

**CSA Community Advisory Group
To Western Forest Products
May 14, 2008
Minutes
Town Centre Hotel**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:00pm: 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 guests Greg Neeld, President and CEO of Hawkeye Energy, Steve and Mik Drosdovech, Drosdovech Forestry and Project Managers, Jackie Timothy, First Nations Liaison for Hawkeye, Dr. Graham Corley-Smith, Sigma Engineering, and Steve Mynott, Hawkeye Corporate Communications.

Code of Conduct

Code of Conduct for Community Advisory Group was reviewed

Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Agenda was accepted as amended

Correspondence

Copies of recent correspondence was provided and reviewed

- Email inviting Jackie Timothy to attend meeting
- Letter to PRPAWS
- Emails to Sliammon and Sechelt First Nations
- Letter from Powell River ATV Club regarding trails
- Email inviting Greg Neeld and Dr. Graham Corley-Smith to attend meeting and discuss proposed plans for IPP project in Toba, Jim Brown, and the Eldred

OIM Review

Current Activities

Harvesting – PD-242, PD-248, PD-252, PD-411, PD-414, PD-456, ST-205, UL-801

Road Construction - GI-114, GL-636, ST-233

Engineering – GI-032, PD-197, PD-198, PD-199, PD-280

What's New on the Map

New Blocks – GI-032

New Roads – GI-032

Cutting Permit Approved Areas – None

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

Map Updates

Logging Complete – TM-218, TM-242

Road Construction Complete – BT-668, GI-057, ST-147

Engineered Blocks – GI-029, GI-057, GI-116, NA-912

Engineered Roads – GI-029, GI-116

Note: Harvesting and Road Building activities may be curtailed due to current market conditions.

Question: When are you going to start logging GI-116?

It's in the plan for next year. We're doing road construction this year to prepare for next year.

Action List

One outstanding action item. Paul Kutz will make copy of Recreation features inventory map. Stuart's name has been added to the item as Paul has moved on.

Stuart explained that the data and map have been handed over to the government and are going through the process. WFP will complete when government has finished their part.

Company Updates and Other Business

There have been two fires on the DFA. The first was at Mount Mahoney. It was discovered, Emergency Preparedness Response Plan was activated and the fire was put out that night. The second was around 4km on Stillwater main and was also extinguished on the same day. Both fires were started by the public.

There was a spill on the DFA. 5 – 10 litres of diesel was spilled near a creek. Emergency spill response went as planned and it was quickly contained and clean-up activities completed.

Question: Did any of the diesel get in the creek?

Yes, some did. Unfortunately, things can happen, but the good part is we were prepared, it was contained, and there was no impact.

Review and Acceptance of Minutes

Minutes from Island Timberlands April 9th meeting and Plutonic Power April 23rd were reviewed and accepted.

Guest Speaker, Dr. Graham Corley-Smith of Sigma Engineering – Overview of Hawkeye Projects

Dr. Corley-Smith works for Sigma Engineering. The company has a contract with Hawkeye to do engineering and environmental work.

He explained that Hawkeye has developed a team of people to help with various things and he is a member of the team. He has prepared a presentation and will call on other members of the team to speak based on their expertise during the presentation.

Dr. Corley-Smith said that some other IPPs find streams that look promising, make calculations regarding volume of water and how much power can be made, do the engineering, and then go out and start consultations with stake holders. Hawkeye is starting by talking to people, such as First Nations and forestry companies, telling them their intentions, and asking if they see any possible negative impacts, either on the environment, First Nations, or forestry. He said that this allows them to work with the various people to try and minimize impacts. For example, Mik and Steve Drosdovech of Drosdovech Forestry have been working on finding out what the best route would be for putting in transmission lines with the least amount of effects on other stake holders including forestry companies. A special emphasis has been given in routing transmission lines to minimize effects on helicopter logging.

Question: What are you a doctor in?

Biology. I started out in general zoology. My masters was in aquaculture. My PhD involved fish research as did my four post doctoral training sessions.

Dr. Corley-Smith begins his presentation with a picture of a creek flowing over a weir. He chose the photo because it shows what the upstream area of a run of the river project looks like. He explains that all of the projects that Hawkeye is interested in are non-storage. They will build a small weir and put a pipe underneath the water so the pipe does not suck any air in. If air gets sucked in, a lot of pressure is added as it goes down the pipe and when it comes out at the bottom if it goes in the gills of fish it could kill the fish, if it went straight to the fish rather than through the system we have planned for all facilities. In affect, we have two redundant and extremely reliable systems to safeguard fish. Actually three, but I'll spare you the technical details.

If the project is built properly it should not be visually unattractive, the weir would be small, the pipe should be buried underground, and the powerhouse

would be build amongst trees or alongside a cliff, or underground. So, most of the structure should be very low impact.

Steve Drosdovech said, this project interested him because he liked Greg Neeld's approach. Greg wants to let everyone know what they are doing, and how they are doing it within the context of the BC governments call for power. This is not something that Plutonic or Hawkeye came up with. This is based on BC government's call for power. The BC government says we import 15% of our power. That power tends to be grey power such as nuclear, fossil fuel, and coal. All of the kinds of power we don't want. Each of us turns on lights, cooks with power, etc. WFP wants to continue to exercise their rights under their tree farm license to harvest timber. They can tell you how long it takes to regenerate a tree and they can tell you what it costs to do that. They are able to do things within their forest stewardship areas, but are very limited in riparian management zones. The call for power has allowed IPPs to go into the stream itself to use the potential energy of flowing water. The most corrosive, erosive force on the earth is a rain drop. The energy in that water is what the world wants. I saw an opportunity to participate in this development, bringing a forestry perspective to it that enables us to look at what needs to be done while minimizing to the greatest extent the impact of doing it. That's what we are doing with Hawkeye – looking at the impact that these in-stream power projects will have. The engineers can tell you far more accurately than I how this works. We've known about IPPs for a long time. MoF, like MoE and ILMB, said 80% of these things will fail and they will go away. This is not happening. The real impact has more to do with the transmission of power than with the works in the stream. I have no problem with the footprint of those things. They are sitting in places where normally loggers can't go. The fact that these companies can go into streams says that the government thinks this is so important that IPPs can go in there and work and foresters cannot. It's not going to go away, it is going to get worse. I'm suggesting that the forest industry get on board through the MoF and begin to participate in this development. If they don't the MoE and ILMB people will prevail. I had a conversation with a senior member of the CFA (Canadian Forestry Association) and as far as they were concerned they weren't at this time prepared to influence the outcome – I find that disturbing. That will impact what these gentlemen do in the woods tremendously. I like what Hawkeye is doing. I think it is the right approach to use the energy that we have. I don't agree with grey power. What we are trying to do for Hawkeye is provide them with an honest and clear opinion on the impact that the various parts of their project will have on the forest industry. I would like to see the industry far more proactive with government to make sure that we do the planning that is cooperative and consistent and enabling.

Dr. Graham Corley-Smith said, they are trying to do is collect feedback from the industry and other groups to find out what problems they will be causing and is there reasonable ways to lessen those impacts.

Dr. Corley-Smith said, there is an increasing demand for power. BC Hydro will have to buy more and more power. Approximately 70 % of the power BC Hydro buys is made by burning coal and gasoline. There are small contributions from

other things such as wind (although only when it is windy). Hydrogen isn't really an energy source, it is actually only storage. You have to put in three times as much electricity in as you get out compared to 90% efficiency of a regular battery.

Question: Hasn't BC been exporting power under long term contracts for a long time? And why isn't anyone using tidal power? Tidal power would give 24 hour consistent power.

There is a huge amount of power in tides and waves. The problem is capturing that power. People have been trying to capture the power numerous different ways. You can build dams in fjords or inlets and put huge propellers in them, but they tend to chop up fish. You can put tubes on top of waves and their bending generates power or balls on top of the water with strings attached to them and the stretching of the string generates power. You could put all of these things in the ocean, but then you have to run transmission lines from them to the shore somehow. These are all alternate sources of power people are looking into. So far nobody has got them to work very well.

Regarding exporting power, it is my understanding that BC does not have any long term contracts to export power. They do have short term exports during peak times. On average, BC imports 12% of their power.

Comment: Years ago there used to be a long term contract.

Perhaps, I'm not aware of that one. The problem is once we start exporting under a long term agreement, we are not allowed to turn it off – same as water.

Comment: When we shut down a lot of our electrical appliances and draws on our electricity, the same amount of electricity continues to be generated by the turbines in the water and is going through the transmission lines and is not being drawn off. That energy is lost unless there is a market for it elsewhere.

You can't store power that comes through powerlines properly. You either use it or lose it.

Comment: That's right. In the evenings when the lights are shut down, granted a lot of industry keeps going, there is a significant amount of reduction of draw of that electricity. That electricity is in the lines not being utilized. Is there any thought being given to how that surplus could be stored in factory formats or working with water and splitting off hydrogen and then later converting it even though there is only a small return it would be better than nothing?

One of the other techniques that is used is the BC power grid acts as one big unit. Whereas the power we get on the coast and Revelstoke are one big grid. Late at night they turn down the amount of water coming from the reservoir so that less power is generated. Same thing will happen when it is windy and the wind farm on Banks Island will generate power, BC Hydro will be able to turn down the

water coming through the dam at Revelstoke and turn it back up again when the wind stops.

Mik Drosdovech said, as we go to bed and turn off all of our appliances the 1000 watt sodium halide bulb street lights come on creating a massive draw on power. (note that 1000watt is equivalent to ten 100 watt light bulbs in a house)

Comment: Graham, I think we need to remember that we are part of the North American grid which is a huge power sink. The grid has to balance itself all of the time. When there is no need here the power is sent somewhere it is needed.

There is an initiative by the government for BC to be self sufficient by 2016.

Question: We use a lot of power during the winter when it is cold and dark, and we use less power during the summer. Aren't these projects are going to produce most of their power during run off in the spring and summer when we need less power, so the power will go elsewhere? Really what is happening is we are in a balancing act and we have to get power back in the winter.

If you look at the amount of water that comes down certain streams you will see that low elevation streams have a peak at a different time of the year than a stream higher up in the mountains coming from a glacial bed. Winds have a different peak during the year. Quite often by using different sources you can get a reasonable balance. Another thing, it is a little bit hard when you are getting power from wind which can change in an hour. Wind generators do not necessarily shut down slowly. When the blades turn below a certain speed there is a sudden stop to electrical generation, and many wind mills shut off at approximately the same time. That has to be balanced by a reservoir like Revelstoke. Whereas with run of the river you have better predictability over the short term as stream flows fluctuate less than the wind. You know what the profile is so it is easier to balance over time.

If there are fish in the stream you might have to drop the flow right down in certain months. BC Hydro has graphs that show peak months and peak times during the day that power is required. When BC Hydro buys power it pays a lot more during dinner time than it does during the middle of the night.

Comment: There is a Liquefied Natural Gas plant proposed for Texada Island. Part of their argument in their proposal is that they can firm up your kind of energy.

I think you're asking about firm and non-firm. The old type of storage dams had a big lake that they could draw water from continuously throughout the year as needed. That is called firm energy because you always have the same amount of energy. Run of the river has more power in certain months depending on the amount of rain coming down for instance.

Comment: I understand that. What they are saying is that they have to bring LNG from Australia or the South Pacific to firm up your energy. That is the

rational for LNG – gray energy on Texada. Your industry is being used as rationale for building that plant.

I realize that, but I don't think it is necessary to build that kind of situation to balance out the power in BC.

Question: So how do you suggest they firm up your energy then?

I think what will eventually come will be some storage power like a big storage dam. We can supply a lot of power, but if you want to get firm power you have to build storage. That is not what Hawkeye is looking at. We're looking at supplying extra power to help out with the grid. We cannot say we are going to provide firm power.

Comment: BC Hydro put out a report showing what stringent conservation measures would do. I forget the exact numbers were, but the demand for power line came way down.

I guess it depends how hard you push it. You can mandate hybrid cars, but I'm not sure how happy people would be if they were told they had to buy a hybrid car.

Mik said, the more we push to hybrid vehicles, where will the power come from to run them?

Comment: I'm not advocating hybrid cars.

I know. I'm just saying that the more we move away from using fossil fuel the more we are using electricity to power our every day needs. Once we have electric cars we have to charge electric batteries.

Comment: Will that electric energy come from natural gas or run of the river?

I think all of us in this group hope that it comes from zero carbon emitting sources.

Dr Corley-Smith said, one of the things that will probably take place in the not to distant future is we will get new metres in our houses and we will get charged different rates depending on when we use the power. If you had a hybrid vehicle and plugged it in during the day you would get charged a lot more than if you plugged it in during the night. I think that will make a big difference.

I think a lot of people don't consider the production of energy polluting. They consider cars driving around to be polluting. If you were to consider an electric car it wouldn't have any emissions when you drove it around, but if the electricity used to charge it came from burning coal the production of the energy was polluting. Coal is not on its way out. The price has risen from \$100 to \$300 in the last year. If we are making electricity with coal and then running the hybrid

car on that electricity, we are in effect burning coal to run that hybrid car. How you produce energy matters.

If we think BC needs more energy then we must choose how the energy is generated. Then we should try to figure out how we can minimize the negative impacts while producing that power. One thing that I would like to stress is that we do not think that we can do anything with a zero impact. We can't build a log cabin or a trail without an impact. It's a matter of deciding which ones are acceptable and which are not. This is the choice people in BC are faced with. We can import electricity. This will primarily come from oil and gas from Alberta or Montana. It rains a lot here and if we capture some of that rain when it comes down the mountains and turn it into electricity there is very little pollution that comes from it. There is some pollution from the actual construction, but the set up can last for one hundred years producing electricity with virtually no CO2 produced. This is our choice. Do we need more energy? If we do, do we want it from oil and gas or do we want to use the energy we have in streams?

Dr. Corley-Smith showed a diagram of a run of the river project showing the stream with an underground pipe and a small power house in some trees as an example. He said it is hard to show an actual picture as much of the project is underground. He said the water is unchanged, within 1 degree in temperature to its entry into the pipe. The quantity of water flowing above the intake and below the powerhouse in the stream remains unchanged, there is however a reduction in water in the quantity of water flowing down the stream between the intake and powerhouse. As long as some water flows through the stream there should be little impact on the fish downstream.

Question: Are there any guidelines regarding impacts on resident trout and amphibians? Trout would be coming from upstream so removal of water would likely have some impact.

The studies to get a water license for one of these projects is between \$300,000 and \$750,000. They are very big studies. The person that wrote the guidelines on how to do these studies is the person that Hawkeye has retained to do the studies. One of the things we do is presence and absence of fish. If there are no fish it will allow you to leave less water in the stream. If there are fish you have to figure out what type they are and if they are steelhead then it's bad news. We have actually walked away from 5 or 6 streams already. The streams we are looking are those we believe do not have fish. Further studies to confirm absence of fish are required.

Question: Are you backing away from streams with rainbows or cutthroats?

Yes. There are some streams that have fish that you can make an agreement with the government to leave certain amounts of water in the stream at certain times of the year, but that is energy that you are giving up so it is best to use streams without fish.

Dr. Corley-Smith displayed a list of individuals from First Nations and the forest industry with whom he had spoken about proposed projects

A map of proposed Hawkeye projects and transmission lines was presented. One possible route for the proposed transmission line follows Plutonic Power's transmission line route.

Question: What would be the width of your powerline?

The right of way would be around 50 metres. The government asks that we submit for 500 metres so that we can wind around OGMA's or other areas of concern.

Question: and the height of the poles?

I guess that would depend if there was a crossing or not.

Question Will they be wooden poles?

Yes. The majority of the transmission line is planned to be build with wood poles.

Comment: That will limit your height.

It wouldn't have to because we could go to steel towers where needed.

Comment: One of WFP problems with PPC is crossing heights and isolating timber.

That's why we hired Steve and Mik Drosdovech. If we follow PPC's transmission line, I don't know that we would be isolating timber that isn't already isolated.

Steve Drosdovech said, transmission is going to be the major issue of IPP in BC. It is the major impact. It's 50 metres x length x volume removed forever. The trade off that the provincial government has envisioned or chooses to ignore is the impact of the powerline itself. Hawkeye recognized that fact immediately and that we had to do all we could do to minimize the impact. That means we have to have a lot of cooperation between the participants. Your representation of WFP and the community is a powerful thing.

Comment: Our community voice is really to advocate for sustainable forest management. When we see good forest land and have PPC coming down the valleys alienating some of the very best forest land forever from the crown forest we find it hard to see sustainable forest management played out. We have worked with WFP and its predecessors for eight years. We've worked with them to put our values in place. We've come from a bad experience with PPC and we find ourselves getting frustrated with not being able to see sustainable forest management played out.

Steve said, I completely agree with you. With the regional district and the provincial government we have been talking about this many times. BC Transmission has a role to play which we believe they have abdicated. There needs to be recourse. We're not trying to remove jobs. Our job is to advise Hawkeye on the best approach that minimizes the impact on the timber harvesting land base, no matter whose it is.

Question: Forest licensees are only able to log in OGMA's under strict limits and the OGMA has to be replaced in the same BEC zone. They can't even run a road through an OGMA without permission. But transmission line construction will encroach on OGMA's and even more dramatically on the wildlife habitat areas if you are going down in valley bottoms in the Toba it is prime grizzly habitat. Those areas were off limits to the forest industry. Is that policy being modified?

That is a very good question. As you know there is a 17 or 18 page directive about how to amend an OGMA. What ILMB tells us is that as long as the hectareage committed to OGMA by BEC unit remains the same then you can compromise the OGMA as long as it can be replaced.

Question: What if right of way that has had its timber removed is now no longer part of the timber harvesting land base? Will the timber harvesting land base of the tree farm license or BC Timber sales be reduced by the amount of right of way hectareage?

You have to ask the minister that one, because right now that is a real question before the executive. Remember what I said earlier – the call for power was very clear, ILMB manages the OGMA's and WHAs. Forestry manages the cut. TFL sets its cut periodically and the chief forester reviews that cut. I can't answer that question.

Comment: It is important because if that land is actually removed from the timber harvesting land base of the TFL then the actual land that has to be in OGMA by biogeoclimatic zone drops because the land that has to be in OGMA is a percentage of the TFL.

I can't speak to that directly because that is up to ILMB to manage. We can propose and make applications to them and there have been instances where that kind of compromise has been approved.

Comment: I find it astounding the MoF and Ministry of Environment allow this to happen.

They are not on the same page.

Comment: Could I try to explain how this transmission line is starting to compound now. PPC has their one line as a result of calls for power. The second call for power is coming up in September. When the first call went through, PPC's attitude was that they had two turbines and maybe three more so they needed a 230 kilowatt line. Their thinking wasn't broad spectrum thinking at all.

Now PPC is going to go up into Bute and Knight Inlet and they want two 320 kilowatt lines and they are saying one might go to Campbell River and the other will come down through this regional district to Malaspina substation. Now, Hawkeye are talking about a transmission line based on their call for power and everything is based on this two year staggering. If you go beyond the two years maybe Hawkeye, PPC, or some other company will find another great area for a project and based on this they may decide they need another 320 kilowatt line and so on. These lines are coming in staggered measure because no one planned it all initially. That is the dilemma that the government and power companies have. The companies are responding to calls for power. There isn't just one call for power, there could be three or four. Every call for power brings transmission lines and we just happen to be a very great distance from where the IPP sites are, so the first line is 148 kms for PPC, they have another that is 374 kms, part of which runs through our regional district. If they cannot go through Campbell River, PPC will put another line through this regional district. It is the staggering of the calls for power that results in the multiplicity of transmission lines. You can't blame the companies, it's just the way the government set it up. As Steve said, the government didn't realize how successful this was going to be.

Steve said, I think the government underestimated a lot of things and continue to do so. We must remember our population is growing and getting more power orientated and demands constantly go up. We can't blame one person. The call for power is simply responding to that. However, we have people in Victoria elected to manage our resources. The MoF, MoE, and Ministry of Agriculture and Lands are the three big ministries. They should be together with BC Transmission and BC Hydro. That should be the table.

Comment: No one is planning for fifty years, it is all 2 year increments.

We should be looking a lot longer than 50 years.

Greg Neeld said, when they first came here they realized people weren't opposed to the power, they were opposed to the transmission lines. They don't want transmission lines crisscrossing all over their back yard. It is a beautiful pristine area and all of us at Hawkeye agree with that. We put our heads together and decided to go to PPC and sit down with them and look at putting in one single line that is built for the next five to ten years and that is capable for the next 20 or 30 years. We all sat down and talked about it and their response was to turn around and double stake a couple of our rivers, so that idea fell off the plate. I'm still on board, but to jump from 230 to 500 kilowatt transmission lines the price jumps from \$500,000 per kilometre of line to \$2.5 million per kilometre. The cost would break the backbone of the projects. What I think is we should team up and go to the government and say this is your initiative, why don't you throw in some money. Whatever is above our cost could be picked up and we could build a line that is good for the next 10 or 20 years. I think that would be visionary, but whether it could be done soon enough I don't know. Getting the government involved could take too long.

Comment: The whole point is to persuade the government to change legislation

so that BC Transmission Corporation has the mandate to actually do anything, because at the moment BCTC says we are not in that business. If we want the government to get involved they have to pass legislation that says BCTC is going to be involved in these lines as a utility or partner. Then that rational result will come out. The problem is that the government has said we will leave it up to the IPPs not realizing that leaving the transmission lines up to the IPPs and two year calls would be such a big issue. I'm impressed by the fact that the Minister of Mines, the Minister of Lands, two deputy Ministers, representatives of BC Hydro, and representatives of BCTC have agreed to meet with little Powell River Regional District, Sunshine Coast, and Mount Waddington to try and thrash this out. That tells me somebody is worried.

We are willing to throw whatever help in that we can. We could come to the meeting...

Comment: I don't recommend that. We are going to recommend that after the meeting they have some serious discussions with PPC, and Hawkeye.

I think that is great.

Comment: Kiewitt has powerlines ordered and in July trucks will be hauling them up to be installed. I think we would be fooling ourselves to think we are going to just have one powerline through Powell River.

What we are talking about is trying to minimize the number of powerlines behind Powell River.

Dr. Corley-Smith said, one thing we should remember with the 500 kilowatt lines is that it is really expensive to hook up to an existing 500 kilowatt line. In one case it was cheaper to build 86 kilometres of smaller line than hook up to an existing 500 kilowatt line. What happens is people build lines to hook up together and then attach to the 500 to share the cost and you end up with a spider web of lines hooking up to the big line. The big web is just as bad for the forest industry.

Comment: we are not going to the government with any answers, but we want to encourage them to take this very seriously and start working on it.

I'm not saying you shouldn't. I'm just pointing out some practical problems.

Comment: Most of the projects are short term. The licenses are for 40 years, so the money you are investing is only for 40 years.

The equipment we are putting into the ground is good for 100 years.

Comment: But the water licenses are for 40 years. That is how these are bid. There is a time frame to get your money out. PPC is using an existing road line to minimize costs. The impact is pretty big around here with the extra traffic and the difficulties they have cause local forest industries. That's just the start.

There should be a change in the policies regarding roads.

Question: Will the roads around Toba, Jim Brown Creek, and Eldred be off limit for people around here when your proposal gets accepted?

No. I don't think it is possible to do that. The way it is written is that during the construction phase you can make it so that nobody else can use the road due to liability and DFO protecting the fisheries. Following that, other people can use it if there is a road use agreement. Hopefully, there will be regulations that the company has to be reasonable.

Greg Neeld said that Hawkeye would not want to be restrictive. They would want to share the roads.

Comment: Jim Brown Creek and Eldred are WFP and the public's roads. It would impact WFP and the public.

Dr. Corley-Smith said that roads have to be built differently for the forest industry.

Comment: That has changed. Now everyone has to meet the same standard now.

I think the Toba is a fantastic highway from what I understand.

We're reasonable, we would want to use existing roads rather than build new roads. We would be using the same roads as PPC is using.

Mik said, within the Toba area ILMB made a mistake in issuing a license to PPC without consulting the TFL holder which is Hayes Forest Service Limited. Hayes was issued a cutting permit from MoF for 70,000 cubic metres, went to use the road and PPC told them no. They went to the government and the government said it was a gray area, so Hayes will probably be taking PPC and ILMB to court and suing for the use of the road, because according to the license for road use agreement it is a license of occupation which does not convey exclusive use. There has to be shared use of that area. It is crown land and if someone else wants to use the road there has to be an opportunity for a reasonable agreement for shared use of the road.

Comment: I think they told us at the last meeting was that it is their road because they are building it.

Steve said, that is a technicality that comes during the construction phase. That construction phase is largely determined by ILMB in consultation with the applicant. They can stall until they get the completion declaration. ILMB could go in there with one of their enforcement people and say 'what did you agree to?'. The terminology in PPC's agreement gave them exclusivity for construction. I have read the document. There will be some fire going on for a while.

Comment: I just want to avoid this with Jim Brown and Eldred. If you are up front and talking about it. It is a great start.

Greg Neeld said, we would be crazy to go ahead without talking to WFP.

Mik said, we've had several meetings with the Powell River Alpine Club because they are concerned about access after the fact and we have discussed after the completion of our roads that they could go to the MoF and apply for that road to come under forest service or resource service road giving the public access. The last thing that we want to do is cut off access to the public. I live here.

Dr. Corley-Smith showed a google earth map showing possible transmission line routes within the TFL.

Question: Which route would you prefer?

Graham said, most groups in Powell River would prefer the route next to Plutonic Powers.

Walt Cowlard said, some of Hawkeye's routes are going through a lot of scrub and alpine which has no impact on the timber base. Parallel to the PPC transmission line goes through prime forest land for the most part, so that will have a greater impact from his point of view.

Dr. Corley-Smith said, if we put it next to an existing power line we will only have to extend by another 20 metres and if we put it elsewhere it will need an additional 50 metres.

Comment: You may find that PPC has the best route and you will have trouble with the area next to them.

Question: Can you put everything you have on one line?

The projects we are advancing for the 2008 CPC have a combined power output that can be easily carried by a single 230kV Transmission Line.

Question: Jackie, before we wrap up, do you have anything to add?

Jackie said, I'm just taking it all in. Listening I am hearing about a lot of changes to come. In the history of the indigenous people there has been a lot of impact and changes forever. I've been talking with Greg and listening to what he wants to accomplish. I have been talking to chiefs of other territories about the impacts that will be occurring in these indigenous communities. This is going to be so important in a global sense we are going to be affected either way if we do this or not. What is happening in the aboriginal communities is an opportunity that hasn't been presented to indigenous people in the past. There is an opportunity here to find a common ground for all involved. Each must give something in order to gain something. This is going to have a great impact on aboriginal nations, but we can gain from it an opportunity for education, and the children

will have something for the future. This is how I see it. It is going to happen either way and this is the least amount of impact.

Question: I have a little creek with a little weir. Behind the weir is always silting up. Is it going to silt up behind your monster weir?

Dr. Corley-Smith said, no.

Question: How do you avoid it?

What you have is a still area where things can settle out. If you have enough water funnel through it will just flush it out. We're just trying to make a little puddle for the pipe intake.

Comment: I completely understand. I just don't know what you are going to do with the silt.

It rains on certain days and we will have a huge amount of water coming through flushing things out and it will be naturally occurring silt not anything extra we've put in. We're not going to be changing the system in that respect.

Comment: I'm not convinced. It doesn't work on my creek. I think it's only a matter of my teeny little creek and your great big creek, they work the same. It rains, we get silt. It rains, we get more silt and the silt piles up and the more water that comes it just backs farther up the creek before it starts to go over. It doesn't flush the silt. So, I'm curious how you are going to get rid of that. We actually have to go in and dig it out by hand.

One of the things I used to do is build streams for fisheries. There were two things I used to do. One is go in and try and build something where fish had never been spawning and the other was to go back to streams where fish had spawned. When we put gravel where it had not been before it flushed out. Another time we cleaned up a stream where many years previous logging practices had left many logs lying across stream.. Using a chainsaw we removed the log sections blocking the stream flow. It ended up being a beautiful stream because the hydrology was right. I think sometimes backyard type stream aren't the same as an outdoor type stream.

Comment: This isn't a backyard stream. It is a real creek. I'll watch.

Mik said, what type of weir is it? Is it the same type? A properly designed weir with moving water should not result in deposition of silt.

Comment: I don't know. That's why I asked the question.

Greg Neeld said that Hawkeye is here to work with everybody on the Sunshine Coast. Forestry, First Nations, recreation, and all interested parties. We want your feedback. Our contacts here are the Drosdovechs for forestry, if you have transmission line questions please feel free to call Graham at Sigma. We are in

support of limiting the number of transmission lines. The quicker we get on top of that the better. On behalf of Hawkeye, thank you for having us.

Comment: Thank you Greg, Graham, Jackie, Steve and Mik. Perhaps we can connect with you periodically for updates.

CSA Technical Committee Meeting Report

Find Notes from CSA Technical Committee Meeting attached.

2008 CSA Audit review

Find PowerPoint presentation attached.

Alternate Strategies review from 2007

Find PowerPoint presentation attached.

Next CAG meeting – June 11th with IT

Meeting Adjourned 9:00 pm

**Stillwater CSA Community Advisory Group
Western Forest Products
May 14th, 2007
Attendance**

Name	Position	Member Seat
PRESENT		
Jane Cameron – Chair	Primary	Member at large
Kathy Kirk	Alternate	Member at Large
Rory Maitland	Primary	Contractor
Dave Rees	Primary	Tourism
Barry Miller	Primary	Environment
Colin Palmer	Primary	Local Governments
Paul Goodwin	Alternate	Forest Dependent
Nancy Hollmann	Alternate	Tourism
Mark Hassett	Primary	Local Business
Ted Byng	Alternate	Local Governments
Dave Hodgins	Alternate	Recreation
8 Seats represented		
ABSENT MEMBERS		
George Illes	Alternate	Environment
Ron Fuller	Alternate	DFA Worker
Wayne Borgfjord	Primary	Forest Dependent
Ken Jackson	Primary	Recreation
Bill Maitland	Alternate	Local Business
Doug Fuller	Primary	DFA Worker
PRESENT		
Resource – others		
Dr. Graham Corley-Smith	Sigma Engineering	
Jackie Timothy	First Nations Liaison	
Mik Drosdovech	Drosdovech Forestry	Hawkeye Project Manager
Steve Drosdovech	Drosdovech Forestry	Hawkeye Project Manager
Greg Neeld	Hawkeye Energy	President and CEO
Steve Mynott	Hawkeye Energy	
Walter Cowlard	WFP	
Adam Culos	WFP	
Stuart Glen	WFP	
Valerie Thompson	Secretary/Facilitator	

Notes from the CSA Technical Meeting, 6 to 9PM, April 30, 2008, Campbell River

In addition to the Technical Committee members, the meeting was attended by 5 members of the Campbell River advisory group and two of us from Powell River.

New in the Z809-08 Standard

Z809 standard is the CSA standard for sustainable forest management

The Z809-02 standard is being revised. It was posted for public comment during Feb and March of this year. This revision will clarify the 02 edition and strengthen certain sectors.

The 08 edition will include mandatory topics for discussion by Public Advisory Groups (PAGS) for each of the six criteria, and will include topics such as pesticides, clearcuts, etc.

It will also include 25 or 30 core indicators which will become part of our VOITs and the SFM Plan.

There will be some updated definitions and strength added around aboriginal rights and title.

About CSA

There is a global organization called the Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification. (PEFC) .CSA Z809 has been accepted by that organization. Canada has almost half of the certified land base registered in PEFC, There are 200 million ha certified in the world and of that 200 million about 78 million ha are found in Canada. In BC, 85% of forest land is certified, 50 million ha certified out of 60 million ha total. Of the 50 million ha total which is certified, 30 million, or about. 60%, is CSA certified. Another little known fact about CSA Z809 is that it is the only CSA standard which includes mandatory public consultation.

Indicators

Advisory Groups all wrestle with creating good indicators but each group doesn't have to invent the wheel. The sites below may offer inspiration and the Z809-08 standard will have the new core indicators

Suggestions for indicators and criteria can be found in a number of places. Examples are the MoFR website, the Canadian Forest Ministers website, and a site by John Innes, SFU professor.... SFM indicators.org.

The mandatory discussion topics will help PAGs with their indicators.

We were strongly encouraged to examine our community's values and to create indicators specific to those values. For example if variable retention was important to us, we should have an indicator for VR. Similarly if interface buffers are important to us, we should identify that value and create indicator(s) around that value.

There will be a new core indicator about sustainable harvest levels under Element 2.2 Forest Ecosystem Productivity

New CSA Standard for Woodlots

A standard is being developed for woodlots which is less formal than Z809. It is appropriate for operations of about 4000 ha and smaller and may also be appropriate for community forests of that size.

Discussions about PAGs

We were asked a number of questions such as:

- How do we learn?
- How often does one PAG meet with other PAGs?
- Who supplies us with information
- Should there be more opportunity for PAGs to get together, e.g. at CSA annual meetings
- Should CSA set up a website for PAGs and host digital communications
- Should the technical committee create an “SFM for Dummies?”
- As PAGs are a very strong asset, should CSA be doing more to support and advance the groups?

Conclusions

We both came away with a sense of how exciting the CSA process is and how meaningful it can be to the community. The new discussion topics will certainly be helpful to us. Sometimes we don't even know what questions to ask and these will really help initiate and focus our discussions. It will be interesting to see how we feel about the new core indicators and how well they fit in with our ideas. Both the topics and indicators will help us move forward and become more aware of the mainstream knowledge whereas now, we're a bit isolated.

We wish that all of our members could attend such a meeting and become infected with the enthusiasm which is expressed by the committee.

We thank WFP for arranging the invitation and Island Timberlands for their contribution to expenses, both of which enabled us to attend.

Ken and Jane

2008 CSA AUDIT

Review for CAG



Indicators Assessed

- Office Interviews with staff
- 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 16, 17, 25, 26, 27, 29
30, 32, 35, 39, 41, 43, 46, 47, 48,



Indicators Verified

- Field Audit

- 4, 5, 13, 19, 36, 13, 19, 32, 1, 6, 8, 13, 10, 17, 18, 22, 25, 28, 29, 34, 35, 41, 42, 32, 33, 35, 12, 27, 4, 5, 9, 21, 16

- ST-184, TM-218, TM-263, Deer Creek M/L, Lewis Lake Campsite, TM-188, ST-221, LL-064, LL-004



Meeting with CAG members

- There is a feeling that the CAG process is working out very well.
- Everyone on CAG gets along well.
- The facilitator encourages discussion with everyone allowed to provide their input. All decisions have consensus.
- Although there was a feeling that there is good representation of the public sitting on CAG, there was consensus that there should be youth representation.



Meeting with CAG members

- There was concern expressed of the lack of FN representation/participation in the CAG process. They did feel that the Operation has made an extra effort to try and get the FN involved. They felt that the company can , however only do so much to get FN involvement.
- There is a feeling that the company is not hiding anything, and has provided all pertinent information to help make better decisions by the CAG.
- There was a feeling that the CAG was fully involved in the process of reviewing indicators, and providing input.

Positive Aspects

- Public tours of field operations to look at sustainable forestry – CAG members give presentations.
- Use of First nations to do archaeological assessments.
- CAG members involved in selection of new facilitator.

Positive Aspects

- Excellent communication observed among Stillwater staff and between staff and contractors.
- Thorough cutblock and road release packages – detailed list of instructions.
- Recreational “hotline”
- Trail crossing constructed better with new road construction.

Recommendations

- Indicator #3: consider revising O,T,V to address need to protect identified habitat for each of the 5 species at risk.
- Indicator #5: consider clarifying the target of 90%
- Indicator #16: consider changing T,V to reflect herbicide use on DFA.
- Indicator 25 and 46: Consider whether indicators have usefulness.



Recommendations

- Indicator #47: consider modifying O,T to address FN response to plans.
- Indicator #48: consider adjusting O, T to reflect # of CMTs in areas to the number accidentally harvested.
- Consider modifying some of the wording in the indicators to a simpler form.



Results

- No system weaknesses
- Recommended for continued registration to the CAN/CSA Z809-2002 Standard



SECTION 2

Alternate Strategies

During the development of the Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets with the Advisory group there were many discussions between the organization, guest speakers, scientists and the advisory group on the management strategies to protect these values. These alternate strategies as shown below represent the dialoged exchange that occurred between the company and the advisory group, and in some case do not reflect the current management strategies that the organization has documented in section one of the FSP document. A detailed documentation list of all the discussions on alternative strategies is included within the monthly advisory group meeting minutes.

Appended below is a summary of the alternate strategies discussed in developing and maintaining the Z809 / 02 data set as it relates to specific indicators.

Indicator # 1

Alternative Strategy:

(June 13, 2007) Marv Clark - Forestry Tour of Chile presentation. Marc Clark, researcher with FERIC gave a presentation on his observations and learning's from a tour completed of forestry operations in Chile. Items discussed related to differences between forest management in the DFA and Chile. Several of these differences discussed relate to indicator #1 and include rotation ages, plantations - species and MAI, cutblock size, planting density, and stand tending regimes,

(January 9, 2008) The Western Forest Strategy program for conserving biodiversity on company tenures was reviewed with the CAG by Bill Beese - WFP Forest Ecologist. The presentation included up to date results and learning's from the Adaptive Management Program to explain the Western Forest Strategy. The Western Forest Strategy includes learning's and findings in relation to alternate harvest strategies which are relevant to indicator #1.

- Patch size. Different structural responses to different sizes of patches. A range of patch sizes are being retained across the DFA. Old forest and recruitment areas are being retained in a range of patch sizes from large OGMA areas to WTR and/or Retention areas associated with each block harvested. Different silviculture systems in the Western Forest Strategy also result in different patch sizes being retained.

Indicator #2

Alternative Strategy:

(January 9, 2008) The Western Forest Strategy program for conserving biodiversity on company tenures was reviewed with the CAG by Bill Beese - WFP Forest Ecologist. The presentation included up to date results and learning's from the Adaptive Management Program to explain the Western Forest Strategy. The Western Forest Strategy includes learning's and findings in relation to alternate harvest strategies which are relevant to indicator #2.

- Stand level retention. Bill Beese reviewed the stand level retention requirements for the Western Forest Strategy and how they relate the various biogeoclimatic subzones found in the DFA. Certain subzones have higher retention requirements relating to the previous harvesting history. Learning's from the adaptive management program which show a range of patch sizes being preferable was reviewed and the amount of non retention blocks to be harvested across the landscape to provide for larger stand level patches being retained was explained.

(June 13, 2007) Marv Clark - Forestry Tour of Chile presentation. Marc Clark, researcher with FERIC gave a presentation on his observations and learning's from a tour completed of forestry operations in Chile. Items discussed related to differences between forest management in the DFA and Chile. One of these differences discussed relating to indicator #2 is cutblock size. One of the cutblocks visited in Chile was 500ha in size vs a general maximum cutblock size of 40ha on the DFA.

Indicator # 3

Alternative Strategy: (Supports change in reporting and management strategy)

(January 9, 2008) The Western Forest Strategy program for conserving biodiversity on company tenures was reviewed with the CAG by Bill Beese - WFP Forest Ecologist. The presentation included up to date results and learning's from the Adaptive Management Program to explain the Western Forest Strategy. The Western Forest Strategy includes learning's and findings in relation to alternate harvest strategies which are relevant to indicator #1.

- Patch size. A range of patch sizes are being retained across the DFA. Different silviculture systems in the Western Forest Strategy also result in a range of patch sizes being retained.

Indicator # 4
Alternative Strategy

(June 13, 2007) Marv Clark - Forestry Tour of Chile presentation. Marc Clark, researcher with FERIC gave a presentation on his observations and learning's from a tour completed of forestry operations in Chile. Items discussed related to differences between forest management in the DFA and Chile. One of these differences discussed relating to indicator #4 is stand reforestation. Discussion related to regenerating monoculture stands of trees (eucalyptus and radiate pine) vs of stands containing a range of tree species.

Indicator # 13

Alternative Strategy:

(January 9, 2008) The Western Forest Strategy program for conserving biodiversity on company tenures was reviewed with the CAG by Bill Beese - WFP Forest Ecologist. The presentation included up to date results and learning's from the Adaptive Management Program to explain the Western Forest Strategy. The Western Forest Strategy includes learning's and findings in relation to alternate harvest strategies which are relevant to indicator #13.

- Windthrow. Windthrow results from the adaptive management program were reviewed relating to different levels of stand retention. Different silviculture systems in the Western Forest Strategy affect the size and range of patch sizes being retained enabling additional strategies for minimizing windthrow.

Indicator # 19

Alternative Strategy

(June 13, 2007) Marv Clark - Forestry Tour of Chile presentation. Marc Clark, researcher with FERIC gave a presentation on his observations and learning's from a tour completed of forestry operations in Chile. Items discussed related to differences between forest management in the DFA and Chile. One of these differences discussed relating to indicator #19 is stream management. Discussion related to stream protection measures in place in the DFA that protect water quality and quantity.

Indicator # 24

(March 14, 2007) The CAG invited Sue Bonnyman from the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) to discuss the environmental assessment process for the proposed Plutonic Power Corporation project. There is concern about the transmission line and the impact on the recreation and visual resource as well as loss of productive forest area all of which impact the DFA. Alternate route options were discussed and have been provided by WFP which would reduce the impact to the DFA and Indicator #24.

(December 12, 2007) Stuart Glen - WFP Forester. Stuart provided an overview of the major amendment relating to harvesting of ST-205 prior to the installation of the Plutonic transmission line. Harvesting prior to the installation of the transmission line limits the amount of timber isolated from safe and practicable harvest. Harvesting this area now temporarily increases the area of harvesting that is visible in a non-greened up state. A full professional visual analysis was completed prior to harvesting to help determine the most suitable strategy. The strategy to harvest the timber now that could be isolated from practicable harvest once the transmission line is constructed was implemented to limit the area impacted by the transmission line corridor.

Indicator # 27 and 46

Alternative Strategy: (Supports ongoing strategy discussions)

((January 10, 2007) As part of the silviculture update Rudi presented information on herbicide use. Rudi explained what the impacts can be of alternate strategies related to the timing of herbicide application and the associated amount of herbicide required to be applied. For example, an early treatment is effective at knocking the brush back and reduces the amount (if any) of herbicide required in the future. Information was also presented on new research results from growing alder in conifer stands. Data shows that up to 200 hectares of alder in conifer stands is actually increasing the growth and volume of conifers. An alder regeneration strategy is included in the new FSP and now provides for an alternate strategy which WFP believes will reduce brushing costs and herbicide use.