university-based research cooperatives. The forest owners that are members of these associations and cooperatives collectively prioritize the importance of the issues and allocate the work accordingly. The forest owners provide the funding that supports the work of the trade associations and the university cooperative research programs. Rayonier staff are involved in each of these trade associations and cooperative research programs and actively participate in the decision process.

[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to increase 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

Completion of Road Maintenance, Fish Passage Program

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

- ☒ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Latitude

47.2

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-123.9

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Washington

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☒ Yes

(8.15.2.9) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

170040

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

1999

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☒ Please specify :2020

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

- ☒ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
- ☒ Ecosystem services maintained and/or enhanced
- ☒ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

(8.15.2.15) 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

Support and incentivize sustainable production and community land use practices

- ☒ Collaborate on integrated watershed management and remediation activities

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

- ☒ Sub-national government
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Private sector

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

Rayonier was recognized by the Washington state Forest Practices Board for our investments in protecting clean water for humans and fish alike. The state Forest Practices Board, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, and the Washington state departments of Ecology and Fish and Wildlife recognized more than a dozen large landowners that completed their obligations under the RMAP program before the October 2021 deadline, with monitoring and recognition in 2022.

As a part of this initiative, Washington state's large landowners have corrected nearly 8,500 fish passage barriers and reopened 5,200 miles of fish habitat since 2001 under the Washington Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) process.

(8.15.2.18) 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 :DNR and Department of Ecology

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

Rayonier has corrected over 900 fish passage barriers and reopened more than 250 miles of fish habitat since 1999 under the Washington Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) process.

(8.15.2.20) 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

NAFO Wildlife Conservation Initiative (WCI)

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Latitude

31.5

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-86.8

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

U.S. South and U.S. Pacific Northwest regions

(8.15.2.8) 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 across our land base.

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

2015

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☒ Not defined

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

- ☒ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
- ☒ Increased and/or maintained protected areas
- ☒ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

(8.15.2.15) 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

(8.15.2.16) 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/rural associations

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

The Wildlife Conservation Initiative (WCI) is a voluntary, collaborative effort 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 Inc. (NCASI) to conserve fish and wildlife species on private working forests. The WCI, which began as individual, regional collaborations, has now grown into a formal, agency-wide initiative and a model for engaging forest owners, federal and state agencies, and stakeholders in effective voluntary species conservation. The WCI has a very simple objective: to conserve common, at-risk, threatened, and endangered species through active forest management of private working forests. The WCI also operates simply. NAFO member companies join with NCASI, the USFWS, and other collaborators to identify priority species that need private working forests for their habitat, collect field data on how active forest management affects species populations, and use the data to determine together how to maintain and improve conservation benefits. The WCI has ongoing species conservation projects in every USFWS region where NAFO members own or manage significant acres of forest land and is demonstrating the value of active forest management as a wildlife conservation tool. NAFO members own and manage more than 46 million acres of private working forests in 34 states.

(8.15.2.18) 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)

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

Rayonier and other participating NAFO members collaborate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on a project focused on conservation without conflict. Through this joint effort Rayonier works with the Fish and Wildlife service to better understand the conservation status of species on our land. We provide data on the location of our land, the forest characteristics such as species, age, and habitat types, so that its value for species of interest can be assessed. This collaboration helps the Fish and Wildlife Service determine the viability of wildlife populations on our land and the need for additional conservation efforts. This enables Rayonier to effectively implement conservation practices in a timely and cost-effective manner. 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, Rayonier 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 achieving 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.

(8.15.2.20) 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

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Latitude

30.9

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-82.5

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

U.S. South region

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☒ Yes

(8.15.2.9) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

400000

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

1994

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

- ☒ Not defined

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

- ☒ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
- ☒ Forest fires monitored and prevented
- ☒ Improved community resilience from climate adaptation plans or mitigation efforts

(8.15.2.15) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

- ☒ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

- ☒ Promote and implement climate change adaptation and mitigation activities

Enhance government and capacity

- ☒ Support enforcement of land-use and/or zoning plans

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Producers

- ☒ Private sector
- ☒ Other, please specify :Local forest/rural associations

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

The 80-member Greater Okefenokee Association of Landowners (GOAL) represents more than two million acres of public, private, and commercial lands in South Georgia and North Florida. The grassroots group's stewardship ethic aims to manage, protect, and promote forest resources in and around the Okefenokee Swamp. Moreover, the group's vision is to produce a consolidated and influential entity to actively assure that these resources will be available for future generations. In 2005, GOAL was recognized by the USDA for outstanding contributions to wildland firefighting and America's wildland firefighters.

(8.15.2.18) 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 :Greater Okefenokee Association of Landowners (GOAL)

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

The Greater Okefenokee Association of Landowners is a cooperative effort between private industry, state forestry agencies, the U.S. Forest Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to manage the forests surrounding the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge. We collaboratively address habitat issues, and work together on wildfire prevention and firefighting. Progress is monitored at quarterly meetings of the association to discuss issues and opportunities for collaboration. Progress is evaluated in the impact that the activities of the association has had on the number and severity of wildfire in the greater Okefenokee region.

(8.15.2.20) Claims made

Select from:

- ☒ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

Row 4

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

- ☒ LJ4

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Latitude

31

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-86.4

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

U.S. South region

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☒ Yes

(8.15.2.9) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

500000

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

2021

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☒ Please specify :2023

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

- ☒ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
- ☒ Increased and/or maintained protected areas
- ☒ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

(8.15.2.15) 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
- ☒ Share spatial data and land management plans with other stakeholders in the landscape/jurisdiction

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

- ☒ National government
- ☒ Sub-national government
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Private sector

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

Rayonier collaborated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the conservation status of gopher tortoises in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama. We provided data on locations where gopher tortoises were present across our land base in this region. We also provided data on the forest conditions where gopher tortoises were located. This helped the Fish and Wildlife Service complete their species assessment and respond to the petition to list the species as endangered under the U.S. ESA. Based on the data provided the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined that listing was not warranted.

(8.15.2.18) 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 :Monitoring plan developed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NCASI, and NAFO to provide data needed.

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

The results from this effort were used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine that the populations of gopher tortoises were healthy and that private forests continue to provide abundant habitat for the species. Therefore, listing the species as endangered was not warranted.

(8.15.2.20) Claims made

Select from:

☒ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

Row 5

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ5

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

East Nassau Community Planning Area (ENCPA) including the Wildlight Conservation Habitat Network

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.15.2.4) Latitude

30.7

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-81.5

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Nassau County, Florida

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☒ Yes

(8.15.2.9) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

11000

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Convener: Leads or facilitates the design, set-up, and high-level management of the initiative

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

2013

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☒ Not defined

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

- ☒ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
- ☒ Increased and/or maintained protected areas
- ☒ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

(8.15.2.15) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

- ☒ Co-design and develop goals, strategies and an action plan with timebound targets and milestones for the initiative
- ☒ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for biodiversity, habitat fragmentation and/or threats to IUCN Red List species in priority areas
- ☒ Collaborate on landscape sustainability assessments through participatory mapping
- ☒ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

- ☒ Private sector
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ National government
- ☒ Financial institution
- ☒ Sub-national government
- ☒ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

In late 2023, we received approval for the second phase of our Wildlight development project, an important milestone as we continue to advance the community. At its completion, Wildlight will be a 24,000-acre mixed-use community, approximately half of which has been committed to conservation through an intertwined conservation habitat network that runs throughout the property. Our research of the sensitive coastal ecology, the inherited historic patterns found in the towns and villages, and a desire to connect people with one another as well as the natural environment has led us to focus on creating environmentally responsible places. Our goal is to build on key characteristics and sensibilities of local communities while respecting and enhancing the natural systems vital to the region's sustainability.

(8.15.2.18) 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 :East Nassau Community Planning Area (ENCPA) sector plan and Detailed Specific Area Plan (DSAP)

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

The East Nassau Community Planning Area (ENCPA), also known as Wildlight, is a 24,000 AC mixed use master planned community in Nassau County Florida. Initial planning for the ENCPA/Wildlight began in 2007. It was approved by Nassau County and the Florida State Legislature in 2011. The first, 2,900 AC, Detailed Specific Area Plan (DSAP) was approved by Nassau County in 2013, and the initial phase of development began in 2016. Nassau County approved a second, 15,000 AC, DSAP in 2024. The ENCPA/Wildlight is a collaborative effort between Nassau County and Rayonier to develop 24,000 acres of timberland in eastern Nassau County. The plan aims to balance economic development, housing, and natural resource protection. Nearly 50% of the land area of Wildlight is conserved in environmentally sensitive wetlands and uplands. This conservation habitat network (CHN) provides habitat protection, wildlife corridors, biodiversity, storm water attenuation to increase storm resiliency, and recreational opportunities. The CHN is owned and managed by the East Nassau Stewardship District (ENSD). The ENSD was approved by the State in 2017. The East Nassau Stewardship District ("District") is a local unit of special-purpose government and political subdivision created and existing pursuant to Chapter 2017-206, Laws of Florida ("Act"), and Chapter 189, Florida Statutes, being situated entirely within Nassau County, Florida. The District is limited in its special purpose with the power to provide, plan, implement, construct, maintain and finance as a local government management entity its systems, facilities, services, improvements, infrastructure and projects, and possessing financing powers to fund its management power over the long term and with sustained levels of high quality. <https://eastnassausd.net/>. The ENSD board is bound by Florida's sunshine laws, which require full transparency. The ENSD has adopted a CHN management plan which guides the ongoing maintenance and operations of these natural areas including but not limited to, monitoring for invasive species, habitat management, and environmental education.

(8.15.2.20) Claims made

Select from:

☒ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

Row 6

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ6

(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) Latitude

33.4

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-92.4

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Arkansas

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☒ Yes

(8.15.2.9) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

6495

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

1995

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☒ Not defined

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) 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

(8.15.2.15) 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

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☒ Sub-national government

☒ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

Moro Big Pine is managed in collaboration with Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, and the Nature Conservancy.

(8.15.2.18) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☒ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

We are actively managing a 6,495-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 cooperation with the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, and The Nature Conservancy. The conservation entities 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 threatened 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 2025 population of 103 adults with 34 active cluster sites.

(8.15.2.20) Claims made

Select from:

☒ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

Row 7

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ7

(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) Latitude

47.2

(8.15.2.5) Longitude

-116.3

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Idaho

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☒ Yes

(8.15.2.9) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

2700

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☒ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

1990

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☒ Not defined

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) 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

(8.15.2.15) 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

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

- ☒ National government
- ☒ Sub-national government
- ☒ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

The Mica Creek Experimental Watershed was established in 1990 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.

(8.15.2.18) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.19) 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. 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.

(8.15.2.20) 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, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

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, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 3

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ3

(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, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 4

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ4

(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, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 5

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ5

(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:

☒ No, we do not produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction

Row 6

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ6

(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, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 7

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☒ LJ7

(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, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

[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

☒ Involved in industry platforms

☒ Engaging with communities

☒ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

☒ Funding research organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☒ Please specify :Pacific Northwest and US South, U.S. Lake States (mills only)

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We are members of and actively participate in: The Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI), The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), The National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO), American Wood Council (AWC), and The National Council on Air and Stream Improvement Inc. (NCASI). NAFO is a national advocacy organization committed to advancing federal policies that extend the viability of working forests that provide clean air, clean water, wildlife habitat, and jobs through sustainable practices and strong markets. NCASI is 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. Additionally, Rayonier collaborates on specific research initiatives with industry associations, other individual industry participants, and university/industry cooperatives. In the U.S., Rayonier is a member of nearly 30 university/industry cooperatives, which provide us with access to a wide range of basic and applied research programs to support our forest management efforts.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☒ Involved in industry platforms

☒ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☒ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We are members of the International Sustainable Forestry Coalition (ISFC). The ISFC brings together leading global companies that own, manage, or source from sustainably managed forests. Its purpose is to strengthen the economic, societal, and environmental value of forests through coordinated policy advocacy, standards development, and engagement in global climate and biodiversity processes.

[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 2

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☒ Project 2

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☒ Threatened and protected species

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

☒ 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

Rayonier strives to protect gopher tortoises by maintaining the conditions they need to thrive through our forest management practices. This is a regulatory requirement in Florida and a voluntary effort in other states.

(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

☒ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2021

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☒ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

(8.17.1.13) Longitude**(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency***Select from:*☒ Six-monthly or more frequently**(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**

In 2022, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announced that listing the gopher tortoise as a T&E species is no longer warranted for most of its range. Specifically, in the eastern range of the species, including Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and most of Alabama, the gopher tortoise has been withdrawn as a candidate for listing.

Row 3**(8.17.1.1) Project reference***Select from:*☒ Project 3**(8.17.1.2) Project type***Select from:*☒ Threatened and protected species**(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project**

Expected benefits of project

- ☒ Compliance with regulation
- ☒ 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

Rayonier restores salmon habitat in the U.S. Pacific Northwest. This is a regulatory requirement in Washington State.

(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
- ☒ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

1999

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

- ☒ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

- ☒ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

123

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency*Select from:*☒ Six-monthly or more frequently**(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?***Select all that apply*☒ Compliance with regulation☒ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss**(8.17.1.17) Please explain**

Rayonier has invested \$28.5 million in the Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) program in Washington, to open more than 250 miles of stream habitat to salmon. This effort was guided as part of the Forests & Fish Rules in 2001. The Forests & Fish Law is one of the most comprehensive environmental laws in the U.S., which protects 60,000 miles of streams across Washington's state and private forests. It uses the latest scientific standards to restore the best possible habitats for salmon to live and spawn in, as well as other amphibious creatures that depend on upland streams. In addition to replacing insufficient culverts and bridges to improve salmon habitat. Rayonier also improved forest roads to reduce the amount of sediment making its way into streams and, when possible, closed nonessential forest roads altogether.

Row 4**(8.17.1.1) Project reference***Select from:*☒ Project 4**(8.17.1.2) Project type***Select from:*

- ☒ Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

- ☒ Improvement of water availability and quality

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

- ☒ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Rayonier is collaborating with the University of Florida, The Suwannee River Water Management District, and the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement for a project on 25,000 acres in Florida to determine the impact of forest management on water yield in forested watersheds. We are working with our collaborators to determine how forest management practices can be changed to increase water yield to both ground water and stream flow in the Santa Fe River Watershed, which is an Outstanding Florida Water. This is a voluntary effort by Rayonier.

(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

2020

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

- ☒ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

10117

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

10117

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

29.5

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

82

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☒ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☒ Improvement of water availability and quality

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

This project will help public and private landowners determine the impacts of forest management on water yield and thus address critical water issues in North Florida. The research conducted in collaboration with the Suwanee River Water Management District and the University of Florida is testing hydrologic models that determine water yield from forested watersheds based on soil type, rainfall, stand density, forest leaf area, and forest management practices. The results of this work will help to manage water supplies in the southeastern United States and address water related issues associated with climate change.

Row 5

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☒ Project 5

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☒ Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

☒ 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

31.3

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-81.5

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☒ Annually

(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 existing open spaces and forested areas. We do not have the total investment over the project period.

Row 6

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

- ☒ Project 6

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

- ☒ Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

- ☒ 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 6,495-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 Rayonier 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 entities 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 threatened 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. We have 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 combined with forest thinning and improvement harvests. 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.

(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)

6495

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

6495

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

33.4

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-92.4

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☒ Six-monthly or more frequently

(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 Rayonier 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 entities, and local stakeholders is held annually. Updates on forest management completed, red-cockaded woodpecker reproductive 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 project 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 publicly release 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

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.

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Data is not available.

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not collected and/or reported

Select from:

☒ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(9.1.1.7) Country/area and river basin of exclusion

United States of America

☒ Other, please specify :United States: St. Joe River (ID), Lower Mississippi and Sparta Aquifer (AR)

(9.1.1.8) Estimated volume of water the exclusion represents (megaliters)

8

(9.1.1.9) Estimated % of total water

1

(9.1.1.10) 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:

☒ Other, please specify :Forest rainfall measured daily. Wood products periodically

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We calculate the water withdrawals from rain in our forests using hydrologic models that have been published in peer reviewed articles. The water withdrawal volumes by source, including groundwater and other water systems in our wood products facilities are measured using flow meters. Withdrawal from groundwater and public water supply systems at other facilities is monitored directly from metered wells or metered public supplies or from estimates of water use based on square footage rates.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We estimate the total rainfall in our forests using the PRISM hydrologic model. In 2025, Rayonier forests withdrew an estimated 21,336,000 megaliters. Withdrawals at our facilities are metered or estimated based on square footage rates provided by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). We monitor water withdrawals at all of our wood products facilities by source. 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:

☒ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We calculate the water withdrawals from rain in our forests using hydrologic models that have been published in peer reviewed articles. The water withdrawal volumes by source, including groundwater and other water systems in our wood products facilities are measured using flow meters. Withdrawal from groundwater and public water supply systems at our facilities is monitored directly from metered wells or metered public supplies or from estimates of water use based on square footage rates.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We calculate the water withdrawals from rain in our forests using hydrologic models that have been published in peer reviewed scientific articles. The water withdrawal volumes by source, including groundwater and other water systems in our wood products facilities are measured using flow meters. Withdrawal from groundwater and public water supply systems at our facilities is monitored directly from metered wells or metered public supplies or from estimates of water use based on square footage rates.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Water quality data collected periodically for rainfall, streams, and groundwater in the U.S. by federal, state, and local regulatory agencies.

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The quality of water withdrawals from rainfall, streams, and groundwater are measured periodically by federal, state, and local agencies that regulate water quality in the U.S.. These efforts monitor water quality and ensure that we have high quality fresh water sources that are acceptable for potable uses based on concentrations of dissolved solids less than 1000 mg/l.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The quality of water withdrawals from rainfall, streams, and groundwater are measured periodically by federal, state, and local agencies that regulate water quality in the U.S.. These efforts monitor water quality and ensure that we have high quality fresh water sources that are acceptable for potable uses based on concentrations of dissolved solids less than 1000 mg/l.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Forest discharge measured daily. Wood products periodically

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Rayonier calculates the water use from our forests using hydrologic models. This percentage is subtracted from water withdrawal to quantify the amount of discharge from rainfall in our forests. For irrigation purposes, we quantify the amount of evaporation and runoff as use and subtract this from water withdrawal. All other sources are metered, or we assume 100% is discharged.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We estimate the total rainfall in our forests using the PRISM hydrologic model. In 2025, Rayonier forests discharged an estimated 57,782,000 megaliters. Water discharge at our wood products facilities is monitored using flow meters at discharge sources. Water discharge can be difficult when flow is intermittent.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Forest discharge measured daily.

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Rayonier measures the water discharge volumes for each of our forests using hydrologic models based on measured rainfall and evapotranspiration (ET) from our forests. Remote sensing data is used to determine leaf area from which ET is calculated.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rayonier measures the water discharge volumes for each of our forests using hydrologic models based on measured rainfall and evapotranspiration (ET) from our forests. Remote sensing data is used to determine leaf area from which ET is calculated.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Rayonier tracks the quantity of water discharge that receives tertiary or secondary treatment at municipal sewer treatment plant for our facilities. Discharge to the natural environment without treatment encompasses the natural rainfall brought into our company boundary and subsequently discharged from our forests. This quantity does not undergo any treatment outside of natural processes.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rayonier tracks the quantity of water discharge that receives tertiary or secondary treatment at municipal sewer treatment plant for our facilities. Discharge to the natural environment without treatment encompasses the natural rainfall brought into our company boundary and subsequently discharged from our forests. This quantity does not undergo any treatment outside of natural processes.

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:

☒ Other, please specify :Periodic monitoring of water quality by federal, state, and local regulatory agencies in the U.S.

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water quality from Rayonier forests is protected using well-tested best management practices that are designed to protect water quality based on the specific topography, soils, and forest conditions in each region where we operate. These BMPs address chemical pollutants such as nitrates and phosphates, petroleum products, suspended sediment, and temperature.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water quality from Rayonier forests is protected using well-tested best management practices that are designed to protect water quality based on the specific topography, soils, and forest conditions in each region where we operate. These BMPs address chemical pollutants such as nitrates and phosphates, petroleum products, suspended sediment, and temperature.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water quality from Rayonier forests is protected using well-tested best management practices that are designed to protect water quality based on the specific topography, soils, and forest conditions in each region where we operate. These BMPs address chemical pollutants such as nitrates and phosphates, petroleum products, suspended sediment, and temperature.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water quality from Rayonier forests is protected using well-tested best management practices that are designed to protect water quality based on the specific topography, soils, and forest conditions in each region where we operate. These BMPs address chemical pollutants such as nitrates and phosphates, petroleum products, suspended sediment, and temperature.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water quality from Rayonier forests is protected using well-tested best management practices that are designed to protect water quality based on the specific topography, soils, and forest conditions in each region where we operate. These BMPs address temperature as a particularly important water quality parameter.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water quality from Rayonier forests is protected using well-tested best management practices that are designed to protect water quality based on the specific topography, soils, and forest conditions in each region where we operate. These BMPs address temperature as a particularly important water quality parameter.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water consumption is calculated using hydrologic models that quantify the company's water withdrawal minus water discharge.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water consumption is calculated using hydrologic models that quantify the company's water withdrawal minus water discharge.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water used at our facilities is mostly borrowed water. The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement found that approximately 88% of the water used at U.S. forest products facilities gets treated and reintegrated into the surface water cycle. State and federal standards protect the waters receiving treated effluent discharges. Approximately 11% is returned to the atmospheric water cycle through evaporation and the remaining water (~1%) is contained within finished products

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water used at our facilities is mostly borrowed water. The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement found that approximately 88% of the water used at U.S. forest products facilities gets treated and reintegrated into the surface water cycle. State and federal standards protect the waters receiving treated effluent discharges. Approximately 11% is returned to the atmospheric water cycle through evaporation and the remaining water (~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:

☒ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The company tracks its provision of drinking water for all workers and is in compliance with OSHA standards.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The company tracks its provision of drinking water for all workers and is in compliance with OSHA standards.

[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)

802

(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:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water used at our facilities is mostly borrowed water. The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement found that approximately 88% of the water used at U.S. forest products facilities gets treated and reintegrated into the surface water cycle. State and federal standards protect the waters receiving treated effluent discharges. Approximately 11% is returned to the atmospheric water cycle through evaporation and the remaining water (~1%) is contained within finished products and residuals.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

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 :Discharges cannot be calculated.

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

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.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(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:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

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.

[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)

387

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Facility expansion

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

48.25

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Identification tool used

☒ 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 2025, 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 is 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)

222.9

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Much lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Change in production at our mills combined with expansion project at Waldo would impact volume of surface water withdrawal.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

579.1

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Change in production at our mills combined with expansion project at Waldo would impact volume of groundwater withdrawal.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our wood products facilities use little water and we can track withdrawal and provide information; however discharge data is not feasible due to inability to measure the periodic small quantities released.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Not applicable.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our wood products facilities use little water and we can track withdrawal and provide information; however discharge data is not feasible due to inability to measure the periodic small quantities released.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Not applicable

[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Indicate the highest level to which your wastewater is treated (either by your organization or a third party) before being discharged to the environment.

Quaternary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not applicable

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not applicable

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

50

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☒ 91-99

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☒ No other factors considered

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge with secondary treatment applies to the wastewater treatment in septic systems in use at our facilities.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not applicable

No treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not applicable

Unknown

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not applicable

[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☒ Nitrates

☒ Phosphates

☒ Pesticides

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Rayonier currently complies with all forestry water quality regulations through implementation of our sustainable forestry practices, including the use of best management practices. Such compliance constitutes compliance with all laws in the U.S. such as the U.S. Clean Water Act and with voluntary guidelines such as the Sustainable Forestry Initiative and the Forest Stewardship Council certification standards. Implementation of these guidelines was initiated prior to 2000 and continues today. Our target is compliance with all applicable water quality laws and regulations.

[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:

☒ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.4) Please explain

Rayonier has not identified any sites in the company's direct operations with substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☒ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Rayonier has not assessed our upstream value chain stages for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities.

[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	1425000000	1776807.98	No change expected.

[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	Rayonier's timber or wood products do not contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority.

[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:

☒ Yes

(9.14.2) Value chain stage where low water impact is assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

(9.14.3) Indicator used to assess water impact

Water quantity

☒ Lower water withdrawal/consumption than conventional processes

Water quality

☒ Lower water pollution than conventional processes

(9.14.4) Have you used a certification standard to classify your products/services as low water impact?

Select from:

☒ Yes, please specify standard :SFI and FSC

(9.14.5) Definition used to classify low water impact

Forests enhance water quality in several important ways: 1) Filtering pollutants: Trees, shrubs, and forest soils act like natural filters. They trap sediment, excess nutrients (such as nitrogen and phosphorus), pesticides, and other pollutants before they reach streams, rivers, lakes, and groundwater. 2) Reducing soil erosion: Tree roots hold soil in place, preventing it from washing into waterways during rainstorms. Less erosion means cleaner water with lower sediment levels. 3) Managing stormwater runoff: Forest canopies intercept rainfall, and forest floors absorb water like a sponge. This slows runoff, reducing the amount of pollutants carried into water bodies and decreasing flood risks. 4) Recharging groundwater: Water that infiltrates forest soils can replenish underground aquifers. As water moves through the soil, natural processes further remove contaminants. 5) Maintaining stream temperatures: Trees along streams provide shade, keeping water cooler. Cooler water generally contains more dissolved oxygen and supports healthier aquatic ecosystems. 6) Supporting healthy ecosystems: Forests provide habitat for plants and animals that contribute to nutrient cycling and natural water purification processes, helping maintain overall watershed health.

(9.14.7) Please explain

Rayonier believes our timber is classified as low water impact since nearly two thirds of the rainfall in our forests is discharged back to the natural environment. Additionally, we look at how we protect water, as well as how we take a proactive role in improving water supply as contributing factors to being a low water impact organization. We estimate that approximately 21,336 gigaliters of rainfall fell across our forests in 2025, of which 15,554 gigaliters was returned to the natural environment.

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Science-based target set in this target category according to SBTN guidance
Water pollution	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years
Water withdrawals	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	Select from: ☒ Yes	
Other	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	

[Fixed row]

(9.15.1) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Water target 2

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Site/facility

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☒ Reduction of water withdrawals from groundwater

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2023

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

36251450

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

30812500

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

28349800

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

145

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

☒ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☒ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Pine seedling production at our Elberta, Alabama tree seedling nursery is our largest single use of water. We implemented a program to target an improvement in water use efficiency at this facility in order to decrease groundwater water use from wells by a total of 5 million gallons or 15% from our base year. To date, we have exceeded this target and have saved 8 million gallons or 22% from our base year.

(9.15.1.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Rayonier installed new valves and a computer-controlled distribution system to improve water use efficiency at our Elberta, Alabama forest tree seedling nursery. The new system was designed to distribute irrigation water more efficiently throughout the nursery based on soil moisture and seedling demand. This system was designed to reduce water use by approximately 15% compared to the previous hand operated system of wells, pipes, and valves.

(9.15.1.16) Is this a science-based target according to SBTN?

Select from:

☒ No

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

None

Row 2

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Water target 3

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☒ Increase in the proportion of employees using safely managed drinking water services

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2023

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

419

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

1827

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

1827

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

☒ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☒ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Rayonier's goal is to provide clean, drinkable water for all employees company-wide for drinking, sanitation, and hygiene. This target has been met annually for more than 20 years.

(9.15.1.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Rayonier is in compliance with OSHA standards as it relates to water. OSHA requires employers to provide potable water that meets the standards of the U.S. Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards. The company tracks its provision of drinking water for all workers and compliance with OSHA standards is measured annually.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

Clean, potable water for drinking, sanitation, and hygiene is provided at 100% of Rayonier facilities.

Row 3

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Water target 1

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☒ Other water pollution, please specify :Maintain watersheds within our forests below EPA total maximum daily load limits for nitrogen in streams identified by the states for measurement.

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2023

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0.9

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

0.9

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

0.9

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

☒ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☒ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Rayonier's water pollution target is based on EPA ambient water quality criteria for rivers and streams in United States. No exclusions apply.

(9.15.1.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Our water quality efforts are focused on protecting stream water quality in our forests using the best management practices required by each state where we operate. These BMPs set performance standards that have been proven to protect water quality when implemented. The U.S. EPA has determined that BMPs are a better option to protect water quality in forestry than a quantitative permit system such as those used for industrial facilities. Rayonier audits the performance of our suppliers (contractors) to effectively implement the required BMPs. These include up to weekly or biweekly reviews that are documented for each site where suppliers (contractors) are operating. We also conduct periodic internal and external third-party audits of our BMP compliance. The results of these reviews are documented and included in our land management records. If issues are identified, we correct them.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The total target represents a total nitrogen concentration less than 0.9 mg/L be met.

[Add 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

- ☒ Law & policy
- ☒ Species management
- ☒ Education & awareness
- ☒ Land/water protection
- ☒ Land/water management
- ☒ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[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

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		☒ Pressure indicators ☒ Response 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:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Red Hills Salamander, Hairy Rattleweed, Marbled Murrelet, and Red-cockaded woodpecker.

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:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

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:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Big Thicket and Olympic 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

Not applicable.

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

Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, 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 collaboration 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

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Red Hill Salamander Habitat

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

7520

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity losses, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Olympic National Park

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity losses, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Big Thicket Biosphere Reserve

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

97983

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity losses, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Olympic Biosphere Reserve

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity losses, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 5

(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

Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity losses, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 6

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Marbled Murrelet

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

184

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity losses, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 7

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Hairy Rattleweed

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

17219

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Our active management includes but is not limited to silvicultural activities and road maintenance with varying adjacent hectares annually.

(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

☒ Site selection

(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

Forestry activities have the potential to impact biodiversity in both positive and negative ways. We utilize a mitigation hierarchy to avoid biodiversity loss, document occurrence of species on our land, and adhere to best management practices specific to each state where we operate, which include non-disturbed timber buffers.

Row 8

(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)

6495

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Over twenty years of habitat management and translocation of federally threatened 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 2025 population of 103 adults with 33 potential breeding groups and one single bird group. The RCW population on Moro Big Pine has become 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

Rayonier's forest management and timber harvesting activities in and around 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 threatened 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. We worked 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 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 maintained. We have reintroduced frequent fire regimes and completed 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 9

(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 catchments of Mica Creek, a tributary of the St. Joe River. The Mica Creek Watershed contains small areas of 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

Rayonier 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 10

(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. Rayonier 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
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	<i>We have not pursued assurance of GHG data at this time.</i>

[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.

	Additional information	Attachment (optional)
	FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENT - see attachment.	ForwardLookingStatements.pdf

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Vice President, 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 to facilitate collective action in priority basins.

Select from:

☒ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute

