

From: [FLNR Old Growth BC FLNR:EX](#)
To: [Old Growth Strategic Review](#)
Subject: FW: Strategic review
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 10:01:51 AM

From: Michael Burnip <mb.logscaling@gmail.com>
Sent: January 31, 2020 10:38 AM
To: FLNR Old Growth BC FLNR:EX <Oldgrowthbc@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Strategic review

Hello I would like to share my opinion.

I am a log scaler, timber cruiser, waste surveyor and I have delved into intermediate engineering, silviculture and quality control.

I have worked primarily as a contractor extensively on the coast from Rupert to Vancouver and all of Vancouver island for the last 19 years.

I and have had various engagements in and out of major companies looking at stand viability (as a business perspective) as well as laying out and cruising Larger and smaller scale as well as special projects that offer low impact, high cost, high value opportunities (single stem and worm cutting and other basal area retention extraction methods). I have worked on better fibre recovery initiatives with companies from a quality and waste, value, risk perspective.

I have enjoyed working alongside with terrain specialists, biologists, engineers and other highly qualified people with real life experience that depend on our industry to feed there family's and live a good life.

Here is my opinion.

To be blunt, To be looking only at the old growth perspective of the industry is shortsighted not nearly enough.

First let's take a breath. we need to remind ourselves that this industry is viable and feeds numerous families and has a trickledown effect into all other businesses in our communities.

That being said.

I believe we need to appreciate habitat quality for ungulates, birds, fish etc. We need to appreciate what we are doing to the water cycle and look at the whole hill.

Now this in my eyes means we need to set aside quality second growth in trade for possible old growth cutting allowing it to mature into habitat, so we don't have naked valley bottoms and flooding events, so we have places for animals to hide and reproduce. (not just rock bluffs, creeks and swamps)

We need to find an altitude distribution equation for each hill, a shifting equation that opens up opportunities as stands progress.

I fully understand we struggle with mid slope inventory in all divisions. And it will take years to get into a position that yields us a model that works well.

We are still learning to be Stuarts.

We use "carbon capture" as one of the major drivers in our decision tree surrounding old growth retention. I want to ask about the water cycle and have we negated it's power in dramatic whether

events?

I want to remind that Second growth offers a carbon sink as well. Do we have good quality information surrounding the measure of this?

Have we even tried to measure the difference? Do we know entirely that we are deprecating the land base in every instance when we cut old growth forest?

We also have issues after we harvest with stand conversion changing what was there before to planting a more quickly greened up species or the current flavour which was done extensively in the 1960 and 70s and continues to some extent today. This is causing stand density and biodiversity issues.

We need to look at Changing rotation times based on stand volume and biodiversity quality up and down the hill and not just in old growth stands.

We may need to also thin some stands to allow undergrowth for habitat quality, fire risk and danger trees as well as low impact opportunities.

When it comes to old growth retention opportunities we already set aside large swaths in the TFL for different management reasons. Some of which are possibly justified entirely others that aren't or may need careful reviews.

As For the coast as a whole we have parks and other areas exempt from any cutting we need to measure as part of the overall equation.

Some of these areas could and should be part of a flowing harvest equation whether it be small extraction (low impact) and we have methods for such opportunities.

Logged or retained they should be measured.

Let's be clear I'm not saying open up the flood gates to logging parks I'm saying we should be measuring all retained regardless of age and size over the whole cost.

We also live in a world where we do not have level playing fields with all harvesters/tenure holders. The private land once extracted from the TFL has and will continue to play by its own rules unless checked.

We need to work on fibre recovery in all areas private or crown.

At the upmost we have a social obligation to family's and community's that depend on this industry and we need to keep them employed. I have been in forestry since I was 16 years old and have seen the constant automation causing displacement, taking away good entry level jobs and replacing logical hard working assets making way for educated people without yet gaining the real life experience and ultimately downsizing our industry, ultimately feeding less people with our vast resources.

I see companies close the door after record earning and not standing beside our citizens through harder times.

I have also seen the gate shut in our backyard leveraged on "safety" taking more away from our people and taking away from being free Canadians.

The forest is a place to learn, appreciate and do business.

Please look at the whole picture.

Please put the people at the top of the list.

Thank you

Mike

Sent from my iPhone