

## *Minutes*

### **CSA Community Advisory Group To Western Forest Products April 11th Minutes Western Forest Products Boardroom**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

7:15pm: Meeting called to order  
Quorum noted

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Chair welcomed Shannon Janzen, WFP Manager Strategic Planning – Carbon, Forests and Wood Products and Laura Braden from Career Link. Group introduced themselves.

#### **Review and Acceptance of Agenda**

Agenda was accepted.

Chair suggested group send letter of support to Disney regarding its intent to use only certified wood products including CSA and group agreed.

#### **Correspondence**

Copies of recent correspondence was provided and reviewed

- Emails inviting First Nations and Erik Blaney to meetings
- Letter to PRPAWS
- Bark Beetle letter to IT
- Kamloops CAG recognition
- Email from Laura Braden at Career Link expressing interest in CAG
- Thank you letter to Erik Blaney and invite to fill FN chair.

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

Minutes from March 9th Western Forest Products meeting were reviewed and accepted.

#### **Operational Information Map Review**

##### **Current Activities**

##### **Harvesting**

GI-057, GI-059, GI-127, GI-008, HE-521, ST-020, ST-216, ST-287, TH-500, TH-501

##### **Road Construction**

CH-400, FH-040, PD-463, ST-032, ST-039, UL-811, UL-836, WL-044

##### **Engineering**

CH-402, GI-122, NA-912, NA-920, NA-922, NA-930, NA-935, ST-024, ST-255, UL-805, WL-913,  
WL-952, WL-954

**What's New on the Map**

**New Blocks**

ST-225, UL-838

**New Roads**

ST-225, UL-838

**Cutting Permit Approved Areas**

FH-040, GI-008, GI-027, GI-203, ST-029, ST-032, ST-039, ST-148, TM-243, UL-809, UL-810, UL-811

Note: There are no new blocks and roads located along the Sunshine Coast Trail.

**Logging Complete**

ST-011, ST-247

**Road Construction Complete**

ST-022, ST-148, ST-232, ST-265

**Engineered Blocks**

CH-402

**Engineered Roads**

CH-402

**Company Update**

Nothing to report.

**Shannon Janzen – Carbon, Forests, and Wood Products**

Climate Change and Forests:

Information about changing climate is changing and this presentation a year from now could be completely different, but this is the state of affairs as it is right now. We are starting to see the impact of natural disturbances caused by climate change regarding forest health. These include yellow cedar dieback, Mountain Pine beetle, and in this area – Douglas Fir Beetle.

There are both positive and negative impacts to forest productivity. Some people say that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere induces growth and there are trials and stations all over BC testing for this. They can grow faster if the soil has enough nutrients. Negatives include landslides caused by heavy rains earlier in the year. The soils are not adapted to such early rains. Bridges are designed for fifty year flood intervals and the floods are more frequent. Winds are coming from different directions now. In 2007 the International Panel on Climate Change said “In the long term, a sustainable forest management strategy aimed at maintaining or increasing forest carbon stocks, while producing an annual sustained yield of timber, fibre or energy from the forest, will generate the largest sustained mitigation benefit.” This is because wood is renewable as apposed to other products such as concrete or steel. Planting and renewing forests sequesters carbon. Growing forests faster can sequester more carbon. Harvesting forests and putting into wood products stores carbon for decades. Bioenergy and recycling are another important aspect. Sustainable forest management is key. In countries where they are deforesting and not replanting, harvesting forests would not be a good way to combat climate change.

## *Minutes*

The more we grow and the faster we can grow the more carbon can be stored. Enhanced growth and fertilization and brush control help with carbon retention in the carbon life cycle. Rapid salvage and commercial thinning help with insect and disease management.

When comparing wood with concrete and steel, carbon is stored in wood for many decades, wood waste can displace other forms of energy, and renewable wood products have the least carbon cost (the amount of energy input for treated roundwood is 4 tonnes of carbon vs. concrete at 17 T and steel at 38 T).

Question: At what age does a tree maximize its net carbon intake?

It depends on the species. In forestry that is called the mean annual increment. Around here it would probably be around eighty years. It starts to level off and take in carbon quite slowly. A growing forest takes in more carbon. Eventually it the forest will rot faster than it grows although some old growth forests do accumulate a carbon.

Question: What is the growth curve on the Douglas fir and hemlock in this area? Will you decide to start logging at eighty years because that is when the maximum carbon uptake ends?

If you were managing for carbon only the answer would be yes, but we don't just think about carbon.

Your financial age is generally a lot lower than the mean annual increment age. If you are looking to maximize your returns on investment your rotation may be at a lower age than the maximum growth age.

Question: Then some companies wouldn't be looking at biodiversity or any other factors if they were only considering financial return.

Absolutely we have to consider how our management practices relate to biodiversity.

In terms of carbon, the University of Washington has done a bunch of work that shows shorter rotations, provided that you actually maximize the carbon in the forest, is better because you get the wood from the shorter rotation into your house which is storing for up to 100 years which is accumulated through time.

Carbon Policy:

Carbon offset is an omission reduction credit from a project that results in less green house gases in the atmosphere than that would otherwise occur. If you fly Harbour Air right now you pay an additional ~80 cents every time you fly because they have a carbon offset. You pay the 80 cents and they use it to grow some trees somewhere and they say that makes you carbon neutral because they are using fuel and them making up for it by growing some trees somewhere that trees would not otherwise grow.

Additionality is: for a project to be considered a carbon offset emissions reductions or removals must be over and above those that would otherwise occur. It is very important when you look at carbon protocols and carbon tracking because what they are worried about is you might have done something anyways. You have to prove that you wouldn't have made the same choice in the absence of carbon market. Baseline is greenhouse gas emissions in a specific year against which future emissions are measured.

Question: Are there studies going on to find out which tree species are best for maximizing carbon?

## *Minutes*

Those that grow fastest are best for carbon uptake. Hemlock from WFP's nurseries is at 32%, not genetically modified just bred for fast growth. It would be a great carbon tree, but it may not be a great wood products tree. It may not be what you want to grow in the forest. You may want to grow cedar because you are looking at the future.

Carbon equivalency of other greenhouse gases is important. We always hear about carbon dioxide because we all know about it, but there are other chemicals like methane that are worse. The other chemicals are compared to carbon regarding how good they are at being a greenhouse gas. Methane remains in the atmosphere for approximately 9 to 15 years and is approximately 20 times more effective at trapping heat in the air as carbon over a hundred year period. That means it has a carbon equivalency of 20. Nitrous Oxide has a carbon equivalency of 280. Forest fires and pulp mills emit nitrous oxide. The industrial carbon count usually comes from chemicals other than carbon because of the high carbon equivalencies.

Question: So highly processed dry wood products such as pellets would release less carbon?

Yes. I highly efficient wood or pellet stove would release less nitrous oxide into the atmosphere than a fire in your backyard.

Question: Pulp mills say that moisture doesn't matter for their hog fuel boilers and they actually have to add moisture. That doesn't make any sense.

That's a good question. I don't know how they trap their gases or what type of scrubbers they have. Biomass comes into question because of the efficiency of the burn and how you are burning your materials does depend on whether you are carbon neutral. Forest fires are a concern as a result of this. Under current policy it is assumed that carbon is released into the atmosphere as soon as you take a tree down. We know that is not true. It sits on site in a pile or it goes into a house and gets stored as a wood product. If you can take the pile and burn it for energy rather than using an alternate energy is what makes it carbon neutral. That is a policy issue and will be interesting going forward. People are questioning it and depending on how things work out biomass may not be considered carbon neutral in the future.

A sink is an entity such as a forest that removes more carbon dioxide than it emits. An ocean would be another example of a sink.

A source is a forest that emits more carbon dioxide than it removes. Because of the Mountain Pine Beetle the forest in the interior is a source. On the coast we are generally a sink because we remove more than we emit.

If you look at where global emissions come from, per capita Canada has quite high emissions. Africa has low emissions and China is still fairly low per capita. China has high emissions if you take the per capita part of the equation away.

Question: Do the tar sands have a big impact on our emissions?

I am not completely sure, it depends on how you look at it. If you include usage it changes how big of a culprit they are. The tar sands and the oil and gas industry also takes carbon dioxide emissions and pumps it underground because there is a big sponge underground and they are saying that is an offset.

## *Minutes*

There are reports about that and what they are showing is that the oil and gas industry is tacking huge credits for pumping carbon underground which is a relatively cheap way to deal with carbon and they could flood the carbon market if you don't limit how much the offsets will be. Greenpeace has been saying not to count forests in any carbon tracking because you can flood the carbon market and people won't have to reduce their emissions. Creating a carbon market is really tricky and it could collapse like a financial market. You can create a monster that will not be able to sustain itself.

In 1997 nations gathered in Kyoto, Japan to negotiate binding limits on greenhouse gases for developed nations. Nations that were not developed had not benefited from industrial revolution, so they should not pay for it. They committed to a 5.2% reduction in greenhouse gases from 1990 levels by 2008-2012 period. Nobody has made it and Canada has definitely not made it. Canada signed the Kyoto Protocol saying that Canada would reduce 6% from 1990 levels by the end of the first reporting period. There has been a growth of 12% from the 1990 level. Canada signed in 1998 and in 2001 the US said they wouldn't sign the Kyoto Protocol. They objected to the lack of involvement from the developing countries and called it economically irresponsible. Kyoto couldn't really come into effect unless the US signed it because they have so much of the greenhouse gases per capita. The only other country that could do it was Russia. Nobody thought they could do it, but they were using really dirty power (e.g. coal) and by moving to cleaner alternatives they felt they could do it and they signed on. So, Kyoto actually came into effect in 2004. Failure to meet it could result in sanctions. In 2007 people were wondering what Canada was doing to meet their commitment. The Conservatives said we want to have a total greenhouse gas reduction of 20% by 2020, which is nowhere near the Kyoto commitment because greenhouse gases. They implemented an intensity target for industrial emitters. 6% per year from 2007 to 2010 reduction and 2% per year until 2015. Intensity targets are interesting because for example for oil and gas, for every barrel of oil produced the intensity of energy input into the barrel is reduced. Five times more oil may be produced, so the actual absolute emissions have actually gone up. This method is criticized all over the world and it is the method that the US adopted. Between 1990 and 2000 greenhouse gas intensity emissions increased by 1.4% per year and the GDP grew by 3.3%. It is always less than the GDP growth because people are always trying to reduce the intensity because it reduces cost per unit. As a country it is easy to bring in intensity target because people are doing it anyway. In 2007, Premier Campbell wanted to be seen as the green premier and he wanted to distance himself from Ottawa so he signed a memorandum of understanding with Arnold Schwarzenegger the governor of California to be part of the Western Climate Initiative. This commitment has a minimum of 15% reduction of absolute greenhouse gas emission below the 2005 level. This comes close to the Kyoto Protocol. IN 2009 there was the economic crisis. In 2010 there was speculation that Obama would have the whole US and not just some States accept the Western Climate Initiative, but this didn't happen. With the economic crisis, people are now wondering how we go forward. The States are wondering what China is going to do. If we set up an initiative that will essentially make our goods more expensive how will we compete with China if they are not making the same commitments?

Comment: Local governments will be financially penalized if they don't bring down their emissions. In the Powell River Regional District it would cost \$18,000 to avoid paying a \$1,267 penalty. In metro Vancouver there is a real incentive to get their gases down.

Relevant Policy - Carbon Neutral Public Sector:

The Kyoto Protocol is important because Canada didn't include forests in the 2008 – 2012 commitment. They looked at things like insects and fire and predicted that it would be a source. Also, because of Kyoto they are saying that as soon as a tree is harvested the carbon is emitted into the atmosphere. That

## *Minutes*

was the simplistic policy that they came up with at that time. Now on Copenhagen they are trying to figure out how to work it out correctly. If you just look at harvest there is emission.

Question: Is it the wood or the logging?

You would have to look at net. As a general average, one cubic metre is 0.8 metric tones of carbon into the atmosphere if it was rotting plus the fuel it took to harvest the cubic metre. The Western Climate Initiative brought in the BC greenhouse gas target act saying emissions would be reduced 33% by 2020 with the new baseline of 2007. Interim targets were – 6% by 2010 which we didn't accomplish, and 18% by 2016. The government is implementing initiatives to force reduction. They are setting up things that will cost is targets are not met. By 2010 the public sector should have been carbon neutral. There are a lot of 2012 targets as well. They have a greenhouse gas reduction cap and trade act for BC. Cap and trade goes for the large industrial emitters such as Catalyst. WFP does not get anywhere near the 100 thousand tones of carbon dioxide equivalent for a year. WFP doesn't even hit 10 thousand per year at each facility. All of the pulp mills will because of nitrous oxide. The carbon tax act is hitting us all right now because we are paying 4.5 cents for each litre of fuel. This will go up to 8 cents in 2012. Other fuels have different amounts of carbon tax on them. That was supposed to get people to drive less and be more efficient with their fuel. Theoretically as prices go up people will drive less or use more efficient fuels. Everybody got to choose their own targets for the Western Climate Initiative and BC wanted to be better than everybody else. So, BC and Oregon have pretty stringent reduction rates. Some people argue that it creates a trade differential between the non-contributors as well as between the contributors. BC is penalizing itself with these targets. BC already had quite low emissions because we rely heavily on hydro for our power. Other places had more opportunities for alternative energies.

The Pacific Carbon Trust is a new provincial crown corporation that will offer carbon offsets. The mandate is to offer credible low cost offsets to meet public sector demand necessary to meet its targets for a carbon neutrality. They haven't been able to produce any offsets yet.

Cap and trade:

If you are part of the cap, each firm, operation, or facility (dependent on sector), over a certain threshold, has a limit on the amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e that it can emit. Allowances will be all that the operation is allowed to emit and they will have to go out and trade. The trade relies on the fact that it will be cheaper or easier for some firms to reduce their emissions below their required limit than others. Those who emit less than their allowance can sell their extra allowances to those who are not able to make reductions as easily. Firms can also participate in the trade through the production of offsets which can only be 10% of the total and which function the same as an allowance or an emissions permit. WFP can benefit although they are not under the cap by reducing emissions and selling their offsets.

Question: Do you think this is the road to success?

If they set it up right and if there is the political will to implement it right. All of the industries are lobbying to keep the caps high.

Comment: A number of years ago lead was removed from all gasoline over a two year period because the government said if they found any lead in gas the company would be heavily taxed. Other alternatives were found.

## *Minutes*

In Europe they had a functioning carbon market, but they gave away too many allowances and the value went down to zero.

### **Election**

Jane Cameron was nominated and seconded as chair. Ken Jackson was nominated and seconded as first vice-chair. Dave Hodgins was nominated and seconded as second vice-chair. All were elected by acclamation.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm**

*Minutes*

**Stillwater CSA Community Advisory Group  
Western Forest Products  
April 11th Attendance**

Name	Position	Member Seat
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Jane Cameron – Chair</b>	Primary	Member at large
<b>Nancy Hollmann</b>	Primary	Tourism
<b>Colin Palmer</b>	Primary	Local Governments
<b>Dave Hodgins</b>	Alternate	Recreation
<b>Read English</b>	Alternate	Local Business
<b>Ken Jackson</b>	Primary	Recreation
<b>Bill Maitland</b>	Primary	Local Business
<b>Paul Goodwin</b>	Alternate	Forest Dependent
<b>George Illes</b>	Alternate	Environment
<b>Barry Miller</b>	Primary	Environment
<b>Mark Hassett</b>	Alternate	Contractor
<b>Doug Fuller</b>	Primary	DFA Worker
<b>Rob Stewart</b>		
<b>9 Seats represented</b>		
<b>ABSENT MEMBERS</b>		
<b>Dave Formosa</b>	Alternate	Local Governments
<b>Andy Payne</b>	Alternate	Member at large
<b>Russ Parsons</b>	Alternate	DFA Worker
<b>Rory Maitland</b>	Primary	Contractor
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Resource – others</b>		
<b>Mike Dunn</b>	WFP	
<b>Shannon Janzen</b>	WFP	
<b>Stuart Glen</b>	WFP	
<b>Valerie Thompson</b>	Facilitator/Secretary	