Arrow Timber Supply Area
Timber Supply Review

Summary of Public Input

B.C. Ministry of Forests
Arrow Forest District
845 Columbia Avenue
Castlegar, B.C
V1N 1H3

This is a summary of the public input that has been received on the Timber Supply Review in the Arrow Timber Supply Area. This summary does not assess the feasibility or validity of the input or whether it relates to the clearly defined mandate of the chief forester in the allowable annual cut determination.

Arrow Timber Supply Area

Background

As part of the review of timber supply in the Arrow Timber Supply Area, the British Columbia Forest Service distributed a *Public Discussion Paper* and two technical reports, the *Timber Supply Analysis* and the *Socio-Economic Analysis*. The public was encouraged to review and comment on the accuracy of the information in these documents and to provide additional information. This report summarizes the input received during the 90-day review period. This information was provided to the chief forester for his consideration when he reviewed the allowable annual cut for the Arrow Timber Supply Area.

The first section of this summary outlines the public review process implemented by the Forest Service and describes the types of public input received. The second section summarizes the public input in sufficient detail to indicate the range of input received. The original submissions (with personal identifiers removed in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Privacy Act*) can be reviewed at the Arrow Forest District office.

Public Review Process and Response

Arrow District Staff actively solicited public input on the Timber Supply Review in the Arrow Timber Supply Area through the following actions:

- direct mail-out of the three documents to local municipal councils and regional districts, area licensees and forest industry unions and all sectors involved in the Slocan Valley CORE Project. The *Public Discussion Paper* included a response form which readers were encouraged to complete and return to the district manager
- 17 information sessions were held by Arrow District staff with representatives from the industry, labour, local governments and other interest groups (see Table 1)
- two open houses were advertised extensively
- local radio coverage
- local newspaper editorial

Table 1 lists the public information sessions for the Arrow timber supply area. Forty-six individuals attended the open houses. The Arrow Forest District also received four completed response forms and seven written submissions (see Appendix 1).

The Arrow Forest Association, which includes the major timber companies operating in the Arrow Timber Supply Area, also commissioned a consultant to technically critique the *Arrow Timber Supply Analysis* (referred to as the 'technical critique' in this report).

Activities (No. of participants)	Date
Meetings	
Arrow District Staff	October 24, 1994
Castlegar Chamber of Commerce	November 16, 1994
Slocan CORE Sectors	December 6, 1994
IWA	November 3,1994
Arrow Forest Assoc.	November 22,1994
Rossland	October 24, 1994

Regional District Kootenay-Boundary	October 27, 1994
Castlegar	November 1, 1994
Fruitvale	November 7, 1994
Slocan	November 9, 1994
Nakusp	November 10, 1994
Trail	November 14, 1994
Salmo	November 22, 1994
Regional District Central Kootenay	December 10, 1994
New Denver/ Silverton	December 13, 1994
Open houses	
Nakusp (11)	December 1, 1994
Castlegar (35)	December 7, 1994

Table 1: Participation in public information sessions.

Arrow Timber Supply Area

Public Input

In this section, public input on the information presented in the three Timber Supply Review documents for the Arrow Timber Supply Area is summarized under the following headings:

- timber supply analysis
- socio-economic analysis
- public discussion paper

Public input on other ongoing government processes that may influence the timber supply in the Arrow Timber Supply Area in the future is summarized at the end of this section

Timber Supply Analysis

Technical critique

The critique first confirms the results of the Forest Service analysis and then examines the implications of changing three of the forecast factors used in Forest Service analysis: using the 'Table Interpolation Program for Stand Yield' (TIPSY), increasing the size of the timber harvesting land base and changing forest cover requirements. The critique reaches the following conclusions:

- **Using the Table Interpolation Program for Stand Yield (TIPSY)**
  TIPSY, which estimates volumes from managed forests was not available when the Arrow timber supply analysis was done. Instead, as in other timber supply areas which were analyzed early in the Timber Supply Review, timber volume estimates from unmanaged forests described by the Variable Density Yield Projection (VDYP) were used. Using TIPSY has a major effect on the projected long-term timber supply, raising it approximately 25 to 30 per cent above the VDYP projection used in the Forest Service analysis. The use of TIPSY has no effect on the short-term harvest level.

- **Increasing the size of the timber harvesting land base**
  Including the 'problem forest types' and 'environmentally sensitive areas' and reducing the area deleted for roads and landings increases the timber harvesting land base in the Arrow Timber Supply Area by 10 per cent compared to the land base used in the Forest Service analysis. Consequently, timber harvesting in both the short and long term is projected to increase relative to the Forest Service base case.

- **Changing forest cover requirements**
  The forest cover requirements used in the Forest Service analysis are based primarily on 1992 guidelines. The technical critique contends that its assumed forest cover requirements are more stringent than those used in the Forest Service analysis and more representative of operational realities in 1994. The effect of this change on the short-term timber supply is noticeable--the projected initial harvest level is 557,000 cubic metres per year (if the Forest

Service analysis land base is used).

Based on these findings, the critique projects the current allowable annual cut of 619,000 cubic metres can be maintained for 50 years. Periodic timber supply reductions are projected 60, 80 and 120 years from now, with a subsequent increase to a long-term sustainable level of approximately 650,000 cubic metres in 150 years.

The critique concludes that future timber supply analyses will require improved land base definition to reflect current integrated resource management, local managed timber yield information and more reliable estimates of site productivity in old and very young forests. The critique recommends development of reliable and predictable rules for forest allocation to improve the Forest Service analysis model.

Other Public Input

- **Length of green-up periods**
  An industry submission, referring to the critique, states that growth projections using 'managed stand yield curves' indicate more rapid growth in plantations or managed forests which suggests possible increases in long-term timber supply.

- **Integrated resource management practices**
  Though many submissions support the concept of integrated resource management, some reflect concern about how this objective is implemented.

One submission suggests responsible management requires harvesting at the long-term sustainable level now, thereby allowing time to improve understanding about forest ecosystem relationships and the use of forest resources.

Another submission proposes that adequate protection of water quality and stream flow requires trees to be 70 to 80 per cent of their mature height or at least 20 metres tall.

Many of the submissions acknowledge the difficulty of maintaining the current harvest level using existing forest management practices while achieving acceptable management of non-timber resources. These respondents question whether acceptable management of non-timber resources can be achieved using 'more recent integrated management practices' and emphasize that the Forest Practices Code will further constrain the volume of timber available for harvest.

- **Combined impacts**
  A number of the submissions identify the potential for combined effects among critical factors.

One submission considers the combined effect of green-up and riparian impacts and concludes that the combination of poor growth of plantations and restricted access to timber in riparian areas will reduce the harvest level by 15 per cent.

Another submission, acknowledges the uncertainty

regarding appropriate green-up and the availability of existing mature timber and states these factors were not adequately reflected in the Forest Service base case forecast.

Socio-Economic Analysis

- **Employment and community impacts** Some individuals and local government emphasize that timber harvesting and silvicultural activity in the timber supply area should benefit local communities. It is mentioned that local mills sometimes have difficulty finding wood supply and that strategies are needed to support local manufacturing.

  Industry submissions reflect skepticism about the ability of communities dependent on harvesting jobs to adjust to reductions in the allowable annual cut.

  One submission criticizes the *Socio-Economic Analysis* for:

  - overly optimistic estimates of potential non-timber harvesting activities
  - estimating potential growth in tourism sector employment inconsistently with other recent reports
  - estimating the effects of indirect and induced employment associated with harvesting levels using a multiplier with no supporting documentation
  - implying the actual number of jobs lost in the timber supply area because of reduced harvest levels could be partially offset by drawing on alternate sources of wood. This idea is contradicted by other studies indicating timber supply from all sources will be scarce and therefore subject to intense competition.

  One submission affirms that the intent of economic transition strategies is to offset short-term job losses associated with reduced harvest levels. This respondent questions the

ability of replacement jobs to provide an equivalent income to high paying forest industry jobs. Furthermore, a significant reduction in the harvest level could affect a large portion of the community and strain the ability of government to provide adequate social programs. One respondent questions the effectiveness of developing strategies to address job losses and encourages government to better outline means of allocating resources to address expected unemployment.

- **Non-timber values**
  Some submissions suggest benefits from non-timber values such as mushrooms, botanical forest products (greens, boughs, etc.), forest recreation and tourism have not been adequately accounted for in the *Socio-Economic Analysis*.

  One industry submission suggests revenue generated from wildcrafts, specifically the harvest of pine mushrooms, was overstated.

  Another industry submission suggests recent public land-use forums have resulted in significant accommodation of non-timber values. The respondent was encouraged by the agreement of a diverse group of participants -- government, industry and special interest. However, concern is expressed that demands for further protection of non-timber values would have an extreme impact on employment and the social fabric of communities. It is stated that further recognition of non-timber values requires careful consideration in light of the uncertainty of available biological information and the ability of local communities to adjust.

  One respondent expresses concern because the relationship between forestry activity and the tourism/recreation sector is complex and requires more thorough study.

  Another respondent indicates the Forest Service Socio-Economic analysis fails to address the impacts of current management practices and future options on non-timber resource values such as recreation, fish and wildlife.

- **First Nations**
  The Ktunaxa/ Kinbasket Tribal Council submission suggests consideration be given to the cumulative effects of developments within the Columbia River basin. This submission also suggests the *Socio-Economic Analysis* does not address the issue of First Nations employment and contracting opportunities. The submission recommends that development halt until assessments and 'traditional use studies' are complete. Any development without consent is perceived to be a potential infringement of aboriginal rights.

Public Discussion Paper

Several issues raised in the *Public Discussion Paper* prompted public comment.

- **Old growth**

One submission asserts that old growth forests exist only when the trees have reached a minimum age of 250 years.

Another submission states that much of the old growth and mature forests of hemlock, cedar and balsam contain many unusable decayed trees. This respondent suggests these forests should be preserved for the wildcraft community and for the production of pine mushrooms.

- **Root diseases**
  A number of submissions identify the potential of root disease to impact both current and future harvest levels. One submission notes that more data is required to better reflect this influence in the timber analysis.

- **Allowable annual cut adjustment**
  Input on whether and how the allowable annual cut should be adjusted varies from a suggestion that a reduction is not needed in the short term to support for immediate reductions by as much as 32 per cent. Most submissions agree that a reduction to the allowable annual cut is inevitable.

  One respondent suggests a 32 per cent reduction is required to protect biodiversity, watersheds, visual sensitivity and other non-timber resources. A 32 per cent reduction would result in an allowable annual cut of 422,000 cubic metres, the long-term timber supply level projected in the Forest Service analysis.

Another respondent suggests that much public opposition has resulted from the impacts of approximately 30 years of harvesting at the current level. Furthermore, this opposition is not likely to change unless the harvest level is significantly reduced.

One submission proposes an immediate annual allowable cut reduction of 10 per cent to compensate for poor and inadequate growth in planted forests.

An industry submission remarks that based on both the Forest Service analysis and the technical critique, a reduction is not required for 50 to 70 years. It suggests other government processes (CORE, Protected Areas Strategy, Forest Practices Code) will ultimately influence the short-term harvest level.

The First Nations submission suggests a percentage of the allowable annual cut be reserved to satisfy treaty obligations.

One respondent acknowledges the uncertainty in the Forest Service analysis and suggests that this uncertainty does not detract from the base case scenario. The respondent concludes that the Arrow Timber Supply Area has an adequate timber supply to sustain the current level of harvest for a number of decades.

A number of submissions acknowledge that more reliable and accurate information is needed for assessing the timber

supply and for considering acceptable harvest levels. These submissions suggest a concerted effort is necessary to acquire data before the next timber supply review.

Related processes

Comments on other on-going government processes in the Arrow Timber Supply Area are summarized to indicate perspectives on issues that may influence timber supply in the future.

- **Commission on Resources and Environment, Forest Practices Code and Protected Areas Strategy**
  These processes are of significant concern to the industry. Decisions to protect significant ecological areas through the Protected Areas Strategy or through the 'proposed protected' and the 'special management' zones outlined in the West Kootenay-Boundary Land Use Plan, will result in a reduced timber harvesting land base, and therefore will impact both the short- and long-term timber supply.

- **Watershed management requirements**
  The requirements for watershed assessments in the new *Community Watershed Guidelines* will change practices within designated community watersheds and many other watersheds that are licensed for domestic or consumptive use. In addition, the Forest Practices Code describes requirements that apply to important fisheries streams. BC Environment staff believe these requirements will impact both the short and long-term timber supply in the Arrow Timber Supply Area.

Appendix 1

Submissions received by the Arrow Forest District

First Nation
Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Tribal Council, Cranbrook

Industry
Bell Pole Co. Ltd., Salmon Arm
Interior Lumber Manufacturers' Association, Kelowna (two submissions)
IWA Sector, Slocan CORE Project

Environmental Conservation
The Valhalla Society, New Denver
Slocan Valley Watershed Alliance, Winlaw

Individuals
Two

Other
Three