APPENDIX 8

Comments Received on Draft Management Plan 10

(Note: MP 10 Sections 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3 provide a summary of advertisement notices, comments, and responses. The actual advertisements, comments, and responses are not provided in the digital submission, but will be provided as with the hardcopy submission)

Memo

Date: October 18, 2002
To: Derrick Curtis
From: Rick Brouwer
Re: Gitanyow Consultation meeting, Oct 17/02 (10:00 – 12:00) at Gitanyow Museum

Six attendees

Gitanyow – Debbie Good
MoF – Dave Bewick, Linda Robertson, Katherine --- (note-taker), Jacques Bousquet
SCI – RB

Debbie Good indicated that Herb Russell was supposed to attend as well, but he never showed up.

Debbie is not speaking on behalf of the Gitanyow as a whole.

Debbie is speaking for her mother, who could not attend due to a death in the community. Debbie's house is Wetaxhayetsxw ("Big Copper"), which covers the north side of the Kiteen and Stenstrom Valleys and is the only Gitanyow house in TFL 1. From her perspective, the issues of concern to her house are:

- Protection of fishing sites – she described this as 100 m buffers from the "fish streams" - sounded like she meant the main stems of the Kiteen, Stenstrom, Cranberry.
- Protection of the old village site at the junction of the Kiteen and Cranberry Rivers
- Mushroom ground
- Protection of Cultural features (petroglyphs, cache pits) - identified in their Traditional Use Study maps
- Protection of grave sites.

I requested a copy of the TUS map – Debbie said that's what the map is for, and she will try to get us a copy.

At this point, Linda Robertson mentioned that this consultation meeting was "with prejudice", meaning that it would be used as part of the formal consultation record – Debbie said that she has been instructed that when by herself, she should not speak unless a meeting is <u>without</u> prejudice.

Impass. No further on-the-record discussions. No discussion around accommodation. Much of the issue revolves around the fear that anything Debbie says will end up being used in the upcoming litigation next week in Vancouver (regarding Gitanyow claim that the licence transfer to NWBC is invalid).

Result – Gitanyow will view this as inadequate consultation. Another meeting with representatives of the Gitanyow (as opposed to the house representative) will have to be scheduled, after next week's court case.

RB

December 6, 2002

To: FILE TFL 1 Management Plan 10
TFL 1 2003 FDP

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: December 5, 2002 meeting with Chris Knight, Alex Bolton, Willie McKenzie

I received a telephone call on Dec 4 from Bruce Low of the Kitsumkalum, requesting that I attend a Dec 6 meeting to followup on SCI's request for input into Management Plan 10 and the next Forest Development Plan (& maybe also Kitsumkalum's proposed Co-operative Forestry Agreement). I said I would attend.

In the early afternoon of Dec 5 I received a telephone request from Chris Knight (a negotiations consultant for the Kitsumkalum & Kitselas) to meet in advance of the Dec 6 scheduled meeting to discuss the agenda. At 3:25 pm on Dec 5, 2002, I met with Chris Knight, Willie McKenzie (Kitselas), and Alex Bolton (Kitsumkalum).

They gave me an original letter which stated that they would not participate in any further consultation or accomodation on Management Plan 10 or the Development Plan until the TFL 1 replacement and Tenure Transfer consultation and accomodation is completed.

I stated that I understood, and then explained that the MP 10 and FDP information sharing (or whatever you want to call it) is an opportunity to get First Nations' management input into what is happening on their traditional areas. I stated that I don't think it's part of the treaty issue, and it should be viewed as separate from the tenure transfer/ TFL issue.

They said they never mentioned treaty, this is not about treaty, this is because they have not received any response back from NWBC on the input they provided at the TFL 1 replacement consultation meeting, including the proposals that they provided to NWBC. "Everything has been according to SCI's agenda, not ours" (paraphrased from Chris Knight)

I told them I'd bring the letter, and their desire/demand to continue consultation and accomodation on the TFL 1 replacement/ tenure transfer, to Derrick Curtis' attention. They want to meet with someone who has the mandate to deal with this issue. If it's not Derrick, they want John Sparks. (They know he's in town, so he can come tomorrow)

I passed on the letter and the info to Derrick.

I called Chris Knight, at just before 5:00 pm, and mentioned that Derrick has not been able to get ahold of John Sparks, and John is scheduled to fly out tomorrow morning, so unless things change, there won't be anyone there from SCI tomorrow.

Chris Knight called at ~9:15 a.m. today and left a message, saying that he guesses that John Sparks is unavailable and is not coming to this meeting this morning. Chris would like to have a meeting set up to deal with this issue. I passed on the message to Derrick Curtis.

RATCLIFF & COMPANY

BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS

Suite 500, 221 West Esplanade
North Vancouver, BC V7M 3J3

TELEPHONE: **(604) 988-5201**
FACSIMILE: (604) 988-1452

GARY R. YABSLEY
W. BRUCE CAMPBELL
JOHN R. RICH
KERRY L. SOMERVILLE
BRENDA A. MCLUHAN
F. MATTHEW KIRCHNER
RICHARD L. BENNETT
DARYL J. COLLIER
CHARLES G. STEIN *
KARL P. STEPHAN
SUSAN J. ALCOTT
R. BRENT LEHMANN
MICHELLE M. ELLISON
LESLEY A. GIRODAY
BRIAN A. HANSON
GREGORY J. MCDADE, Q.C.
JIM REYNOLDS
CHARLES G. PIERCEY
MANIJEH MOIENI
JAMES P. TATE

ASSOCIATE COUNSEL, STEVEN H. TURNER PERSONAL LAW CORPORATION

CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FIRM ARE ALSO CALLED TO THE BARS OF ALTA., SASK., MAN., ONT., YUKON, N.W.T., NUNAVUT AND TEXAS

* NON PRACTICING PARTNER

December 13, 2002 File No. 02-0209

Rick Brouwer, RPF
Consulting Forester

Email: BrouwerR@Skeena.com

Dear Rick:

Re: Management Plan 10 for TFL 1 - Skeena Cellulose

I am counsel for the Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band and the Allied Tsimshian Tribes Association. James Bryant has passed on a letter from you dated November 29, 2002, addressed to the 'Allied Band Council' regarding Management Plan 10.

I am instructed to request that you correspond through myself in future in respect of TFL 1.

The Reasons for Judgment in *Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band et at v. Minister of Forests and Skeena Cellulose Inc. et al*, were released this week. In that decision, Mr. Justice Tysoe found that the Crown has a legal duty of consultation and accommodation in respect of the Lax Kw'alaams, Allied Tsimshian Tribes and Metlakatla.

We would like to defer our comments on Management Plan 10 to that process, unless absolutely necessary.

I can advise you that Management Plan 9 has wholly failed to meet the objectives of my clients, and we look forward to a dramatically different approach to Management Plan 10.

We note that the Minister of Forests has defined the Government's objectives in respect of TFL 1
as including:

> "Increase the economic certainty in First Nation communities"

I look forward to discussions with Skeena Cellulose Inc. and the Provincial Crown to ensure that future Management Plans meet that objective for the Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla.

Yours truly,

RATCLIFF & COMPANY

GREGORY J. McDADE, Q.C.
Barrister and Solicitor
gmcdade@ratcliff.com
GJM:lw

cc: Garry Reece
James Bryant
Harold Leighton

DRAFT

January 21, 2003

Ratcliff and Company
Suite 500
221 West Esplanad
North Vancouver, BC
V7M 3J3

Attention: Gregory J. McDade, Q.C.

Dear Sir:

Re: Management Plan 10 for TFL 1 - Skeena Cellulose Inc.

Skeena Cellulose Inc. (SCI) has received your letter, dated December 13, 2002, responding to our request from the Allied Tsimshian Tribes, specifically the Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakla Indian Bands, for input into the development of Management Plan 10 for Tree Farm Licence 1 (TFL 1). We have also had several follow-up communications, including our letter of January 12, 2003, your response of January 15, 2003, and telephone calls.

You have indicated that the Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla are your clients, and that you are to be the contact for correspondence in respect of TFL 1. We will do so, with copies to Mr. Bryant, Mr. Heighton, Mr. Drury, and Mr. Reece.

We continue to invite your input into forest management on TFL 1. You indicate in your letters that you wish to defer comments on MP 10 until after completion of the Crown's consultation and accommodation process, based on the December 2003 court decision (*Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band et al v. Minister of Forests and Skeena Cellulose Inc. et al*). We wish to point out, however, that it is a requirement of the current TFL licence that a managment plan is prepared, and this is separate from the TFL 1 replacement or tenure transfer process. Further, it is our expectation that forest management will be occurring on the TFL lands regardless of who controls the tenure arrangements. We would expect that your clients have an interest in good forest management, and therefore re-iterate our request for your input into the preparation of management plan 10.

In your letter of December 13, 2002, you state that "Management Plan 9 has wholly failed to meet the objectives of my clients, and we look forward to a dramatically different approach to Management Plan 10". We therefore respectfully request that you clearly provide us with the objectives of your clients, understanding that we can only discuss objectives that are potentially controllable through a management plan. We also request that you provide us with your thoughts on what a "dramatically different approach" for Management Plan 10 would look like - again, understanding that this would have to be within the confines of a managment plan for a TFL.

DRAFT

Your letter seems to indicate that one of your clients' objectives is in agreement with the Minister of Forests' objective to "increase the economic certainty in First Nations communities". We again invite your ideas on ways to achieve this, within the bounds of forest management on the TFL area that overlaps with your claimed territory.

We look forward to receiving your input. Please note that we are still working within the timelines required under our current TFL agreement for preparation and completion of the management plan.

Please copy any correspondence to us to **R. Brouwer, RPF** by mail to 4900 Keith Ave, Terrace, BC V8G 5L8; or by fax to 250 638 5720; or by e-mail to BrouwerR@Skeena.com.

Yours truly,
Skeena Cellulose Inc.

DRAFT
John Sparks, Senior Vice-president

Pc: Derrick Curtis
Rick Brouwer
Garry Reece
James Bryant
Harold Leighton
Wayne Drury

January 9, 2003

To: FILE 612.6 - TFL 1 Management Plan 10
802.21 - TFL 1 2003 FDP

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: January 8, 2003 meeting at Gitanyow Museum

On January 8, 2003, I drove out to Gitanyow (Kitwancool) for a 2:00 pm meeting to discuss planning on claimed Gitanyow territory on TFL 1. This meeting was a result of discussions between myself and Debbie Good at the October 17, 2002 TFL 1 replacement consultation meeting. It was originally scheduled for several dates in December, 2002, but emergencies prevented the meetings from occurring until now.

The meeting was to provide an opportunity to discuss

- SCI's performance respecting Management Plan 9 (MP 9)
- Development of management objectives for MP 10
- Asserted rights and interests on the claimed Gitanyow territory that overlaps TFL 1 (*Wetaxhayetsxw House*, in the Kiteen drainage)

In preparation for this meeting, on December 2, 2002, I faxed a letter to Debbie Good and to Glen Williams requesting Gitanyow input on the above. The letter indicated that this input should be considered independent of the consultation process on the TFL 1 replacement. (Note that the Tysoe decision indicated that the obligation for consultation and accomodation on the tenure transfer and TFL 1 replacement rests solely with the MoF. This backs up the statement in my letter.)

The meeting started at ~2:10 pm. In attendance were:
Gitanyow – Debbie Good (*Wetaxhayetsxw House*)
Tony Morgan (Treaty Office)
Guy Morgan; Gary Williams; Ron Johnson (Chiefs of other houses)
George Daniels (unsure of affiliation)
SCI – Rick Brouwer

We discussed the purpose of the meeting. I indicated that it is my desire to discuss and identify the interests and areas that are of concern in their claimed area so that we can decrease areas of conflict and establish strategies to deal with areas of concern.

Debbie indicated that she has been instructed to ask for blocks and volumes so that they can determine impacts. I re-iterated that I am trying to change the planning process– we want to arrive at the blocks after we locate cultural areas/ issues and establish strategies, so there are no blocks to discuss at this point.

Gary asked if this is a consultation meeting. I said that this is nothing to do with the TFL replacement, but I am sure some lawyer will call this some form of consultation. Gary then asked if this is SCI's view of accomodation. I said that we're getting off track, but I assume that what accomodation is will be different for each first nation, so if they consider this accomodation, then it is.

Debbie indicated the following management concerns:

- Fisheries resource on the Kiteen (100 m buffers were mentioned in October meeting)
- Village site near confluence of the Kiteen and Cranberry (exact site not specified)
- Moose Winter Range near the mouth of the Kiteen (approximately eastern portion of mapsheet 103P045)
- Maintenance of Grizzly Bear corridors (locations not specified)
- Mushroom ground is of interest (no areas specified)

Debbie also mentioned that receiving information will move towards accomodation, specifically, the blocks and volume in their house territory (within TFL 1).

- I committed to provide the FDP blocks and volume to Debbie.

Ron Johnson stated that they are interested in being accomodated, and had a proposal to provide to Dan Veniez in a meeting they were supposed to have with him today (but he never showed up). Ron did not provide details, but indicated that accomodation must benefit the Gitanyow, and could involve

- Co-management
- Revenue Sharing
- A contract or some access to the SCI undercut

There was a several minute discussion that occurred between the Gitanyow representatives in their own language.

Gary asked about the total volume of timber in TFL 1 that is on their territory – I said I do not have that number, and that if I were to provide an estimate, it would be subject to so many caveats that it would be useless. However, I did indicate that I would look at the operability lines in the area.

George feels that the TFL 1 replacement consultation and this request for input on MP 9/10 and the FDP cannot be separated. The consensus of the Gitanyow representatives was that they want to resolve the accomodation that comes out of the TFL 1 replacement first. After that, perhaps there will be an opportunity for jointly discussing management in the Kiteen. As a result, they do not think that further meetings to discuss the management plan or development plan for the TFL are worthwhile at this time.

I left them with 1:20000 maps from the last FDP, plus an overview map of the northeast portion of TFL 1.

The meeting adjourned at ~3:30 pm.

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 9, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Trapper review of Draft Management Plan 10

Mr. Skip Warner, trapper for the West Copper/ Kitnayakwa (trapline 609T035), came in today at 11:40 a.m. He said that he had received notice of a plan that he should look at. I showed the Management Plan 10 document to him.

Mr. Warner asked when the bridge is going in across the Copper Slide (Glen Falls Creek). I told him that we hope it will be in before the end of the month, but that is dependent on the logger (that has the bridge installation as part of his timber sale) finding a place to market his logs. Mr. Warner will appreciate having the bridge in, as it will make access to his trapline easier. (He worked the north side of the Copper this winter, but plans to work the south side this upcoming season.)

Mr. Warner also commented on the Kitnayakwa, stating that he would like to see mountain top to valley bottom timber strips left, which allows better animal movement. He felt where this is not done (he gave the lower Clore as an example), there has been an adverse impact on the animal populations.

Rick Brouwer

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 11, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Public review of Draft Management Plan 10

Mr. Mike Folkema came in today at 1:15 p.m. He said that as a member of the public, he would like to look at the draft Management Plan 10. I showed the document to him.

We discussed what a management plan is, and I went over the contents of the document with him.

He had no comments at this time.

Rick Brouwer

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 11, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Trapper review of Draft Management Plan 10

Mr. Otto Lindsrom (250 635 2489) and Mr. Dave Kenna (250 635 6450), trappers for the Zymacord/ Erlandsen (trapline 615T006), called today at ~9:30 a.m. They said that they had received notice of a plan that they would like to look at. They came down right away, and I showed the Management Plan 10 document to them.

They felt that they did not have much conflict with the TFL and New Skeena's operations on it, as they have had good communication with the staff at the office. They appreciated the contact, and felt that ongoing communication was the best way to resolve any concerns.

They indicated that they have a cabin in the regen on the Zymacord side, and promised to provide a map showing its location. They also plan to put two lean-to cabins in the Erlandsen side, and will talk to us about the locations when they are ready to proceed. They would like to know when we are across the back end of the Erlandsen, as they would like to trap some of the bigger "Stone" Marten back there. Most of their trapping takes place mid-slope and lower.

If there are beaver problems along the roads, let them know, and they will do what they can to trap them out of there.

They indicated that they did not have a need to make any specific comments on the Management Plan.

Rick Brouwer

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 17, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Public review of Draft Management Plan 10

Ms. Mary Dalen and Mr. Lyle Dalen of Cedarvale came into the office during the week of May 12, 2003 [I am not sure of the exact date, most likely May 15th]. They asked where their area of interest fit in with respect to the advertisement for Management Plan 10 (their area of interest is Cedarvale, normally on the north side of the Skeena River, but they also discussed the Seven Sisters area). I explained that the draft MP 10 is for TFL 1 and does not cover the area that they were interested in. I showed them the draft MP 10 document, but they were not especially interested in viewing it. We discussed other matters respecting commercial tourism activities in the Seven Sisters area, but this was not related to Management Plan 10.

Rick Brouwer

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 20, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Guide/Outfitter review of Draft Management Plan 10

Mr. Bob Milligan (Guide/ Outfitter area 610G001), telephoned today at ~9:30 a.m. He said that he had received notice of Draft Management Plan 10. He doesn't have to see it, and is in favour of forest management and logging – the logging roads actually benefit his business.

We discussed other matters respecting Buffalo Head Forest Products and access across the Bowser bridge to the Bowser Lake area, but this was not related to Management Plan 10.

Rick Brouwer

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 25, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Trapper review of Draft Management Plan 10

Mr. Edgar Guno (250 633 2664, fax 250 633 2271), trapper for the upper Hoodoo (trapline 616T015), called June 16, 2003 and left a message, and again June 17 at ~11:00 a.m. He said that he had received notice of MP 10, but was having a hard time figuring out where his trapline was in relation to TFL 1.

Mr. Guno asked that I fax up a map to him at a better scale so that he can see where his trapline fits in, plus a short note on what NSFP is planning for this area. I promised I would get something to him by Friday (June 20). I also mentioned to him that the Management Plan provided general direction and strategies, but I did review the boundary of his trapline with respect to the Development Plan and it looks like there may be a small overlap with portions of two blocks.

I prepared a letter summarising what MP 10 says about trapping, wildlife, and access, and included a map showing his trapline and the TFL in more detail. On Friday June 20, 2003, I called his phone number and got a woman who said Mr. Guno was out right now, but she would go and get a fax if I sent it. I faxed the info to 633 2271, and also mailed the information to him.

Rick Brouwer

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 12, 2003

To: FILE: MP 10 (612.6)

From: Rick Brouwer

Re: Trapper review of Draft Management Plan 10 – E. Guno

Mr. Edgar Guno (250 633 2664, fax 250 633 2271), trapper for the upper Hoodoo (trapline 616T015), called August 11, 2003 and left a message. I returned his call on August 12 at 11:15 a.m.

Mr. Guno asked when the road construction that is noted on the map that I previously sent him was scheduled. I indicated that due to the state of New Skeena at this time, I could not predict when any activities would start on his trapline area, but that I believed it would be at least a year before anything occurred. He indicated that since there would be no activity, he would be putting his traps out this winter. If there were to be activity, he felt that trapping would not be viable as all the animals would be scared off.

Mr. Guno mentioned that his brother had received a small brushing contract previously when activities were occurring on his brother's trapline, and was wondering if that would be also be a possibility on 616T015. I stated that I couldn't make that kind of commitment, as I had no idea who New Skeena would have in place if and when it started back up. He accepted my answer, and voiced his hope that the Company would get back on its feet.

Rick Brouwer

Management Plan 10

We are requesting that input be given on the assumption that Skeena Cellulose Inc. continues to hold and carry out operations on TFL 1. This is without prejudice to treaty negotiations.

Looking for input on forest management strategies

- With respect to asserted interest (title or right)
- With respect to other issues

Background - Current management objectives as described in MP 9:

Corporate

- To operate the company's manufacturing facilities as an internationally competitive producer of pulp and lumber products and at a minimum cover the cost of capital over the business cycle.
- To maintain and operate modern manufacturing facilities in order to ensure high quality products, long term cost efficiencies and flexibility in meeting our customers' changing needs.
- To commit ourselves to excellence in forestry and environmental management and to conduct our business in a responsible manner in the eyes of the public and the consumers.
- To ensure all operations are carried out safely

Land Use

- To manage and protect the forest resource by practicing environmentally balanced, integrated resource use within the context of government resource use legislation.
- To implement sustainable forest development and harvesting practices that maintain the natural biological and ecological diversity of the flora, fauna and landscape values.

Timber

- To harvest an annual volume of 720, 000 m^3 of fibre (sawlogs, pulplogs and minor products) using harvesting techniques that maximize the economic utilization of fibre.
- To pursue forest management and harvesting strategies that will ensure a sustainable long term fibre supply and maintain the forest productivity.
- To cooperate with the Ministry of Forests in the administration of a Small Business Forest Enterprise Program apportionment of 29,950 m^3.

Silviculture

- To continue a basic silviculture program that regenerates all logged areas in accordance with the Silviculture Practices Regulation.

Forest Health

- To maintain the forest in a healthy condition by pursuing pest management strategies that minimize the activity and outbreaks of pest infestations and disease.

Fire Protection

- To pursue a fire protection program that minimizes losses to the timber resource from wildfires.

Water

- To minimize the potential for any adverse effects of forestry practices on the stream network as they pertain to water quality, quantity and flow, fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, aesthetics and designated water users.

Recreation

- To ensure that a broad range of recreational opportunities continue to be available for the public.

Fish Habitat

- To maintain the aquatic biological productivity of all resident and anadromous fish streams.

Wildlife

- To maintain a broad diversity of wildlife habitat capable of supporting existing wildlife populations.

Public Involvement

- To increase the opportunity for local communities in the Terrace region to participate in key resource decisions that affect management of the TFL 1.

Aboriginal Bands

- To cooperate with local aboriginal communities to provide training and employment in forest operations.

Other Licensed Users

- To seek input from other licensed crown users when preparing operational plans.

Input on the objectives in MP 9

- Was SCI moving towards meeting these objectives?
- What worked well?
- What needed improvement?

Input on objectives to be developed for MP 10

- Similar to MP 9?
- Completely different?

Forest Development Plan

Assumption is that TFL 1 exists and that operations will be continuing. This is without prejudice to treaty negotiations.

Requesting input on asserted interests (title or rights) within the Kitsumkalum territory that may be affected by forest operations:

- Area specific
- Not specific to a particular area

Strategies to deal with asserted interests that may be affected by forest operations

Kitsumkalum input on Management Plan 10

SCI is looking for input on forest management objectives

Note: We are requesting that input be given on the assumption that Skeena Cellulose Inc. continues to hold and carry out operations on TFL 1. SCI views this as part of the consultation and accomodation process. This is without prejudice to treaty negotiations.

- With respect to asserted interest (title or right)
- With respect to other issues

Background:

A Management Plan (MP) is part of the requirements of a Tree Farm Licence. A management plan describes the objectives and strategies for management of a TFL for a five year period. The current MP for TFL 1 is MP # 9, which is in effect to the end of 2003. SCI is currently working on the next management plan: by getting input on the current management plan, we hope to produce an even better management plan # 10.

Current management objectives as described in MP # 9:

Corporate

- To operate the company's manufacturing facilities to maximize the return on capital.
- To operate the company's manufacturing facilities as an internationally competitive producer of pulp and lumber products.
- To maintain and operate modern manufacturing facilities in order to ensure high quality products, long term cost efficiencies and flexibility in meeting our customers' changing needs.
- To commit the company to responsible forestry and environmental management, and to conduct our business in an acceptable and safe manner in the eyes of the public and the consumers.

Land Use

- To manage and protect the forest resource by practicing environmentally balanced, integrated resource use within the context of government resource use legislation.
- To implement sustainable forest development and harvesting practices that maintain the natural biological and ecological diversity of the flora, fauna and landscape values.

Timber

- To pursue forest management and harvesting strategies that will ensure a sustainable long term fibre supply and maintain the forest productivity.
- To harvest an annual volume of 720,000 m^3 of fibre (sawlogs, pulplogs and minor products) using harvesting techniques that maximize the economic utilization of fibre.
- To cooperate with the Ministry of Forests in the administration of a Small Business Forest Enterprise Program AAC apportionment of 29,950 m^3.

Silviculture

- To continue a basic silviculture program that regenerates all logged areas in accordance with the Silviculture Practices Regulation.

Forest Health

- To maintain the forest in a healthy condition by pursuing pest management strategies that minimize the activity and outbreaks of pest infestations and disease.

Fire Protection

- To pursue a fire protection program that minimizes losses to the timber resource from wildfires.

Recreation

- To ensure that a broad range of recreational opportunities continue to be available for the public.

Visual Quality
- To maintain visual quality along highway corridors and the defined visual polygon within Nisga'a AIP lands.

Soils
- To minimize site disturbance and maintain the long term productivity of forest soils.

Biodiversity
- To maintain biological diversity over the landscape and recognize that the continuance of forest biodiversity will ensure a sustained timber resource.

Water
- To minimize adverse effects of forestry practices on the stream network as they pertain to water quality, quantity and flow, fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, aesthetics and designated water users.

Fish Habitat
- To maintain the aquatic biological productivity of streams providing anadromous and resident fish streams.

Wildlife
- To maintain a broad diversity of wildlife habitat capable of supporting wildlife species.

Aboriginal Bands
- To cooperate with First Nations people in assisting with identifying opportunities for training and employment in the forest industry.

Public Involvement
- To increase the participation of local communities in the Terrace region in key resource decisions that affect management of the TFL.

Integration with Other Licensed Users
- To seek input from other licensed crown tenure holders when preparing operational plans.

Input on the objectives in MP 9
- Was SCI moving towards meeting these objectives?
- What worked well?
- What needed improvement?

Input on objectives to be developed for MP 10
- Similar to MP 9?
- Completely different?

Kitsumkalum input on the next Forest Development Plan for TFL 1

SCI is requesting input on asserted interests (title or rights) within the Kitsumkalum territory that may be affected by forest operations:

- Area specific
- Not specific to a particular area

    Note: We are requesting that input be given on the assumption that Skeena Cellulose Inc. continues to hold and carry out operations on TFL 1. SCI views this as part of the consultation and accomodation process. This is without prejudice to treaty negotiations.

Background:

A forest development plan (FDP) indicates planned operations: harvesting, road construction, and road deactivation. The FDP text describes the various factors that influence how the operations are planned – things like wildlife or recreation areas, biodiversity constraints, cultural features, etc. and First Nations' interests. The FDP maps show some of the features of the area, and the planned location of the operations. The plan is made available to the public and referred to government agencies and First Nations for review and comment.

Description of area-specific asserted interests that may be affected by forest operations

Area-specific interests

- To be determined through input from Kitsumkalum

Interests that are not specific to a particular area

- To be determined through input from Kitsumkalum

Strategies to deal with asserted interests that may be affected by forest operations

To be discussed/ developed as necessary.

Skeena Cellulose Inc. - Tree Farm Licence 1
2000-2007 Forest Development Plan (FDP)
Blocks within Wetaxhayetsxw House Territory (Gitanyow)

Block #	FDP volume (m3)	FDP area (ha)	Status
410013	21000	59.7	logged
400062	400	0.9	logged
400064	300	0.7	logged
400072	500	1.2	logged
400074	4600	11.4	logged
400075	1400	3.4	logged
400077	200	0.4	logged
400078	1200	3.1	logged
400081	1100	2.8	logged
400082	600	1.6	logged
400911	14000	38.4	logged
400913	30000	71.8	partially logged
410109	137000	263.4	partially logged
410119	38000	92	
410305	13000	35	
410311	51000	134	
317609	12500	42	
317612	3200	12.1	
317608	4900	17.6	
317031	17700	51.8	
Total	**352600**	**843.3**	