

**CANFOR LOGGING PLAN FOR WEST TROPHIES: PUBLIC
MEETING 1 OF 9
NOTE: MINUTES APPROVED BY PARTICIPANTS**

**Information Meeting between
the Upper Clearwater Referral Group
&
CANFOR Vavenby
28 January 2012**

Abridged Transcript with Highlights in Bold

(Note: The following document is based on a voice recording transcribed by Erik Milton and Victoria A. Ross, here edited for brevity by Trevor Goward on behalf of the Upper Clearwater Referral Group. Both the original voice recording and the unabridged transcript are available upon request from tom.dickinson@tru.ca).

Participants

Dave Dobi (DAVE) – Canfor Forester
Ryan Papp (RYAN) – Chair/Referral Group Member
Tay Briggs (TAY) – Referral Group Member
Frank Smith (FRANK) – Referral Group Member
Tom Dickinson (TOM) – Referral Group Member
George Briggs (GEORGE) – Referral Group Member
Trevor Goward (TREVOR) – Referral Group Member
Erik Milton (ERIK) – Referral Group Member (stepped down in 2014)
Ellen Ferguson (ELLEN) – Referral Group Member (stepped down in 2013)
Steve Murray (STEVE) – Referral Group Member (stepped down in 2013)

Observers

Nick Frost – valley resident
Larry Cochrane – valley resident

Meeting Highlights

[Note: the following eleven meeting highlights have been viewed and endorsed by members of the Upper Clearwater Referral Group].

- (1) CANFOR is aware of the link between logging and the decline of Wells Gray's Mountain Caribou.
- (2) CANFOR acknowledges that the government's data on wildlife requirements may not capture all the information needed to enable the Mountain Caribou to "persist at present numbers or target numbers in this area".
- (3) CANFOR also accepts that Area G extends upwards on the east slope of the Clearwater Valley from the park road to the park boundary.
- (4) CANFOR agrees that logging in the Clearwater Valley will enhance cougar populations and thereby increase the likelihood of "interactions between people and predators".
- (5) According to CANFOR's forester there are no special visual management guidelines for the Clearwater Valley; but even if such guidelines did exist, CANFOR's plan to salvage log would negate them.
- (6) CANFOR's forester says that "water quality, quantity, and timing of flow were buzz words for the day. I don't believe government knows what that is today on any stream that I can think of". Notwithstanding this, CANFOR will be hiring a hydrologist who "takes a look at these values and will give us some sense of whether we're going to impact those based on what we're proposing".
- (7) CANFOR's plans to log the Clearwater Valley is not a one-time initiative: "It's a periodic process. There's a number of stands that we're not interested in that right now are age-class 4 or an age-class 3, and 15 years from now those stands may look interesting." Hence, Canfor's plans for the Clearwater Valley run in direct opposition to the guidelines as set out in to the Guiding Principles.
- (8) CANFOR'S position on the Guiding Principles: "They're very broad, don't give a lot of detail... There's not much behind them, so from a broad perspective, I think what I showed goes a distance to addressing them". Referral Group members, however, made clear that they did not feel that their concerns were addressed.
- (9) Does CANFOR log differently adjacent to a provincial park than elsewhere? Answer: "The short answer to that is no. Park is a park, and I don't want this to sound flippant, but there are currently no rules around that. There are cases where licensees will do something different". Hence Canfor intends to treat the Clearwater Valley no differently than any other valley in the province, notwithstanding the many demonstrated values above and beyond wood fibre.

(10) The person at CANFOR who makes the final decision on whether to proceed with logging in the Clearwater Valley as of 2012 is Jim McCormack:

Jim.McCormack@canfor.com.

(11) Regarding the viability of CANFOR's Vavenby mill: "There is a fall-down effect coming, and powers much greater than me are making decisions on how they're going to address that when it comes. In the interim, the saw mills that are out there are running and they are trying their best to make money, and those that aren't making money have been shut down".

Abridged Transcript First Recording 1/2

[Note: Main points discussed are indicated in bold].

0:00:00 = tape time

DAVE: So, before I get started, first of all, thanks. Thanks to Trevor for pulling everybody together to have a conversation, I'm hoping... I'd like this to be an information session and information both ways. So I don't know the history of the documentation that comes with the Upper Clearwater. I came here after that was done, so if there is information that I don't have here, please let me know, pass it on, and if you have any questions along the way please jump in. Trevor told me some time back that he was hoping to get a plan that you guys would be able to comment on. I don't have that and hopefully out of today's presentation you'll understand why that is. We're in pretty early stages here in terms of looking at things. There's three maps on the wall; two of those maps I'll talk about fairly early on in the discussion... ??? So, what I'd like to talk about essentially is how Canfor operates, what we do in terms of planning, outlining our timber harvesting priorities, in the end how that fits with this area, steps we take in our process, looking at the resource values that I'm aware of, and like I say, if there is something that is not on that list if you could let me know I'd appreciate it. Reviewing the Guiding Principles for plan area 'G' and how I see them fitting, and then description of where we are today and where we expect to go down the road. So in terms of priorities the first things we look at are access on the land-base and right now we only have the one road accessing this area, essentially, and that's the Trophy Mountain FSR – comes off Road 80. So there's the whole slope rolling over from the plateau above that doesn't have road access at this point in time – I'll talk about that a little more later. And then what I do is identify stands in my role as a planning forester, we use the term 'available volume,' so once I've identified a stand and it's cleared the types of legislative requirements, spatial requirements, and all of those things, then I put that stand... **best way to think of it is as a bucket. So we have one bucket – it's called 'available volume' so when a stand of timber becomes available it goes in there for selection by our operations group**

depending on sawmill profile and needs and those kinds of things which I'll talk about a little more. So when I'm identifying those things the first thing I am looking for right now is pine content greater than 40% stands. And that's essentially to salvage the dead pine that's out there, and that's a priority of government, it's a priority of ours. There's some rules around how that happens. The second priority for us is pine content less than 40%. The 40% number, just for information is when you're getting into those stands that are greater than 40% pine, if that pine falls out of that stand you're left with very low volume stands. So really... all of a sudden it becomes alienated for a period of time because the volume is so low. So that is why we are pushing into those stands first. Mature stands age class 7 and 9 is the next priority and then other stands that we might come across just through looking at the landscape. Any questions about that?

So, you're about to see two of the ugliest maps, I was telling Ryan that I made in a long time, but it's meant to sort of show you how those priorities I was telling you about play out in this landscape up in the Trophies. So if you look at the red, purple you'll see a little bit of blue – those are stands that don't meet our priority list at present – either too young, they're deciduous leading, it could be just an area that is rock and ice for a lack of a better word – we've got a lot of rock areas in this neck of the woods. So essentially what we're looking at in terms of planning is the white space in between which comes up better on the next... so, this colour here and this colour here are pine leading greater than age class 5. One comment about this is it's not the definitive because we are using the government inventory system so you'll find that this is what the government has identified the stands to be but when you get on the ground sometimes they can be very different. So it's not terribly reliable but this gives us an indication of what's there. In here is spruce/balsam primarily and in here. And then these purple are Douglas fir leading stands. (0:08:56)

GEORGE: the map that we have is this one....?

DAVE: Those two are yours to take away, yeah, from today... So in terms of how we go about identifying what we're doing on the landscape and what volume we're targeting – so we have a strategic plan for the sawmill here, that aligns with the tactical plan which is what I put together – which is essentially the 'available volume bucket' and with our annual business plan that tells us what volume, species, piece size, and harvest systems we're going to focus on. And then we have to go out on the landscape and try and find those. And right now, I guess as an example, we are not targeting fir stands in the short term because Douglas fir doesn't have a lot of value and we don't have a market for it. In terms of piece size we're targeting primarily pine but we're got an array of pine and spruce piece size targets that we have to meet. So it's not, it's what I'm trying to get across with this piece is that **it's not about a stand, it's about that bucket and how what everything in that bucket fits with the mill needs over time**. So within the planning unit as I mentioned up here we're looking at access options and identifying the potential stands which we've done some work on site with. And we do field reconnaissance, which is the phase we're in right now looking at the resource values assessing what they are, where they are and as part of that process we refer. So I refer to this, the Upper Clearwater Referral Group in advance of the regular referrals we do

because there's a plan up here and **I really don't have the history so I wanted to make sure that our ideas got on the table early on in this process.** Once we go through and we've identified the blocks, where they are, what their makeup is – we test them against our strategic plan, our forest stewardship plan, our assessment work we've done and we revise them if they need revision and then they go into the 'available volume bucket' as I've mentioned. And at that point, I understand there is an interest in knowing timing and those kinds of things – it's difficult to do because a block can sit there for two years, three years, we've had some blocks that have sat there for ten years and not got to the harvesting stage, but when, so, our operations group will develop an annual harvest plan, it'll pull blocks that it needs to meet species and volume targets and that's when the field work starts. So that's when we'll start laying out the block, cruising it, preparing it for a cutting permit or road permit solution. And once that's done, it goes into the queue for that season and then it gets harvested. And we, the process that we use now is pretty tight in terms once we have a block in that cue it gets harvested, we don't technically, we used to have a lot of blocks that were sitting out there in the ether that were ready to go but we weren't logging them, now when we make that commitment *we're cutting them.* Any questions at all so far? **(0:13:06)** So in terms of resource values these are the kinds of things that we look at in our FSP, the Kamloops LRMP document, our forest stewardship plan has some commitments around them. So this is the list that we have. I'll go through this if there is something you see that's missing, as I mentioned, let me know. In terms of private land, *rights of way and highway*, **the kinds of things we're looking at in relation to those values is the down-slope risk.** So if we're doing any activity up above private land, the rail line, things like that – we're assessing what impact, if any, that might have on down-slope values and what the risks associated with that are. **Primarily it's hydrology that drives that, terrain stability to some degree, and wildfire we just look at that fairly broadly until completion of harvest and then we have to do some survey work under the wildfire act.** In terms of water resources up here the government database shows 49 records, 10 of them are inactive. I've got a little map that I'll pop up here in a minute. **21 licensees, 2 of which are government – kind of puzzled me why government had licenses up here but I guess they do. Primary uses up here are domestic and irrigation.** I'm sure you guys are familiar with this but essentially these are the units that those water licenses are associated with. We've already started – I've got a hydrologist hired – to start looking at the hydrology across the slopes here in terms of those units there and once we've refined our assessment of the timber types up above he'll be taking a look at those and any implications on the water resource values down-slope and that will be started this summer. There was a bit of mitigation work done in Fage Creek. George I think you'd be familiar with it - it was long before my time but...

GEORGE: Yeah, yeah... it was in '96

DAVE: They essentially cleaned up a bunch of things from some history up there – historic harvesting and road building operations. So that is the map of the water resource – points of diversion for lack of a better word. Grouse/Moul Creek there and then working down through canyon, Fage Creek here...

In terms of recreation resources what we've got identified as gazetted recreation reserves or trails – the one recreation reserve at Canyon Creek, which is showing on all three of these maps I believe. And then there's **five gazetted rec trails** – rec trails is a little bit of a... I don't know if it describes it adequately because one of those is Road 80. Like Road 80 actually has a recreation designation. There's two trails in Canyon Creek and two off the Trophy Mountain FSR, which all of those are showing on these maps as well. So in terms of trail resources those are the ones that I'm aware of 'cause that's what the government data set shows us.

So old growth – **we do plan for old growth** – it comes out of the Kamloops LRMP originally we're gone through a fairly extensive process since the LRMP to identify the **Old Growth Managements Areas (OGMA)** in the entire, what is it called now, the Thompson Rivers District – which includes Clearwater and Kamloops. The government right now is going through an internal process where they're reviewing the OGMA's spatially – they are all spatially defined. They're doing their consultation with First Nations and I would expect that we'll see – I am not sure if it comes out for public advertising, I don't remember – but it will be designated through some kind of order whether its land-use objective regulation or government action regulation. **The government's intent is to legalize those OGMA's with some criteria associated with it. So for the most part here in this landscape the OGMA's are identified right along the Trophy extension of Wells Gray Park and there is a couple other smaller ones that you can see but this was mainly around caribou habitat which the government felt was important so that's why they put the OGMA's there rather than other places.**

In terms of wildlife tree retention, again there are some commitments that come out of the LRMP, there's also a Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) that we are signatories to that talk about retention for wildlife. That's a specific decision that the prescribing forester makes on each block as to what is retained and where it's retained. Part of the reason for that is it depends on what the values they identify are. If there's, what would be a good example.... if they find a nest of some kind, or if they find a group of trees that's being used by an owl or something like that – that's where it tends to be focused.

Visual quality objectives. I know that that's been identified in the plan here. **Interestingly the Clearwater portion of the Thompson Rivers District has not got any established visual quality objectives.** This gets a little complicated I suppose. The terminology is kind of specific here, "establish the objective" means that the government has said 'here's the visual quality objective, you need to follow it according to these rules. That's occurred down in the Kamloops portion of Thompson Rivers but it has not occurred in the Clearwater portion. We do have some forest stewardship plan requirements around that, but they are less stringent under the Forest Planning and Practice Regulation than they are when they are established this way.

TOM: Was there a reason they didn't establish them up here – was there a reason or an oversight or not a priority?

DAVE: Yeah, that's a good question. **I think for a long period of time it was not a priority. Then at one point they tried to push it through the Kamloops LRMP and ran into some issues in terms of process and how they were trying to do it versus how the LRMP said it's done. So when they didn't get it through that I'm not aware that they've come back with anything else since.** There is a report, or an audit on visual resource management – Forest Practices Board (FPB) Report – that for those that are interested you can go and find it on the **FPB website. They did the audit, I believe it was last year, of visual management here.** One of the things regarding visuals in our FSP at least, this may not apply across the board to all other licensees, but **in our FSP where we are in a stand that is greater than 40% pine or all species in the stand are more than 20% damaged, then we have more flexibility around visual quality objectives than if those conditions didn't exist.** The reason for that is the scale when you're looking at pine stands, and you're looking at the scale of that event, to try and meet a visual quality objective whether it's retention or partial retention, it would lock you out of those areas. Now, saying that we have more flexibility we do recognize that that's a resource and we do try our best in terms of mitigating that, whether it's the type of areas we're retaining, the type of features within a block we're retaining and that's discussed to some extent in here – in this FPB report. Any questions there?

0:24:12

Range tenures -- there's two range tenures that I'm aware of up here. George, you pulled one of those, and then the other one is John McMann's, which currently is not occupied. It was [inaudible] above Jason [inaudible] at SR. There's **two trapping tenures** here. **No guide tenures -- there's no Crown Land commercial recreation tenured** in the area that I'm talking about, and I'm not sure if there's anything else, but I know there's -- you have tenure over this way on Road 80, but around this base I didn't see any indication of tenure in the government's data. **Fisheries values on the Clearwater River** obviously, which is where everything ends up. Interestingly, **Fage Creek has fish**, which you might know, but I was really surprised to find that out. But **I'm not aware that there's fish values in any of the other streams on this face. Wildlife resources -- mountain caribou**, that's governments address. A mountain caribou, which originally was part of the Kamloops LRMP then the government went through a process province-wide where they identified areas for essentially reserving them from harvest in efforts to provide the mountain caribou habitat needed to sustain the population targets that they – the population that they were targeting. So that's already happened in half a year, I believe, in 2007. **The government used their legislation to reserve significant areas in the North Thompson from harvesting. And in their mind, that addresses their mountain caribou concerns.**

FRANK: We were talking about fish stocks. Are you saying that Grouse Creek has no representation in that? That they say that's a fishless stream, or?

DAVE: That's what they say.

FRANK: No, that's -- that's just incorrect.

DAVE: Well, that's -- that's okay. I mean, I know there's -- I know there's a couple of really good fishing lakes that they don't identify.

TREVOR: So is it possible that the government may also have missed some important caribou habitat if they obviously don't catch everything?

DAVE: It's entirely possible -- but we could have a long discussion about mountain caribou.

TREVOR: I'm sure we will, but **the question is whether you'd be open to the idea that the government has not actually captured everything the caribou would require to persist at present numbers or target numbers in this area.**

DAVE: **Yeah. The government's data is only as reliable as what they chose to input. I know there's quite a bit of information that's missing out there.**

TREVOR: Yeah.

DAVE: **In terms of Mule deer and moose, winter range essentially, the LRMP has not identified any critical winter ranges up in this area.** They've identified two for the Clearwater portion of the Thompson River's district, and one of those is in Raft River, and then the other one is up by Vavenby behind that slope where you get all the deer bodies every winter. Those are the only two.

They removed the moose winter range. There used to be quite a few moose winter range habitats designated in Clearwater. They removed those when they created no-harvest areas for mountain caribou because they didn't see the logic of managing for moose when if you're managing and increasing the moose population, you are also drawing in the wolf population, which kills caribou as a secondary predator or secondary predatory relationship.

TREVOR: **So you just said that if you increase moose and other ungulates, that the government recognizes that that is detrimental or can be detrimental to caribou.**

DAVE: **Yes.**

TREVOR: **Would not logging in this area do the same thing by creating a younger habitat? This is just a question to ask whether you would acknowledge that that is a possible scenario.**

DAVE: **Oh, it's going to create early seral habitat which attracts the ungulates that will feed in that habitat, no question.**

TREVOR: Okay.

DAVE: Third one on the wildlife resource list that I have is species at risk. The government has a species-at-risk database through the Conservation Data Centre, I think it's called, where all of the species that they have cataloged as rare or endangered are entered. That is notoriously unreliable as a data set. There's -- I know we've made observations around where an endangered species is, and they're still not showing up on that data set. We also have the sustainable forest management plan that we're signed on to that talks, I believe -- I can't remember how many indicators we have around the species at risk, but there are a number both in terms of rare ecosystems and in terms of rare and endangered species on the government's list. And then there's wildlife habitat areas. Where they exist [inaudible] there's **no wildlife habitat areas in the Clearwater**. They are -- most of them right now are down in the Kamloops area in the drier belt where I guess they see that's a place they need to put some focus. And then the other piece here is site-specific findings which we -- we find them once in a while, species that are on the list that need special management, things like badger. I know one of the licensees was putting a block together and there was a badger area and they had to reserve that, so they reserved that area from harvest, just that kind of thing. These are the guiding principles for the Upper Clearwater. I don't know if you want me to read them -- read through them, or -- I may as well. Okay. **So for plan-area G -- which I understand there was a misunderstanding in the ministry and that area is actually bigger -- the right area's on these maps now. Integrity for a bear habitat to be maintained.** I'll go through this, and then I've got another couple of slides that talk about how I think our planning will either address or not address those values.

0:32:10

RYAN: Just a quick question about areas shown on the maps. What exactly were you talking about for area G?

DAVE: Okay. So area G is essentially from Moul to Grouse Creek down this line down to here.

RYAN: Actually, that north/south line is the boundary of the Wells Gray Park extension on the Trophies.

DAVE: **There's some confusion around that from my perspective, and it doesn't really matter where it is. I'm fine with it being on this line because we're looking at the values and everything downstream** as [inaudible]. So that's fine with me. Maintaining water quality, quantity, and timing of flow. And then there's a notation in there to precede any work with a hydrology study. Alluvial fan at Ordschig Creek. I can never pronounce that right. Maintaining habitat features and quantity [inaudible] bear dens. Maintaining old growth, visual quality, [inaudible] in Green Mountain. Informing the residents of activities that we might have planned. Assessing activities for impact on soil stability and water quality. Locating horse trails with caution. Some of these -- I've got a little list -- some of these won't apply to our activity, I don't think. Locating hiking trails away from cougar habitat. Mining activities should consider the unique values. Proposed mining activities should be referred. No gravel pits in the area,

and high-elevation logging in the Trophies should be referred to the public. So that is the list. (0:34:19)

RYAN: What's considered high-elevation logging?

DAVE: I don't know, but I'm taking that to be anything -- well, that blue on that map I would take to be high elevation [inaudible]. Once you're into the ESSF, Spruce-Balsam stands, you're into the higher elevation. So this is what I pulled out that I don't believe is applicable to woodlands operations, so any feedback if you think that these do apply, I'd appreciate it. I don't think that from our perspective locating horse trails -- that's not something that we're doing. Locating hiking trails away from cougar habitat or mining, and then I put in red, "no gravel pits in the area." I wanted to get an understanding of that one. Is that industrial gravel pits that we're talking about? Do we know?

STEVE: It was to do with road construction. They didn't want a mass excavation on the side where they wanted to build the road on site.

GEORGE: The idea of some of those, like, the horse trails and stuff like that, I mean, basically -- mainly they were talking about protection of privacy of people, and so -- and this, of course, would be a much minor kind of an intrusion on people's privacy -- locating a horse trail compared to, you know, a major harvesting operation. So that's just an indication of the degree to which people wanted concern for other people. So in a sense you're not going to be having horses, but the idea that that expresses goes [inaudible] located horse trails for caution. What I'm saying is that potential impact is infinitesimal compared to the impact that logging would cost, right, on a relative basis. So the fact that that may not address logging, it does affect, in a sense, on a whole lot of the [inaudible] guiding principles in the sense that people are concerned about, you know, their privacy and that factor. So --

TREVOR: And just to -- this just is also a question from just, not so much for later. You see that we've talked about the concern with cougar. That's because in the Canyons area, it's a well-known area for cougars, especially in the wintertime. I just want to ask you **whether you would agree with a proposition that, again, logging by creating ungulates will increase predators which will include cougar and therefore likely over time increase the numbers of cougar in this part of the valley.**

DAVE: Yeah.

TREVOR: **That was our concern. We just don't want interactions between people and predators.**

DAVE: M'mm-hmm. (0:39:40)

DAVE: Any other question? Comments? Okay. **So as a planning forester, when I read these things, I take perspective based on the framework that I'm operating in. So for plan area G, the integrity of fur bearing habitat -- from my perspective, we're**

managing that through coarse woody debris retention which we're committed to in our FSM plan. Wildlife tree species and placement and species with [inaudible] assessment. Those are things that we do now that in my mind lead to managing that particular principle. In terms of -- I've got a bunch of them together here. The water quality, quantity, timing flow, the alluvial fan at Ordschig Creek and the slope soil stability and water quality. We use a hydrologist to assess these kinds of things which we've started to look at already.

GEORGE: There's some important furbearers that don't care all too much about logs that are left on the ground. I mean, you have to have trees. I'm just saying that, some of the things that the way you analysed them, maybe -- I don't know. We'll be looking at them later, maybe.

DAVE: Right. Well, **I guess I'm saying from the perspective that I come from which is likely not the same as everybody around the table, we have a license to harvest timber over time. The land base gets harvested in order to manage these things. These are the things that we do on the harvesting side, and in order to manage the things that you're pointing out, that's why you have old growth management areas. That's why you have parks. That's why you have other -- in terms of the way government views it -- how they're going to manage their landscape. (0:42:19)**

GEORGE: And it's -- on the water quality, it's kind of hard to measure what it is now or after harvesting. I mean, you need to gauge streams ahead of time. You need to know what the normal flow is. It's not a question of logging it and then measuring it afterwards.

RYAN: Or the fluctuation over the previous decades.

DAVE: My career in forestry got started just a little bit before the [inaudible] code came into being. I view things, and this isn't meant as a criticism, this is just the way government was at the time. **Water quality, quantity, and timing of flow were buzz words for the day. I don't believe government knows what that is today on any stream that I can think of. I don't know. Other than maybe Penticton Creek. Quantity changes so radically depending on what your weather patterns are and things like that. It's -- it's a nice phrase, but I don't know that it means a lot by itself. There's -- this is why we do this; right? To spend money to try and figure that out, that costs an absolute fortune.**

GEORGE: Yeah, but to do it and have it damage because you didn't do a study is a lot more harmful.

DAVE: Right. But what I'm suggesting is that this is how we manage that. **The hydrologist is the one that takes a look at these values and will give us some sense of whether we're going to impact those based on what we're proposing.**

RYAN: But I guess George's point is how could even a hydrologist know that without having studied it for a period of decades?

DAVE: That's kind of why I said earlier [inaudible]. You're going to have a sense in terms of quality -- really, today you've got a stream. It's got natural events happening. It's going to have some sedimentation depending on what happens in that system; right? And it may be a one-event thing. It may be multiple, smaller events over time, so really your objective is don't add anything; right? If you're doing that, then mother nature's variations are what you'll scope out when you're done; right? Maintaining habitat features for [inaudible] and deer. I put in here and bear dens similar to the fur bearers, so you have those things. I take George's point, but really I'm not sure -- do you guys have information on this? On bear dens? **(0:45:21)**

TREVOR: We're gathering data right now on wildlife use in the area.

DAVE: Okay. Maintaining old-growth timber -- from the perspective I come from, government's done that. They made a decision on -- for beach landscape unit in the Thompson River's district about where the old growth was going to be placed, and they're in the process of finalizing that now. Old growth can also be reserved in wildlife tree retention areas, so this piece we have some control over managing, this piece we don't, or won't shortly because government's going to legislate that. Maintaining visual quality from Spahats on Green Mountain -- that's managed through our FSP currently, and I talked a bit earlier about more flexibility where there's more Pine. Where there's not more Pine, there's visual quality objectives out there that we do have to manage for. Informing the local residents and the high elevation logging and Trophies, that's why I'm here today. Any questions on this?

GEORGE: I guess some of it's just a matter of interpretation. **(0:46:43)**

DAVE: Yeah, it is. So what we've done to date -- those maps that I had over there will be helpful in a few minutes here. In terms of access -- so obviously the timber that's up on the plateau will be accessed from the Trophy Forest Service Road. The two areas north and south of Third Canyon, they're very tricky areas to access and really limited opportunity in terms of road placement. And when you're looking at road placement, you're looking at trying to mitigate any -- or minimize any risks related to where you're placing that road on the slope. So south of Third Canyon you've got these canyons that kind of constrain what you can do with the road system, so you're going to have -- if you put a road in there, it's going to be short and it's going to be like this going up the hill. North of Third Canyon you get some access, I think, right across from the woodlot, but then there's a piece of private land -- or not piece, but the way the private land changes here and comes out this way, if you were to access -- if you were to come off somewhere here with the road, have to come up really significantly to get around that private land, and you'd have to drop all the way back down here again, so it's a complicated road system and difficult to do, particularly now with the trucks that are hauling lumber. It's adverse. Grades of 5 percent are about as much as you want to go. We used to be able to haul steeper adverse grades, but one of the things with roads -- so when I say "adverse," that means the trucks taking the wood up the hill instead of down the hill; right? So if you have to build an adverse road, you end up with more road, not less road, because you've got to take that road farther to get to the same elevation if you -- instead of going [inaudible]. Which would

have to be [inaudible] anyway. So adverse roads give you a higher road density on a landscape. I guess that's the message. (0:49:06)

GEORGE: So what are you proposing? What are you planning?

DAVE: Well, what we're investigating right now, first of all, to -- we're -- [inaudible] we have a sense of these, but until we have the blocks identified that we want to take a closer look at, we haven't started on any of these yet. Like, if we don't find any volume here south of Third Canyon on that slope, then we're not going to do anything there; right? Same with this or this. I did send a map out. I think I gave it to --

GEORGE: I have one. I've shown it to the other folks and --

DAVE: I wouldn't be surprised if it got a reaction, and not a very positive one, but the third area of access is off Helsid Road which is a Ministry of Highways right of way to Crown Land, and that essentially -- if you're planning a road system, that gives you access to come back this way and come up here. Now, again, we're still in the early stages because I'm not sure how far down this comes with these blocks, and again, I was talking about adverse road. If you choose to try and take these blocks out the Trophy Forest Service Road, you've got an adverse all the down, and it's just a lot of road whereas the other route would take that volume out this way and through Helsid Road.

GEORGE: So you do or you do not know at this point what you intend to do? You're just still looking, or?

DAVE: We're still -- we're still in the early stages, like I say, and I'll explain exactly where we are here.

TAY: I was just wondering -- what sorts of volumes do you have to see? Because I'm just wondering where the government priorities fall out if you were taking that Pine out and where the volume maintenance kick in because I think sometimes they would be -- sometimes on those we don't have a lot of volume.

DAVE: Right. Right. Yeah, okay. Now I understand. So in terms of Pine stands -- our experience is Pine stand that is classified as age class 5 on the inventory maps -- usually has a P size that is viable either for Canfor Vavenby sawmill or Interfor Adams Lake or West Fraser Chasm. Once you get below a P size of about .2 cubic metres a tree (there's a little bit of play in that number) then it starts to rapidly fall off the table in terms of a saw log. I think the one important thing to understand out of this is this is how Canfor is viewing the world. There are other players on the landscape, and there's more players now than there's ever been. There is nothing -- and I'm not saying this to be alarmist, this is just the way the world is right now. **There's nothing stopping another licensee from coming into this area and planning a block and logging. And particularly when you start getting into those very small Pine stands, they may not have value as a saw log, but they may have value for bioenergy or some other purpose. Generally right now if it's a small P size Pine stand on steep ground over 40 percent, chances are it's not going**

to get touched by anybody because that means cable harvesting, and that's just too expensive. (0:53:26)

TAY: So I just have one more question. What about [inaudible]? I mean, I don't know how the value of those Pine stands [inaudible] but on some of the ones where you figure the P size is big enough, what are you finding as far as the value of that stand? I'm thinking for a small log [inaudible] how what's [inaudible] sit there not [inaudible].

DAVE: Yeah. I'm as surprised as the next guy how much we're able to recover out of those stands. It's pretty significant given what -- when you stand there and look at it, it doesn't look like there's much there, but it's quite surprising how good the recovery is through the middle. It's difficult. I was talking with our mill manager Friday when we put a bigger piece of wood like this through our canter [phonetic], it takes off what's called side boards. The side boards generally are not very good because that's where the checking depth is, but the centre boards are fine, so. You do lose some, but -- and in terms of P size, the smaller pieces actually appear to be better. **We're getting more recovery out of the smaller stuff than the bigger stuff. I think because there's less checking in it, but I don't know that for sure. (0:55:02)**

TREVOR: I'm afraid I don't know what P size is. "P size" is it?

DAVE: P size. So when you measure a tree, the diameter -- diameter times height divided by three, essentially. So the volume of the cone -- so the volume of the tree when it's .2 cubic metres or less, generally, you don't look much longer at those things. West Fraser Chasm I think is taking stuff down to .16 or .18. But we don't.

TREVOR: Okay. And the second thing is nowadays when there's a wind blowing in the forest and you're in the Pine forest, I mean, I don't feel safe anymore because you hear the trees coming down. So are people comfortable being out there with chainsaws knocking these things down when they're ready to go as it is?

DAVE: We have safety policies around that. Generally for harvesting operation it's not much of an issue because they've got rollover protection canopies and those kinds of things that are in a machine. It's more of a concern for the guys that are out walking around. When I was over in Lillooet I was working in a stand that was Pine that was dead 13 years, and you could almost push them over at that point. And we're not quite there yet, but we're getting pretty close. **(0:56:55)**

So this is the map that you guys I've got to try and read it. I handed this out without really thinking myself whether I'd be able to see it without glasses on or not. Maybe we'll start at the bottom and work up. So this is T-115 down here which is -- it's right up against Road 80, so essentially the old Road 80 is the boundary to the east, and the highway is the boundary to the west, and the park is the boundary to the south. So that we -- we've looked at that. That can be available for harvesting. It does contain a Pine component to it. It's not Pine priority lot. It's actually got more Fir than anything else in it, so. [ETC. ETC.]

TREVOR: So what do you mean by the word "defer" in this context?

DAVE: So **defer doesn't mean walk away from it. It means that right now it's not something that we're interested in.**

TAY: So just to be clear, the percentages that you assign to **(1:08:36)** logging, whether it's Pine greater than 40 percent or Pine less than 40 percent, in some ways is all administrative as far as your flexibility – as far as what you're allowed to do on the ground as far as visuals and cuttings and that sort of thing?

DAVE: Right now, it's legal. "Administrative" I suppose you could use as a term, but we have that legal right now with our forest stewardship plan that that's our limit.

GEORGE: Is there any significance in the year of attack as far as you're concerned?
(1:12:51)

DAVE: From my perspective in the short term there's not many significance to that. I just put it in there more for information so people got a sense of when it was --

GEORGE: Wouldn't matter when it was attacked then?

DAVE: At this point in time, that won't make a difference. **Once you've had two or three years post-attack, essentially they're pretty close to the same kind of log. (1:13:27)**

GEORGE: Until they fall over.

DAVE: Yeah, until they fall over, exactly. So our work plan short term -- I mentioned access is a problem for us, so we're planning to brush out the Trophy Forest Service Road and some Spruce so that we can get access into the back here. Right now when we get just about right to Buck Hill. That's about as far as we can get. Maybe with a really, really good snowfall we can get in there in the winter, but we're going to brush it out, brush out this road so we can get in the back end here. So our plan as soon as the spring is done or we've got access up there with a machine is we'll go in there and brush the road out so that we can get in there with the pickup. **(1:14:46)**

DAVE: Hydrology assessment -- we've already got the units identified. We're running some calculations on sort of the characteristics of each of those water sheds right now, and then when summer comes we'll start to take a look and feel at what's going on. As our plans firm up, the implications of those plans on hydrology will be assessed, and we hope to have that done by the end of this year. We'll be confirming the blocks in the field and making some decisions on those, and they'll either become -- and when I say "block," consider some of these blocks might split, so some of these great big ones we may choose to -- that we're going to take part of that block and not another part. So anyway, so it will either move to an available volume -- it'll go into that bucket, or it becomes not planned, and it gets on the deferred list. And then the ones that move to available get referred out. Like I said, we -- I sent you some information so we could start a conversation early. We

still have the ranchers, the trappers, and there's -- I don't want to send them out with vague information. They want to know where a block is. That's what they like to see, so once we've firmed it up, we know what it looks like, that's when we send -- we refer it out to First Nations, trappers, ranchers. And then **(1:16:23)**

TREVOR: The referral group of course is supposed to be referring this to people up at Clearwater. Is this map -- I mean, you have no other areas of interest that you're not showing here?

DAVE: I think if -- you're welcome to send it out as an interim because there may be more coming.

TREVOR: There may be more?

DAVE: Yeah. There may be more coming on the table as we get access into the back [inaudible]. I don't know at this point.

TREVOR: **The whole purpose of this meeting is to have something that we can refer, you know, we can actually alert people to what's planned.** We're already taking some flack because we've been a little slow at it, and so -- **(1:17:20)**

DAVE: Well, I think it's fine to take that out to them and say, "This is where Canfor's at today." That's fine.

I'm not going to give you guys a wrong answer here. There's always potential for change. I think that's part of what I was trying to get to with this. I think we've got it, but who knows. I could go out there this spring and basically most of that information has come from the government from me looking at air photos and from the government's inventory database. It's possible that there's something out there that I missed that they've got classified wrong. I don't know.

TREVOR: **Is this a process that goes on? Does it happen again in another ten years?** Or, like, you say you missed it. I mean, couldn't you just leave it missed and -- and just let us have this and say, "This is what we're working with"?

DAVE: **It's a periodic process. There's a number of stands that we're not interested in that right now are age-class 4 or an age-class 3, and 15 years from now those stands may look interesting. I mean, who knows what the industry's going to look like then.** But, you know, those stands may look interesting, so that's when you'd come back and you say, "Okay. Now we need to take another look up here." Ten or 15 years from now, that's when you're **(1:18:54)** adjacency constraints change again, right? Because usually you either have to deal with a block that is greened up; right? Or you're dealing with patches, and patches have to be more than 20 years different from their neighbour. So those -- when those things change, that's when you start to relook at them.

TREVOR: But I'm sure you can appreciate that from the point of view of people who live here, we can't be working with something that's always changing. If you want more, you should tell us the maximum and then we work on that.

DAVE: Right.

GEORGE: **It looks like your position is that being an interest area -- in your interest area or whatever -- there's no consideration really given to the people who have made the deal with Forest Service.** At least from your perspective that's all timber.

DAVE: Yeah, I'm not sure how to answer that. **This area falls within our operating area. We have a forest license that allows us certain volume per year of fiber. This is one of the places that it can come from.** If you have --

GEORGE: The forest license covers that -- this area?

DAVE: We have a forest license for the Kamloops TSA that allows us to harvest 209,638 cubic metres a year including this area. The licensees in the Kamloops TSA have gone through a process -- the major licensees, the ones with the replaceable license -- have got a gentleman's agreement about where they operate. This is where we operate, so the other majors don't encroach, but the non-replaceable licensees right now can operate -- unless their license restricts it -- can operate anywhere in the TSA.

GEORGE: So but to get to that question a little -- I guess I gave two questions in one -- kind of hard to

(1:25:30) answer those kind, but I guess what I'm trying to say is considering that whole that we're looking at, anything on this map between the Clearwater valley road east up the slopes to park boundary, that area north of Spahats and south of Moul Creek -- it's the idea or the opinion of Canfor that that is an area that they will be able to work in perpetuity. I mean, they will continue to consider that as in their wood basket and to make decisions to log in that area based upon how it fits into your overall plan?

DAVE: Right. Yeah.

TREVOR: **I was interested to hear about your gentleman's agreement. You know then how it would feel if you'd made a gentleman's agreement and somebody came in and dishonored it, failed to honour it, came in and competed where they said they weren't going to. Canfor wouldn't be happy with that, so you can understand that perhaps the people of this valley won't be happy if the same thing is done to us.**

DAVE: **Well, I understand.**

TREVOR: **Just so you understand. That's all. At this point it's just to understand.**

DAVE: **No, no. I understand. (1:26:59)**

GEORGE: What about the deciduous?

DAVE: That's not something that we have an interest in. It's something that Ainsworth -- well, there's a 20,000 cubic metre a year license awarded in the Clearwater portion of Thompson Rivers district for just deciduous.

GEORGE: Any of us that [inaudible] coming here because of the consideration for the guiding principle.

DAVE: That's up to Ainsworth. We're all companies, but we don't necessarily do business the same way.

GEORGE: That's understandable as long as you know what the rules are.

ERIK: Dave, just looking at the map, **a lot of blocks or potential blocks butt up to the park boundary. I'm just not sure with the present code, but do you have to log differently there than you would anywhere else?** Or is that just going to be --

DAVE: **The short answer to that is no. Park is a park, and I don't want this to sound flippant, but there are currently no rules around that. There are cases where licensees will do something different.**

ERIK: Right. But it's up to you? It's voluntary?

DAVE: It's up to the licensee. It depends on where, what, who, whether it comes up as an issue, those kinds of things.

ERIK: All right.

DAVE: So that was a long slide. The last thing is just the route finding. So once we've made our decisions here, looked at things, that's when we'll start looking at road systems. We're just not there yet. **(1:28:59)**

Medium term -- so for 2012, I think this is one takeaway. For 2012 our business plan is already essentially finalized. Part of our 2013 plan is already finalized, so 2013 and '16 is just the dates I've put on this, but there's nothing happening tomorrow, I guess, or short term is the message out of that.

TREVOR: So you mean in 2012 none of this will happen?

DAVE: There won't be any harvesting of any kind --

RYAN: Okay. Let's take ten. Thanks.

Second Recording 2/2

0:00:00

RYAN: First thing maybe we could do coming back now from the break is just talk about -- I know at least three people, maybe four, are here from when this process was gone through with Ministry of Forest to develop the guiding principles document. Maybe you guys would like to talk about that process just to give an overview of what all went into it.

TREVOR: Yeah. I guess some people here weren't present, so I'll say a few words and we can just kind of go down. The process started in the -- what was it? '97 or something like that, and it was -- what happened was we had a meeting in the precursor to this hall and sort of somebody came -- a couple people came from Ministry of Forests to basically tell us that we were going to have these woodlots in the valley and they -- the reaction was very electric and was quite almost violent, so much so that the -- if I think this is correct to say -- that they got out of here with their lives, basically. Ellen: It was really quite interesting actually because there was a lot of very grim-faced people sitting in the hall.

TREVOR: Yeah.

ELLEN: And they unfortunately sent two of the most mild people that worked at the ministry.

TREVOR: Yeah.

ELLEN: I recall one in a very quavery voice saying, "We're not the enemy, you know." And nobody even smiled, which was really serious.

TREVOR: Well, at any rate they decided that the way to handle this group of people was to initiate a process, and we were in that time when people were doing, you know, community based sort of land decision process, and so it was quite natural. So **the Ministry of Forest actually by and by hired a facilitator, Hannah Horn, who for two and a half years -- well, I think the process was almost three years by the time everything was signed off, but I think she was here for about two of those years as our facilitator, and so we worked it through, the local people and Ministry of Forest representatives trying to come to some sort of mutual understanding. Our understanding at the time and in fact to this day was that the document that was produced from that process would stand as kind of a higher-level document, at least in terms of practice if not in terms of legal standing as a signed agreement between the government and the local people -- sort of guiding practices in the valley, and because we put so much work into it personally and government itself had spent quite a bit of money orchestrating the thing, it seemed like it was something done in true democratic style, and so Jim Munn signed the document into effect, agreed to the terms and said he couldn't guarantee what would happen with regard to other interest groups like the mining and so forth, but for forestry the principals were acceptable to him and to his ministry and would be adhered to.** And at no point in this process did we say to ourselves, "Well, this is a five-year process." It was something that we were doing because we were permanently giving up parts of the valley for woodlots, of which there are three now, and in exchange for that, we had achieved what we assumed would be the balance in this valley with regard to harvest and use for industrial purpose

and the maintenance of the valley that we've all come to love. That was the principle. **As the referral group I need to say our purpose is not to represent the valley. We're bringing to your attention some of the background to all this, and we're gathering information at the end of this. We'll somehow present what there is to present to the people of the valley, and then the valley will decide what to do next.** So that's what I would say. Tom, do you have any further comments? (0:04:30)

TOM: I think it was **genuinely a community decision** because there were areas that they had identified as potentials, and we sort of roughly blocked them out, and then we made this sort of balanced decision. Here, this valley might outweigh this other one. Wildlife are more important in that area right adjacent to the park -- what was the area A? So we said, "Okay. As a community, we recognize that value is higher there but then other opportunities might be available down in this other adjacent areas." So my memory of it was that it was really quite a good process. Everybody's ideas were on the table and, you know, we respected everybody's ideas. And then some won; some lost, and you walk away with that.

GEORGE: I always think about the letter that **Jim Munn who was the district manager back in 1999 when this Upper Clearwater process was finally completed.** And the Forest Service was really helpful to us. They actually hired a moderator. Tay worked for a while as moderator until they got somebody. Forest Service was more than anxious to help and they hired that girl by the name of Hanna Horn, and she moderated throughout the whole process for a couple of seasons. And there was lots and lots of meetings, but the thing that always kind of impressed me that I don't often see this kind of a statement coming from anybody, especially forestry people, but we [inaudible] saying that agreeing to support the guiding principles. He said -- well, there was -- he did mention that some people didn't sign on, and that's to be expected because it was a consensus procedure, you know? It was everybody, and what most of the people would agree to was what finally was agreed to. **About the process he says, "I believe that through this process we have achieved a new level of understanding and trust in each other as individuals, businesses, even government." And that's what we're dealing with here. And he said, "Entrusted with the task of finding and implementing solutions to a broad range of sometimes seemingly conflicting values, I believe that with the guiding principles, there is a balance with which we can all live."** And what else can you say? [Inaudible] I think certain things were given and certain things were taken, but this is an agreement between, as he says, businesses, government, individuals, everybody. So I think it has some strength and meaning and some longevity more than up to 2012. I think there's something we have to consider very seriously, and we need to talk to the Forest Service and also talk to Canfor. Hopefully there's some understanding there. Anyway, that's about all I can say.

TAY: I guess having served with the LRMP and with that experience, the idea of the need for a consensus-based process that included as many knowledgeable parties as possible was accepted as a gateway to make decisions [inaudible] and basically the process was entered with the blessing of the Ministry of Forests and the auspices [inaudible]. So I think when the document was produced, it was produced in that vein as an add on in

saying [inaudible]. So I think it was considered and again probably as a testament to the amount of time people put into that document that it was entered into with the feeling that it would be considered seriously in the future. (0:09:55)

STEVE: Well, one of the things with the document is people that -- long term or short term people here, they were brought -- the newer people came because of the way the valley functioned -- whether it was completely dysfunctional or not -- the document was produced as a living entity. It wasn't supposed to hold back time or anything else. **Things change constantly as have the people here, but principles in the document remain the same, and we have seen people attempt to do things here.** Mining was one of them that didn't meet with the needs -- and again was consensus. It was the closest we could get to people agreeing, but everyone got their say, and so new people or old, it didn't matter. The value was there for each individual reason. The people had to say something, so in 2011 it's no different than it was in 1996 when we started, you know? There's different people here now, but the valley remains, and if we don't look after it, that therein is the problem. We may sound like a bunch of people from hillbilly heaven, but all we want to do is protect what's here. One of the things you have to remember, Dave, is the only thing we have between us and Wells Gray Park is the buffer that you're looking at logging; right? It's all around us, so we realize that things will change within it, but if we can't have some input into what happens, then it's a waste of time for us. We don't [inaudible] but we can't control what you do, but we might be able to influence them, and that's all we want out of this meeting here. Our next step will be the forestry to see what they have say about the legality of the document, you know? So in the long term all we want to see is something left.

RYAN: All right. We talked a little bit about timeline, I guess. I think I recall there's going to be a record of landowner comments or absentee land owners --

ELLEN: Yeah, I have people who are absent at this time. Most people will be back in valley in May.
(0:12:44)

TREVOR: Yeah, I think -- so as I recall it was 18 or 19 people were contacted who are absentees. And of those, was it 14 who replied?

ELLEN: Yeah, indicated that they would like to take part.

TREVOR: Yeah. So the majority of people want to actually be present to partake in discussions and so forth, and they're not here right now, so.

DAVE: Right. So how does that work? What's -- what's the plan for that? The referral group will get together, do what it is you need to do -- whatever that looks like -- and then are you guys presenting something to the community? Is that the thinking? Just so I understand it.

RYAN: Yeah. As far as timing on our part goes, we're gathering information now. We'll meet again as a group to then figure out how we're going to get in **(0:14:00)** touch with community members, especially those who want to be physically here to walk around, look at maps on the wall in the hall with all of us to understand better what -- what's going on in the valley. So as Steve said, once we've met as a group to discuss that, we'll then also be having to discuss with the Ministry of Forest, and that's as part of this referral group -- my understanding is **the referral group is an entity that gathers information, disperses information, and communicates with the Ministry that information.**

TREVOR: Yeah, I think the rest of the -- if I may -- I think the rest of the answer to your question is that we don't have any mandate to represent the valley. We're just representing the process that took place, and so once the information goes out -- with this map -- goes out to the people of the valley, then whatever happens happens. And so I'm sure some group will configure, whether this is a nucleus of it or whether it becomes a completely separate group, no way of knowing at this point. Or there may be more than one group for all I know. There may be opposition groups. Who knows what will happen. But something will certainly come, but we can't say what that is now.

DAVE: No, that's fine, just so I understand it. And, sorry, any vision on when you'll sort of have some information to provide?

TREVOR: The information -- I mean, what **we're saying with the absentee people is that really not too much should be happening until they're actually here to participate because they're -- I mean, they own land in the valley, and they go away in the wintertime, but anyway they've indicated that they want to be involved, so sometime -- was it mid May or so -- would be the earliest that we could start to gather these.** There's some, if I recall, who can't be here until later than that, but the --

ELLEN: But the greater majority will be here by then.

GEORGE: At the conclusion of this Upper Clearwater public input process, the Forest Service told us that they would like to see us set up a referral group and they would be a liaison between any activities, especially including logging, compositions due to logging or whatever, that they would get the information and kind of represent the people in the valley and then the Forest Service -- then this was supposed to -- Forest Service was than supposed to be engaged; right? None of us -- we were just sort of trying to gather some information with respect to guiding principles and then [inaudible] and talk to whoever in the Forest Service is willing to talk to us or wants to, probably Rick Sommer. He was up and he seemed, you know, like a pretty fair sort of a fellow anyway, so he has, I think, some copies of the guiding principles. But other than that he -- he hasn't been involved. So we'll involve him and talk about the thing and see what happens with you folks will probably [inaudible] be involved in some way when we're going to try to work this out. **(0:19:20)**

DAVE: I have a question. Moul Creek, is there a trail there right now?

ELLEN: On the north side of the creek there is.

DAVE: So in this may carry no water, I have no idea. I'm only making this comment because I was talking outside and went through a similar process with a community over in Lillooet, and one of the questions that I asked them was, "**Understanding in all likelihood that there's something that will happen, what would you like to see happen that's actually going to provide value to you?**" Right? And I don't know what that looks like. Maybe the answer is there isn't anything, but I was just wondering because maybe you want to keep this wild, but maybe you don't. Maybe you want to be able to put a trailhead in there and gain access.

TREVOR: **If we were to answer that question we would be betraying our role here when we're not supposed to be representing the valley.** The valley can answer that question.

DAVE: I'm just putting the question forward. Is there anything -- understanding the area, understanding these other maps and the discussion that I had -- is there anything that's of value to you guys that can come out of any activity that we might do? **(0:21:25)**

STEVE: **Well, be aware, Dave, that there's no skidoo or quad access right now. As soon as you put roads in, that changes the volume of people that are in here. Now, it's not our private domain, but it's work to go to any those places right now. It will not be once you finish the process that you're describing, and it's also behind the houses all the way up, whereas right now we don't have to deal with people crossing the property [inaudible] existing trails or whatever you do. But overall, people can't access some of the areas because of private land. As soon as you access it through Crown Land, it changes the whole dynamics of what exists around there.**

DAVE: Right.

TAY: Dave was just asking us to consider it, and we will.

DAVE: So, I mean, there's potential solutions to the issue that you just raised, and one of them is don't give Crown Land access -- access through private land that can be closed off. That's one possibly. I mean, I know -- I can tell you that there's government regulations that could be enabled to stop that, but based on my experience to date, they enabled the regulation and can't enforce it, so [inaudible] but anyway just as a ...

0:23:00

TREVOR: So are we in question/answer, or?

RYAN: So might as well, yeah, go around the table with any specific questions anybody has in particular. Anybody want start?

TREVOR: Well, I have several questions. I can ask one and see where it goes. I just want to know from the point of view of Canfor who actually makes the decision? Like, who decides what's going to happen in the end? How does that actually play out? Is it at your level? Or the level above you?

DAVE: In terms of which decision?

TREVOR: Well as to, I mean, if there's a process, you know, for and against logging in this valley, which I suspect there will be, are you the one who decides we will log here or we will not? Or who is there another person who has to be talked to?

DAVE: So let me put it this way. So we go through a process -- let's assume or believe that the outcome is some opposition. I would inform my bosses that here's where we sit --

TREVOR: Okay.

DAVE: -- and then they would inform me where we go.

TREVOR: Okay. So could I have your bosses names?

DAVE: No.

TREVOR: That's not fair. So he will not give us his boss's names. Is there a reason for this?

DAVE: Are you recording this?

TREVOR: Of course I am.

DAVE: Well, I don't know. It would have been helpful to know that. I can give you my boss's name. I don't have a problem with that.

TREVOR: Well then please do.

DAVE: I will. I'll give you his contact information. I'll e-mail it to you.

TREVOR: Okay. **We'll be getting his boss's name. So this is the person who will decide one way or the other on the industry's side whether you'll go forward with this?**

DAVE: Yes.

TREVOR: Okay. Thank you. I have several more questions, but maybe other people should join in. **(0:25:11)**

TAY: Since we haven't a visual management process up here, and they aren't finding any visual quality concerns over and above, you would be using the forest practices code?

DAVE: Yeah. **We will be using the visual quality objective information that's committed to in our forest stewardship plan, and that's linked to the forest planning practices regulation section 9.2.**

TAY: Forest planning practice regulation section 9.2 – but Canfor develops their stewardship plan based on that, and your visual quality objectives come from your stewardship plan that you developed.

DAVE: So with visual quality objectives, I guess first of all they either exist or they don't.

TAY: Right. And we've established they don't; right?

DAVE: No. So there is mapping information available for Clearwater that provides recommended information.

TAY: Oh, it includes this area as well? **(0:26:34)**

DAVE: Yes. It's not established so under legislation. Because it's not established, you then move to section 9.2. And 9.2 describes how you're going to manage visual-quality objectives in the absence of these established ones over here.

TAY: So you're saying that they are developed but not adopted? Is that what it means by "not established"? That they do exist, but they're not accepted, or?

DAVE: Yeah, **they have to go through a process at a couple levels. One level would be the -- as I understand it, they would have to take it back to the Kamloops LRMP because right now the Kamloops LRMP has designated scenic areas, and it would require a change to that plan. And if you change that then that requires a change in -- or an amendment to the higher purpose -- an amendment to the land-use objective regulation, and once that's done, then they would have to establish them under a government action regulation, I believe. But there's a regulation. Don't quote me on whether it's government action or that there's a regulation that allows it to be established at some point.**

TAY: So basically as far as Canfor is concerned, because those objectives weren't established here under that process that you go back to 9.2 in the forest stewardship plan to determine visual quality objectives in your area of work?

DAVE: Yes. **(0:28:25)**

GEORGE: The issue a little bit beyond the current view requirements, like the map from the lookout – the old lookout -- and it looks like end of this area and there is a recommended visual for retention or partial retention for that area. Now, I don't know to what degree that adds forest, but that map is in existence. I talked to the people in -- I don't know. They change everybody around [inaudible] the person who was in visual quality, I forget the guy's name.

DAVE: Yeah, Peter Remmy.

GEORGE: Peter, yeah; Remmy, yeah. Exactly. [Inaudible] anyway, but in addition to those, which do exist, [inaudible] I know I have a map at home. But **there's also the kind of concern about visual quality that people have maybe -- take Fisher Place there. I mean, he's got his restaurant and this that and the other thing, and it looks like that hill** right across from him right next to Ryan's property there which is right -- gets [inaudible] all the rest of it, and if that hill turns into kind of a messy-looking area with roads all over it and skid roads or whatever, there's some sort of an economic impact there that may not be so much directed in some other policy, but **it certainly is going to affect, you know, people's businesses.** And so that's another aspect of it that may not be in any regulation, but it may have some impact for him and probably for other folks too. Frankly he's got a couple of really nice structures that -- making a living, helping, feeding [inaudible] right across the creek from the road, logging trucks been up and down all the time. Things like that do have affect on people. **(0:31:00)**

TREVOR: I guess the question you're asking is how will Canfor address people's concerns? I mean, **to what extent are you willing to kind of move and relocate and back off and so on if people come up with concerns of this kind?**

DAVE: I'd like to see the concerns before I make any comment.

TREVOR: Does that mean that you would actually back off? Or I guess it doesn't mean you won't back off. You'd like to see them, so presumably you mean that you would back off if the concerns seemed to be legitimate?

DAVE: Well, it depends what the concerns are. **There are some things that we can address, and there's other things that we likely can't address.**

TREVOR: So there's, you know, okay. So the point is you're prepared to address some stuff.

DAVE: I came here because we're prepared to have a discussion.

TREVOR: You came here to give us information, and we're getting information by asking questions.

DAVE: Right. So let me back this up another notch. **From a current forest legislation perspective -- not mine, but from the legislative perspective -- the only thing that forest licensees refer to the public these days is our forest stewardship plan. There's no requirement beyond that, so coming here is -- whether it's here or anywhere else, it doesn't really matter -- it's more of a professional obligation than a corporate one, so I think that's important for people to understand. It's different. It used to be under the forest practices code days that a lot of things went out to the public. That's not the case anymore.**

ERIK: Earlier when you had some points that you were considering, like when you were doing your planning process --

DAVE: Yeah.

ERIK: -- and you asked if we had any more suggestions to bring them to you, and one of the things is **there's often a debate about where the entrance to Wells Gray Park is, you know, the gateway. For me anyway, and I think a lot of people agree, the overwhelming emotional entrance to Wells Gray Park is coming over the canyons. That's where people -- you get up to the top there, and the whole park just opens up in front of you. This is where hundreds of thousands of tourists that come here to visit it for this sense -- feeling. This is where they get it is coming across that top. And there's obviously the park entrance in Clearwater saying we're the gateway as well, but that's the emotional entrance to the park, and if they're going over this area and the slopes to their -- on both sides of the valley are logged, it will impact that sense a lot. And people come here for that, so I'm just making that point.**

DAVE: Good. (0:33:56)

TREVOR: Okay. I guess the question that really has to be asked -- whether it's by me, it doesn't really matter -- but what is Canfor's -- or if you can't speak for Canfor -- **what's your position vis-à-vis the guiding principles that predate you by a decade?**

DAVE: **I think they inform. Like, I put up on the board some of the -- some are up on the screen -- some of the ways I think we address them and how we go about developing permits, developing blocks, and developing landscape. So from that perspective we paid attention to them. They're very broad, don't give a lot of detail to them. There's not much behind them, so from a broad perspective, I think what I showed goes a distance to addressing them. There may be other things, as I mentioned, that I'm not aware of that I'm open to.**

TREVOR: I'm very interested in that statement that you've addressed -- you feel you've addressed -- the guiding principles insofar as **I thought when you were telling us how you set these blocks out, you were telling us, basically, you were looking for timber type and volume. That doesn't seem to have much to do with the principles.**

DAVE: Yeah. Well, what I was talking about on the board was things like old growth. You have one of the guiding principles is around old growth.

TREVOR: Yes.

DAVE: **The government has come up with a strategy for old growth; right? There's a couple other things in there -- I would have to go back and look -- but I think there's already things in place that address some of those guiding principles, and that's what I was getting at.**

TREVOR: Okay. **We're obviously reading the document very differently, but that's fine. We'll get there.**

GEORGE: [Inaudible] trying to explain the coarse woody debris -- that's stuff that ends up on the ground in so many cubic metres or hectare, but it doesn't **(0:36:03)** affect these trees that are probably going to -- green trees that are in the area will probably be more [inaudible] for a wildlife than coarse woody debris. I mean sure, certain members of the wildlife community do require coarse woody debris, but there's lots of them that need green trees or trees because either they roost in trees or they hunt in trees or [inaudible]. And so it's -- even though, I mean, you mentioned that part of what you do will affect wildlife, but that's really all. **You're not going to address that particular guiding principle which refers to all wildlife and not just wildlife which needs coarse woody debris.** So there's a partial addressment of it, but not really a real, true addressment of it. And you might say as far as the old growth goes, yeah [inaudible] growth management areas [inaudible] looked at and set aside, but there's old growth up there and to [inaudible] creek and places like that, Furs like that. I mean, they're huge and they're beautiful. And it's a patch that managed to avoid the fire in 26. And there's lots of places where there's old growth, and they're not in our news, but they're there. And this doesn't say it has to be in [inaudible]. It says what we're interested in is preserving some old growth here in the valley. Not only for wildlife, but for people who can hike up. It's worth the hike up there just to walk through that stuff. It's amazing. Anyway, here [inaudible] cut down necessarily that's why we had the guiding principles, and these aren't [inaudible], but they're important. But they'll be eaten up and gobbled up and gone, you know, because -- anyway, that's why [inaudible]. Even though you have addressed it, I think, and you made a real attempt to it and you have pointed it out that **there are certain parts of your program that probably would address some aspects of the guiding principles, but really they're a long way from addressing them,** and it's not your fault, I'm not trying to say you did anything wrong. I mean, we appreciate you coming, we really do. You're a great guy, and we just -- we're trying to learn from each other, but those are some things that I just wanted to point out. **(0:38:58)**

DAVE: No, and that's why I'm here.

GEORGE: Yeah, exactly, and we appreciate that.

TREVOR: As for me, I'm sure you're a good guy, but I don't know that yet. But I will know that within two years. But I've just been sitting sort of digesting your comment about having, you know, accommodated the guiding principles. **The guiding principles, as I think Tom said, were intending to get a balance between the amount of dedicated to industry in the valley and the lifestyle. We had achieved that balance ten years ago, and you're proposing to come and make the valley into something different than we agreed ten years ago,** and that takes us out of bounds. We did this so, I mean, we're not talking here about not in our backyards. **Ten years ago we said, "Okay, in our backyard we'll allow this**

and this and this,” and the Forest Service signed off on it at that time and gave us a sense that we had done our bit toward industry, and we now have two mills in the valley for example. I don't think that proposing cut blocks at all addresses the spirit or the intention of the guiding principles. Anyway, this is where we'll find out whether you're a good guy or not.

STEVE: So remember, we're only the tip of the iceberg.

DAVE: Oh, I understand that.

STEVE: You haven't seen the valley in action.

DAVE: Actually, I have around Buck Hill. I've seen a little bit of action. I used to work for LP, so. **(0:40:57)**

TOM: So if you wanted to go at that high elevation stuff, would you have to pass your plans over to the caribou people and the provincial committee? Or how does that work?

DAVE: So the mountain caribou conversation gets very interesting. Government, in its wisdom, chose to adopt a preservation strategy to manage caribou populations everywhere except I think -- well, I shouldn't say everywhere. But so they adopted a preservation approach, and in some areas of the Thompson Rivers district they added a zone adjacent to that that allowed -- that recommended licensees adopt -- it's like a -- what do you want to call it? It's not your standard forestry practices. It's forestry practices that will assist in bringing that landscape after it's harvested back to a suitable condition sooner, whether it's retaining clumps of stems or, you know, stems where lichen can populate --

TOM: And I know Wes Bieber did an awful lot of that stuff and Berry Creek and --

DAVE: Well, he tested a lot of theories, and we presented -- as a group of licensees we presented an approach to government which they chose not to accept. And they went on the approach that they did. Interestingly enough, **the Trophy area does not have a modified harvest practice zone.**

GEORGE: Okay. **They did have -- they did have a modified practice zone.**

DAVE: For a period of time, I think, in the Kamloops LRMP, I think. But when they zoned it, I think the Trophies was still not zoned for caribou habitat. **(0:43:22)**

GEORGE: After -- I forget what year it was. It was either in '92 or '96 -- well, this -- on the caribou. The caribou at one time, as part of the LRMP, it had two particular ways to harvest -- ways that they could harvest. One was that they were supposed to harvest and leave certain size blocks in between the blocks that are harvested, and it was supposed to act as a buffer. And there was a -- and then the other angle of it, it was a little bit more restrictive as to the percentage of stems that they had to leave. But then in 2009 -- and that was part of the LRMP for a long time. [Inaudible] but of course at the time before the LRMP process really got going [inaudible] had removed the habitat, most of it. I mean,

you look at those maps and all these green blocks, they're all out of blocks. That was all high elevation Spruce and Alpine and Fir. And that was all what they call late-winter habitat which is incessantly for caribou survival. They took it out, so in 2009 then some people in agriculture tried to change it, and they did change it. And eventually there was an order issued by the Ministry of Environment in 2009, which was subsequent to a full and lengthy process -- several years -- carried out by the species-at-risk coordinator -- call that SARCO. [Inaudible] but it must be a government body that is concerned about species at risk, which the caribou is a species at risk. And you have to take special concerns for species at risk. And they had public and stakeholder input. I never hear of it. (0:46:00)

DAVE: I was involved in it.

TREVOR: (0:50:12) Well, if you look at your map, the one that Dave's provided, there's a white area just around where the roads fork there at Buck Hill. That area was burned in 26, and it's grown up now, and caribou actually do come down there. There's a major wildlife crossing below the south face of Buck Hill. Anyway, they come down there, and if you go up there and you ski around in the wintertime, you see that perhaps they are actually accessing -- not in great numbers -- but they're accessing. They're exploring, I guess, looking for habitat down here because there are times when they need to come down to mid-elevation, good habitat with hair lichens, and anyway that's another subject. But it's wrong to say they're not using the area. They do come down because I've seen tracks myself, and I'm going to go up this winter and try and see some more tracks, so.

TREVOR: (0:53:10) So, I guess, may I ask another question?

DAVE: Fire away.

TREVOR: So assuming -- let's just do what we would call from our perspective worst case scenario -- that is, you do come in here and you log; okay. So these patches are gone. Then in 10 or 15 years it happens again? I mean, it doesn't stop once it starts? Once it starts it's --

DAVE: That's fair to say.

TREVOR: Yeah. So it continues, so ultimately this valley would just be part of the working forest like any other valley in the province. That's important because a lot of people assume it's a onetime thing whereas it's not a one time.

DAVE: No.

TREVOR: It's a beginning of something continues until the sun goes out or whatever --

DAVE: Right (0:53:58)

TREVOR: Okay. So it sounds as though what's happening at this point is that the forestry is basically getting as much wood as it can into its mills before, you know, things become untenable and then it just, you know, the money it makes from there it invests in women's lingerie -- wherever it goes, right? It goes somewhere else, but this is sort of the last days. If there's this famous fall down that they've been talking about for the last three or four decades, it's upon us, and so the mills are actually speeding up their rates of operation over what they've done in the past. This is the start -- this is the -- you can dispel this rumour if it's wrong.

0:55:30

DAVE: Okay. I'll do that.

TREVOR: Please. Is it wrong?

DAVE: In my opinion it is. Mills run based on business decisions. And whether you're bringing wood in that's private wood or what we call [inaudible] wood, which is our license volume, the mix of that changes depending on cost, various other profile -- various factors. **There is a fall-down effect coming, and powers much greater than me are making decisions on how they're going to address that when it comes. In the interim, the sawmills that are out there are running and they are trying their best to make money, and those that aren't making money have been shut down.** And those that -- whoever the decision makers are [inaudible] and it's got very little, if anything, to do with the kind of things you're taking about.

TREVOR: Except that they will -- they will no longer run once they no longer make money -- what you just said? **(0:56:40)**

DAVE: If you're not making money, you're not going to run very long.

TREVOR: Yeah. Okay. Fair enough. **So then it just becomes a question of how long will your mill make money, and you don't have the answer to that.**

DAVE: And the fall-down question is a real question and there's lots of studies out there. I think there's a couple of think tanks that tried to work through that and said in -- I believe the Royal Bank analyst actually for forestry came up with some numbers around how many mills they expect to see in existence post mountain pine needle, so that's constantly happening.

TREVOR: Yeah.

DAVE: There's mills being repositioned and shutdown and started up and rationalized all over this province. **(0:57:27) Canfor's closed at least one operation up in Prince George in terms of rationalizing how they do business. Other operations are doing the same thing, so that will play itself out over the coming years and who, you know, who knows what that's going to look like.**

TREVOR: Yeah. I feel -- I guess you understand the reason for my question is that you're informing us that there will be some logging in our valley. **Somehow for me it would make a difference if the company, the industry, that was doing this was going to be part of this our community forever, or if it's just some cooperation that will keep operating until it's no longer feasible to do and then will shut down. In which case what we're left with is the aftermath of an industry in its sort of final phases. That's a very, very different picture; right?**

DAVE: Yeah.

STEVE: **For years Slocan, CTP, wanted to log Wells Gray Park, but the bottom line was if it took Wells Gray Park to save the mill, the mill was already done. And I have the same -- very same idea with Canfor. We don't have enough wood in this valley to keep Canfor going. It's only a small portion in the basket, but I think what you're going to find is the majority of people here will say that you don't need it in your basket. There's wood other places. The impact on us is direct. It's not on Canfor, so we'll have to live with what you do.** And, again, I'm only voicing my -- my family's been here for just shy of a hundred years (1:02:29).

GEORGE: Ordschig Creek, the highway's finally getting replaced, and we get tired of replacing [inaudible]. That place would -- used to be a little meandering, kind of nice creek, and after they finished up there, I'll tell you, it washed out. It must have washed out a number of times and finally they said, "To hell with it." (1:05:48). You can't even walk through it now. It was a little piddling creek. It dries up, you know. But, boy, can be a mean sucker. It can come down there just -- you just can't believe it, just shoots of water. And it's all now eroded. I mean, some places 6 feet deep down there now. (1:07:12)

DAVE: Yeah. **Well, that's why we've got the hydrologist coming to take a look.** You can get a sense of the drainage just based on looking at it. You don't need to see the water in it.

TREVOR: So just so I understand, **you're not going to be cutting any deciduous; is that right?** Is that what you were saying earlier?

DAVE: **Not as a rule. It's not our -- it's not what we do.** We don't know deciduous, and usually if we run across deciduous, it ends up being retained on site -- standing, preferably.

STEVE: **So does that mean that in the AAC, if you're cutting evergreens, it can be subcontracted, the deciduous?**

DAVE: No. Our -- I shouldn't say no. We don't do it. **There's been proposals on the table from licensees who do harvest deciduous to go in and harvest the deciduous before we go in and harvest the coniferous. It's never actually happened. I don't know how that would actually work.**

STEVE: Well, the reason I say that is there's two sawmills still here that operate strictly on deciduous, Birch. And it's not inconceivable that you guys may go in, push these blocks through, and then subcontract out the Birch that are there because the two mills are right here. They would certainly be in favour of hauling them out. Now all of a sudden we have nothing standing, not even the deciduous. You see, there's no guarantee that deciduous isn't going to be taken down. (1:09:25)

GEORGE: These Birch trees can transpire, pump out of the ground, water a couple [inaudible] tree in a 24-hour period, and you start taking the Birch down and then the soil is -- there's nothing to take the water out of our soil, it's going to [inaudible] and they're [inaudible] quantities now if you do work up there and we're going to have a, you know, great big portions of that area are going to slip out. I mean, you just can't take all the --

STEVE: Were you even aware that that would be one of our concerns -- the deciduous within the wild blocks?

DAVE: Not in the way you're characterizing it.

TREVOR: I guess the question is, is there anything on the table from anybody operating in this valley as a means to get Birch or whatever? This is just Canfor talking here?

DAVE: Just Canfor.

DAVE: (1:14:00) I just have one. I'd like to know what you're doing with that or the purpose of that.

TREVOR: So you mean why we're recording this?

TREVOR: The reason is that we were actually going to have a transcriber here, but she couldn't make it.

RYAN: We all wanted to participate in this meeting rather than scrambling writing notes, and we weren't able to get a hold of or hire a note taker, so.

DAVE: Okay.

TREVOR: I don't know what's going to happen with this process. As you say it's [inaudible] valley, but I think that we have to record everything that gets said one way or the other, and I mean ...

RYAN: We're hoping to copy you on all this as well.

DAVE: I would appreciate that.

RYAN: Thanks... A couple of comments that I have just from discussions I've had elsewhere with people who are away in the States for the winter and within the group and

things I've heard -- the big things I see are that **a forest company coming in to do clear-cut logging on the hill can't guarantee there won't be impacts to water, there won't be impacts to wildlife, and there won't be impacts to visual aesthetics. I see those three items as being really critical to whatever you are looking at for a plan and going forward.** And when you start talking about roads across hillsides, I mean, holy smokes. If you're driving to town from Flat Iron Trailhead that's what you're looking at. If you're sitting down for dinner at the Black Horse Saloon, that's what you're looking at. So that's just one comment I wanted to make about that. Also -- and I think it was mentioned earlier -- I think Eric mentioned about this idea of the entrance to the park as you come up on the crest of the canyons. What? Yeah -- that's what **my comment was going to be about the proposal for UNESCO status of the park.** I think that visual quality of the corridor as you're -- I mean, yeah, you've got the park on two sides, basically, and this funny little corridor -- it's like a dog leg sticking up -- **that I personally don't believe it ought to be treated like every other valley,** and so that's something that I think you need to consider in the planning process as well because it's a pretty unique dog leg as far as --

ERIK: You're aware then UNESCO --

DAVE: Yes.

ERIK: -- and that part of the requirements for that application or that process is that they see a consensus process between everyone who lives there, like, in other words a community. They don't want to see it treated, like, haphazardly, so that's one of the requirements to get that status is that there's a sense of care for -- even if you are resource extracting and running businesses that there's still a sense of care for something greater than individual businesses. There's a greater care for some concept that's bigger than the players.

DAVE: Right.

TREVOR: **Every inhabited valley in inland British Columbia has at some point had somebody like you come and somebody like us sitting here on the other side and say, "We want our water; we want our forest; we want our wildlife; we want..." And you have to only look at Google Earth to see what actually happens. The only things that cause this valley to be different than the others are: (A) this document that we worked on -- the democratic principles involved; and (B) the fact that this is an incursion, if you like, into Wells Gray Park, and so there's a context here; and (C) therefore the fact that tens of thousands of people come up and see this area every year who come with expectations. (1:21:52)** There are lots of things that make this area different, and I think you'll find if you decide to push forward you'll find that there will be much greater resistance from us than from others - it's just a question of how much time you want to spend on it.

RYAN: The only other question that I had on my list was, **are you aware the Forest Practices Board recently identified salvage logging as a contributing factor to negative impact on water sources?**

FRANK: Dave, I was thinking this afternoon that **there's something like 9 or 10 tourist-oriented businesses in this corridor, so the whole process of visual-impact objectives is really important -- me being one of them. And I see that as something that seems to have been left out of the process by your saying that there didn't seem to be any specific designations up here, so it reverts to that section 9.2.**

RYAN: Like, all it says specifically in the guiding principles (1:25:13) is in area G, not even in relation to all areas, but in area G it just says: "Maintain visual quality from Spahats picnic area and Green Mountain."

DAVE: Right.

FRANK: You know, that's a major issue specifically for me, and I don't speak for anyone else, but kind of coupling with what Eric was saying about the emotional entrance is obviously if that will have an impact on my business and others. If you have a choice of having an accommodation in a particular area or in some other place in which the view is markedly different, so I see that as a major issue that needs to really be spoken to.

DAVE: Okay. It's still out there. It's just in a -- it's not in the form one would expect.

RYAN: Okay. So does anybody have any other specific questions, comments? (1:26:36) Then is it fair to say that's a wrap for the meeting?

DAVE: I want to thank you guys. I don't envy you your next task, but thanks for not running me out of the room today.

RYAN: It's not our purpose.

DAVE: I appreciate the discussion.

FRANK: It's sort of like you're being forcibly adopted because the company is a stakeholder, just like every private individual here is a stakeholder, and that's where the process gets off the ground is the discussion and what's going to impact that.

TAY: I think we have to acknowledge the thoroughness and honesty with which Dave has discussed these issues with us.

MEETING ADJOURNS