

Submission to Old Growth Review Panel

Presentation outline by Bruce McMorran.

Brief Bio: 40 years living in the Broughton Archipelago building our wilderness resort Paddlers Inn, 24 years tree-planting including management and contracting for interfor with 18 employees, 10 years' operating the Malcolm Island Woodlot's sawmill.

Basic foundational errors in our industry: Ignoring UNDRIP. We were taught that we could log forests and then do it all again in 80 years! But we can't regrow old growth trees in 80 years. MB's slogan was "we plant 2 trees for every one we log" IE: 1 Old Growth = 2 seedlings!*\$#! McNeill MB stated that there is more wood volume per hectare in second growth, [but it's not worth anything and gets shipped raw-log]. It doesn't make sense to use 400 year old trees for short term uses when we could be using annual crops for this.

Back in 2016 The BC Union of Municipalities voted in favor of "calling for an end to logging OG forests

on Vancouver Island”. This is not a hippy or environmental organization, this organization represents a diversity of BC businesses. When this happened I took a deep breath and felt hope.

In 2015 BCTS auctioned off a series of cut blocks on Craycroft Island directly across from Robson Bight, the main tourism draw in the NI. Although there have been established commercial kayaking base camps located there for more than a dozen years, and although they opposed and pleaded for these plans to halt, logging went ahead as usual. One kayak company brings in about \$150k/ year from this one location employing about 20 people. This happens every year and can continue to keep happening year after year. Logging the area’s second growth may have provided \$150K+ logging income but with fewer employment opportunities, and only for one year and then wait another 80+ years?

Afterwards I met with the Port McNeill BCFS district manager: There is no consideration in forest policy

to accommodate stopping logging plans. The only way to legally stop a logging development plan is through parliamentary intervention, including financial compensation for expenses incurred & unrealized potential profits. Achieving parliamentary intervention is close to impossible which seems to leave & actually encourage two other options that can work: Civil disobedience (blockades/ picketing etc.) & social pressure and license.

When I complained to our district manager about the lack of accessible OG in the southern GBR the response was “we need to share the resource”. I challenged him to tell me where there is even 100’ x 100’ of OG in the Broughton Archipelago that I can “share” with our guests. This is not likely to be found in spite of the claim that 70% OG is retained in the GBR.

Describe GBR forest policy regarding OG, FN consultation, and bears etc.

Old Growth: Section 2-Table 1 & shows that between 13-28% of OG will be retained but Section 5 goes on to say that this can be reduced by 2/3 in support of maintaining the timber supply. **Section 6 states that trees that are not OG can be called OG if the landscape unit is intermediate to high!** This results in very incorrect figures as to OG retention achievements and therefor all forward OG planning.

How can there be 70% retention of OG in the Southern GBR area 80% of it is already logged?

FN Consultation: UNDRIP & P.13 & 15 GBR state the parameters around consultation and basically say that as long as the company makes a reasonable attempt to make contact that that is fine, and that no reply implies consent!

Bears: P.40 GBR There were no additional management plans regarding bears in the GBR than already existed prior, and the data on schedule D shows no Class 2 habitat south of a man made line on the map that has no reference to reality on the ground, including not showing bears in places well

known for sightings (Bond Sound), and no connectivity protection/ considerations for unconnected spotty identified locations.

Timber Supply: P.43 & 65 GBR & BC Reg. 14-2004 Sec. 8.1-3 All these state that all is good with the intention and plans as long as they don't unduly effect the timber supply. Impossible! You can't add layers of consideration and sustainability etc. without effecting the timber supply.

Being interested in forest management last year I requested information on the MI Woodlot's "development plans" and was surprised not to be able to get any information. The contractor didn't want to provide any info, the Port McNeill BCFS office wouldn't provide any info, and the NI Woodlot association assured me that all I had to do was ask the licensee or look on-line where I would find all the info I was requesting. Not so. After that I inquired of the Forest Practices Board as to whether there was legal requirement to provide me/the

public with any of the information that I was requesting.

Their response was that **there is no requirement for the license holder to disclose any info to the public other than when the license is first awarded**, and then to do so is at the discretion of the local BCFS manager. These licenses can be renewed without any requirement for public disclosure or input.

Not long ago forest companies were required to consult and inform the public about all their development plans, that's not the case anymore. **Now what we have is no legal requirement or ability to know about or provide input toward logging on [private or] public-crown forest lands, and no policy statement or ability to stop any logging plan once it is in the planning stage.** This does not support the concept of democracy or sustainable and equitable use of our forest lands, especially when considering UNDRIP and the diversity of community values.

Solutions:

- Incorporate UNDRIP into all forest policy.
- Open public disclosure and input on plans.
- The Annual Allowable Cut should be based on a 250+ year rotation not an 80 year rotation.
- Actually farm the next crop employing workers to prune and thin trees, adding value.
- Offer retraining for forest workers to exit the industry.
- Subsidize if necessary exploration of second growth manufacturing and uses. (Port Alberni).
- Stop raw log exports.
- Stop harvesting [live standing] OG and focus on salvaging the OG that was left on the ground after the first cut. *We've taken more than our share.*
- Tourism revenue now surpasses logging/ fishing/ mining combined and so we need to find ways to derive more tax dollars from this industry. E.g.: (Accommodation providers should pay room tax

regardless of how many rooms they have. IE: VRBO
& Air B&B etc.) Tax tour operators.