

From: Dave Stevens
Date: 12 January, 2013 4:14:43 PM PST
To: Alan Baxter
Subject: Quick core comments

Hi Alan,

These are some comments on PIR's proposal to log in the Quick core ecosystem.

In these I don't speak for the Community Resources Board, even though I'm a member.

I don't know why a ten day public comment period was chosen. I've seen comments from others and have seen the information you circulated to the CRB for the October 2012 CRB meeting. I can't say for sure but it's possible the CRB would host a public meeting around this issue.

As I understand it the AAC for this TSA was reduced substantially from 2002 to 2008, the volume coming instead from areas east of here that were subject to heavy MPB populations. Doesn't that leave lots of unharvested area here outside cores that would make suitable harvest blocks?

I question this because core ecosystems are a fundamental part of the LRMP's biodiversity strategy and if other areas can support harvest levels I think they should be preferred. Logging is likely to reduce interior forest conditions and produce more edges, which are quite different for biodiversity purposes. And a roaded area is always easier and cheaper to return to in future; it open us access in various ways.

There is likely to be, indeed there already is, noticeable public interest and concern about this proposal. If it proceeds there is likely to be less public scrutiny around similar proposals in future. So the precedential nature of this application needs to be taken into account - will it in fact ease future interventions in cores or corridors? And is this a good thing with respect to the values they are intended to preserve, which are by no means limited to timber representation.

If the dead trees fall down other trees will grow there even if the land is left alone. An early seral forest has values, both present and future, apart from fiber flow. Cavity nesters and various little critters that will make use of dead or fallen trees come to mind; no doubt a forest ecologist could provide more values.

I suppose your firm must be trying to anticipate the reduced area available for harvest in consequence of the Telkwa caribou WHA. But this has not happened yet. A plan for how to deal with the contingency is reasonable, but implementing it preemptively is not. The TSR3 process may make additional

volumes available and so on. Responding to uncertainty with logging is natural but it isn't LRMP management direction.

In a TSR workshop in your boardroom yesterday as I write (on January 11, 2013) Tim Penninga said that comparison of harvest scale results with inventory species profile showed that the balsam component was underestimated by 18%. This makes a good case for better inventory and monitoring information but works to undermine the rationale for the Quick core. In particular I think the core would make a useful test of what happens to a heavily disturbed ecosystem after the insect disturbance.

It seems well established that climate change is at least partly a driver for conditions that led to beetlemania. These changes, especially larger oscillations in precipitation and temperature as more energy is trapped by greenhouse gases, seems to indicate more rather than less prudence in biodiversity reduction.

I don't know what the Wet'suwet'en think of this. Although consultation and accomodation must take place I haven't any information about how this has been addressed. It would make quite a difference to me if I knew that the Chiefs were in favour, likewise if they were opposed, but I think information about that consideration is not available.

Dave Stevens