

FINAL DRAFT

Woodshed Analysis
for the
North Coast LRMP

Methodology, Approach & Results

Prepared by the
Major Forest Licensee Sector
North Coast LRMP

October 10th, 2003

FINAL DRAFT



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<p>TABLE OF CONTENTS ii</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <p>PART A: NORTH COAST WOODSHED ANALYSIS 3</p> <p><i>1.0 Executive Summary</i> 3</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <p>PART B: BACKGROUND 4</p> <p><i>2.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND</i> 4</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <p>PART C: WOODSHED METHODODOLOGY 5</p>	<p><i>3.0 Analysis Methodology</i> 5</p> <p>3.1.1 Grade Distribution Tables by Landscape Unit 5</p> <p>3.1.2 Domestic Log Selling Prices 6</p> <p>3.1.3 Access Management Plan 6</p> <p>3.1.4 Spatial Input Coverage & Net-downs 7</p> <p>3.1.5 Creation of Operational Costs 7</p> <p>3.1.6 Gross Timber Values 7</p> <p>3.1.7 Resulting Timber Value 7</p> <p>3.1.8 Limitations of Use 8</p> <p>3.1.9 Conclusion & Summary 8</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <p>APPENDIX 1.0 9</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <p>Woodshed 10-Year AMV 10</p> <p>Woodshed 1995 AMV 12</p> <p>Woodshed 2002 AMV 14</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/>
---	---

PART A: NORTH COAST WOODSHED ANALYSIS

1.0 Executive Summary

The purpose of this document is to provide the North Coast LRMP on behalf of the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management (MSRM) with the methodology and approach used to determine the North Coast timber values, which are ranked based on the Woodshed Analysis prepared by the Major Forest Licensee Sector. The woodshed analysis has been completed by the North Coast Landscape Units. This document outlines the steps in the process used to deliver the resulting timber values and accompanying maps. The resulting tables and maps have been completed using three separate market conditions to demonstrate how each landscape unit timber values respond to different market conditions. The resulting tables and maps are intended to be used as a tool for assessing potential timber values when considering land management decisions. Although this document and associated maps can be used as a valuable planning tool, caution must be given to the level of scale and detail used. The woodshed analysis and timber ranking maps are intended for high level planning only. The technical review of this document ***“Review of Woodshed Analysis Input Data & Results for the North Coast Land & Resource Management Plan”*** by Lynx Forest Management, August 2003, is considered an essential part of this document.

PART B: BACKGROUND

2.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Preliminary research has indicated that an estimated 90% of the North Coast land base will never be operable, regardless of how high the markets will ever go or regardless of what harvesting techniques are used, due to physical/ecological constraints and/or the cost of operations. It is therefore critical to know what areas of the remaining land base are economically feasible and under what market conditions.

The operability mapping for the North Coast Forest District has been the basis for determining the allowable annual cut (AAC) for the past 2 Timber Supply Reviews (TSR). Public input on the Data Package and Analysis Report challenged the accuracy and reliability of the operable land base used in TSR. The operability mapping used in TSR 2 was based on an economic \$100/m³ operability limit, which is static and as such, does not provide land managers with any certainty to existing and future market conditions. The Ministry of Forests was therefore challenged by the Chief Forester to develop a process, which would allow for modeling the operability limits to changing log values. The software Timber Market Potential 2000 (TMP2000) was developed by the Ministry of Forest to address that challenge. In preparation for the LRMP, MSRM reworked the operability lines to reflect a more realistic coverage that recognizes current market demands and existing harvesting practices. This was completed in conjunction with MoF and Major Licensees in 2001.

In order to address uncertainties surrounding timber values on the new operability mapping, Major Licensees together with MSRM, have prepared the woodshed analysis using three separate market conditions. Domestic log selling prices collected by the Ministry of Forest have been used to demonstrate timber values by corresponding Landscape Units. TMP2000 was used for the creation of the woodshed analysis report, which is intended to provide LRMP table members with a product that will assist them in critical land management decisions.

PART C: WOODSHED METHODOLOGY

3.0 Analysis Methodology

The woodshed analysis allows for constraints to be modeled using any combination of attributes, at any given time, to yield both existing and potential Timber Values based on various market conditions. By compiling average market values and specific grade distribution tables by landscape unit, net timber values are calculated against engineered operating costs. The steps involved with the analysis are:

- Creation of woodshed grade distribution tables by Landscape Unit
- Compilation of domestic log selling prices by letter grade based on 10 year average
- Compilation of domestic log selling prices by letter grade based on strong market (1995)
- Compilation of domestic log selling prices by letter grade based on weak market (2002)
- Creation of woodshed access plan, which recognizes helicopter zones, existing and future roads.
- Creation of applicable input coverage, which is limited to the timber harvesting land base (THLB).
- Running woodshed analysis to assign grade distribution to each individual forest cover stand
- Running woodshed analysis with domestic log selling price based on species by letter grade
- Test of variance on standard deviation to ensure the calibration model is within 5% (T-test)
- Creation of operational cost coverage using average hauling distance and helicopter drop zones.
- Applying operational cost net-downs to each stand revealing the Timber Values coverage.
- Creation of Timber Values output tables and maps by Landscape Unit
- Internal review by Forest Engineers.

3.1.1 Grade Distribution Tables by Landscape Unit

Grade distribution tables for the entire North Coast district were collected from actual scale data from timber sales and cutting permits from harvested areas covering a 10-year period up to 2003. They were then geographically referenced and sorted by Landscape unit for which they belong to. Landscape units, which had no previous harvesting, were allocated grade distribution tables from areas of similar topography and species profile within the same Biogeoclimatic subzone. The assumption made in the woodshed analysis is that the grade distribution is uniform across the landscape unit. This is reasonable since the THLB is fixed in order to be consistent with the information used at the LRMP however it is recognized that the grade distribution table could have been cross-referenced to specific Analysis Units if time and resources would have allowed for that work to occur.

3.1.2 Domestic Log Selling Prices

Domestic log selling prices have been used for a 10-year average, the log selling market in 1995 and in 2002 to show how the timber values respond to different markets by Landscape Unit.

TOTAL	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	U	X	Y	Total	
ALDER												2.97	52.31	45.99	51.01
BALSAM	213.39		161.87		112.41	86.17	71.07					51.69	48.63	47.75	81.08
CEDAR	311.50		271.47		170.87	129.15	113.74	149.64	129.11	91.30	59.57	41.47	22.87	117.91	
COTTON													37.34	34.62	36.76
CYPRESS	621.23		454.55		283.09	180.53	95.35					64.49	36.94	24.87	167.61
HEMLOCK	260.77		190.90		112.34	89.51	64.72					51.29	48.33	47.95	75.66
PINE	125.50		98.54		82.10	60.10	62.78					36.19	34.39	33.62	54.93
SPRUCE	604.50	510.44	466.98	345.01	188.44	137.97	74.84					61.78	49.45	47.88	166.08

Figure 1.1 Ten (10) year average log selling market

1995	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	U	X	Y	Total	
ALDER												40.45	37.39	39.69	
BALSAM	344.49		252.53		153.92	120.39	96.32					89.33	88.97	88.35	114.58
CEDAR	247.35		219.85		138.52	103.97	81.95	120.80	101.02	71.68	43.46	35.69	25.37	90.05	
COTTON													45.91	41.39	44.27
CYPRESS	629.34		474.11		284.77	185.80	85.34					61.64	44.36	27.28	163.39
HEMLOCK	355.70		272.00		154.33	126.79	98.38					91.17	88.71	88.89	112.27
PINE	103.34		83.72		100.70	84.23	78.10					74.11	76.48	74.55	78.37
SPRUCE	876.57	810.22	738.84	557.90	294.59	224.38	97.52					102.31	92.29	90.20	261.51

Figure 1.2 Average log selling market 1995

	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	U	X	Y	Total	
ALDER												73.26	72.80	73.05	
BALSAM	149.89		123.35		91.02	73.21	69.69					44.58	39.16	38.57	74.43
CEDAR	362.94		314.73		212.68	156.08	146.61	195.72	169.13	121.16	84.09	52.88	19.19	155.24	
COTTON													32.60	33.91	33.10
CYPRESS	712.10		469.34		264.03	164.77	117.42					81.35	33.54	21.74	180.70
HEMLOCK	240.15		170.61		92.56	71.90	57.43					42.46	39.58	38.36	64.80
PINE	286.34		88.91		69.60	50.09	69.94					28.70	20.98	19.81	58.12
SPRUCE	478.61	400.73	352.09	258.20	121.87	72.74	70.39					41.94	39.04	39.19	124.42

Figure 1.3 Average log selling market 2002

3.1.3 Access Management Plan

Forest Engineers and forest consultants prepared an Access Management Plan, which is used to calculate the delivered costs by comparing existing and future roads compared to helicopter drop zones with regards to road building, bridges, hauling distance and end-haul. Projected mainlines were digitised for each Landscape Unit with specific engineering cost per Kilometre. Helicopter costs were limited to a buffer from the nearest drop zone or mainline so that exaggerated flying distances would not be calculated.

3.1.4 Spatial Input Coverage & Net-downs

In order to be consistent with information presented at the LRMP, the woodshed analysis was limited to the same THLB used for the base case regardless of how favourable market conditions were. There are small variances on both area and volume, which may have occurred due to pixel resolution however variance is less than 1% and not considered to have any impact on the resulting Timber Values for the level of scale it is intended to be used for. It was necessary to make allowances for non-spatial net downs to the Timber Values coverage for components such as riparian reserve zones, which are dynamic in nature and difficult to map spatially.

3.1.5 Creation of Operational Costs

After considering the various options to project operating costs, it was decided to use the Coast Appraisal Manual to calculate harvesting costs, road building costs, layout, overhead, and silviculture. The woodshed analysis compares the total volume for each forest cover polygon to add that value to the operational cost constraints. This yields an output that reports on net dollars/hectare. Costs calculated from the access management plan include all of the associated costs in accordance with the Coast Appraisal Manual.

3.1.6 Gross Timber Values

The gross Timber Values are assessed for each polygon based on individual species and volume attributes within each forest cover stand. The volume estimates in the forest cover files have already been calculated using VDYP and are reported by the appropriate species percent. The estimates are reported in m³/hectare.

The woodshed analysis scans the dataset and lists all species it found within the Landscape Unit into species categories. For each species category, grade distribution tables are applied. Once the species grade and associated percentages have been entered for each species, the woodshed analysis processes all timber values entered by multiplying the total \$/m³ species values from the average domestic selling price with the volume/ha estimate for each separate forest cover polygon. As each polygon has more than one species, the application calculates each species separately resulting in total stand value. This gives each forest cover polygon a gross Timber Value per hectare (\$/ha).

Example

If one of the species the application found was Western Red Cedar (Cw), the woodshed analysis separates the species volume by the grade distribution table for that Landscape Unit. If the grade distribution summaries for that Landscape Unit had 9% "H" letter grade saw logs at \$385/m³ then woodshed analysis would assign the timber value \$/m³ by the percent Cw for that stand accordingly. This is repeated for each species by letter grade per forest cover polygon.

3.1.7 Resulting Timber Value

Once the total operational costs have been calculated for each stand, the application overlays the gross Timber Values with the Operational Cost values. If the total operational cost exceeds the Timber Values then the forest cover polygon will be assigned a negative dollar/hectare value. If the total operational costs are less than the Timber Values then the forest cover polygon will have a positive dollar/hectare value. Each stand is then summarized and reported by Landscape Unit.

3.1.8 Limitations of Use

Even though the woodshed analysis uses detailed operational costs and grade distribution input tables from actual scale summaries by landscape unit, it loses its reliability by way of the Forest Cover and TRIM. The woodshed analysis is intended to be used for planning purposes and as such, the resulting Timber Values should only be used for high level planning. When using this information, the user must be conscious of the variance of error based on the applications it will be used for.

Landscape units which are completely covered by parks or have no economic THLB value are not reported on and left blank in the maps associated with this document.

It must be noted that there are spatial reductions to the THLB, which may not be exactly representative to area specific locations described in the non-spatial timber supply analysis performed by MoF in 2001. This is however not considered to have a significant impact to the resulting economic timber values.

3.1.9 Conclusion & Summary

The results on the economic return based on the domestic log-selling price are attached in Appendix 1.0 comparing the 10-year average log selling market to results from 1995 and in 2002. Grade distribution, species composition and operating costs have for the purposes of this analysis remained the same in all 3 scenarios with only the log selling price changing to demonstrate how the land base responds to various markets. In reality, regulatory stumpage adjustments and legislative amendments have increased the cost of operations significantly since 1995. The operating costs in accordance with the Coast Appraisal Manual (July 2003) have been used for all scenarios even though they are significantly higher than actual costs in 1995. This provides a comfort level that is appropriate for the 10-year average.

Since the resulting timber values are analysed in a total chance plan situation, the user can not assume that negative timber values means the particular domestic log-selling market does not support harvesting in that landscape unit. Although most of the landscape units in the 2002 AMV resulted in negative timber values, forest companies harvesting schedule that year was very productive. The reason being is that in reality, operations change to portions of the land base, which support viable economic return i.e. grade and species profile.

For a more realistic interpretation of actual timber value for any particular log-selling market, the woodshed analysis software should be allowed to identify and change the THLB and road construction routes based on the profile and grade that supports a positive economic return. This is what the software is designed to do and how it will be used in the future however it would be very difficult for the LRMP table to compare different area and volume summaries for each landscape unit by year and market against other interest. For the purposes of this analysis, the THLB remained fixed, as did the access management plan.

In order to assist land management decisions at the LRMP, the 10-year average market value (AMV) has been created as the base case as it represents the land base response to markets over a longer time period. Recognizing the problems with a fixed THLB and access management plan, the 1995 and 2002 AMV's can therefore only be used for comparison.

Appendix 1.0

- 10 year AMV Timber Values
- 1995 AMV Timber Values
- 2002 AMV Timber Values

NORTH COAST WOODSHED ANALYSIS 10-YEAR AMV

ID	Name	Net Area (ha)	Volume (m3)	Value (\$)	Cost (\$)	Net Value	Current Value Index/m3
1	Marmot	4,517	2,435,725	\$212,094,106	\$240,348,215	-\$28,254,108	-\$11.60
2	Kshwan	38	19,588	\$1,739,077	\$1,739,240	-\$163	-\$0.01
3	Kitsault	8,272	4,682,479	\$370,871,613	\$435,754,843	-\$64,883,229	-\$13.86
4	Olh	74	40,558	\$3,776,986	\$3,646,421	\$130,566	\$3.22
6	Belle Bay	3,016	1,593,000	\$160,103,765	\$163,744,671	-\$3,640,906	-\$2.29
7	Stagoo	2,377	1,471,109	\$141,945,572	\$145,964,368	-\$4,018,795	-\$2.73
10	Pearse	1,870	1,013,993	\$98,165,014	\$104,336,846	-\$6,171,831	-\$6.09
12	Chambers	4,623	2,465,688	\$233,311,300	\$236,276,217	-\$2,964,918	-\$1.20
13	Kwinimass	4,585	2,739,111	\$270,526,169	\$269,277,700	\$1,248,470	\$0.46
14	Somerville	5,722	1,991,492	\$194,178,189	\$194,645,605	-\$467,416	-\$0.23
16	Union	2,437	1,090,796	\$112,879,970	\$111,286,042	\$1,593,928	\$1.46
17	Khyex	3,338	1,871,644	\$182,317,309	\$190,359,409	-\$8,042,099	-\$4.30
18	Kaien	5,451	2,588,580	\$271,713,708	\$260,593,417	\$11,120,290	\$4.30
19	Stephens	19	4,511	\$430,613	\$543,152	-\$112,539	-\$24.95
21	Khtada	5,142	2,824,407	\$274,963,937	\$273,465,354	\$1,498,582	\$0.53
23	Scotia	4,801	2,483,828	\$223,663,153	\$221,918,873	\$1,744,280	\$0.70
24	Brown	975	518,595	\$54,419,222	\$49,905,793	\$4,513,430	\$8.70
25	Kumealon	4,525	2,007,496	\$193,142,352	\$186,322,735	\$6,819,617	\$3.40
26	Big Falls	4,170	1,688,969	\$173,505,852	\$168,780,184	\$4,725,668	\$2.80
27	Johnson	3,935	2,223,169	\$229,753,515	\$224,768,810	\$4,984,706	\$2.24
28	Sparkling	2,564	1,583,161	\$174,269,480	\$169,875,356	\$4,394,124	\$2.78
29	Kitkiata	2,618	1,054,044	\$98,471,522	\$103,852,576	-\$5,381,054	-\$5.11
30	Hevenor	3,497	1,672,889	\$171,571,139	\$172,112,669	-\$541,530	-\$0.32
31	Red Bluff	2,609	1,333,399	\$140,040,235	\$132,268,029	\$7,772,206	\$5.83

North Coast Woodshed Analysis 10-Year AMV

ID	Name	Net Area (ha)	Volume (m3)	Value (\$)	Cost (\$)	Net Value	Current Value Index/m3
33	Hawkes South	1,933	1,114,169	\$122,737,397	\$115,182,474	\$7,554,922	\$6.78
34	Monckton	1,579	774,991	\$79,980,120	\$74,675,771	\$5,304,349	\$6.84
36	Gil	2,419	1,373,121	\$133,209,770	\$128,978,724	\$4,231,046	\$3.08
38	Whalen	5,659	2,996,808	\$266,519,502	\$276,994,089	-\$10,474,586	-\$3.50
41	Surf	3,384	1,895,329	\$170,912,224	\$171,536,802	-\$624,578	-\$0.33
45	Helmcken	3,097	1,606,615	\$141,666,490	\$145,398,515	-\$3,732,024	-\$2.32
47	Aristazabal	877	352,597	\$38,603,570	\$35,368,687	\$3,234,883	\$9.17
49	Observatory	499	266,900	\$24,715,746	\$29,240,439	-\$4,524,693	-\$16.95
50	Tuck	4,020	1,598,436	\$162,762,811	\$158,567,870	\$4,194,940	\$2.62
51	Quottoon	3,398	1,539,698	\$165,198,022	\$157,729,373	\$7,468,649	\$4.85
52	Porcher	5,903	2,066,828	\$187,087,529	\$187,331,467	-\$243,938	-\$0.12
53	Pa_aat	1,535	779,295	\$76,816,559	\$74,179,424	\$2,637,136	\$3.38
54	Captain	2,524	1,246,912	\$128,782,298	\$120,509,844	\$8,272,454	\$6.63
55	McCauley	1,011	434,993	\$44,604,435	\$43,603,111	\$1,001,324	\$2.30
56	Banks	2,123	983,841	\$106,085,512	\$104,166,477	\$1,919,035	\$1.95
57	Hartley	3,905	1,946,024	\$200,361,280	\$186,614,516	\$13,746,764	\$7.06
58	Gribbell	2,068	908,357	\$97,404,627	\$88,723,965	\$8,680,663	\$9.56
59	Triumph	3,186	1,365,098	\$126,490,998	\$124,336,972	\$2,154,025	\$1.58
61	Campania	179	89,655	\$11,097,637	\$10,954,520	\$143,117	\$1.60
62	Chapple	2,060	871,268	\$75,857,643	\$77,247,940	-\$1,390,297	-\$1.60
63	Dundas	183	109,414	\$15,238,749	\$13,410,443	\$1,828,306	\$16.71
64	Bishop	4,400	1,793,023	\$170,548,461	\$168,864,765	\$1,683,696	\$0.94

NORTH COAST WOODSHED ANALYSIS 1995 AMV

ID	Name	Net Area (ha)	Volume (m3)	Value (\$)	Cost (\$)	Net Value	Current Value Index/m3
1	Marmot	4,517	2,435,725	\$306,394,401	\$240,348,215	\$66,046,186	\$27.12
2	Kshwan	38	19,588	\$2,682,111	\$1,739,240	\$942,871	\$48.14
3	Kitsault	8,272	4,682,479	\$558,335,863	\$435,754,843	\$122,581,021	\$26.18
4	Olh	74	40,558	\$5,703,175	\$3,646,421	\$2,056,755	\$50.71
6	Belle Bay	3,016	1,593,000	\$212,042,958	\$163,744,671	\$48,298,287	\$30.32
7	Stagoo	2,377	1,471,109	\$210,030,429	\$145,964,368	\$64,066,062	\$43.55
10	Pearse	1,870	1,013,993	\$129,983,985	\$104,336,846	\$25,647,139	\$25.29
12	Chambers	4,623	2,465,688	\$336,572,582	\$236,276,217	\$100,296,365	\$40.68
13	Kwinimass	4,585	2,739,111	\$402,394,088	\$269,277,700	\$133,116,388	\$48.60
14	Somerville	5,722	1,991,492	\$272,268,967	\$194,645,605	\$77,623,362	\$38.98
16	Union	2,437	1,090,796	\$149,251,424	\$111,286,042	\$37,965,382	\$34.81
17	Khyex	3,338	1,871,644	\$261,598,398	\$190,359,409	\$71,238,989	\$38.06
18	Kaien	5,451	2,588,580	\$367,363,877	\$260,593,417	\$106,770,460	\$41.25
19	Stephens	19	4,511	\$411,116	\$543,152	-\$132,037	-\$29.27
21	Khtada	5,142	2,824,407	\$394,899,989	\$273,465,354	\$121,434,635	\$42.99
23	Scotia	4,801	2,483,828	\$315,374,990	\$221,918,873	\$93,456,116	\$37.63
24	Brown	975	518,595	\$77,775,722	\$49,905,793	\$27,869,930	\$53.74
25	Kumealon	4,525	2,007,496	\$252,410,893	\$186,322,735	\$66,088,158	\$32.92
26	Big Falls	4,170	1,688,969	\$242,358,804	\$168,780,184	\$73,578,619	\$43.56
27	Johnson	3,935	2,223,169	\$316,789,199	\$224,768,810	\$92,020,390	\$41.39
28	Sparkling	2,564	1,583,161	\$254,289,696	\$169,875,356	\$84,414,340	\$53.32
29	Kitkiata	2,618	1,054,044	\$136,133,248	\$103,852,576	\$32,280,672	\$30.63
30	Hevenor	3,497	1,672,889	\$208,659,475	\$172,112,669	\$36,546,806	\$21.85
31	Red Bluff	2,609	1,333,399	\$181,937,144	\$132,268,029	\$49,669,115	\$37.25

North Coast Woodshed Analysis 1995 AMV

ID	Name	Net Area (ha)	Volume (m3)	Value (\$)	Cost (\$)	Net Value	Current Value Index/m3
33	Hawkes South	1,933	1,114,169	\$167,711,326	\$115,182,474	\$52,528,852	\$47.15
34	Monckton	1,579	774,991	\$100,173,022	\$74,675,771	\$25,497,251	\$32.90
36	Gil	2,419	1,373,121	\$163,703,656	\$128,978,724	\$34,724,932	\$25.29
38	Whalen	5,659	2,996,808	\$359,711,038	\$276,994,089	\$82,716,950	\$27.60
41	Surf	3,384	1,895,329	\$218,244,586	\$171,536,802	\$46,707,784	\$24.64
45	Helmcken	3,097	1,606,615	\$173,851,823	\$145,398,515	\$28,453,308	\$17.71
47	Aristazabal	877	352,597	\$40,127,640	\$35,368,687	\$4,758,953	\$13.50
49	Observatory	499	266,900	\$34,900,570	\$29,240,439	\$5,660,131	\$21.21
50	Tuck	4,020	1,598,436	\$210,705,212	\$158,567,870	\$52,137,342	\$32.62
51	Quottoon	3,398	1,539,698	\$229,912,595	\$157,729,373	\$72,183,223	\$46.88
52	Porcher	5,903	2,066,828	\$236,836,133	\$187,331,467	\$49,504,666	\$23.95
53	Pa_aat	1,535	779,295	\$94,051,380	\$74,179,424	\$19,871,957	\$25.50
54	Captain	2,524	1,246,912	\$151,933,782	\$120,509,844	\$31,423,938	\$25.20
55	McCauley	1,011	434,993	\$45,518,174	\$43,603,111	\$1,915,063	\$4.40
56	Banks	2,123	983,841	\$122,497,865	\$104,166,477	\$18,331,388	\$18.63
57	Hartley	3,905	1,946,024	\$245,019,839	\$186,614,516	\$58,405,323	\$30.01
58	Gribbell	2,068	908,357	\$118,749,393	\$88,723,965	\$30,025,428	\$33.05
59	Triumph	3,186	1,365,098	\$168,050,080	\$124,336,972	\$43,713,108	\$32.02
61	Campania	179	89,655	\$13,918,275	\$10,954,520	\$2,963,754	\$33.06
62	Chapple	2,060	871,268	\$96,280,304	\$77,247,940	\$19,032,364	\$21.84
63	Dundas	183	109,414	\$21,973,026	\$13,410,443	\$8,562,583	\$78.26
64	Bishop	4,400	1,793,023	\$215,470,061	\$168,864,765	\$46,605,296	\$25.99

NORTH COAST WOODSHED ANALYSIS 2002 AMV

<u>ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Net Area (ha)</u>	<u>Volume (m3)</u>	<u>Value (\$)</u>	<u>Cost (\$)</u>	<u>Net Value</u>	<u>Current Value Index/m3</u>
1	Marmot	4,517	2,435,725	\$180,115,895	\$240,348,215	-\$60,232,319	-\$24.73
2	Kshwan	38	19,588	\$1,359,849	\$1,739,240	-\$379,392	-\$19.37
3	Kitsault	8,272	4,682,479	\$309,286,776	\$435,754,843	-\$126,468,067	-\$27.01
4	Olh	74	40,558	\$2,992,863	\$3,646,421	-\$653,557	-\$16.11
6	Belle Bay	3,016	1,593,000	\$144,115,326	\$163,744,671	-\$19,629,345	-\$12.32
7	Stagoo	2,377	1,471,109	\$114,206,699	\$145,964,368	-\$31,757,669	-\$21.59
10	Pearse	1,870	1,013,993	\$89,660,313	\$104,336,846	-\$14,676,533	-\$14.47
12	Chambers	4,623	2,465,688	\$195,030,309	\$236,276,217	-\$41,245,908	-\$16.73
13	Kwinimass	4,585	2,739,111	\$215,826,116	\$269,277,700	-\$53,451,584	-\$19.51
14	Somerville	5,722	1,991,492	\$166,015,433	\$194,645,605	-\$28,630,171	-\$14.38
16	Union	2,437	1,090,796	\$101,325,358	\$111,286,042	-\$9,960,684	-\$9.13
17	Khyex	3,338	1,871,644	\$150,596,471	\$190,359,409	-\$39,762,938	-\$21.24
18	Kaien	5,451	2,588,580	\$241,103,301	\$260,593,417	-\$19,490,117	-\$7.53
19	Stephens	19	4,511	\$490,950	\$543,152	-\$52,203	-\$11.57
21	Khtada	5,142	2,824,407	\$224,148,820	\$273,465,354	-\$49,316,534	-\$17.46
23	Scotia	4,801	2,483,828	\$193,065,220	\$221,918,873	-\$28,853,653	-\$11.62
24	Brown	975	518,595	\$45,375,656	\$49,905,793	-\$4,530,137	-\$8.74
25	Kumealon	4,525	2,007,496	\$180,480,320	\$186,322,735	-\$5,842,415	-\$2.91
26	Big Falls	4,170	1,688,969	\$149,652,345	\$168,780,184	-\$19,127,839	-\$11.33
27	Johnson	3,935	2,223,169	\$200,939,217	\$224,768,810	-\$23,829,593	-\$10.72
28	Sparkling	2,564	1,583,161	\$140,752,874	\$169,875,356	-\$29,122,482	-\$18.40
29	Kitkiata	2,618	1,054,044	\$86,867,222	\$103,852,576	-\$16,985,354	-\$16.11
30	Hevenor	3,497	1,672,889	\$169,855,657	\$172,112,669	-\$2,257,012	-\$1.35
31	Red Bluff	2,609	1,333,399	\$130,457,608	\$132,268,029	-\$1,810,421	-\$1.36

North Coast Woodshed Analysis 2002 AMV

<u>ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Net Area (ha)</u>	<u>Volume (m3)</u>	<u>Value (\$)</u>	<u>Cost (\$)</u>	<u>Net Value</u>	<u>Current Value Index/m3</u>
33	Hawkes South	1,933	1,114,169	\$106,847,314	\$115,182,474	-\$8,335,160	-\$7.48
34	Monckton	1,579	774,991	\$77,183,223	\$74,675,771	\$2,507,452	\$3.24
36	Gil	2,419	1,373,121	\$130,022,790	\$128,978,724	\$1,044,066	\$0.76
38	Whalen	5,659	2,996,808	\$240,911,891	\$276,994,089	-\$36,082,197	-\$12.04
41	Surf	3,384	1,895,329	\$161,703,159	\$171,536,802	-\$9,833,644	-\$5.19
45	Helmcken	3,097	1,606,615	\$139,700,178	\$145,398,515	-\$5,698,337	-\$3.55
47	Aristazabal	877	352,597	\$42,723,992	\$35,368,687	\$7,355,304	\$20.86
49	Observatory	499	266,900	\$21,183,803	\$29,240,439	-\$8,056,636	-\$30.19
50	Tuck	4,020	1,598,436	\$149,348,587	\$158,567,870	-\$9,219,284	-\$5.77
51	Quottoon	3,398	1,539,698	\$141,008,650	\$157,729,373	-\$16,720,723	-\$10.86
52	Porcher	5,903	2,066,828	\$176,936,308	\$187,331,467	-\$10,395,159	-\$5.03
53	Pa_aat	1,535	779,295	\$75,981,307	\$74,179,424	\$1,801,883	\$2.31
54	Captain	2,524	1,246,912	\$130,320,278	\$120,509,844	\$9,810,434	\$7.87
55	McCauley	1,011	434,993	\$49,589,092	\$43,603,111	\$5,985,981	\$13.76
56	Banks	2,123	983,841	\$109,106,469	\$104,166,477	\$4,939,993	\$5.02
57	Hartley	3,905	1,946,024	\$196,073,205	\$186,614,516	\$9,458,690	\$4.86
58	Gribbell	2,068	908,357	\$94,952,598	\$88,723,965	\$6,228,634	\$6.86
59	Triumph	3,186	1,365,098	\$116,499,959	\$124,336,972	-\$7,837,013	-\$5.74
61	Campania	179	89,655	\$10,532,569	\$10,954,520	-\$421,951	-\$4.71
62	Chapple	2,060	871,268	\$72,913,618	\$77,247,940	-\$4,334,322	-\$4.97
63	Dundas	183	109,414	\$12,382,825	\$13,410,443	-\$1,027,617	-\$9.39
64	Bishop	4,400	1,793,023	\$164,582,403	\$168,864,765	-\$4,282,362	-\$2.39