

**CSA Community Advisory Group
To Western Forest Products
December 12th, 2007
Minutes
Town Centre Hotel**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:04pm: Meeting called to order
Quorum noted

Safety Review

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

Welcome and introductions

Chair welcomed everyone. Announced that Patrick Brabazon will be stepping down as Local Government Primary Member and introduced Colin Palmer as his replacement. Introduced guest speaker Mark Anderson, Operations Manager – C&E, Ministry of Forests and Range, Sunshine Coast District.

Code of Conduct

Code of Conduct for Community Advisory Group was noted.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Agenda was accepted.

Review and Acceptance of Minutes

Minutes from the Island Timberland's November 14th meeting were reviewed and accepted.

Correspondence

Copies of recent correspondence were provided and reviewed.

- Letter sent to Mr. Bruce Sieffert, Integrated Land Management Bureau regarding interest in being considered stakeholders in the high level planning process.
- Letter to Stuart Glen, WFP regarding WFP's application to amend FSP.
- Emails to Slaimmon and Sechelt First Nations providing minutes from previous meetings and extending invitation to December 12th meeting
- Shared email regarding bear attack
- Stuart Glen responded regarding application to amend the FSP outlining efforts WFP made to encourage Plutonic Power to move or bury the transmission line corridor on TFL 39 Block 1.

Guest Speaker – Mark Anderson

Mark said that Compliance Enforcement is the main part of his duties here on the Sunshine Coast Forest District. He has had a total of 20 years working on the Sunshine Coast at two different times. He was here in the early 80s as well as the last 10 years. He spent time in Nelson, Quesnel, and Squamish as well. He has

had lots of history with the Stillwater pilot and the beginnings of this group. He said he would like to congratulate the group on its longevity and contributions to the forest management in the Powell River area.

Mark explained that the Coast Forest Action Plan is a recent initiative that the government has introduced. It is an effort towards revitalizing the coast forest industry. One of the big parts of the plan here on the coast is a move towards second growth harvesting. Powell River has shifted along way already towards the second growth goals. He said that generally on the coast between 10 and 15 percent of the forests being harvested are second growth. The Sunshine Coast forests are around 50% second growth harvest and much higher around Powell River. Unfortunately, second growth Douglas Fir which is what grows around here is subject to poor markets right now.

Reallocation, a term that has been in use for a few years, is all about increasing the volume of wood being sold by BC Timber Sales, determining stumpage rates for the Province, and for redistributing volume to FN and small tenures. In the Sunshine Coast Forest District, the Ministry's efforts are primarily done. Most of the shifts have already been made in this area. We have three community forest licences; One in Powell River, one in Sechelt, and one with the Sechelt Indian Band. Plans to increase woodlots are currently awaiting some policy decisions regarding how to distribute them. There is 15,000m³ available. They are not quite sure how to distribute it. There are also forest range agreements which are pre-treaty accommodation with a number of FN's.

Mark said that the AAC on the Sunshine Coast is seen as a very stable wood supply. The many challenges that the Sunshine Coast has doesn't compare to some in other districts and timber supply areas. The species mix and proximity to the markets as well as relationships and cooperation with stakeholders support this.

FSPs are about 90% complete. This means 90% of the operations in our forest district – Howe Sound to Bute Inlet – have approved Forest Stewardship Plans and operations active underneath them. Recently the Forest Practices Board responded to a complaint that came out of Powell River. FPB agreed that FSPs are too hard to read and have too much legalese and make it very hard for people who care to see the details acknowledging some of the concerns being brought forward. There isn't much activity to report yet on the operations associated with the approved plans. Although we have these approvals there hasn't actually been a lot of harvesting under the FSPs. There has been some and the Ministry is out doing inspections on them and Mark's early reports are there is no noticeable difference between forestry operations under the FSP on the ground versus the previous legislation.

Question: Would you have expected differences?

No. The goal was administrative efficiencies and equal to or enhanced environmental standards. Our early findings support that.

Question: Are you doing as many inspections?

Here on the Sunshine Coast our inspections have increased. We have a plan that we make every year that is basically risk based. We decide which operations and which areas of the district need the most inspecting and we follow through on the plan. It's not just subject to activity. We're out there inspecting other forest activities as well.

Question: Are your inspections public?

Yes they are.

Mark remarks on private land removal. Government agreed to support forest industry revitalization. One of the ways was by allowing some private land removals from TFLs. There are lots of opinions on this matter. There is a lot of concern about sustainability particularly on private land. Unfortunately I haven't much to say on this issue as it is private land and it is outside the TFLs so it's not Ministry of Forests jurisdiction.

Question: Do you have anything to do with Native Land such as inspections?

No. There are no inspections on First Nations reserves.

Question: Does it fall under Environment?

Environment would be concerned with any creeks, and what they do up to the creeks is probably fair game in simple terms. If they actually damaged a creek Environment or Fisheries would have jurisdiction over that. Another example would be if someone was going to store something very dangerous (perhaps in their backyard) there is legislation to prevent that from happening. Government doesn't want to increase legislation on private property and that is why the forestry issue has been so contentious.

Question: Do they have the same set back on creeks?

I don't believe so.

Question: Does it come under Federal Jurisdiction?

Yes, but in Powell River Provincial officials do most of the enforcement.

Question: Do they have the right to export every single log on their land?

This doesn't fall under my jurisdiction.

Mark explained just for clarity that the Strategic Land and Resource Plan is being lead by a different government agency. It used to be a Ministry of Forests lead process years ago when we had LRMPs. Now it is being lead by the Integrated Land Management Branch. MoF is just another stakeholder that gets asked for

input. This one is being lead by ILMB and FNs. They are calling it a government to government planning process “ ILMB is currently exploring terms of reference and mandate”. A lot of people talk like it is going but they are actually currently at the point of creating Terms of Reference for it, which is very important to people in this room. It is not a done deal, but it is heading down a path and I commend and encourage you to keep the door open to provide input and participate when possible.

C&E is the department that Mark is responsible for here in Powell River. There is a high level of compliance which is the result of years of MoF doing inspections. The forest industry is complying at a very high level on the environmental standards that are near and dear to everybody’s hearts. We have examples of administrative errors that result in breaches of the law and our department’s job is to take action to correct. The actions go from talking about it, to reporting on it, to ticketing, to opportunities to be heard, which is a quasi-judicial process where the case is put forward in front of the district manager and he makes decisions and levies fines and ultimately if there is a belief in the investigating group that there is a serious breach of the law and there was intent there could be very serious consequences and it could go to the court system.

Mark’s group is now focused on results and strategies. Those are the things that concern many people because they seem like they are hard to measure, hard to look at, and hard to figure out what they say when you read the FSPs, but that is their focus. He is confident that when he goes out in the field that if a forest practice looks bad and feels bad it will get assessed very thoroughly and there will be a contravention if there is a bad environmental impact. MoF is revenue focused now. A few years ago government decided to take some of the environmental resources and shift some of them into revenue collection. Regarding stumpage; basically, considering the high compliance rate the government said “why don’t you shift some time over to the scaling side where we are collecting 1.2 billion dollars a year. We should just make sure that what is falling through the cracks is tolerable and that we can speak to it with more depth”. So, the staff that Mark has now inspect appraisal data submissions more closely and are checking the crews compilations more closely. They are also checking timber marking and scaling practices much more closely than in the past.

IPPs. The challenge for us at the Ministry of Forests is primarily around the tenure inside of it. The permits actually come from ILMB except for the small license to cut. Mark’s staff’s job on IPPs is to make sure they are collecting revenue. The government has made decisions on impacts to the environment just by approving some of these permits. The public comes to MoF and questions what they are doing, but in fact these are decisions made by ILMB who issue the permit.

In summary, the Ministry of Forests role here on the Sunshine Coast is compliance and enforcement, so the group that Mark has is out in the field checking revenue and environment. In addition, Tenuring - plan approvals, FSPs, and giving out permits for cutting- is a big function of the Ministry, as well as

revenue collecting – scaling and making sure they get stumpage. Those are the bread and butter parts of the office that Mark works in. There is also BC Timber Sales, and Protection is the fire fighting branch up at the airport focused on putting out forest fires.

Mark also pointed out that the carbon footprint is becoming a bigger and bigger part of the MoF strategic discussions. They are trying to integrate that whole carbon concern into their business. There are opportunities out there for all of our waste. People are looking in at B.C. from all over at the mountain pine beetle in the interior and all of the other waste and thinking there are some great opportunities for bio-energy.

Inter-agency synergies are a big push now. Government wonders why we have one mines inspector and two COs for the same area as we have fifteen forest services guys and the forest services guys keep reporting back year after year that we're doing pretty good. They ask why don't we get these agencies together and cover the risks off on our land bases better. Mines B.C. has 15 – 20 people issuing 5,000 permits and nobody to check on them. There are some serious environmental concerns sometimes. They are not looking for a super-ministry, just synergies. It's all about things like giving the conservation officer a ride to Bute Inlet if there is a group of MoF people going already.

Finally, District Manager Greg Hemphill is retiring on January 25th, 2007. Mark asks if there are any questions.

Question: What's your biggest non-compliance issues?

Administrative errors where someone isn't even aware that they need a permit. Perhaps they had a permit from one agency and they didn't realize they needed two other agencies before they could get going on a road right of way. Therefore, a majority of our findings are trespasses. Environmentally I would say noncompliance revolves around creeks. The impacts of these issues are very minor.

Question: When Plutonic is building a line and they are crossing creeks are you involved with checking that out?

If we get asked to go along we will and we will report back our findings.

Question: Who's been asking? Plutonic?

ILMB. They have issued the permit. The agency that issues the permit carries the responsibility to ensure that it works.

Question: and are they here doing oversight?

I don't know. I do know our field staff has interacted on this because sometimes we have to issue permits on forest service roads and we do get staff commenting.

We take our concerns back, but we can't take over a mandate that we are not asked to take over.

Question: Do you oversee the sale of the wood?

Yes. The wood is distributed in a lot of ways. Sometimes it is sold from MoF to Plutonic. Up in Toba it will be sold to a licensee up in Toba. Some of it will be going to Plutonic for sure after a discussion about who wants it.

Question: In the case of Saltery Bay going through BCTS land – do you oversee the sales there?

If it is actually sold and it has much volume it would be sold by BC Timber Sales. If it is small volume or low value it could be sold directly by us license to cut. We'd give them a permit and a stumpage rate would be set.

Question: Paul Kutz and I were having a discussion and he said that theoretically WFP still gets first rights to that timber and they can say yea or nay as to whether they want it because it is still held under their TFL and they still have some responsibility regarding replanting. It's a legality.

What happened is the government made commitments to TFL holders for a certain amount of wood each year from that land and if somebody comes in and is doing a project on that land the right of first refusal goes to where the commitments are. Lastly it would go back to Plutonic.

Question: So the revenues from the right of way, where would they go?

All back to the crown no matter who got it.

Question: Do you know what the volume logged on your BCTS take back this year was?

No. It's not in our office. It's in the BCTS program. I could find it.

Question: And if I wanted to get a salvage permit for that area how would I go about doing that?

You'd go to our office and depending on the land that it is on you might get a permit from us, you might get steered to BCTS because it's an operating area of theirs, or you might get sent up to WFP.

Comment: I'm talking about yours or BCTS

BCTS isn't actually mine. Basically you'd come to our office and talk to the guys in charge of salvage and they're job is to make sure there isn't any conflicts. They'd check to make sure nobody would have a problem with a salvage operation before they'd issue a permit.

Question: So can you issue a direct permit to that person that applied without having to go to tender?

Yes we can, depending on the circumstances. Their job is to maximize revenue but there is a point of efficiency so we do issue permits without going to tender. Depending on numbers, volume, and how much interest we think there is.

Question: You have the staff to do that?

Yes.

Comment: My point is some should go back to the people in this area.

I wish I had numbers in my pocket, but relative to the forest districts on the coast we are on the high end for salvage opportunities. There are a bunch of champions in this district that support salvage opportunities.

Comment: There is more this year due to the storms.

Question: Regarding the carbon footprint. I think pile burning is wrong. Are they going to back off the burning?

Yes. The ability not to burn is there already. Legislation only says to assess the hazard. If you assess the hazard as high you will decide to burn during the November rains. If there is no hazard then you don't need to burn. We've tended to burn because it looks good, but the way the law is now written we should see less burning. There are some environmental advantages to leaving it.

Question: Aside of second growth, what are some of the other initiatives taking place?

Innovation and technology, efficiency of timber marking – not everything needs to be timber marked anymore, land use certainty – more secure tenures, more harvesting of 2nd growth, First Nations tenures, log exports, value added, and pulp and paper. It's not a silver bullet, but it was government working with Industry? to come up with some solutions.

Question: Where do our stumpage dollars go to?

How much does it take to run the MoF? I say that because in that is Research and Development, investment in second growth forests and fertilization, and all the other things. I think probably about a third goes back and the rest goes back to general revenue.

Question: Under this plan rotation will go from 80 – 90 years to 40 – 60. If they change that the AAC will double?

No. The land has the ability to grow only so much wood and the government practices thinning and fertilizing changing the distribution of that wood. If they

Minutes

thin a bunch of trees the volume cut down just goes to the ones left. They did this in the late 80s and stopped and then they looked at it again in the late 90s and said we want to be in the 2nd growth business lets speed it up. The fastest growth is in the first 40 years – you don't get twice as much wood after 80 years. You make more money on cutting twice in 80 years.

Second growth is challenging right now.

What I learned as a forester is do what Mother Nature says. If alder grows best there grow alder.

Comment: There aren't any big companies with research and development department left in Canada to come up with innovative ideas. Finland has some of the biggest companies and they are doing well.

By the way, I am very optimistic for Powell River. We have the best forests, we've got the best features, we've got the best access to market, and the smartest people doing it. Don't believe we're going into the tank. Change it – perhaps we don't call it forestry. Powell River is going to do fine.

Comment: I'm concerned that forestry isn't even involved in the high level land management meetings.

We are involved. We're just like you and we want the best for Powell River.

Comment: You're not in control any more. Power companies just buy their way through.

Comment: The power companies should have to share one line.

Discussion regarding burn piles - supports leaving smaller unburned piles over burning. Birds and squirrels like it better, less of a carbon issue, and trees grow better around the piles.

Question: Have they looked at another species to grow in the interior instead of pine?

Yes.

Question: Are they doing any indigenous trials?

No. They aren't that successful. They are trying species that are suitable. They don't plant much pine. It just comes back as thick as pea soup. There is lots of research about how to adapt but the solutions are not simple.

Question: What is stumpage for alder?

One dollar.

Question: Shouldn't that change?

There are just pockets of alder business. You're better off to let the business get strong before you start debating stumpage.

Question: But doesn't that decrease how much alder is growing.

Not necessarily. They might want to plant more.

Comment: It's a pretty hard species to plant.

Comment: I know. They tried on Texada.

My job is to champion the forest. If somebody wants to use it for a mine or something else, if they ask me I say I'd rather not, I can grow good trees there. Sometimes a decision gets made that is beyond me.

Comment: One ally you have is in the Regional District. We continually send referrals on powerlines back telling them no until they've sorted out the line they are building right now. We are probably not getting anywhere, but we keep trying. We've had one bunch of civil servants come up and tell us what a great thing Plutonic Power is and they went away with a bee in their bonnet. We've missed forestry at the table. It's too bad.

Powell River Salmon Society

A member states that on November 14th he did a picture presentation on the blowdown near Duck Lake. He says that one of the concerns P.R. Salmon Society has is that they are getting a fair amount of silt related to blowdowns. Trees pulled up and runoff water has been going into the river bed. They want to get the message out to all of the people cutting in the area. Eagle River has the same kind of issues.

The member said that last year WFP submitted their request for water monitoring in the Lang Creek area. It came back that they are not going to get the funds because they will be used for capital costs such as purchasing new equipment and the funding is not meant for capital projects. They intend to resubmit. The member asked for support from CAG, WFP, IT, Community, City of Powell River, PR Regional District in the form of a letter. The reason being that they don't know how much damage is being done. The funds are available for labour to administrate and manage monitoring, but not for the equipment.

Question: Paul, how hard and fast is the rule that they don't give money for capital?

We worked long and hard on it. One of the issues is it was hard to tell if it was on the TFL.

Question: What is the source of the funds?
FIA.

Question: How much money?

\$25,000 for the initiative and \$3,000 to \$5,000 per year for the labour.

Question: You don't expect any problem with the \$3,000 to \$5,000 annually?

No. It wasn't a labour issue, it was the capital.

Question: Is there any other money available for the capital? \$25,000 isn't a lot of money.

Comment: The Regional District has access to over \$700,000 in community works funding over 5 years and we are trying to persuade our staff that it's not our money. It is coming from all over Canada and we don't have to worry about moving it as long as it's for environmental issues. I'm already trying to help George with his washroom issues and I think the previous year I was interested with helping with the monitoring but I thought it had already been dealt with. Patrick and I can go back to the board and start pushing for \$30,000. No guarantees but that's where the money is.

Operational Information - review and updates

Current Activities

Harvesting – GI-100B, GI-100C, GI-152, LL-067, LL-068, ST-258A, ST-262, TM-122, UL-801, WL-911

Road Construction

PD-248, PD-411, PD-414, ST-229, ST-233, ST-822, TM-242

Engineering

GI-057, BT-668

What's New on the Map

New Blocks – None

New Roads – GI-057: road extension projected

Cutting Permit Approved Areas

None

Note: No new blocks or roads are identified adjacent to the Sunshine Coast Trail.

Map Updates

Logging Complete

GI-053, GI-054, ST-335, WL-926A

Road Construction Complete

ST-205

Engineered Blocks

None

Engineered Roads

GI-057, WL-024

Question: How far north does power line currently go? Did they leave the campsite alone?

Yes. It's on the top side of the road.

Wind pruning. Goat Island-152 The blowdown block they are currently harvesting, ST-335 – Spring Lake, and Chippewa 538 and Heather 517. I used a helicopter with a pruner to thin and take the sail out of the tree which allows the wind to blow through.

Question: Are you targeting more scenic areas?

We go through a windthrow assessment. If it is moderate to high risk we ask things like if trees blow down would it cause a land slide?, is there a recreation feature?, is there a fish creek?, is it urban interface?, are there values we want to protect? It's very expensive treatment so we can't do it everywhere.

Question: Could we use it in our indicators? We have a blowdown one don't we?

It's one of our tools. Sometimes we will choose not to have a straight edge and that can buffer the wind. We look at our options.

Company Updates

Third lake road (ST-205 block) visual assessment to show the proposed harvesting was presented. Three view points are used to show what the hillside will look like after WFP takes the timber that they need to take before the powerline goes through. The FSP major amendment to enable additional harvest due to circumstances (building of powerline through TFL) beyond WFPs control.

ST-822 is the block that WFP is currently building road in. One of the SFMP indicators has WFP work with PRPAWS if one of their roads or cutblocks impacts the SCT. WFP had field visits and numerous meetings in the office to come up with a plan for this block. Stuart showed a map with the SCT and surrounding area and explained how WFP and PRPAWS came up with plans for a new road and cutblock design that considered the SCT. A lot of work was done to come up with a plan that both parties agreed to.

Comment: Thanks for explaining that because I think it's important for us all to understand how hard you worked to accommodate the Sunshine Coast Trail.

www.cagstw.org was down for a number of weeks and is up now but has had no updates. Another site is being built and Val will be able to update it. This way we will be able to update it ourselves. It should be ready by early January.

Forest Practices Board report

Comment: The Forest Practices Board had sympathy regarding complaints about the FSP but legally the companies were in compliance. On the question of

the CAG it was not within their jurisdiction to comment so they did not. Their findings do not support any of those complaints although there was sympathy that the FSP was difficult to read.

Comment: The problem I have is that the report essentially vindicates WFP, but the news release is worded in such a way to give the impression that WFP and CAG have been slammed and people read the news release and not the actual report.

Terminal Leader damage update. The leaders of 32% of the Douglas Fir trees in an established monitoring site in a heavy hit area have been clipped off on 3 – 4 meter high trees. WFP has been monitoring with the MoF to try and find out what this is. They still don't know what it is that is causing it. The trees will probably just send up a lateral and when the tree is large it will be fine.

Revised DFA for 2008. New map is presented showing the new government takeback and the smaller DFA.

Recreation

Paul Kutz presented some photos of recreation areas around Powell River. Paul explained how recreation is funded in Stillwater. There are three sources of funding. There is a new Ministry of Tourism, Sport and Arts (which used to be managed by MoF), Forest Investment Account, and WFP. Primary activities that have been worked on over the last year are maintenance to the Powell River canoe route (FIA funded), some as-built mapping of the drive to campsites, upgrade of Lois Lake campsite, and getting ready for next year. Lois Lake campsite has been upgraded. Seven new campsites have been added, a new parking lot, and a new switchback road. It was built leaving open the possibility of adding more sites. Next year at Lois the shoreline which is eroding will be fixed by placing rock along the shoreline, the road will be recapped, and day use sites will be put in, as well as a few more campsites. WFP will be doing a complete inventory of the canoe route and find out what needs to be fixed. FIA funds an agreement for the maintenance of the route including checking sites and cleaning up. The Khartoum Lake campsite upgrade will include changing the road, fixing up the campsite, and putting in some new tables. E-branch will have road maintenance, a collapsed bridge will be removed, water management, and brushing up to the cabin near the Knuckleheads. Up at D-branch the two slides on the road to Mt. Alfred will be fixed. Lastly, WFP is working on a late rotational aerial fertilization plan. We will be selecting sites that will benefit. Using a urea based fertilizer. It is very effective at increasing annual tree growth.

Action Items

Action Item #1 – Paul will make copy of Recreation features inventory map available for members. – Ongoing

Action Item #2 – Member will find a copy of the article regarding solvents in some herbicides that may be toxic to fish. – Done

Chair's Remarks

Minutes

I had a phone call from the consultant to the Regional District who is looking at getting set up for reviewing the Southern OCP and they phoned Makenzie Leine and she suggested that this lady phone me. So I talked to her about take backs and telling her how important forestry was to the community.

Next CAG meeting – January 9th with WFP

Next IT meeting – February 13th with IT

Meeting Adjourned 9:15 pm

**Stillwater CSA Community Advisory Group
Western Forest Products
December 12th, 2007
Attendance**

Name	Position	Member Seat
PRESENT		
Jane Cameron – Chair	Primary	Member at large
Rory Maitland	Primary	Contractor
Ken Jackson	Primary	Recreation
Patrick Brabazon	Primary	Local Governments
Paul Goodwin	Alternate	Forest Dependent
Doug Fuller	Primary	DFA Worker
Dave Rees	Primary	Tourism
Nancy Hollmann	Alternate	Tourism
Mark Hassett	Primary	Local Business
George Illes	Alternate	Environment
Kathy Kirk	Alternate	Member at Large
Ron Fuller	Alternate	DFA Worker
Wayne Borgfjord	Primary	Forest Dependent
10 Seats represented		
ABSENT MEMBERS		
Brent Rothwell	Alternate	Contractor
Ted Byng	Alternate	Local Governments
Bill Maitland	Alternate	Local Business
Dave Hodgins	Alternate	Recreation
PRESENT		
Resource – others		
Mark Anderson	Ministry of Forests	
Stuart Glen	WFP	
Paul Kutz	WFP	
Colin Palmer	Regional District.	
Valerie Thompson	Secretary/Facilitator	