

**CSA Community Advisory Group  
To Western Forest Products  
January 9, 2008  
Minutes  
Town Centre Hotel**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:03pm: 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 and introduced Barry Miller, new CAG member for the Environment seat as well as Martin Buchanan, Western Forest Products Regional Forester for this geographic area, and guest speaker Bill Beese, Western Forest Products Forest Ecologist.

**Code of Conduct**

Code of Conduct for Community Advisory Group was reviewed.

**Review and Acceptance of Agenda**

Agenda was accepted.

**Guest Speaker – Martin Buchanan – Transmission Line Corridor Update**

Martin said that the biggest issue that WFP has been facing lately regarding the Toba partnership is safe line heights. Worksafe BC regulations require for this line one metre more clearance for safe line height than the CSA standard which most transmission lines in the country are developed under. WFP met with Plutonic, Worksafe BC and the BC Hydro engineer designing the transmission line for Plutonic. These organizations recognize that there is an issue. From that there was another higher level meeting between Worksafe and BC Hydro. They also recognize that there is a difference between the two standards. Worksafe says that their standard stands and although in the regulations there is an opportunity to apply for variance according to Worksafe there is no way that they will issue a variance on a line this size. WFP does have a commitment from Grig Cook that the line will end up being what WFP needs it to be for a safe height. There are still ongoing discussions between BC Hydro and Worksafe because this is a Provincial issue. There are all kinds of lines being built in the province and they are being built to CSA standards. If the line is built to CSA standards WFP is stuck with limits to approach and that will cause us problems. There are a lot of these projects coming to the coast. The forest service is aware of this issue and they are working on it. The bright light within the MoF is they now have a regional IPP (Independent Power Producers) specialist in Nanaimo.

WFP is now close to having a road use agreement with Plutonic. Things have been going smoother with the line clearing and WFP has a cutting permit for the right of way wood that is now going through our operation.

*Question: Is Plutonic bringing their 17 Bute projects down this way? They have applied for land tenure from Bute to Toba for those project. Do you know about that and does this mean we are going to have a double 230 kv line?*

My guess is that we will have a double 230 kv line, but they haven't said that. I believe there are still options to go to Vancouver Island. One of their earlier postings showed an alternate route to Vancouver Island. Vancouver Island needs power so that's why there are several proposals for lines to go to Vancouver Island. The Klinaklini project is a 700+ mw project which is a double 230 kv line which hooks into the grid at Campbell River.

*Question: What is the required clearance on the line?*

To meet Worksafe BC regulation, we've asked for safe clearance to move a standard grapple yarder on an off highway lowbed under the powerline at crossings without dismantling anything. We need 65 feet to have safe clearance for that. Basically, the CSA standard is at 62 feet. There is about one metre difference. This gives us the 15 feet clearance that Worksafe BC requires for a 230 kv line.

*Question: I understand that recently there has been some kind of delay in Plutonic Powers schedule is that due to a forest issue?*

I'm unaware of that. The portion of the line that is coming through TFL39 block1 – they've cleared a lot of the line already. It could be something that is farther north, but I'm not sure. They have the right of way now.

*Question: Do the Knight Inlet and Bute projects belong to the same company?*

No. Knight Inlet is Klinaklini and Bute is Plutonic. Plutonic does have proposed project that are right next to the Klinaklini proposed project transmission lines. Plutonic have proposed projects all the way up to Knight Inlet.

*Question: Are they working together? The infrastructure for putting the first line in is obviously the major cost. Cooperating would be to the benefit of the people putting in subsequent and adjoining lines. It seems to me that the government should get its act together.*

I asked why don't they build a 500 kv line. It carries four times the power of a 230 line. A 500 kv line is very expensive and an independent can't build it because there is nothing making other groups put power into their lines and they don't know if proposed projects are going to go ahead. That is where the provincial planning or BC Transmission Corporation needs to get involved. Also, you can't run the small projects into them because it costs too much to boost the power.

*Question: Have you talked to Hawkeye? I have real concerns with them getting in the Eldred Valley.*

Their consultant got in touch with me before Christmas and we are trying to set a date for them to come and talk to us. The consultant didn't want to talk to me alone, they wanted to bring the principals of Hawkeye. They are coming to Campbell River to meet with others as well.

*Comment: When the referrals for land tenures for transmission lines come into the Regional Board we turn them down, apart from the one that is being built right now. Until, they resolve the issue of where the power is going to end up and the question of who else is going to use the line we don't support any of these land tenures until the government forces the IPPs to get their acts together. The Regional Boards impression is that there is chaos within the government in regards to this issue. When six ministries came to Powell River to talk to us we were educating them. The first application was four years ago and now the government finally appoints someone to deal with the issues. The existing line will support 5 turbines. Any other turbines will require another line. Plutonic applied for 24,000 hectares of land tenure for transmission lines for the Knight and Bute project and admitted that they didn't know where the power was going to end up. We don't know if the government will take notice of us, but this is our stand. We don't want to stop the projects, we just want to stop the chaos.*

We just want the impact to our business to be small as possible. We as the tenure holder are not being referred directly on smaller projects. Just the government agencies and First Nations.

*Question: Just to clarify – the new person in Nanaimo is to coordinate the forest activities...*

It's a point person for the forest service which is a small ministry in this thing. ILMB is the big ministry here. I don't know if it is chaos but it is very confusing.

**Guest Speaker – Bill Beese**

See attached PowerPoint presentation "Western Forest Strategy - A program for conserving biodiversity on company tenures"

*Question: Is this in effect now and how long has it been effect?*

It was approved by the senior management July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007 and I went on a road show to each of the operations in the fall to describe the strategy as I am to you. It will be phased in by 2010. 2008 is more or less status quo because everybody's planning was already in place. We want to be halfway to the target in 2009 and have it fully implemented in 2010.

*Question: The reason I asked was because in the last couple of years we've had such unusual winds we've had huge blowdowns and I was wondering when the*

*strategy would be in place to help with the problem. What I'm hearing is that it will be a year and a half before it is all in place. Is that correct?*

Yes. We have already made a lot of adjustments to deal with the windthrow. This just gives another tool to use for those situations. Our CEO was clear that we need to phase this in evenly across the company even though it might be easier to reach the target in some areas as others.

*Question: If they change the age class from 80 – 90 years down to 60. How will that change this model?*

Over the past decade generally rotation ages on the coast have gone down as people look at the economics. To me it means more of a need for doing retention on the landscape because you are not going to be developing as many mature forest conditions as you would if you left the wood for 80 or 90 years. If we were at an average of 90 year old forest a lot of our forests would be getting those older forest attributes. If nothing gets past 60 years all the more reason to retain some areas that have older forest attributes. This whole approach blurs age classes and makes it all more complicated as a 40 year old forest with lots of older forest will behave differently than a forest that is all 40 years old.

*Question: Do you foresee leaving these retention patches for perpetuity?*

The way the retention system was defined in the BC regulations (although it is no longer formally in regulation) was that the retention should remain until at least the next rotation. So if the next rotation is in 60 years the retention should remain for the 60 years also. Supposing that all of the things we think are important now are still considered important then the retention should continue to be there. Also, we could have put it in the wrong place or made them the wrong size, so in 50 years foresters might say these patches are way too small or in the wrong place and do it differently then. There is some flexibility in the system to take this into account.

We used to think that it was enough to save 15 – 20% of forests for parks, but now we know that we need to have a more integrated approach and have a variety of retention in between the parks. I think this makes more sense than the black and white approach of either park or clearcut.

*Question: Is there adequate liaison between the MoF and industry regarding different aspects of the environmental impacts of harvesting on a sustainable basis?*

I work closely with my counterparts in the MoF and they are very supportive of our program as it goes beyond what we are required to do legally.

*Question: When you are measuring edge effects of cutblocks and you border on someone's land do you measure the blowdown only on your land or do you count the blowdown that came down on the neighbouring property as well? Are the percentages that you showed based only on your land?*

If the block had an edge that is not on our land Colin Peters who does the field work for us would have gone around that edge and counted the trees whether or not they were our trees. So it would reflect other people's trees.

*Question: What are you going to do along the powerlines. Are you going to count all that as edges?*

Martin Buchanon said they are edges associated with the powerline – not harvested blocks.

*Question: But the trees are still yours aren't they?*

Martin said the trees still belong to WFP. It can be problem. We've already seen along the road that they've left thin patches. It will have an impact over time.

### **Review and Acceptance of Minutes**

Minutes from the Western Forest Products December 12th meeting were reviewed and accepted.

### **Correspondence**

Copies of recent correspondence were provided and reviewed.

- Shared email sent to Lars. He will be attending the February IT meeting.

### **Operational Information - review and updates**

#### **Current Activities**

Harvesting – GI-152, LL-067, LL-068, PD-456, ST-184, ST-258A, TM-218, UL-801

Road Construction - PD-411, PD-414, PD-248, ST-147, ST-229, ST-233, ST-340, ST-822, TM-245

Engineering – BT-668, GI-057, NA-912

#### **What's New on the Map**

New Blocks – BT-915, BT-918, NA-912

New Roads – GI-057: future connector road, BT-664, BT-915, BT-918

Cutting Permit Approved Areas – ST-184, TM-218, ST-822, GL-072

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

#### **Map Updates**

Logging Complete – None

Road Construction Complete – TM-242

Engineered Blocks – None

Engineered Roads – None

*Question: Will any of the activity be a problem for the people with cabins?  
[Dunn Main blocks and roads]*

I don't think so. There aren't any cabins directly where we are working and we meet with cabin owners when necessary. For example, at Pickles Point we moved some cabins while we were active.

**Company Updates**

[www.cagstw.org](http://www.cagstw.org) is a lot closer to being ready. Stuart has seen a draft and the programmer is working on it. When it is ready they are going to teach facilitator how to update it.

Comment by Chair: Stuart and I tried very hard to find a way to invite the public to this meeting, but we were unable to do so without the new website working.

**Action Items**

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

Action Item #2 – Colin Palmer to go back to the Regional Board to ask for \$30,000 for capital to support PR Salmon Society water study. George gave Colin a package and Colin is working with the board on the issue. Ongoing

**Next CAG meeting – February 13<sup>th</sup> with IT**

**Next WFP meeting – March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

**Meeting Adjourned 9:00 pm**

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Member Seat</b>
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Jane Cameron – Chair</b>	Primary	Member at large
<b>Bill Maitland</b>	Alternate	Local Business
<b>Ted Byng</b>	Alternate	Local Governments
<b>Barry Miller</b>	Primary	Environment
<b>Colin Palmer</b>	Primary	Local Governments
<b>Paul Goodwin</b>	Alternate	Forest Dependent
<b>Doug Fuller</b>	Primary	DFA Worker
<b>Dave Rees</b>	Primary	Tourism
<b>Nancy Hollmann</b>	Alternate	Tourism
<b>Mark Hassett</b>	Primary	Local Business
<b>George Illes</b>	Alternate	Environment
<b>Kathy Kirk</b>	Alternate	Member at Large
<b>Dave Hodgins</b>	Alternate	Recreation
<b>8 Seats represented</b>		
<b>ABSENT MEMBERS</b>		
<b>Brent Rothwell</b>	Alternate	Contractor
<b>Ken Jackson</b>	Primary	Recreation
<b>Rory Maitland</b>	Primary	Contractor
<b>Ron Fuller</b>	Alternate	DFA Worker
<b>Wayne Borgfjord</b>	Primary	Forest Dependent
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Resource – others</b>		
<b>Martin Buchanan</b>	WFP	
<b>Stuart Glen</b>	WFP	
<b>Bill Beese</b>	WFP	
<b>Valerie Thompson</b>	Secretary/Facilitator	