Information Meeting 9 of 9:
Referral Group, CANFOR & Forest Service
16 June 2016

PARTICIPANTS

Forest Service: ROB SCHWEITZER
CANFOR: AL ANDERSEN, STEFAN BORGE, LEANNE CHOW (recording)
Referral Group Chair, (backup recording): TREVOR
Referral Group: GEORGE, RENE, TAY, TOM
Guest: JUDY

Note 1: Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations is here referred to as "Forest Service."
Note 2: B.C.'s 2004 Forest and Range Practices Act is abbreviated FRPA.

AGENDA

Item 1: Business
Item 2: Results of meeting with valley residents, 27 May
Item 3: CANFOR's Response to Results
Item 4: Next Steps
Item 5: CANFOR's CSA
Item 6: Review of CANFOR's reports
Item 7: Adjournment

*** * ***

Item 1: Business

(a) **Look into pulling cutblock W106 back from east-facing slope.**

STEFAN BORGE: We've removed W106 from the plans. This is the block visible from Spahats Falls. We've made a decision not to harvest there.

TREVOR: CANFOR deserves a round of applause for this!

(b) **Look into concerns for the river road below proposed cutblock W131.**

STEFAN BORGE: This crossing has $10,000 worth of rock armour. I don't foresee any issues with the road eroding. The road is not going to wash out.

TAY: OK.

(c) **Field Survey of blocks 121, 106 and 122**

STEFAN BORGE: Trevor and I went out for a day looking at some of the trails mentioned at these meetings. We walked the trail west of Ida Falls, most of which is outside proposed cutblock T106. We also walked the trail that overlaps the southwest corner of T121. Our plan is to have a MFZ (machine-free zone) on that trail, so we will take all the merchantable trees but leave the non- merchantable and understory in it because if we leave trees standing they will just blow over. It is just a small area. The game trail on T121 is in my opinion a sparsely used trail with lots of windthrow. This is a salvage block so we'll take the pine and leave the non-merchantable.

TREVOR: You have to understand something about game trails: the arterial are used off and on indefinitely, depending on conditions. Both of the trails we walked are clearly arterial trails, though the one on T121 is little used at present owing to the downed pine. Whether these trails are currently in use is irrelevant to the fact that once the windthrow has decayed they will both be heavily used again. The Guiding Principles put considerable emphasis on the maintenance of wildlife travel corridors. If CANFOR is going to log either area, then it must absolutely ensure the existing trails are left intact. Also, we didn't walk to old forestry trail that leads to First Canyon through T122.

STEFAN BORGE: My understanding was that the object here to increase tourism not to maintain game trails.

TREVOR: Actually, both can be accomplished in the same gesture. Both for wildlife and for future tourists, these trails happen to be two of the three main accesses to the canyons. Maintaining them is really serving both interests; but tourists don't want to walk through clearcuts, and shouldn't need to.

(d) **Meeting between Rob, Tom and Environmental Lawyer: FRPA lawsuits**

TOM: I emailed the lawyer faculty member who looks at environmental issues. She has a 2nd year law student who looked into the results based code and found there's very little that's hit the courts so far. I will be meeting with him next week and will give him my history with the forest and the results based code. So, it's already been started.

Item 2: Results of Meeting with Valley Residents, 27 May

TREVOR: The meeting took place on the evening of 27 May and focussed on the proposed cutblocks north of Buck Hill. This is the area of greatest immediate concern as it is located above properties owned by valley residents and could affect their water. Tay, Tom, Frank and I were all present. Prior to the meeting, participants were sent a hand drawn map of the clearcuts so they could study them. About half a dozen people who wanted more information received a summary of the nuts and bolts of our deliberations at these meetings.

Thirty-five people attended the meeting, not including Keith McNeil from the Times and Carol Schaffer from the TNRD who were also present. At the end of that meeting, we voted, yes or no, to the statement *CANFOR's cutting plan respect the intent of the Guiding Principles*. Thirty people voted no, while five abstained from voting. A few days later the Referral Group sent an extended information package to residents unable to attend the meeting but wishing to have input. Fourteen people responded; all voted no. The final tally was 44 votes representing 29 households [see Appendix 1].

The concern heard most frequently at the meeting didn't pertain to CANFOR's plans per se, rather it was a pervading sense that the Guiding Principles are irrelevant. Many people feel that CANFOR will go ahead and log regardless of the Guiding Principles. I think we were all struck by the depth of cynicism in the room.

We asked for specific concerns vis-à-vis CANFOR's cutting plan, however nobody at the meeting provided us with anything we haven't already covered here.

TAY: People did give us specific concerns. I typed them out.

TREVOR: Not additional to the ones we've covered.

STEFAN BORGE: I just walked the creeks with ULRICH and RYAN. We went over their concerns. It would be nice to know to see what other concerns are.

TAY: Second Canyon was a repeated concern – valley residents have been trapped before. People are worried something will happen to the canyon.

TREVOR: Two e-mail correspondents did send in concerns [see Appendix 2]

Item 3: CANFOR's Response to Results

TREVOR: So, what's CANFOR's response to the unanimous vote by valley residents that your logging plans don't respect the intent of the Guiding Principles?

STEFAN BORGE: Our response to the vote is that we feel that we are following the intent of the Guiding Principles. We've done it with our actions. I'm looking at the key points that were drafted by some of the people in this room. The first bullet was to consider interests of local people. I think we've been doing that since the first meeting and now with the meeting you had with Upper Clearwater residents. We're listening, we're deleting cutblocks that have visual impact, we're reconfiguring other blocks and using a different harvesting system. Another point was to manage for wildlife species. We hired a biologist who recommended that we maintain travel corridors for caribou in the ESSF zone. We feel we can harvest some timber while at the same time respecting the Guiding Principles.

TREVOR: ccc The caribou biologist you hired is an owl expert. As we've discussed, her proposed corridors are too narrow and will blow down. As for harvesting some timber, it was

never the intent of the Guiding Principles that an additional 1000 acres of forestland would be logged, and that only one of the blocks would qualify as salvage.

STEFAN BORGE: The Guiding Principles don't include any specs on block size and volume.

TREVOR: True, but we're talking about the *intent* of the Guiding Principles. Certainly, CANFOR has made accommodations, but your plans are still not in keeping with the *intent* of the Guiding Principles. All Upper Clearwater residents who took the time to inform themselves on the issue are agreed on that point.

ROB SCHWEITZER: Is the issue with salvage or with the size of the blocks? We reached out to the government side and nobody had anything further to add. The specifics are not clearly defined. What we should be shooting for is what the landscape will support. The Guiding Principles don't contain a size restriction or a definition of salvage.

TOM: That's because the Guiding Principles are meant to be *guiding principles*, not *guidelines*. The document expresses a definite intent, but doesn't contain specifics, nor was it meant to. We knew at the time that trying to include specifics like the ones you're asking for simply wasn't appropriate in such a document.

TREVOR: The Guiding Principles were negotiated in an atmosphere of trust. Nobody at the time thought it necessary to bring the document to a lawyer to check the wording. Its intent was clear to everybody involved. The residents of Upper Clearwater have no trouble grasping its intent; and in their judgment, CANFOR's plans simply don't meet that intent. Over the past year the Referral Group has shared various concerns of valley residents. In response CANFOR made small adjustments here and there, but not in a way that respects the intent of the Guiding Principles.

If this were a first pass, then perhaps valley residents could accept some of CANFOR's proposed cutblocks north of Buck Hill. However, this isn't the first pass. According to former District Manager JIM MUNN, Area G has already been 'heavily impacted'. Now CANFOR wants to create even more industrial-scale clearcuts – notwithstanding that further logging is certain to adversely affect Wells Gray's dwindling Mountain Caribou, and notwithstanding the deepening downstream concerns imposed by climate change. ccc Worse, you intend to proceed on the recommendations of a caribou biologist who's really an owl expert, and a hydrologist for whom the profound implications of climate change simply don't register. None of this is what we signed up for when we negotiated the Guiding Principles. It's as though the Guiding Principles didn't exist.

TAY: One of the most important concerns emphasized by the Guiding Principles is water quality. Yet when people look at CANFOR's proposed cutblocks, it's hard to see what distinguishes them from the earlier cutblocks that caused so much grief. Throughout this process it was CANFOR's responsibility to share information about their future harvesting plans so that the people who are downstream have an understanding of what CANFOR plans to do that is different from what was done in the past. That hasn't happened. CANFOR needs to explain why this large clearcut won't have the same disastrous hydrological effects that the earlier large

clearcuts did. This was CANFOR's chance to explain how and why the harvesting of the future was not going to cause the problems of the past. That is all people need to hear. That is the dialogue that prevents contention. It hasn't occurred.

STEFAN BORGE: The earlier cutblocks were located at upper elevations. T113 is a really good growing site with less snow. Maybe if we did things wrong there we could affect the water there. But if we follow the prescriptions, things will be fine.

GEORGE: I don't think there needs to be an impasse here. I think there just needs to be some foresters who are willing to accept a challenge. Your plan is for sustainable forest management, meaning you don't take all the tress at the same time. You just have to approach it more like you're foresters. Like you're trying to develop a cutting pattern that will somehow mimic how the land was like to start with. Not bare the land. This could work if you'd think outside the box. You can make that area beautiful and natural. That's the challenge.

TREVOR: Here I need to repeat a question that CANFOR and the Forest Service have heard before but still haven't properly addressed. Let's say the Forest Service OKs CANFOR's proposal. What does that mean for the Guiding Principles? When the residents of Upper Clearwater engaged in the Guiding Principles process – two years of intense negotiations that resulted in two woodlots we absolutely didn't want at the outset – it was in the expectation that we'd get something in return. Business as usual isn't what any of us – not even the government representatives – had in mind. In effect, business as usual means that all our hard work and trust in government was ill-placed. It means that the cynics were right, that short-term corporate interests will prevail no matter what. At the same time, CANFOR's determination to proceed with cutting plans unanimously opposed by valley residents makes a mockery of its CEO's much touted pledge not to support actions that overturn landscape objectives set through public planning.

RENE: My lawyer has already sent two letters to DAVE DOBI [of CANFOR]. Someone else on Duncan has contacted my lawyer to act on behalf of him. What this is going to turn into is a watershed by watershed issue where a lot of people spend a lot of money on lawyers. If each of them hires a lawyer they might consider a class action. What if you back off anything north of Buck Hill? Then we won't have to run to our lawyers.

TREVOR: Part of our reason for focussing the recent public meeting on CANFOR's proposed cutblocks north of Buck Hill was the hope you'd back off from those, since this is where your plans most blatantly conflict with the Guiding Principles.

STEFAN BORGE: We feel we have revised the plan significantly from DAVE DOBI's original plan and have removed block W106. With block T115 along the park road, we are going to be looking at more of a patch cut so it will be less intrusive. And finally, the old plans called for lots of road development at T113. If we put the roads in then we will have issues there. We are looking at redesigning the lower portion of the block.

TREVOR: But CANFOR's not going for salvage in T113, so this block is disallowed by the Guiding Principles in Area G.

STEFAN BORGE: Forty percent dead pine qualifies as salvage according to our FSP. We are looking at T113, T121, T125 and T160 as salvage. They meet the criteria. [T113 has 69% pine, T121 60%, T125 80%, and T167 57%: STEFAN BORGE pers. comm. 5 July 2016].

TREVOR: There's little if any pine in the "really good growing site" you spoke of just now, so clearly that's not about salvage.

STEFAN BORGE: The key thing is that [CANFOR's hydrologist] MIKE MILNE is a hydrologist not a cruiser. We had cruisers go in and look at this last year.

AL ANDERSEN: T113 is salvage. I've flown over it and there's a big patch of dead pine.

TAY: People are concerned with hydrology. They're concerned about industrial logging above their properties.

AL ANDERSEN: We need to go away and think about this. A lot of dead pine but doesn't mean there isn't any interaction with the hydrology. There are the things I'd want to know if I was living downstream.

RENE: [reads from MIKE MILNE's report on T113]:

"This new drainage info has significantly affected the assessment of T113. Before the changes, my main concern was the effect on flows in Ordschig Creek. Now it appears that Ordschig is sourced will above T113 but Case and its tributary Byrd are sourced almost wholly within T113. There are still significant site level issues with the lower planned road crossing on Ordschig but the effect of development on peak flow and water supply should be fairly minor. So that's relatively low risk except for the road. // For Case and Byrd I would now say that the peak will likely increase, maybe sharply, and low flows (water supply) will likely go down during the high demand period (summer). Those effects are consistent with Rita's findings from Penticton Creek and no reason to think this area is much different. So **T113 will increase peak and low flow hazards and that could have measurable effect on whatever is happening on the channel below**. I know the highway is of limited concern because the channel isn't large or powerful but the points of diversion are a mystery that we'll have to dig into. If there's no infrastructure or use then the consequence could be fairly low, but I recall visiting at least one site down there ... and it was an active intake. I know that dead pine makes up a significant portion of T113, which does give us some rationale as portions will look like a clearcut after deadfall, but not right away and there are portions that are mixed and have green pine as well. Based on the new information, **that portion of T113 that drains to Byrd and Case looks risky unless the points of diversion are absent**."

TOM: So T113 is risky. You're choosing to do a high-risk activity.

ROB SCHWEITZER: You guys amended those. Like Al said, this is a lot of information to take in.

TOM: Where does responsibility hold?

RENE: MIKE MILNE told us he is responsible because of his designation. We asked, "Do we sue you?" and he said "Yes", though he'd probably declare bankruptcy and walk away.

TREVOR: Because there are so many pre-existing cutblocks, valley residents would be hard pressed to prove that a flood or landslide or whatever was *caused* by a particular cutblock. In general, I think downstream consequences will be seen as cumulative. So, I'm not sure most residents would get very far seeking legal action, except possibly RENE: who has detailed water measurements. Still, there are larger issues here having to do with CANFOR's social license and its commitment to prior public planning processes. It's true that CANFOR under FRPA has the law on its side; we knew that a year ago when we began these meetings. But it also has to be accepted that valley residents are justified in expecting the Guiding Principles to be respected; and that they unanimously do not in the present case. How this plays out will, I think, constitute a test of whether the Forest Service respects its signed commitments to communities like ours, or whether it's really just an arm of big business, as we repeatedly heard at our public meeting. Anyhow, this is a good segue to the dispute resolution process.

Item 4: Next Steps

ROB SCHWEITZER: [reads dispute resolution protocol as specified in the Guiding Principles]:

1. Where an issue is in need of resolution, the first step will be the formation of a subcommittee who will assess the situation and try to develop a resolution. The subcommittee will be coordinated by the Upper Clearwater Referral Group.
2. If the subcommittee is unable to reach a resolution, an independent reviewer will be brought in to assess the situation and make recommendations.
3. If the decision of the independent reviewer is not accepted, then the decision will be passed on to the district manager for determination.

[After long discussion, it is decided to forego items 1 and 2 and go directly to item 3, that is, to pass the decision along to the acting District Manager, Racheal Pollard. TAY abstains from the vote.].

ROB SCHWEITZER: Rachel has been with us for two years and is aware of my involvement in these meetings. She knows what's going on and knows this isn't black and white. Morally and ethically this will likely be the toughest decision she'll have to make in her whole career. She'll have to try to weigh the legal side with the non-legal side.

RENE: How long will this process take?

ROB SCHWEITZER: The target is 40 days. Assuming CANFOR's submission is accurate, the revenue end of things and the appraisal will go through quickly. The District Manager can take time to decide.

STEFAN BORGE: As indicated at our last meeting, we want to proceed with submitting. We'll do two submissions. The blocks south of Third Canyon will be submitted first, in July, whereas the blocks north of Third Canyon – 125, 160, 157, 113, 120, 111, 121, 106, 122, 123 – will be submitted later, in the winter of 2017 or 2018. We need to clarify that. We need time to rejig a couple of things there. [We may try to permit T125 and T160 sooner as they are Pine Salvage: STEFAN BORGE, pers. comm. 5 July 2016]

We'll hold an open house on 13 July at the Dutch Lake Community Centre. This will allow us to get a broader view. It will take place between 3:00 PM and 7:00 PM. There won't be a presentation. It's meant to be more informal.

TAY: What area would you look at? Area G? The west side of the river?

STEFAN BORGE: We'll look at this development as planned.

TAY: I think the sort of forestry that should be happening here is the sort of forestry that sooner or later will have to happen everywhere. Sooner or later companies like CANFOR will need to work *with* communities rather than *against* them. That's what I want to see here. I'm disappointed that we sat around the table all this time and still can't assure our neighbours their water will be fine. The way CANFOR wants to proceed is the way big logging companies have always proceeded: a few tweaks to the cutblock and everything's fine. Except that it isn't. What we have in front of us is what we've been trying to avoid all this time, with our neighbours waiting all this time – an impasse. Depending on what the District Manager decides, CANFOR may get a permit to log but it will messy.

TREVOR: We were hoping from the start that CANFOR would see its way to doing things differently, creatively. Ultimately the final test for that is to what extent CANFOR's proposed clearcuts looked like business as usual. We said this at the outset: that business as usual would signal a lack of respect for the Guiding Principles. As things stand, CANFOR's proposed clearcuts look much like industrial cutblocks elsewhere. We've expended a tremendous amount of effort with virtually nothing to show except "let the District Manager decide". I personally feel very sad about this.

TAY: I agree with George. We don't need to seal Area G off from logging. There are things that could have been done to meet the values specified in the Guiding Principles – tourism, wildlife, whatever – and probably still pull some logs out. I don't think the dispute resolution is going to end the dispute.

JUDY: I know I'm not part of the group, but I need to ask: Who makes the final decision?

AL ANDERSEN: STEFAN BORGE and I would make it. This is very serious business for CANFOR. We're talking to people outside our office at higher levels in our company, who understand what's going on.

JUDY: Are they the final decision maker?

AL ANDERSEN: If I'm way off base, I'll get input from others. STEFAN BORGE and I made the decision to drop blocks and make changes. For Spahats, I hadn't been there until recently. Obviously, it's no different from Helmcken. And honestly, we don't need the wood that badly. In terms of viewpoints, it made sense not to log there.

TOM: Will we meet one more time after you've had your open house?

STEFAN BORGE: We'll have to think about that. Originally, we intended to submit the permit within the week. So now we'll do so after the open house.

AL ANDERSEN: I do expect to hear people say no logging. There could be changes depending on what we hear.

Item 5: CANFOR's CSA

[The group decides to forego this item, which had been discussed at previous meetings.]

Item 6: Review of CANFOR's Reports

(a) Hydrology

TREVOR: In our meeting with CANFOR's hydrologist, the Referral Group provided considerable input into his prescriptions and in particular we noted his disengaged attitude toward climate change. Because streamflow is such an important concern for valley residents, it would be helpful to know if MIKE MILNE subsequently modified his prescriptions from the version we saw.

STEFAN BORGE: No, he's waiting on our final block design to give final block reports. But nothing will change.

(b) Terrain

TREVOR: I respect CANFOR's decision not to let Cathie's terrain specialist look at your terrain report. Still, this isn't optimal. The process would be more robust if you allowed a second opinion. Unfortunately, we're running out of time tonight to review CANFOR's Terrain Report and the Wildlife Report.

STEFAN BORGE: The Referral Group is more than welcome to come by the office to discuss the reports.

TREVOR: Leave this with the Referral Group and we'll get back to you.

TAY: It would be good to have even an executive summary that we can distribute to valley residents.

(c) Caribou and other wildlife

[Deferred]

Item 7: Adjournment

[Meeting adjourns at 10:00 PM]

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Outcome of vote by valley residents on the following statement: **"CANFOR's logging plans respect the intent of the Upper Clearwater Guiding Principles"**

Votes at meeting: 30 vote *no*, 0 vote *yes*, 5 abstain.
Votes on line: 14 vote *no*, 1 abstains.
Total votes: 44: 44 vote *no*, 0 vote *yes*.
Total households contacted: 53.
Total households with at least one vote: 29.
Total households that abstained from voting: 5.
Total households that did not respond: 19.

APPENDIX II: Specific concerns sent in by e-mail:

- Helga & Ryan Papp, 4460 Clearwater Valley Road:

Cutblock 113 especially concerns me as it is directly uphill from our home and crosses our water source. It has the potential to wipe out our water source completely, as well as cause material to slide down towards our house and wash out the road.

- Amy Horton & Adam Thornton, 4949 Clearwater Valley Road:

Our general concerns regarding our property are that The Guiding Principles state that water quality and quantity are critical issues. We have had both domestic and irrigation water licences for over a decade. Duncan Creek, Shook Brook, and Grouse (Moul) Creek all potentially affect our water supply. Grouse Creek runs through our property. Any logging would be expected to maintain water quality, quantity and timing of flow of those creeks within their natural range of variability. The required hydrological survey prior to any planned activities (e.g., timber harvest, road or trail construction) to ensure that water quality, quantity and flow are maintained leaves us doubtful. Additionally, the proposed activities must be assessed for their impact on soil stability, and we are concerned that has not happened. During the negotiations in the 1990s, participants were led to believe that future logging in Area G would be restricted to small incursions mostly for the purpose of salvage. Cutblock 125 is labelled "salvage", presumably in the name of preventing fire due to massive pine-beetle kills of mature trees.

Regarding likely effects on our property:

1. *In your note on the 26 February 2016 meeting with CANFOR's hydrologist, you mention that he emphasized his "conservative" approach based primarily on ground surveys, consultation with terrain specialists, and analysis of past streamflow based on old aerial photos (quotes mine). In particular, he stated that only one "channelized event" (on*

Fage Creek) had occurred in Area G since the 1926 fire on the lower/mid slopes above the road (presumably it washed out the Valley Road during heavy summer rain). No other washouts were noted by the CANFOR hydrologist, since the 1926 megafire. What will happen to Duncan Creek and Grouse (Moul) Creek as a result of logging area 125? The majority of the historic local flood events have not been associated with spring runoff, but rather with prolonged summer rain events.

2. *Fage Creek generally dries up in late summer, and prior to past logging it used to run year-round. Will Grouse (Moul) Creek, running through our property year-round, do the same?*
3. *There must be a very peculiar definition of events of concern if one is capable of concluding from past water flow information that most of the streams in area G are fairly resilient to disturbance. Since heavy logging began in the 1970s (and never to human knowledge prior), First Canyon washed out and the Second Canyon crossing shifted as the result of a prolonged summer rain event in July 1997. In July 1999 another summer rain event caused Spahats Creek to tear out its bridge. In July 2001, yet another prolonged summer rain event caused Grouse Creek to do the same. Second Canyon was expensively reconstructed yet again in 2006, and debris and heavy rain caused the Valley Road to be closed for several days in late May 2014, generating an evacuation alert by TNRD.*
4. *Oldgrowth forests (as in area 157, but also 147/167, uphill of 125) absorb considerable quantities of snowmelt and rainwater, releasing it over extended periods, mitigating flash flooding and soil erosion. Eroded gullies are plainly visible, even by satellite photo, in the older cuts between proposed areas 113 and 125.*
5. *The majority of the creeks that rise on the western slopes of the Trophy Mountains flowed through oldgrowth forests, and currently the feed into Duncan Creek and Shook Brook still do, but that would change with the new logging. The prior removal of approximately half of these forests had consequences for downstream landowners. How could removing 50% of what remains not have further impact? If another stand-replacing fire occurred on the lower slopes (more likely now, due to late summer droughts), and the upper slopes were denuded, what would happen to the hydrology? Historic creek flows would not be predictive of future flows, even in the absence of severe weather events, which are increasingly occurring in recent years.*
6. *Has the possibility of whether selective cutting in that area would do an equivalent job of probable fire control been compared to fully removing the mature trees? Removing them cannot guarantee against a fire elsewhere in area G.*
7. *The past logging above the Hansens' property adversely affected their water starting in 1981 (i.e. Item 1 of the Guiding Principles). The drop from the lower clearcut above them is 700m over 2.75km. The drop from the higher cut is 850m/3.5km. These are comparable pitches and distances to the grade above us.*
8. *They registered formal complaints at the time and little resulted from government or the company involved, CLEARWATER TIMBER PRODUCTS.*
9. *In May 1992, Fage Creek washed out the Valley Road. George and Judy Briggs registered damage to their water irrigation lease, but little remediation resulted. At a meeting on 26 February 2016, CANFOR's hydrologist expressed surprise at how little work had been done to rectify the situation "at a time when there was a huge FRBC budget".*

10. *The proposed logging block #125 is essentially directly uphill from us (the Hansens are our neighbors to the south), and it is, according to Google Earth, a rather steep 1-in-4 grade (approximately 750 m drop over 3 km) from our house to the proposed block. We have very little confidence that clearcutting that area will not destroy our water supply.*
11. *We were told that CANFOR is unlikely to log on the steep west-facing slopes above the Clearwater Valley Road (though an earlier CANFOR map showed five numbered cutblocks there), but are curious as to how the 750m drop over the 3km from cut block 125 to the Valley Road (i.e. 25% grade) can NOT meet the definition of steep west-facing slopes above the Clearwater Valley Road. This cut would plainly be visible from the Green Mountain viewing tower (a major stop for tourists visiting the park), contrary to the Guiding Principles—"modify practice to reduce fire risk but maintain other objectives".*
12. *BC Forest Service, CANFOR, and CANFOR's hydrologist have all made it clear that establishing direct causation between downstream flood damage and upstream management decisions is, for legal purposes, by no means straightforward. The Referral Group was led to understand that only the most flagrant disregard for proper road construction and culvert layout would likely lead to legal redress. No assurance was given that any downstream impacts resulting from the cumulative effects of clearcut logging would be actionable. From the Hansens' and Briggs' experience and CANFOR's statements, it seems quite doubtful that CANFOR will accept responsibility. If our house floods, which to this point it has not done, rest assured we'll be filing a claim.*
13. *Should the water supplies below the clearcut in fact be affected, we plan to join RENE in bringing suit.*
14. *This area serves as a wildlife corridor between existing cuts. Complete removal does not bode well for the UNESCO application or Buck Hill Park (i.e. sources of tourist revenue for local businesses) given the 25% size of the current Mountain Caribou herd compared to 2002, and reduced bear/moose sightings/droppings.*
15. *We do not provide informed consent to be in a long-term test of the hydrological effects of the proposed logging.*

    There are other areas of the proposed plan that, while possibly not directly affecting our property, do seem likely to impact the Upper Clearwater Valley as a whole:

    Block 160 serves as a wildlife corridor between existing cuts

    Block 157 was spared by the 1927 fire (i.e. is oldgrowth) and is a wildlife corridor between existing cuts

    Block 113 is very large. What provisions will be made to avoid sequential large windfalls like what happened higher up in the old big cut? We expect more extreme weather in the future than in the past, so merely being lower on the slope is insufficient planning.

    Block 106 IS going to affect drainage through Second Canyon. In light of the extant concerns about safety, passability, and the effect on tourism to the Park, this is worrisome.

    Block 122 (like block 106) IS going to affect drainage through Second Canyon. In light of the extant concerns about safety, passability, and the effect on tourism to the Park, this is worrisome.

    Blocks 120, 111, 147,167, 158, 159 are old growth

Blocks 120, 111, 147,167, are wildlife corridors between extant clearcuts allowing passage from the lower to upper reaches of the Trophies.
Block 121 (near Buck Hill) is likely to become very alder-y given current vegetation in the area. How will that affect the development of the Buck Hill Regional Park?