

**CSA Community Advisory Group
to Stillwater Timberlands - Western Forest Products Inc.
March 14, 2007
Minutes
Town Centre Hotel**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:04pm: Meeting called to order
Quorum noted

Welcome and introductions

Chair welcomed members and guests.

1. Sue Bonnyman – Ministry of Environment, Environment Assessment Office (EAO) – Project Assessment Manager
2. Derek Griffin – Ministry of Environment, EAO – Project Assessment Director

Safety Review

Facilitator noted safety rules – also fire exits and first aid attendants in case of emergency. Meeting place in case of emergency was noted.

Meetings are tape-recorded.

Facilitator noted that meetings are tape-recorded, and requested that members speak up and avoid chatter when someone else is speaking.

Code of Conduct

Code of Conduct from Community Advisory Group was posted. Facilitator noted that the group has worked under the code of conduct for the last seven years.

Introductions

Members introduced themselves around the table and provided information on the seat that they represent.

Martin Buchanan, Stuart Glen and Walt Cowlard from Western Forest Products (WFP) introduced themselves.

Facilitator noted that the group operates under the rules of consensus.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Chair asked for approval of the agenda. Agenda was accepted with additions.

Review of WFP Minutes - February 14, 2007

Minutes from February 14th were reviewed and accepted.

Review of Island Timberland (IT) Minutes - February 14, 2007

Minutes from February 14th were reviewed and accepted with one amendment regarding access in the Haslam/Rainbow main area.

Facilitator noted that Diane Medves is no longer with IT. Bill Waugh is away until March 25th. Diane's position will be posted before March 25th. There has been no correspondence regarding the action list attached to the minutes.

Island Timberland – firewood permits

Member noted that Island Timberlands had stated that they were open to issuing firewood and salal cutting permits but he had no luck getting a call back from Island Timberlands. With some intervention, he subsequently received a phone call to say that all firewood permits were issued to commercial operators only. Facilitator will follow up with an e-mail to Kraig at Island Timberlands.

ACTION- Follow up e-mail to Island re: firewood and salal permits

Member noted that it is possible that permits may be given out to contractors and not to the public because of safety concerns and liability issues.

Maps – There is an electronic map of Island Timberland's DFA available. If anyone wants it- let chair know (large file)

WFP Correspondence

1. WFP Press release – WFP reduces and renegotiates US Term-Debt
2. Letter to PRPAWs re: Sunshine Coast trail information on road construction and logging near the trail
3. Invitation to Sue Bonnyman – Ministry of Environment

Public Correspondence

1. E-mail from Monty Tyrwhitt Drake, PRPAWS regarding December 13th minutes and reply sent by CAG.

WFP Action List

The action list was reviewed and updated.

Action #1 – Ongoing – The updated Visual landscape inventory data and map has been provided to the Ministry of Forests.

Action #2 –Ongoing - waiting for computer images of canoe route from Sam Mottram/Knight Piesold

All other actions have been completed

WFP Operational Information Map Update (TFL39 Block 1)

Stuart Glen

Stuart gave background information on the TFL39 Block 1 Operation Information Map for Sue Bonnyman and Derek Griffin.

Chair noted that the Operation Information Map was originally a requirement from the Stillwater Pilot project and has proved to be an excellent tool that is now included as a CSA indicator.

Map was posted and Stuart provided and showed the updates of harvesting, road construction, engineering, what's new on the map, and map updates:

Current Activities

**Harvesting – CH-538, FH-027, PL-001, PL-002, ST-102A, ST-259, WL-926A, GI-053, GI-054, NA-911
WL-910 (hauling of helicopter wood)
Scattered blowdown salvage operations ongoing.**

Road Construction - GI-152, PD-456, ST-184, ST-324, ST-334, ST-335, UL-825

Engineering – GI-019B, GI-069B, GI-113, LL-056B, NA-008B, NA-910B, NA-912, NA-912B, PD-456A, ST-147, ST-148, ST-159, ST-223B, ST-224B, ST-226B, ST-327, ST-820, ST-822, TM-122B, TM-191B, TM-195B, UL-801B, WL-043, WL-906B

What's New on the Map

New Blocks – TM-245, ST-147, ST-159, ST-327

New Roads – TM-245, ST-147, ST-159, ST-327

Cutting Permit Approved Areas – None

Note: New blocks adjacent to the Sunshine Coast Trail: ST-327, ST-148 (was previously identified)

Map Updates

***Logging Complete – HB-116, (Haywire Bay above Cranberry Lake)
ST-331, WL-909 - heli – far side of the lake***

Road Construction Complete – None

Engineered Blocks – GI-100C, HE-517A (was called HE-517B on February OIM), WL-911, TM-236B

Engineered Roads –WL-911, TM-122B

Question – Is the 24-hour road access hotline number no longer listed in the classified section of the newspaper? Last weekend at 12-mile on Goat Main, there was falling and no active falling signs were posted.

Answer – Stuart noted that the road hotline phone number was put in the newspaper for a number of weeks last fall as a reminder to the general public that the road hotline is still available.

Member provided a suggestion of including the road hotline number in the Telus phone book under Western Forest Products.

Stuart thanked the member for the suggestion and would look into implementing this suggestion.

Walt noted that the block at 12-mile on Goat Main (near the Tony lake cutoff road) is an Island Timberlands' block.

ACTION – Look into including the road hotline number in the Telus phone book.

Member noted that he and a friend put some of the active falling signs up and that there were more signs up on their way out of the block. Member will talk to Island regarding signage for active falling.

ACTION – Talk to Island regarding signage – Goat Lake Main/Tony Lake cutoff – safety concerns.

Question – At Goat Narrows, what are the salvage plans for the blowdown along the lake?

Answer – Walt noted that most of the windfall will likely be yarded into the lake with the tops attached. WFP is looking at dewatering the trees at the Beartooth dump where they would be processed on land. There is one area by the Narrows dump that may be yarded up onto land rather than pulling into the lake.

Question – Is there a new campsite with six sites going in at Windsor Lake?

Answer – Stuart noted that WFP is working with the Ministry of Tourism, Arts, and Sports and are currently upgrading the Lois Lake campsite. Six new sites have been added. Upgrades have also been completed to the existing tent sites. The Sliammon FN has been working on the project and the work is essentially now complete.

Facilitator noted that CAG discussed the Windsor Lake loadout as a potential campsite.

Question – In the Fiddlehead area, a second block has been harvested adjacent to the area harvested last year - what are the visual quality requirements and what is the total size of the area harvested?

Answer – Stuart explained that the total size of the area harvested is greater than 40 hectares and as clarified in the minutes from the last meeting this opening was harvested under section 2.4.2 of the FSP. This enables openings to be harvested which are greater than 40 hectares based on a landscape level analysis of the size and spatial distribution of cutblock openings. The total size of the area harvested is 86.1 ha with 30.6 ha of VR/WTP.

Stuart also noted that a Visual Impact Assessment will have been completed for this block to ensure that the visual requirements for the viewscape from the lake are being met.

Member noted that down the lake road and up to Rainbow main – the logging that has taken place there in the last 8-10 years has been done in a very good manner and has been done quite well. Comments from a number of people who live up there are that it looks quite different now. Member noted that CAG wants to be sure that Western is doing the right thing as far as visual quality requirements on the lake.

ACTION – Stuart - Fiddlehead block (FH-027) – will follow-up on the Visual Impact Assessment for FH-027.

Sunshine Coast Trail

Information provided in regards to the Sunshine Coast Trail:

- a) Two blocks were identified and discussed which are anticipated to have some engineering work commencing shortly:
ST-327: new block identified on the map and influences the SCT
ST-148: previously identified block adjacent to ST-327 and also influences the SCT.

ACTION – Provide information update to PRPAWS in regards to ST-327 and ST-148.

- b) Stuart noted that WFP has just released the brushing and trail clearing work on the SCT to Sliammon First Nations, in conjunction with PRPAWS. Work will done between now and March 31, 2007.

Company Updates

Sunshine Coast Trail:

Question – How is the SCT trail work being funded?

Answer – It is being funded by WFP utilizing FIA funding.

Question –What are the plans for the canoe route this year?

Answer – Western plans to continue providing funding through FIA for the maintenance of the canoe route this year.

Review of SFMP Indicators - VOITs

Facilitator suggested that the review of the VOIT's could be put forward until the April meeting if necessary in order to allow more time for the EAO presentation.

Guest Speakers

Chair introduced Sue Bonnyman – Project Assessment Manager, Ministry of Environment, Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) –and Derek Griffin – Project Assessment Director, Ministry of Environment, Environmental Assessment Office

CAG provided to members and guests a map of the TFL with Plutonic Power Corporation's (PPC) proposed transmission line route and also a list of questions that were prepared ahead for Sue Bonnyman.

Ms. Bonnyman gave a general outline on a flip chart of how the of Environment Assessment Office (EAO) works. The EAO is an agency that has its own specific legislation - the Environmental Assessment Act.

The sole purpose of the EAO is to implement the Environmental Assessment Act legislation. Under this legislation there is an Executive Director who also has a dual role as the Associate Deputy Minister to the Minister of Environment. The Executive Director's responsibility is to make recommendations to the Ministers that make the decisions on projects that are being reviewed under the Environmental Assessment Act. The Ministers that make the decisions are the Minister of Environment (who is involved in every decision) along with a second Minister who is called the Responsible Minister. The Responsible Minister will vary according to the project and for example a highway project would be the Minister of Transportation. The Responsible Minister in this case is the Minister of Energy, Mines, and Petroleum Resources.

Until fairly recently the EAO was a complete stand alone agency so it wasn't attached to any Ministry at all. For administrative convenience in recent government reorganization, the Executive Director was allotted administrative responsibility under the Ministry of Environment.

When the EAO goes into a review they have a standard contact list that they follow which goes to all of the appropriate agencies in government and the agencies can then nominate their representatives.

There are a number of other different Acts which also apply for example, the Wildlife Act and Water Act etc.

There are several people from the Ministry of Environment who form a working group which advises the EAO as they review a project.

See flow chart at the end of these minutes

Question – The Toba is a major fish spawning river on the coast - is Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) involved in the process?

Answer – Yes, when EAO contacts the standard contacts list, we contact CEEA (Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency) with a request to be involved in the review. EAO also contacts other federal agencies as appropriate. There is a harmonized review agreement, but BC leads the review on behalf of both governments.

Federal agencies involved in this project are: Canadian Wildlife Service, DFO, Environment Canada, and Navigational Waters.

Question – How do we get access to the information that comes out?

Answer – In theory, the EAO maintains a registry – the project information centre – where information is posted for transparency

In reality, the federal agencies websites are not always current.

The public can look on the EAO website to access all of the information.

The pre-application process is conducted under Section 11 rules. The public review includes open houses etc. A draft Terms of Reference are developed, which then go to the public for review.

When all the background information is ready and when the draft application is ready, it is put on the EAO website for review and written comments that are received are then posted on the website. Opportunity is provided for public review and comment.

For this project, Fisheries and Oceans did not provide written comment.

The EAO website shows lots of information provided by Plutonic but not a lot from Fisheries and Oceans.

Question – A draft table of commitments is not available for public review - how can we comment on the draft if not available?

Answer – A draft table of commitments was developed as an advisory document for the Ministers. Topics will be covered this evening.

Question – The Toba area is a major mountain goat winter habitat area.

(November 1 – April 30). There are some concerns about the air strip that is going in there now. There should be no flights over there from November 1 – April 30.

They are building an airstrip for Plutonic activity. How is this happening if the project is not yet approved?

Answer – When a project is found to be subject to the Environmental Assessment Act, they issue a Section 10 Order. The order says they may not proceed with the project until we have an Environmental Assessment certificate. It prevents government from issuing permits for activities other than investigative use that are needed to do the project. They can't get a water license or land tenure; they can not get any key authorizations until the environmental certificate is granted.

Environmental assessment is a strategic level decision process. Questions are asked if there are any reasons why the particular project should not proceed in this particular location. The project that is reviewed is the project sent in by the proponent. Details for this project can be found on the Plutonic website.
www.plutonic.ca

Plutonic submitted the application showing the road and transmission line locations. PPC were sent away to do more road planning. There was a lot of additional work done. The road is now planned away from rivers and fish habitat. The transmission line location was sent in and PPC was required to look at where alternate routes could be located. There were some concerns about deer wintering areas and old growth management areas. There was a lot of discussion around the impact on marbled murrelets. That discussion led to a proposal on devising a robust monitoring program so that marbled murrelet are not affected.

Question – When we look at the map - up Daniels River it looks like the line goes through three old growth management areas (no cut areas).

We don't have a good comfort level with that and feel that some of the old growth will be destroyed and some of the wildlife habitat destroyed.

Answer – Ms. Bonnyman noted that it is her responsibility to co-ordinate some of the agencies – and she is not an expert on these subjects. These questions should have been brought forward earlier in the review.

The requirement is to map and show all the sensitive habitat areas and to identify old growth areas. PPC was required to snake the line through the sensitive areas, and to work with the forest licensees in detail on where the poles will be in order to minimize impact in these areas.

Question – That will happen?

Answer – Yes, that is a requirement.

Question – When the proposal was first brought to CAG there was more than one project mentioned, that could possibly come down through this area. What about other projects in the future - could there be multiple lines in the future?

Answer – We would be required to review and look at cumulative impacts. Should another project come through we would be required to look at it. At this time we are not aware of any other projects in this area. Note - there are many mineral claims but not so many mines, many water licences but not always developments.

There are lots of claims in hydro electric projects but they are not always developed.

There is the Klinaklini project in Knight Inlet – but it is not Plutonic's project. That project is not forecasted to come through the TFL.

Member noted that Plutonic has a list of 19 projects on their website including Knight, Bute, Upper Toba, Freda etc. What will the 19 projects do to the TFL?

Answer –If any of those projects are over 50 megawatts, they have to go through the environmental assessment process.

Question – When under 50 megawatts, who looks at those projects?

Answer –They go through the Provincial permitting system that is now managed by the Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB). These projects go through an environmental review but not at the same level as larger projects.

Derek Griffin noted that if there are any other proposals, they have to meet federal CEAA assessments.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that the Freda Creek proposal is being actively pursued and is in the permit review process.

WFP is potentially being impacted by another project in TFL25. This Toba project also has a big impact, and now it seems the Freda project is in some kind of review.

On Freda Creek, which was brought up before, from a WFP land alienation perspective, they are proposing another 18km of power line instead of hooking into the one going directly beside the project. This is because of cost. There are concerns of how and when there is another process going, that this could slip through the cracks. Maybe the proponent should accept extra cost and minimize the impact to forestry. There are concerns that there will be a cumulative impact across the coast – WFP is concerned about the over all cumulative impact from all these projects. The other WFP problem with the review from a forestry point of view is that they all take WFP time and money. WFP has done more forestry review on this project than Plutonic has.

We can't sit idly by and watch – we need to know how this process works. They are all individual proponents.

Brian Smart, an independent consulting forester noted in his comments to the Plutonic project that there was no long term planning of transmission line corridors for the coast and that transmission lines will impact the forest industry Derek noted that they will report back on the Freda project.

ACTION- Derek Griffin will provide more info on Freda Creek project

Question – It would seem the DFO had a lot of impact into assessing this project. What role does the Ministry of Forests (MOFR) play – They are giving out short terms tenures of 25 years for the hydro project – how do they deal with 40, 60, 80 or 100 years of forestry loss?

Answer – The decision is made by the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Energy and Mines. All major information and facts are laid out, they look at numbers, all issues that are raised by forestry, and how the project is viewed by

companies and CAGs. The Ministers are the ones that have to ask the questions; they need to think about those numbers before they allow the project to go ahead. Member noted that the detailed location of the transmission corridor was never available when the project was presented to CAG. Plutonic did not provide enough information to the public, and now they are signing documents with First Nations.

Facilitator asked what is required for adequate public consultation. It was noted in each instance that PPC was invited to attend CAG meetings and discuss the project that they did not have any detailed information on the proposed transmission corridor.

This advisory group is also named in PPC's documents as one source of consultation. We've heard from PPC that is going to look pretty but there is nothing to back it up.

Question – From your Agency's point of view, when looking over the submission, how do you decide that adequate public consultation has been done? Do you actually go back ask what has been done?

Answer – There is a public consultation regulation under the Act. How we decide whether public consultation has been done – we go through the application review, we look at the proposals and we have to advise whether adequate public consultation has occurred. The Act requires that the application be advertised and reviewed by the public. In this case they did meet the requirements. The public has had the opportunity to comment. CAG wrote in 6-8 months after the end of the public consultation period. The response from Cascadia was received during the public comment period. A fairly robust response was prepared for that.

Chair noted that CAG's name was noted in Plutonic's documents regarding public consultation.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that the application process information has been available on the website. Plutonic has had concurrent review comments posted on the PPC website.

Question – This group believes that there will be three projects along this corridor. There will be more corridors and area will be severely impacted, should we be looking at the corridors? Website information is not good. There was an ad in the paper last week for disposition of timber. This is crown land for the work camp at Toba – there is a huge tract of land with an airport that they say will be there for 3-5 years. Why is there no information on this on the website? Why no response from Ministry of Lands when contacted and questions are asked regarding the project at Toba? Member showed a copy of the newspaper ad and noted the website link did not work. Derek asked for the copy of the ad.

Answer – The camp is a temporary thing. Land and water tenure applications have been made.

WFP asked about the environmental assessment process. Cascadia made alternate suggestions for the power line route including a submarine cable down Powell Lake, but were told that the alternatives would cost too much. When it was a \$250MM project Plutonic could not afford the extra \$80mm for the submarine cable. Today, although the project costs have escalated to the \$450MM range, the project is still viable, but Plutonic is still telling us that they can't afford the extra cost of the submarine cable. It is obvious that they are looking for the cheapest alternative regardless of the impact on the forest resource. The initial proposals indicated that the transmission line would be almost a straight line crossing valleys and going over the ridges. As the transmission line layout has been fine tuned, the power lines have moved closer and closer to the mainline roads until now they are right beside the road wherever possible all the way from Saltery bay to the upper Daniels River. I don't believe they have paid any attention to the operational and safety concerns identified by the forest licensee. The Ministry of Forests has not presented the forestry concerns so far. There are huge safety concerns. Worksafe BC will be involved. We have arranged a meeting between PPC and Worksafe BC for next week. WFP wants the route with the least impact on the forest and the least impact on worker safety.

Answer – Ms. Bonnyman noted that you, as an industry, are experiencing frustration, and we are trying to make a strategic level decision. People want on-the ground information that is not available. There is a need to have some robust consultation and to mitigate impacts at the design level. PPC don't have the level of engineering to provide this yet.

WFP noted that PPC has an application to cut within a one km wide band for the license of occupation. WFP is asking what process is there to ensure that concerns are dealt with and commitments made are kept.

Answer - Ms. Bonnyman noted that if the Ministry makes a decision to certify a project and it doesn't work, the certificate can be amended.

Question – Plutonic stated in the beginning that they would stay out of the forest and stay up in the Alpine. We wonder what the visuals are going to be like now that they have moved down along the valley.

Answer – Visual quality is always a tricky problem to deal with in environmental assessment. There are specific visual quality guidelines which forest companies have. The EAO appreciates that there were earlier discussions that were held with CAG on specific visual quality work that has not occurred. It is because of timing that the work requested has not been provided but it is going to be required to be provided.

WFP asked whether the detailed analysis of the various transmission line corridor options had been done.

Answer – There has not been compelling information come forward which would result in moving the transmission line location as proposed by PPC.

Evaluation has been done, and the EAO has to look at the balance and impacts on habitats. It is the job of the technical agencies to look at the impacts. They did not raise the red flag on any potential impacts of this route. A detailed analysis has been done and the answers are in the analysis.

WFP noted that they do not have a comfort level that EAO had looked at the whole balancing of resources and impacts and the best overall option. Isn't this still at a strategic level decision?

Answer - Ms. Bonnyman noted that the analysis was done. They (PPC) have had to provide detailed information - they look at the % of what habitats are impacted, culture heritage, socio-economic impacts etc. Legislation requires that EAO look at these details. A copy of the analysis is on the website.

Question – Visual quality analysis have not been provided for CAG. If they are going to work with WFP and CAG that analysis needs to be provided. The Regional District noted that they are interested in the impact of cumulative projects on the TFL. There are proposed projects that are under 50 megawatts such as the Synex- Philldola and Lausmann Creeks project. Synex has suggested that the transmission corridor might cross over the South Powell divide into the TFL. How do we finesse two companies to share one power line?

Answer – Derek Griffin noted that if the other proponent can be convinced to hook in with another- not knowing the resource values being impacted – it would be a question of what is the most acceptable alignment.

Member noted that the transmission line could be outside of the TFL but will still be in the Regional District.

Question – Member noted that it was felt that the public has been sidelined or blindsided, and didn't realize the scope of the PPC project. They were told that the lines would not be in the valleys.

Answer – Derek Griffin noted the intent of the legislation and the office is that they do want information from community groups and there is a certain requirement in Section 11 that part of the review is a distribution of information that has been adequate. We don't know the specifics but we are concerned if there hasn't been adequate opportunity for consultation.

Member noted that from the first meeting, and the information given, public was under the impression that the transmission line would be in the alpine.

Member notes that the PPC project has engendered concerns for the environment along with concerns for land and job losses. The public has not been able to look at a real plan. Members are in favour of green energy but not at the cost of the damage to wildlife values, tourism values, public values and long term loss of jobs.

Members noted that in the beginning the process was sold as a low impact green energy project. Then issues from the forest company came out – the proposed transmission line crosses the logging roads [now estimated to be 115 times] and there are also concerns about heli-logging and flying over the line. There also

may be an impact on marbled murrelets. All are frustrated by the fact that they didn't know enough in the beginning. Outdoor recreation is a growing industry in this community.

Answer – Ms. Bonnyman noted that the information on the line has been on the website since application was submitted. Public meetings were held at the time the Terms of Reference were being made. It was advertised – and lines were in display at the open house. The lines haven't moved.

Comment - Members noted that the lines cross the Lois and Khartoum lakes area.

Answer - Environmental assessment is a challenging process. We have been striving to understand the impacts. We heard from people and responded to them regarding the placement of poles etc. EAO has noted that the impacts on recreation and has worked with the Sunshine Coast Trail people and those concerned with the road in the Toba Valley.

Comment – For two and a half years, members have asked how many hectares of productive forest land will be alienated. At one public meeting Sam Mottram from Knight Piesold said, “You go figure it out.”

Facilitator noted that at CAG meetings when questions regarding specifics on the transmission route were asked, PPC replied “We don't know yet.”

Members are all for green power- but many questions were *not* answered.

Members noted that they were not aware that some of the answers were posted on the website.

Member noted that the proposed transmission line traversed some of the best fir growing land in the TFL.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that although PPC is required to do a detailed analysis the requirements is not as rigorous as what would be applied to a forest company.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that EAO has the information from the Cascadia Report. They also have information that Knight Piesold produced in response to that report. EAO also has input and questions from CAG as well as information from the report of the independent forester who reviewed figures and produced numbers on the impact on the AAC.

Question – Who was the independent forester?

Answer – Shearwater. We gave the report to the Minister of Environment.

Member noted that, in member's opinion, that Shearwater was not independent and was perceived to be employed by PPC.

WFP noted that there is a meeting pending between WFP and Grig Cook (PPC) next week. From the beginning it has been a battle. If the information comes too late then they employ another forester at the last hour. The info that Walt has

produced, (Cascadia report) is the most detailed forestry information that has been prepared to date. It seems no one has really looked at it. The forest service has people that can look at the information provided by Cascadia and do an analysis. Someone is “asleep at the switch”. The Knight Piesold response on website does not indicate whether the EAO accepts the information. Western goes through a much more rigorous process to get a cutting permit. PPC says economic analysis is done and shows it costing too much to move the line to another location. We don’t think the process has adequately looked at that the social and economic impact. WFP is not opposed to the project but would like the impact to the forest land base minimized.

Answer - Ms Bonnyman noted that strategic level decisions are being made. PPC is not exempt from cutting permit approval; they go through the same process. When EAO moves from strategic level discussions into the permitting stage, there are a number of places where MoE is directly involved with issuing the permits and are subject to all things pertaining to supervision of those permits. Water licenses are subject to all things – they have to hire independent engineers for construction and to do hydrological monitoring. Wildlife requirements include monitoring grizzly, goat and migratory birds with the emphasis on marbled murrelet but not restricted to that. There is a marbled murrelet team. There are hydrological requirements. In any event that the numbers do not play out, MoE would be involved. ILMB is involved in issuing tenure - there are conditions imposed for access in the Toba Valley.

Member noted that during the first meetings between CAG and PPC there was a firm commitment not to use herbicide in this project. Shearwater representative pointed out at a subsequent meeting that it was too early in the planning process to be able to commit to this. There is a firm commitment not to use herbicide. Ms Bonnyman pointed out there is a permitting process and a firm commitment not to use herbicides but in the event of an invasive plant, they would have to apply for a permit just the same as any other commercial operator. Public would be consulted.

Question – Who sets the standards for roads that they build to the poles from the mainline to ensure environmental damage won’t occur?

Answer – What road are we talking about?

Clarification - PPC will be building their roads through some forest lands from the mainlines to the transmission poles. Will they be building to MOFR standards?

Answer – In the Toba Valley where PPC proposes to build a bridge, they are not interested in having to build a bridge to accommodate other company’s very large pieces of forestry equipment. There is still some discussion around finessing the roads. Integrated Land sets the standards, the same as forestry does. This is an unusual situation but it is happening coincidental with forest company issues. PPC is not a forestry company so they cannot legally have a forest road. They can’t apply to the Ministry of Forests for road tenure, they have to meet the

requirements that ILMB sets out for road tenure. ILMB sets the standards for the (PPC) roads, the same way that forestry does for forest roads.

Member noted that member feels a lot of frustration and noted the simplest questions asked of PPC were treated with disdain and seldom completely answered.

Member noted that EAO suggested that PPC hire an independent consultant. In the member's opinion the consultant was not independent.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that the requirement is that they hire professional people. Report was received and given to the Ministry of Forests for review. We are a neutral facilitator and asked them to review with advice on whether it was reasonable.

Member noted that there was an historic connection between Shearwater and PPC and, in member's opinion, Shearwater was not independent and not at arm's length from the company (PPC). Also, the Shearwater report was not stamped with the professional stamp.

Question - Derek Griffin asked what was meant by "not independent". Is there a linkage between the company (PPC) and Shearwater?

Answer - Member noted that on numerous occasions, Shearwater and PPC attended meetings together and wore PPC name badges. On some occasions when Shearwater attended meetings, they answered questions on behalf of PPC/KPC. At other meetings Regional District noted that Shearwater answered the questions. At another community board meeting, Chris Roddan (Shearwater) and Bob Poore (PPC) attended the meeting. Chris Roddan did most of the talking. The presentation was made by Shearwater. There is a direct pecuniary relationship between the two companies

Facilitator quoted from page 2 of the letter from Shearwater Services:

KPC is the company that supplied Shearwater with the information -

It is beyond the professional and technical capabilities of this review team to address issues of line location/routing or other transmission corridor engineering and or cost analysis that were raised within the Cascadia document. Knight Piesold Consulting provided a response to Cascadia's concerns on May 1, 2006 that addressed these issues.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that the EAO doesn't have the professionals on staff to do these types of reviews. The data has to be provided from outside professionals. What I am hearing is that Shearwater would not stamp the report. Member replied that the report didn't get stamped. Sue again asked "He wouldn't stamp it?" Member replied we don't know if he would or would not. The fact is he didn't.

Ms Bonnyman replied she will follow up on that.

Question - Member noted that none of CAG's correspondence has ever appeared on the website. It disappears into a void so we are unsure where it goes.

Answer - Ms. Bonnyman noted that the public consultation regulation provides that material that we receive during the public consultation period is posted on the website. The material that we receive after that is not covered by that policy. Derek noted that concerns that are raised are being dealt with as they come up.

Question - Will our thoughts tonight be transmitted to the MoE or will we be required to write another letter?

Answer - Your views have definitely been captured and we will try to address issues that may arise.

Member - Our concerns also include multiple projects that appear on the horizon.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that there are no known projects in this area.

If the Knight Inlet project were to be coming down this way, then EAO would be required to look at the impacts but the project is, in fact, going in another direction. If any other project comes forward, they will have to look at the impact of Toba and Montrose. Then a cumulative analysis will be done.

Member noted that if the line was changed to where WFP proposed all concerns would disappear. PPC and forest companies should be able to get together to hash things out between themselves.

Knight Piesold did an assessment of alternate routes, they should have looked at the six different routes and they should have showed them to the public.

Ms. Bonnyman responded that EAO asked for some analysis of alternate routes, but not at the same level of the chosen route.

WFP pointed out that in a project this size; there could very well be another route that is for example \$2 million more. Given the size of the project, a more expensive option could be the right decision because it has the least overall impact cost. The route that has been chosen imposes the maximum impact of all the routes.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that the road they are looking at is not less expensive than the initial plan brought forward with that application.

Member said it seems like DFO has the hammer for this project.

Member noted that public perception is there have been limited opportunities for input and information has not been shared with the people who needed to know.

Member noted concern that the transmission corridor could grow to be two or more towers wide as the final route plans for all projects have not been shared with the public.

Member noted that at an open house the member asked why not build on the west side of Powell Lake and why not hook in by the mill. The member was told the lines were too small for an interconnect. Member was told PPC wanted to come through the TFL to hook up to Nelson Island.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that an interconnect study was done and they also looked at the submarine cable option.

Member was told that the lines were too small from Powell River to Saltery Bay.

Member then asked, why not change them?

Question - Who ensures that Plutonic meets its commitments?

Answer - Compliance will be under the usual standards. Under the Environmental Assessment Act it says that when a certificate is awarded, standard conditions, commitments and compliance reporting are built in. The EAO will be involved with receiving and reviewing the reports. There are financial penalties if found in non compliance. There are some standard commitments that are on the website.

Chair noted that PPC committed to no herbicide and they committed to work with CAG on visuals and, as of yet, CAG has seen nothing.

Ms. Bonnyman - That is the question that I want to answer.

The Certificate has conditions and commitments and the force of law. If you don't get that information, phone and let me know. *Commitment statement is not available to public.* Commitments are prepared for the Ministers.

We try to address the things we know about but we don't know everything.

Commitment to work with all stakeholders to minimize visual impacts along the proposed transmission corridor and the proponent will continue to meet with both the forest company and CAG to address visual impact.

Member suggested that they could come and talk to CAG about visuals again

Visual impacts

Not changing any of the existing regulatory review processes that are already in place.

Question - Whose job is it to initiate consultation?

Answer - It is PPC's responsibility.

Question – Without seeing a list of commitment, how will the public know if PPC is non-compliant? Can we see a list of commitments?

Answer – There is a commitment to work with all stakeholders. It is a condition of Section 10.

ACTION – Provide a list of commitments (paraphrased) for environmental certificate.

Member asked for a list of websites pertaining to the PPC project.

ACTION – Provide a list of all the websites pertaining to the PPC project.

Question – Who will get the timber from the right of way?

Answer – WFP gets the timber.

It is a condition of the certificate that compliance reporting goes to the website

ACTION – Provide a copy of the compliance reporting section of the certificate.

Question – WFP asked if PPC was asked to work with us - who decides whether or not they have met their commitments?

Ms. Bonnyman - At the EAO they look at the proponent's report and decide whether they have met their commitments of the certificate. First step would be to bring the proponent into compliance.

Derek Griffin noted that it can be more severe than financial penalties. EAO has the authority to close the project down: that is not a step the EAO would want to take. In Section 10 and 11, there are various remedies.

Ms. Bonnyman noted that they also have to comply with all the other permits for legislation.

Chair thanked Ms. Bonnyman and Mr. Griffin and noted that members like the idea but don't like the details of the project.

Where the project is in terms of the process

Derek Griffin noted that the EAO has completed its report. Report has been sent to the executive director of the EAO. She has sent her report along with her recommendation on the project to the Ministry of the Energy Mines and Resources and the Minister of Environment to review information. The Ministers have 45 days to review the report. It was suggested that if CAG still has concerns about information on the project, there are timelines (less than 45 days)

The consensus of CAG at this point was to send a letter to the Ministers.

Sue noted that the report to Ministers includes the concerns that have been raised by Western Forest Products.

ACTION- CAG to send a letter to the Ministers.

Thanks again to Sue Bonnyman and Derek Griffin.

9:00pm

Items remaining on agenda are to be forwarded to next meeting.

In Camera

Next WFP Meeting – April 11, 2007

Next IT Meeting –? 2007

**CSA Community Advisory Group to Stillwater Timberlands
Western Forest Products Inc.
March 14, 2007
Attendance**

Name	Position	Member Seat
PRESENT		
Jane Cameron – Chair	Primary	Member at large
Ken Jackson – Vice-Chair	Primary	Recreation
Dave Hodgins	Alternate	Recreation
Dave Rees- 2nd Vice Chair	Primary	Tourism
Patrick Brabazon	Primary	Local Governments
Wayne Borgfjord	Primary	Forest Dependent
Paul Goodwin	Alternate	Forest Dependent
Bill Maitland	Alternate	Local Business
George Illes	Alternate	Environment
7 Seats represented		
Absent members		
Andrew Pinch	Alternate	Tourism
Ted Byng	Alternate	Local Governments
Ron Fuller	Alternate	DFA Worker
Kathy Kirk	Alternate	Member at Large
Rory Maitland	Primary	Contractor
Brent Rothwell	Alternate	Contractor
Doug Fuller	Primary	DFA Worker
Mark Hassett	Primary	Local Business
Nancy Hollmann	Primary	Environment
PRESENT		
Resource – others		
Stuart Glen	Western Forest Products Inc.	
Walt Cowlard	Western Forest Products Inc.	
Martin Buchanan	Western Forest Products Inc.	
Cathy Bartfai	Facilitator	
Pam Dowding	Secretary	
Guests		
Sue Bonnyman	Min of Environment	
Derek Griffin	Min of Environment	

