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Remodeling the Forest Science-Management Partnership

Engage in the largest forest management and science event of the decade. Join the Society of American Foresters (SAF) and the Canadian Institute of Forestry/Institut forestier du Canada (CIF/IFC), for a joint convention co-located with the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO) World Congress.

- Build your network during special events
- See it in action while on technical tours
- Learn about solutions for the challenges of today and tomorrow
- Gain applicable skills for professional development
- Challenge your paradigms with insightful plenary sessions
- Participate in IUFRO World Congress sessions
- Explore the Expo Hall for the newest technologies and services
- Get there and stay with exclusive travel discounts
- Improve yourself with powerful professional development workshops
- Discover a new job at the Career Fair
- Get energized at student events
- Treat your guest to unique trips

Early-Bird rates end August 10.
See full details and schedule at www.safconvention.org

Register Now at www.safconvention.org

Canadian Institute of Forestry
Institut forestier du Canada
“In the field it has saved us time and simplified field surveys. In the office it has saved us a significant amount of staff time”...

Ricardo Velasquez,
District Silvicultural Forester
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
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Leave of Senses

I was surprised to see the large number of leaves of absence listed in Membership Statistics in the March/April 2014 issue of the BC Forest Professional. I was subsequently disappointed to learn that a significant number of these requests were initiated because the members’ employers do not believe their job duties demand the services of an RPF or RFT, and thus refuse to pay their fees (The Increment, May 30, 2014). My job description reads “Preference for RPF” but enrollment with the ABCFP is not required. As such, I am also not eligible for reimbursement of my annual ABCFP dues by my employer. I do, however, choose to pay my fees (which are tax deductible) and maintain good standings by adhering to our bylaws, code of ethics and standards of practice, etc. In doing so, I can direct and participate in projects that fall within the scope of the practice of professional forestry. As a member, I can also remain current in public affairs and other developments that influence the management of BC’s natural resources. Lastly, I am proud to be associated with a knowledgeable and skilled cadre of self-regulated professionals who have earned the public’s confidence and trust. We have all invested considerable personal time and money to obtain our professional designation, so why should we solely depend on our employer’s dollars to maintain it?

BRIAN BARBER, RPF, VICTORIA

President’s Message Hits the Right Points

President Dan Graham’s report, “Surviving the Next Black Swan,” in the May/June issue of BC Forest Professional is interesting and timely. In this era of rapid technology advances, a social and economic Black Swan can morph quickly into a norm, and the norm may become an outlier. It is impossible to predict whether forest resources could eventually be managed as a component of the overall value of the environment, rather than for wood production, as the younger generations become increasingly environment-conscious. Will the current mode of solid wood production and pulp and paper manufacture as the core of forest resources management continue forever? I have my doubts.

Information technology has already significantly eroded the pulp and paper industry, and this will continue. The economic well-being of the solid wood manufacturing industry seems to depend almost solely on the housing market (the shift in stock prices in almost perfect correlation when housing-related news is released attests to that).

Large wood-framed suburban houses with big backyards may not be the choice of the next generation; their preferred social interaction is likely sipping coffee in a trendy café rather than barbecuing in a neighbour’s backyard. This shifting norm is already evident globally and technology is driving this trend.

Materials technology is rapidly evolving. Supercomputer and particle physics is the tool of modern day alchemists; they can design and test hundreds or thousands of chemical compounds quickly. The newer materials can be strong but light, and versatile but moldable for different manufactures, including houses.

The president’s call for diversification, not putting all our eggs in one basket, is timely and absolutely correct.

CHENG C. YING, RPF (RET) 1699


Professional Reliance Unreliable

The public should not rely on professional reliance.

We are promoting professional reliance and broadcasting that “the public can expect that members are independent and acting in the public interest — regardless of employer.”

Fortunately, we do qualify the above by noting that “professional reliance isn’t perfect.” The failure of our public forests to provide the intended sustainable outcomes for forest-dependent communities indicates that the legal and institutional framework to support sustainable forest management in BC has been deficient for decades. Forest professionals have worked under and been constrained by this framework. Given this context, the public needs a little more than the idea that there are these heroic independent forest professionals ready to stand up to protect their interests.

The professional reliance notion of the independent forest professional acting in the public interest, regardless of employer, is being used as one of the main props to support changes in the management of public forests. These changes are likely to move our public forests further toward enclosure into the private interest. The notion of professional reliance should not be employed to support something that is not in the public interest. This association does not need to be besmirched with this hypocrisy.

Professional reliance could be a most valuable concept in the management of public forests if forest professionals were directly accountable to the public rather than to forest corporations. Forest professionals need to be given responsibility and authority within a legal and institutional framework focused on sustainable stewardship rather than the exercise of private rights in public forests.

Andrew Mitchell, RPF (ret)

Synergistic Thoughts on Forestry and Tourism

The May/June issue of BC Forest Professional was a credit to our organization, as always. The key topic “Can Forestry and Tourism Co-Exist?” is extremely important and deserves a lot of thought.

After reading the five Viewpoints articles on forestry and tourism, I was a bit disappointed. Tourism is important and the concept of a “Beautiful British Columbia” is dear to my heart. However the only article that addressed the issue in a realistic, knowledgeable and forward-looking way was “Timber and Tourism: Success in Synergy” by Makenzie Leine, RPF. In my opinion she had really done her homework.

The approach that Ms. Leine took was very carefully worded and suggested to me she is very aware of the emotional aspects of this issue and public perceptions that are anti-forestry. She also indicated a good understanding of our tourism statistics and the biases involved.

I have studied the forestry-tourism issue for many years and you have to start with the ministry definition of tourism. It essentially says that in addition to foreign tourists, any British Columbian more than 80km from home is a tourist. Consequently a logger flying from Prince George to Vancouver for a business meeting is a tourist and his travel, hotel meals etc. are included in the tourism statistics. When you read the fine print in the tourism statistics roughly 50% of the tourism industry in BC is made up of British Columbians doing their thing. A very important point made by Ms. Leine is where she states “…nearly two-thirds of the tourism sector employment is in Vancouver.” We all need to give this some serious thought.

When you dig deeper into the tourism statistics and look at the numbers associated with skiing and winter recreation, the wine industry, cruise ships in Vancouver, conventions and indoor sporting events, the number of tourists negatively impacted by forestry activities is pretty thin. In real numbers I would suggest possibly five percent of ‘tourists’ are potentially impacted in a negative way by forestry activities. On the other hand 100% of forestry activities are conducted in a sensitive way, in consideration of tourists, at significant cost to the industry and the people of British Columbia.

If my reading of Ms. Leine’s article is correct she is suggesting that we could expand our tourism industry by introducing forest industry tourism. We do a great job of forest management in this province and we do have a great story to tell and we should be telling it. There is also the potential to expand our wilderness tourism through ‘synergy’ with our forest industry sector.

A final point I want to make has to do with forest-oriented recreation. Some users start fires, vandalize logging equipment, leave garbage behind, fill in water-bars, damage sensitive habitat, cut down trees and generally behave badly. In my experience this is a small minority but they create enough problems to cause forest managers to put in gates, take out roads and build barriers to limit access. This problem needs to be addressed in a constructive way so as to increase forest-oriented tourism, not limit it.

I would very much like to hear more from Ms. Leine as I believe she probably has a host of ideas for expanding forestry and wilderness tourism. Forestry and tourism are not incompatible and I love the term “Success in Synergy.”

Jack Carradice, RFT (ret)
Take-Home Exam Should Test Professionalism

I believe both Brian Smart and the Board of Examiners (Letters, May/June, 2014) are missing the crucial piece that should be examined and that is professionalism — something that is not taught in university or at a technical school. Sure, it is also about understanding an issue, policy or piece of legislation but how one goes about applying professional ethics and obligations to that issue is what’s key to becoming an RPF or RFT. The exam questions should not only challenge the writer on a topic but also on their obligations to the profession and everything that stands for. The questions should recreate the dilemma professionals face each day and must resolve. At the end of the day, that is what stands us apart from someone with just a degree or diploma. Knowledge gained at school provides you with the skills to understand a subject, but knowing your professional obligations gives you the critical thinking needed to make a decision on behalf of the public.

Dwight Yochim, RPF

Protection of Tourism: Forestry Needs to Step Up

The latest issue of the BC Forest Professional featured tourism as one of BC’s major industries, slightly surpassing forestry in GDP returns to the province (3.7% to 3%). The several articles were directed at answering the question: “Can tourism and forestry really co-exist?” conveying the need for close collaboration between the two and, as stated by Makenzie Leine, “….reciprocation must come in the form of a respectful regard for the importance of each economy.”

How is the forestry profession doing in respecting and supporting the tourism values and hence the larger tourism industry in BC? In a recent letter published in the Times Colonist (Times Colonist, June 3, 2014) Louise Alvarez wrote: “A new vision for public forests is, indeed, sorely needed. For example, Vancouver Island could have a huge potential for tourism and eco-tourism with more responsible forest management and logging practices, and more vision from government.”

Obviously from perspectives such as hers, the forestry profession is not doing very well.

Protecting “Beautiful BC” Should Be a Role for All

The latest issue of BC Forest Professional featured the interconnectedness and mutual reliance of the tourism and forest industries with both contributing nearly equivalent GDP returns to the province.

In a concurrent article in the May 12th issue of the Tyee magazine, Rafe Mair commented on the mega projects proposed for BC. Concerning these projects and their relevance to tourism and their future place in BC he stated:

“If the spectacular invasion of our economy and our way of life comes about, British Columbians must be prepared for a great change in their lifestyles. ‘Beautiful’ British Columbia will be much diminished. Tourism will be adversely affected in almost every part of the province. We will have to get used to being an industrial province.”

So while “socially aware forestry” can and is expected to protect the aesthetic tourism values of beautiful BC’s landscapes, shouldn’t the mining and power-related industries be similarly attuned and obligated? All resource-related industries should be bound by the same rules and standards as they all operate on the same landscape.

Otherwise what’s the point?

For far too long the many environmental aspects of FRPA that are aimed at achieving 11 resource-related objectives have directed all forestry-related operations in BC, while the mining industry has not been similarly bound. Recently the operations of the oil and gas industries were declared off-limits to Forest Practices Board oversight! How can the most important resource industries of BC operate on the same landscape and be held to different environmental standards that were developed and determined by the same government? Obviously hypocritical and this by a government that once said, and included as part of its election platform, that it would develop and adhere to environmental standards second to none — globally!

To add insult to injury, the Liberals are planning to eliminate major components of environmental education from the curriculums of the primary schools in BC.

Where is the ABCFP’s voice in these crucial matters? A relatively benign although well-intentioned issue of the BC Forest Professional related to tourism and forestry exhorting respect and collaboration between the two factions just doesn’t cut it! It doesn’t even come close.

In far too many respects the ABCFP appears to be a self-serving, feel-good, old-boys club without any sharp or even refined edges! We must do better, much better.

**Fred Marshall, RPF, P. Ag., Cert. Arb.**
The type of tenure that is best in BC has always been controversial. In large part, this controversy arose because BC is unique in the western world in having 94% of its land base in public ownership. A previous premier of BC described ours as a “Soviet style” pattern of land ownership. Frederick Mulholland, PEng., BCRF, was a believer in public ownership of the forest early in his career. He was subsequently disillusioned by what he saw and by the end of his career became a strong advocate of private land ownership. My personal thoughts are that neither public nor private ownership models are necessarily ‘the one true answer.’ We know for sure that private ownership is a non-starter in BC. So, yes, conversations about tenure reform are going to continue to be heated.

Successive governments have wrestled with the best approach to optimize the economic benefits of our forests and over the decades we’ve had numerous blue-ribbon panels recommending various models of tenure, forest management and timber pricing regimes. They have tried to some extent to incorporate the best attributes of both public and private ownership models. In my view the resulting current tenure system puts our public forests at an unacceptable level of risk and fails to optimize their potential.

In my last column, I talked about “black swan events” which are, essentially, events that are unpredictable. We can’t prepare for them because we can’t predict they are going to happen. Some may argue about the extent to which events such as climate change, the mountain pine beetle epidemic, and the 2008/9 financial crisis — recent events that have had, and will continue to have, significant impacts on forest management in BC — could have been foreseen. Nonetheless, there are things we can do that will mitigate the effects of negative events such as these and allow us to take advantage of positive ones.

One of nature’s key strategies for dealing with unpredictability and surviving disaster is to maintain a state of diversity. Diversity makes a system more robust and allows it to withstand more shocks. This concept is described in folk wisdom as “not putting all your eggs in one basket.” A diversity of forest management styles, tenure systems and tenure ownership in BC will help our province withstand more natural disasters and economic shocks.

At the time I’m writing this column, the government is collecting input into the potential conversion of some volume-based tenures to area-based ones — specifically tree farm licences. There are too many factors involved to say that any one type of tenure is best. Both have their own pros and cons.

As part of the tenure conversion consultation work the government conducted in the spring, the ABCFP was able to make a presentation to Jim Snetsinger, RPF, who is leading the process. Our key messages included reminding Jim that forest professionals are trained to apply ecological science and social goals and should therefore be included in the decision-making process. We also told him that it doesn’t really matter what tenure system is used as long as the components are in place to ensure the forests are managed sustainably and that the system results in the benefits the public expects.

I certainly don’t profess to have all the answers but I do believe that BC will optimize both the sustainability and the benefits of its public forests if the tenure system incorporates a multiplicity of tenure holders, encourages a broad range of forest management practices and provides for real free-market timber pricing signals. Having a diverse tenure system that puts the forests first is going to benefit the people of BC.

Building a Robust Tenure System

President’s Report

By Dan Graham, LLB, RPF
Professional service in the appraisal and valuation of forests and forest resources is a specialized area in the practice of professional forestry. The Foresters Act describes the “planning, advising on, directing, approving methods for, supervising, engaging in and reporting on . . . valuation, appraisal, . . . of forests, forest lands, forest resources and forest ecosystems” (emphasis added) as a direct example of the practice of professional forestry. Valuation of timber and forests can occur on private or Crown forest land.

In previous CEO Reports I addressed the topics of professional reliance and professional independence. Both of these important topics come together when we discuss forest appraisals. While not all ABCFP members work in appraisals, many do. In addition to ensuring you are competent to practise in this area, you must strive to maintain your professional independence and practise professional reliance.

In BC, a majority of the forest land and timber is owned by the people of BC and the public receives the revenue from its trees through a tenure and pricing system managed by the government. ABCFP members are key players in BC’s timber pricing system on Crown land as forest professionals are involved in many aspects of the forest revenue exchange from timber cruising and compilations, to appraisal cost estimates, reviews and stumpage determinations. While these interactions are driven by the requirements of provincial legislation such as the Forest Act, the Foresters Act also has a role here, given its place as a public interest statute. It’s a balancing act — the people of BC deserve to receive a fair price for the timber and tenure holders deserve a fair cost assessment for their work so they can remain healthy and profitable.

As a regulator, the ABCFP recognizes that both environmental and economic harm are risks that are routinely managed by forest professionals on behalf of their employers. Two years ago we summarized the preceding five years of discipline case* statistics and found that 15% of our cases involved timber pricing. More recently, members have been expressing concerns about professional service in this area of practice.

Our bylaws speak clearly about the responsibilities of a member to the public, the profession, the employer and to other members. For these reasons, the ABCFP actively monitors professional service in timber pricing and forest revenue by participating in government/industry subcommittees and working groups, by responding to complaints and by pursuing concerns that affect our members and that might undermine the public trust in the profession.

Some of the key areas of concern for the profession relate to the:

- Accuracy and representativeness of data and estimates in professional submissions, e.g. timber cruise data;
- Review of professional submissions and supporting information;
- Proper accounting and documentation;
- Competence of practitioners to consistently and accurately apply the process; and
- Expectations placed on forest professionals.

In recent years, the ABCFP worked with timber pricing professionals from a variety of business interests to understand some of the tricky circumstances that were causing professionals concern. Foremost in the mind of the profession is the expectation of integrity that the professional brings to the pricing transaction. Our actions and behaviours as individual professionals ultimately affect the health of our profession and the confidence that the public has in the process.

In the coming months we expect there to be a number of guidance products that will help professionals practise in this area including training workshops, a specific standard for professional practice and guidance for professional service. We’ll announce these products in The Increment as they become available. Be sure to read the e-newsletter for all the latest news.

*You can find all our case digests on our website: http://www.abcfp.ca/regulating_the_profession/complaints/complaint_records.asp

Managing the Revenue and Costs: Forest Professional Service in Timber Appraisals, Pricing and Forest Valuation

CEO’s Report

By Sharon Glover, MBA, with assistance from ABCFP staff Mike Larock, RPF, and Casey Macaulay, RPF
Learn More About the ABCFP’s Affinity Partner Program

Did you know that the ABCFP has a number of affinity partners that offer benefits to members? Below is a summary of the partners and their offerings but you can find more information on the Affinity Program page of the website (Members’ Area/Member Services/Affinity Programs).

- **TD Insurance Meloche Monnex** – Get preferred rates on your home insurance.
- **Worldwide Travel Discounts** – A worldwide inventory of hotels and car rentals at exclusive discounted rates.
- **ProGroup** – Save money on your next vehicle purchase or lease.
- **Delta Vancouver Suites** – Coming to Vancouver? Get great rates on your business or holiday travel.
- **SelectCom** – Low long distance rates of 4.9 cents per minute to all Canadian and US numbers.
- **Forest Club** – Great deals on a variety of tickets, merchandise, travel and more.

**ABCFP Presents to Area-Based Tenure Consultation Process**

The ABCFP presented our perspective to the facilitator and former BC chief forester, Jim Snetsinger, RPF, as well as FLNRO staff leads supporting the project. The submission paper is a summary of the responses from our members framed within our regulatory mandate and can be found on the ABCFP website (Publications and Forms/Stewardship and Practice Reports).

Our discussion focused on some important contextual aspects of tenure relative to professional reliance and the public expectations resulting from a tenure conversion that we heard at the Special Committee hearings on timber supply in 2012.

**Council Accepts Advisory Resolutions**

Two advisory resolutions were passed at the ABCFP’s recent conference. The first resolution acknowledged the good work of the host committee and asked council to thank them for their work in putting together an excellent conference. Council agrees that the conference was very well done and included interesting learning and networking sessions. The CEO has sent a letter of thanks to the host committee members.

The second resolution asked council to consider continuing its support of National Forest Week activities. The ABCFP has been a proud supporter and leader of various National Forest Week activities for almost 10 years and council has directed us to remain in a leadership position with the BC Provincial National Forest Week Coalition.

**Forestry Meets Royalty**

On May 20th, 2014, the National Executive of The Canadian Institute of Forestry - Institut forestier du Canada (CIF-IFC) met with the Prince of Wales in Charlottetown, PEI. The meeting was part of Prince Charles’ 2014 Canadian tour which included Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and a short stop in Winnipeg. Among the delegates was the ABCFP’s own vice-president, Jonathan Lok, RFT, who doubles as the 2nd vice president at CIF-IFC.

Among the discussions with Prince Charles, Jonathan highlighted the importance of recruitment and development of young people in the industry. The meeting marked the launch of the Prince of Wales Forest Leadership Award, which was created by the Institute through partnerships with the Duchy of Cornwall and the Institute of Chartered Foresters (ICF), with sponsorship through TD Bank Group.

The award will be open to forestry students in both Canada and the UK; recipients will be guaranteed a bursary and paid summer placement in one another’s homelands. The exchange program will complement the newly minted Prince of Wales Award for Sustainable Forestry, which was first presented in 2013 to ABCFP member Jocelin Teron, RPF, and is also aimed at forestry students and recent graduates.

“A career in forestry is diverse. It can take you to an urban forest or deep into remote woodlands, to a laboratory, or into communities to live and work with individuals whose livelihoods depend on forest resources,” said John Pineau, CEO of the CIF/IFC. “Whether outdoors or indoors, students with a passion for the environment and who thrive on solving complex problems will find this award and exchange program to be a great opportunity!”
When the Editorial Board met for its annual meeting in 2013 to make decisions on the slate of themes that would be pursued the following year, the idea of revisiting the topic of tenure reform for the July/August edition of BC Forest Professional seemed interesting, if not timely. Fast forward one year and it is clear that the decision to explore the topic at this time was pure luck, given how the issue has risen to the spotlight in recent months.

As many forest professionals are aware, the provincial government recently wrapped up an area-based tenure consultation that began on April 1st with an invitation to the public to offer feedback. The consultation was documented extensively by Jim Snetsinger, RPF, who led the two-month consultation and managed a well-trafficked blog throughout the process.

While opinions diverged, as evidenced by the passionate and unfiltered comments recorded on the blog, there is no doubt many British Columbians have an opinion on tenure reform. The consultation saw over 4,000 e-mail responses and nearly 100 stakeholder meetings take place throughout the province.

The ABCFP was also a part of the consultation. Staff solicited member feedback and presented to Snetsinger the social, economic and environmental benefits that should be sought from those interested in converting their forest licences, as well as criteria for evaluating applications and the process for implementing conversions. (See the full report here: http://www.abcfp.ca/publications_forms/publications/documents/ABCFPAreaBasedForestTenureConsultation2014_05_23_000.pdf).

While we await Snetsinger’s final report, due around time of printing, this issue of BC Forest Professional explores some unique viewpoints on tenure reform. One writer, for example, argues against area-based tenure, and for the implementation of local forest trusts. Another writer dismisses the concept of tenure conversion altogether, claiming that priority should be on the effective management of forest resources. Tenure is also examined in the context of ecosystem-based management on Vancouver Island.

Despite the prominence of tenure reform throughout our pages, we would be remiss to not mention that this issue launches a new and exciting feature: our inaugural “Science in Practice” article. In line with the ABCFP’s continued efforts to showcase the latest technologies related to members’ areas of practice, we are giving an in-depth look at how fire grazing promotes dynamic ecosystems. We are excited to launch this feature and invite all members to come forward and share their stories about workplace technological innovations. E-mail your story ideas to editor@abcfp.ca.

The Principles of Stewardship and Forest Tenure Reform

The ABCFP’s Principles of Forest Stewardship provide a framework for examining practices, policies and tools against the long-term nature of forest ecosystem management. Forest tenure is one of the primary tools of resource management that can either contribute to or detract from the long-term success of our management. BC’s forest tenures can be viewed as the fundamental agreement between the landlord (government) and the tenant (licensee); defining the terms, commitments and obligations for managing the public’s forests. The form of forest tenure therefore determines the nature of the relationship between the licensee, government, First Nations and the wealth of other stakeholders on the land base. Furthermore, the tenure agreement sets the time scales and degree of security for the licensee, providing certainty for manufacturing or other forms of investment.

In theory, the degree of tenure security should infer the degree of licensee investment in the landscape and within communities. Conversely, the degree to which that security is threatened, confused or splintered will contribute to the divestment of the licensee.

If we accept that the stewardship principles are sound and we use them as a lens for examining forest tenures, then we are likely to advocate for tenure agreements with a high degree of certainty and security. In addition, we will seek terms and commitments that maintain a high level of ecosystem function, require robust planning, are well monitored, benefit society broadly and provide room for innovation and adaptation. Within such a tenure agreement, the forest professional has the ability to take more ownership for decisions, as the terms will be well aligned with long-term objectives.

1 The main document can be seen at http://abcfp.ca/publications_forms/publications/committee_reports.asp
Safeguarding the Competitiveness of BC’s Forest Industry
British Columbia’s forest industry was once the most productive and efficient in the world. It can and will be again, provided industry and governments take the steps necessary to adjust to ever-changing domestic and global realities.

Emerging from the effect of a devastating mountain pine beetle infestation and a massive downturn in the US economy, the BC forest industry is again positioning itself for success. The industry is transforming itself by making greater use of its fibre supply, generating new products and applying new technology to forestry and to the manufacturing of wood products.

But competitiveness is not just determined by the actions and investments of the companies that comprise the industry. At its foundation, the BC forest industry is a partnership with government — each doing its part to ensure the forest industry, its workers and their families, and communities that depend on it, thrive.

Today, that partnership needs to focus its efforts on five keys to competitiveness. First and foremost, government needs to continue to support industry-led efforts to continually improve safety in our forests and facilities. Working closely with WorkSafeBC in better managing combustible wood dust and implementing the industry-developed Wood Dust Audit Tool are but two examples of how we can work together to keep our employees — our greatest asset — safe.

Second, access to a sustainable supply of affordable fibre is vital to the future of the industry. The provincial government needs to accelerate its work in updating forest inventories in order to support its decision-making about the land base. BC Timber Sales must be properly resourced to ensure it gets its apportioned volume to market so it can generate much-needed revenue for the province.

The province must also take steps to preserve the timber-growing land base to ensure industry, and the communities that rely on it, can thrive for generations to come. BC’s Interior forest sector is undergoing a significant transformation in the wake of the mountain pine beetle epidemic. Uncertainty regarding the total available timber supply is a primary concern for industry.

In part to address this issue, the Special Committee on Timber Supply recommended in its August 2012 report that more opportunities for area-based tenures be created. When and where used appropriately, conversion to area-based tenures can help mitigate Interior timber supply declines, help stabilize communities, and increase company investment and government revenues.

Conversion from volume-based tenure to area-based tenure is not a panacea. These conversions can help mitigate declines in some circumstances but not in others. COFI is of the view that a process leading to a government decision to convert a tenure must:

- Be fair, open and transparent;
- Reflect the views of the appropriate stakeholders in community;
- Be informed by complete and accurate forest inventory information.

Not all COFI members support a focus on area-based tenure conversion as a priority for government. All COFI members recognize, however, that area-based tenures do have their place and support processes that are fair to all licensees and provide the public with the opportunity to provide real input into government decision-making.

Third, we need to work together to better attract, recruit and retain a skilled labour force in the sector. We expect 1,600 job openings a year for the next decade in our industry, with 70% of those jobs in the Interior of the province. Working with the province we need to improve the image of the sector and better align training and resources to enable the “the right training, in the right place, at the right time.” We need to better enable mobility of skilled labour from outside the province to help address critical shortages of skilled workers and at the same time, we need government to work with us to assist communities in adjusting to any necessary rationalizations that happen in primary manufacturing.

Fourth, government and industry need to further advance their partnership in growing markets for new and traditional wood products. This aspect of our partnership has enjoyed spectacular success. One need only look at the phenomenal growth in the Asian markets for our products, the emergence of new wood products such as cross laminated timber (CLT), as well as the steps other jurisdictions are beginning to take to mirror the BC Building Code’s tolerance of mid-rise wood constructed buildings. Minister Thomson’s annual Asia missions are important, as is the government’s continued support for Forestry Innovation Investment, which helped develop the China market and is beginning to do the same in India.

Lastly, provincial support in maintaining modern and efficient road, rail and port infrastructure and services are vital in enabling us to get fibre to facilities and products to market. The province’s efforts in resolving the recent labour disruption at the Port of Vancouver was critical for our industry, but operational issues remain at the port and need to be addressed to the benefit of both truckers and shippers. Rail car shortages are a consistent concern among industry every winter and provincial support in helping press CN and CP for improved rail service in the province would benefit industry and communities. Rail car shortages, coupled with a critical shortage of truck drivers, mean that more work needs to be done in examining new trucking configurations to safely increase loads and improve delivery times.

The decline in provincial timber supply and the forecasted decrease in annual allowable cut will result in industry rationalization, notwithstanding improving market conditions. By focusing government and industry efforts on these five key policy priorities, we can help mitigate any detrimental effects of those adjustments while improving the competitiveness of BC’s forest industry.

British Columbia’s forest industry was once the most productive and efficient in the world. It can and will be again, provided industry and governments take the steps necessary to make it so.

James Gorman is the president and CEO of the Council of Forest Industries (COFI). Prior to joining COFI last year, he served as a deputy minister for the Province of BC.
Over the span of a generation, our public forests have gone from a state of abundant timber supply to a situation of scarcity. A biotic agent, the mountain pine beetle, has affected a large area of forest beyond reference conditions. Compounding that issue, we are economically vulnerable to discriminatory wood export tariffs. We need to find ways to improve the diversity of wood manufacture and increase non-timber and nature-based economic activities. Adequate expenditures on forest stewardship are required to maintain the fabric of our forests.

We need to clarify entitlements in our public forests to keep the peace between timber rights holders, First Nations title, the right to a healthy environment and the needs of various interests. Our forest disputes have been some of Canada’s largest incidents of civil disobedience, indicating that social license for forest management walks a fine line.

Many of our sustainability issues are systemic and we need to be guided by Criterion 7 of the Montreal Process, an international agreement intended to help forest jurisdictions make progress in sustainable forest management. Criterion 7, “The Legal, Institutional and Economic Framework for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Management” is what we should be considering, rather than tenure reform. The comprehensive indicators in the process can help to design an area-based forest management vehicle that will not be a lemon.

Public ownership has been out of vogue for a generation. It is easy to blame our present predicament on Hardin’s “Tragedy of the Commons” hypothesis, which states that free, unrestrained use of a common resource will result in overuse and decline. Our forests were never managed in that way, so it does not fit. Elinor Ostrom’s research found that common pool resources can be sustainable if there are adequate institutional arrangements; in other words, public forests can be sustainable.

Our public forest is not about an ideology of nationalization or government ownership. The basic principle is that stewardship of the forest is more important than ownership. Government would act as the enduring trustee and ensure a wise system of independent professional management. Public forests were seen as a means to encourage diversity and enterprise in wood manufacture. Public timber would be available on an open market and would not be controlled by a few timber corporations. Sustainable communities and a healthy wood manufacturing sector were the intended outcomes.

Successive government administrations made arrangements contrary to the original intentions, which resulted in poor outcomes. The trustee, for example, operated without any trust documents. Sufficient proceeds from harvesting virgin forest capital were not directed to the maintenance of the public forest, and now the trustee intends to solve this problem by relying on private investment — which is an instrument of ownership. What we require instead are new nested institutions with trust documents and some checks and balances; otherwise, our public forests will not endure in this century.

A new framework that embeds independent professional reliance and is accountable to the public can be achieved through nested institutions of local forest trusts and a BC forest trust assembly. A local trust would have a charter to manage a large contiguous area of local forest landscape of sufficient size to permit economic operation. The trust documents or charter would require comprehensive management of all forest resources to Montreal Process standards. The local trust will have a board elected on a ward system from local communities and rural areas. First Nations can have their own local forest trust or be represented on the board of a trust on a ward system depending on geography and local population. The local trust will be managed by forest and associated professionals as a business, drawing income from all forest resources and owing a fiduciary duty to use sufficient proceeds to maintain the fabric of the forest. It would be responsible for the full natural capital of the forest, including the management of fish and wildlife and the development, as well as maintenance, of sustainable trails. Only minor stewardship licenses would be permitted and timber would be sold on an open market.

Local forest trusts would be audited and supported by the BC forest trust assembly and governed by one elected and one professional delegate from each forest trust. The assembly would handle collective services such as fire fighting, insurance, extension and act as a court of appeal. This new framework is an area-based forest management alternative designed to enable progress toward sustainable management under the Montreal Process. It meets Ostrom’s design principles for common pool resource institutions. It renews our public forest institutions and is a more efficient deployment of professional forest management capacity. It embeds professional reliance that is accountable to the public. It will provide social license, symbolized initially by the separation of central government and wood processing corporations from the management of our public forests. While it is probably counterintuitive for both parties to relinquish control, they will both benefit from the new democratic framework.

Andrew Mitchell is a retired forester who hikes 3,000 kms a year in the forest with his autistic daughter. He also actively volunteers his forest engineering skills to plan, build and maintain sustainable trails in BC Parks.

Tenure reform, in itself, is not BC’s most important forestry priority. What is needed are effective on-the-ground forestry outcomes (governance and management), enabled by legislation, that provide economic leverage and attract investment in mills. Growing a high quality timber supply will do this.

Conversion of tenures from volume to area-based will accomplish little. Doing more of the same is not what is needed most. Between 1990 and 2011 the number of medium and large sawmills in all of BC declined from 131 to 77 (41% decline), veneer from 20 to 11 mills (45% decline); pulp mills declined (1991 to 2009) from 24 to 18 (25% decline); and paper mills declined (1991 to 2009) from 12 to 6 (50% decline). If more area-based tenures could correct the cause of this major economic decline, the performance of Tree Farm Licences established since the 1940s would demonstrate that.

Missing since sustained yield was implemented post World War II, are new forests growing high quality wood at a rate similar to or exceeding the depletion rate of logged high-quality old growth. This was never done.

In the September/October 2012 issue of BC Forest Professional, Editor Brenda Martin wrote, “… the time between a stand of trees being declared ‘free growing’ and harvested … (is) … a period of time that doesn’t get a lot of attention.”

Our forestry profession has much more to offer. Osmaston wrote, “The fundamental purpose of forestry may be defined as that which secures the greatest continued value from the land allotted to forestry.” Key forest policy questions include: “What is the quality of the forest growing stock?” and “How can silvicultural practices best manage the productive structure of growing forests, to optimize benefits and minimize losses, during the entire forest rotation?”

The priority of every forest manager is effective management of all resources under her or his control. Forestry success is measured by the condition of the growing stock. Maintaining an optimum level of stocking is the most important task of good forest management. In well-managed forests, silviculturists keep vigorous trees and remove those lacking vigor. Financial success and increasing asset value of a forest is less a result of high volume production and more from ensuring a wide positive margin between income and expenses.

The longest, most stable trend in forest economics is the relationship between timber prices and wood quality. To secure the greatest continued timber value in a forest, effective managers grow high quality wood. High quality logs are straight, with low taper, high ring count, small tight (green) knots, uniform concentric rings, low proportion of juvenile wood and free from defects.

Nature without human intervention, in stands with high initial stocking (2,500 trees/ha), grows high quality wood, as illustrated in Figure 1. Note the very high product values in outer log quality zones 1 and 2:

Figure 1: Old Growth Log Quality Zones and Product Value
A value-based silvicultural system in young forests combines high initial stocking (say 2,500 trees/ha), extended rotations (> 100 years) and frequent light commercial thinnings (each < 30%). This requires control of the levels of growing stock, stand density, reduction of between tree (crown) competition and optimal timing of removals (with or without thinnings). The highest quality wood grows in tree trunks below the green crown. There are ecological and social benefits as well.

Figure 2 compares the effect of different stocking densities (#stems/ha) on coniferous crown development.

Figure 2: Effect of Stocking Density on Crown Development
The differences in timber value between trees grown at “c” stocking levels compared to “a” are orders of a higher magnitude. These January 2014 value differences range from “I” coastal low-grade saw logs ($88.79/m³), to “H” high-grade saw logs ($143.02/m³), and “D” grade veneer logs ($325.23/m³).

Well-managed forests were a priority for founding foresters F.D. Mulholland, the ABCPF’s first President, H.R. MacMillan of MacMillan Bloedel, and G. Warrack, BC Forest Service researcher. They put first things first in forestry. Forest professionals today can build on their legacy.

Ray Travers, RPF, (Ret), has a bachelor of science degree in Forestry (1966) from the University of British Columbia (silvics option) and a master of forestry (1970) from Oregon State University (major forest management, minor silviculture). Ray is an advocate of ecologically-based forestry and value-based silviculture. He can be reached at: rtravers@islandnet.com
(Prices as of January 1985, Madison's Canadian Lumber Reporter)

1) Clear: $1,250 - 4,000/M
2) Near Clear: $600 - 1,000/M
3) Appearance Merch: $450 - 800/M
4) Structural Lumber: $350 - 500/M
5) Low Grade: $200 - 350/M

N.B.: The 'spokes-in-the-wheel' represent branch stubs. Live branches are shown in outline ( ), dead portions are shown in black ( ), and decayed stubs are shown in a mottled tone ( ).
Over the last 130 years or so, forestry in British Columbia has largely been viewed as a technical problem that merely requires the right ‘expert’ solutions. Besides the four Royal Commissions earlier in the 20th century, three general provincial policy inquiries have occurred in the last 20 years, with one general policy review reported in March 2000, and another reported in 2002 with the Forest Revitalization Act and follow-up legislation in April 2003. Also during the first decade of the 21st century, events led to an agreement for the establishment of a form of ecosystem-based management (EBM) on the South-Central, Central and North Coastal areas. Further, as this article is being written, government is examining ways to increase the diversity of area-based tenures, looking at structural improvements in BC Timber Sales and reviewing a proposal to modify operations in the North, Central and South-Central Coastal area. It would appear that the timing for a review of timber tenure and pricing would be at the centre of government’s assessments of policy change and review but this does not seem to be the case.

Often policy inquiries have been limited in scope or severely hampered by pre-review assumptions and agendas. All too frequently, experts have recommended solutions that fixed immediate problems without addressing the systemic political factors that created them in the first place. The existing timber tenure system is a result of the old utilitarian approach of the Progressive Conservation Movement developed around the turn of the last century. The foundation sup-

The ecology of plant communities has historically been treated on a philosophical rather than on an experimental basis with its ancestry easily traced back to the naturalists of the 18th century. Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) was one of a group of intellectuals that adopted the philosophical-religious doctrine of transcendentalism. Among its precepts were the central role of biological nature in religion and that nature could be read spiritually. Further, nature was benign and concerned about human beings. It was only during the last few decades of the 20th century that concepts, experimental techniques and analytical procedures, along with the increasing sophistication of the computer, have been developed, permitting the inductive study of anything approaching an ecological system (Botkin, 2012).

Yet the teleological legacy is evident in BC’s approach to EBM; its evidence is peppered throughout the planning documents concerning EBM implementation in the North, Central, and South-Central coast. In an area that is roughly 7 million hectares (70,000 km²), only about 2 million hectares is available for commercial timber harvesting. Even the name coined by environmentalists in the mid-1990s, Great Bear Rainforest, evokes something other than scientific forest management. EBM implies the application of science but it must be remembered that EBM is not ecosystem management (Kimbmns, 2003).

EBM is being delivered by BC’s traditional timber tenure and pricing system, which makes very little sense. Forests can only be managed as ecosystems if all values are managed under an integrated, multi-value approach by an individual agency/organization or collective over a time scale and area that is consistent with ecosystem processes. A similar observation can be made for BC Timber Sales and its paucity in approach to selling timber. While there are only a few major methods for selling timber and logs, there is no end to variation as to how that is accomplished. Adapting timber or log sales to local conditions could be key to maximizing returns while setting stumpage on the major timber tenures.

There are really only two jurisdictions left in the world that endorse centralized planning and control — North Korea and BC. One has to ask whether the public interest in its forests is better served by having a centrally planned ownership model, a free-enterprise ownership model or something else. The answer is quite likely something else. Agreeing with Haig-Brown, the main issue is the forest itself, its capacity for renewal, and the difference between thinking of it as merely a timber estate versus treating it as a living landscape from which generations well into the future may benefit not only economically but also socially, culturally, aesthetically and spiritually.

Now is the time to step back and examine the goals and objectives of society as it plunges into the 21st century. Is it trying to accommodate change in both society and forests while learning and adapting to ecologically living with the environment, or is it attempting to hold back natural change by embedding the province’s forests in a complex inert system of bureaucracy? It seems that this is the right time to open up the discussion and analysis with respect to reform in timber tenure and pricing.

Will Wagner resides in Campbell River where he is continuing research initiated while with the Canadian Forest Service. He studied forestry at UC Berkeley, forest engineering at Oregon State and the economics of forest resources at the University of Victoria. He has practised forestry in three regions of the US and also in the Interior and on coast of BC.
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Fire is not a problem but rather a critical ecological process that drives ecosystems and promotes heterogeneity across the landscape. In addition to the scenarios discussed in the March/April 2014 issue of *BC Forest Professional* (Gawalko, 2014), we bring forward a third conceptual future. The third future is one that is based on stewardship as defined by the ABCFP, whereby there is an “ethical responsibility to the land and people for current and future generations.” We suggest that this future is based on ecological and cultural methods and techniques that support ecosystem resilience and integrity.

Pyric herbivory, the fire-grazing interaction, is an ecological process that occurs throughout the world. Although often de-coupled from their combined natural ecological process, grazing following fire has occurred across the globe and specifically in the boreal forest for centuries. Fire resulting from lightning and/or human causes is common across the boreal forest as can be seen in charcoal depositions in the soil, firescars on trees, firebrands across the landscape and through oral accounts by First Nations, early explorers and long-time residents.

Historically the Dene people of Fort Nelson First Nation have had an intricate cultural interaction with fire that continues to this day. Over the past five years, Fort Nelson First Nation and Shifting Mosaics Consulting have been documenting oral stories and traditional practices of fire, as well as researching and planning strategies to assist the ecological restoration of wood bison. Wood bison were extirpated from BC in the early 1900s, however, two herds were re-introduced to northern BC by the government and they currently select for the right of way of the Alaska Highway and the petroleum development roads where there are fatal interactions with traffic.

Fire is an important tool for the Dene as well as a vital part of the ecosystem. Fire brings the Dene together with the landscape they have been part of for centuries. Dr. Henry Lewis cites over 70 different reasons that First Nations people used fire, from cooking to warfare to increased berry harvesting to grazing and willow production for basketry. These pyrogenic systems are important not only for grazing and browsing species, but also for the health of fur bearing animals that are trapped and used for food, clothing and crafts.

Fire is also an important process in rangeland management. As a range tenure holder and part of the pyric herbivory research team, Liard River Adventures partnered with Fort Nelson First Nation to implement prescribed fire burn plans in the original range of the wood bison. The recent successful results of this partnership and our work were documented on CBC’s The National, in a segment called “Imagine the Fire” (http://www.cbc.ca/player/News/Canada/BC/ID/2392591483/?page=2). Many forest professionals were involved in the development and implementation of the prescribed fire burn plans, in the monitoring of vegetation prior to and post-fire and providing expertise on fire ignitions and behaviour. Crews from the
Prince George Fire Centre provided integral support in establishing the vegetation exclosures used for monitoring post-burn effects.

The use of prescribed fire as a forest management tool throughout the province of British Columbia has decreased substantially from the period prior to the 1990s when over 300,000 ha were broadcast burned annually. In its absence, BC has experienced a marked increase in high-severity wildfire in ecosystems historically adapted to low- to moderate-severity fire regimes. Such a change in severity can have a profound, and mostly negative, effect on various ecosystem components including: air quality; soil chemistry, biology and structure; water quality; plant community diversity and productivity; and wildlife habitat quality and species diversity. This new pattern of mega fires also severely impacts human ecosystem components including: human health, property and other important social, economic and environmental values.

What little prescribed burning and other fuel hazard treatments that have occurred since the 1990s has been dwarfed by the amount of area burned in wildfires (e.g. 1.5 million ha burned between 2000 and 2010). Following the catastrophic wildfires of 2003, the Filmon Review Team recommended to the province that the rate of prescribed burning be significantly increased. The team also suggested that the focus should shift to more burning in the areas of ecosystem management,
ecological restoration and hazard reduction in the wildland-urban interface. Going forward, far more prescribed fire needs to be applied to the ecosystems most adapted to fire and most departed from its influence, and to protect critical social, economic and environmental values.

Unfortunately, many land managers do not recognize the critical role that humans, fire and pyric herbivory (the fire-grazing interaction) play in maintaining and conserving biological diversity across the landscape. As the climate continues to change and landscapes shift, it is vital to retain both traditional and cultural practices that maintain diverse and properly functioning ecosystems that are resilient and ecologically sound. The teachings and lessons learned from our elders and community members about fire are critical to incorporate in any and all fire and ecosystem management and planning. “Fire is so ingrained in our culture, taking away the right to burn creates imbalance. This is not culture lost but culture stolen,” said Leloni Anne Needlay, research assistant at The Dene Fire Project.

The authors would like to acknowledge the generous donation of time, support and guidance from Oklahoma State University, Fort Nelson First Nation, Environment Canada, the American Bison Society, the Northeast BC Wildlife Fund, Liard River Adventures, Qwest Helicopters, Villers Air, the BC Government (particularly the Wildfire Management Branch and PWGSC/NIFAC crews) and all family and friends. Special acknowledgement to Duncan McCue and Doug Tate of CBC’s The National for producing “Imagine the Fire” – a continuation of Dr. Henry Lewis’s legacy.

Sonja Leverkus is a Forester-In-Training and PhD candidate at Oklahoma State University. She owns Shifting Mosaics Consulting and has the pleasure and honour of working with an outstanding team.

Chris Schippmann is the guide outfitter and owner of Liard River Adventures along with his partner Thor and daughter Cali.

Lana Lowe is the lands director for Fort Nelson First Nation.

Dr. Sam Fuhlendorf is the regents professor and Sarkeys distinguished professor at Oklahoma State University.

Robert W. Gray is an internationally-recognized fire ecologist who specializes in historical fire regime, fire effects and fuel treatment effectiveness research.

Do you have a Science In Action story you want to share? E-mail your ideas to Doris Sun at: editor@abcfp.ca
A Story of British Columbia

A novel by A. B. Robinson, RPF (Ret), about the Queen Charlotte Islands as they were, and a logger who becomes intimately linked to the Haida Indians. It is also about the forest industry, forest policy, foresters, and the Forest Service. Available only in e-book format. Go to Kindle e-books and search for the title. Price – about $5.00.
Can an RFT sign off on a Road Site Plan without a Limited Licence or Special Permit?

Mike says: Your question hinges on the competence and authority of professional practice within the Foresters Act, and on a clear understanding of what is being asked of the professional when providing required services in Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA) and the Forest Act.

All registered members are equally accountable under the law of the Foresters Act. RFTs have authority in ‘aspects of practice’ consistent with their education, training and experience — which is less than the authority of RPFs who have no limitation on authority of practice. RFTs and RPFs are both limited in their practice by their own competence. This last test, the test of competence, is the most defining test (in my opinion) regarding what professional work and documents the RPF and the RFT can sign and seal. In other words, we will be limited by our current competence to do professional work. I have observed that professionals will often push the limits of their own competence. Pushing the limits of practice increases professional learning and opportunities for innovation; however, pushing the limits of practice also increases risk of failure or an undesirable result.

The Road Site Plan is a FRPA requirement between the tenure holder and government. FRPA Section 10 states that the plan must be consistent with the Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP), FRPA and the regulations. And the Road Site Plan must identify how the intended results or strategies described in the FSP apply to the road.

Tenure holders and government use the Road Site Plan to document planning and procedures that ensure they meet the various requirements of FRPA, Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (FPPR), and the Forest Act related to transportation structures in forests. As a result, the Road Site Plan can contain different components, actions and judgements necessary to meet the obligations.

Who can sign the Road Site Plan under the Foresters Act depends on the content of the specific Road Site Plan in question. If the Road Site Plan indicates that the road location is, for example, through an Old Growth Management Area, established for ecologically endangered ecosystem reasons, then the registered member must ask whether he/she is qualified to assist the employer in the achievement of the FRPA section 10 requirements or any other FPPR or Forest Act requirements that have been deemed to be part of the work expected of the forest professional for that Road Site Plan.

An RFT can sign the Road Site Plan document if he/she is qualified. (Being qualified to practise in the area of the Road Site Plan means having both authority and competence.)

The RFT can sign...
The RFT can sign if all of the professional content is fully within the four general practice areas established as ABCFP Bylaw (authority), and the RFT has the necessary competence within the area of specific Road Site Plan content.

Where the professional content of the Road Site Plan is outside the RFT authority (i.e. the four general practice areas), the RFT can sign the Road Site Plan if that portion that is outside his/her authority has been completed by a registered professional (e.g. RPF) who is qualified to undertake the professional content. The professional completing the supplemental work would sign, seal and be accountable for his/her portion of the work. That component of supplemental work is either attached to the Road Site Plan as an ancillary document or kept on the file of the RFT member in support of his/her signed Road Site Plan document.

The RFT or RPF can sign...
Where the professional content is outside the competence of a registered member (either RFT or RPF) then the registered member can sign the Road Site Plan if that portion that is outside his/her competence has been completed by a registered professional (e.g. RPF, RFT) who is qualified to undertake the professional content. The professional completing the supplemental work would sign, seal and be accountable for his/her portion of the work. That component of work is either attached to the Road Site Plan as an ancillary document or kept on the file of the RFT or RPF member in support of his/her signed Road Site Plan document.

Some people like a ‘black or white’ answer. But, of course, situations are varied and the specific circumstances of each situation matter. This represents one of the reasons that most complex processes or environmental situations in forestry require the intellectual and ethical approach of forest professionals. ~

Mike Larock, RPF
Director of Professional Practice and Forest Stewardship
mlarock@abcfp.ca
Over the last couple of years a few of us debated about the appeal of doing a voluntary peer review as part of the ABCFP’s continuing competency program. We all do our annual self-assessment to review our own perceived areas for improvement and learning needs but we felt that although this is a good introspective review, perhaps having someone else look at your practice may bring forth some further opportunities for improvement. As a further benefit, we felt that the reviewers would give us the opportunity to see a different way of doing things that may potentially improve their own practices.

In November 2013 we decided that we would move forward with the idea and that we should try to include anyone who was interested in participating in our office; seven RFTs showed interest in participating (As a note, we have just over 30 RPFs/RFTs in our office). With this interest, I started researching what was required to complete the process. This information is on the ABCFP website, but Jim Crover, RPF, at the ABCFP was there to offer clarity on a couple of issues I had. I then held a meeting with the group to look at what was required and to develop an action plan for how we would move forward. It was decided at the meeting that rather than picking a reviewer, we would randomly draw names for reviewers for each participant.

In our situation this worked well, as we are all RFTs working in the same office with similarities in our jobs. We set a deadline of getting reviews submitted to the ABCFP prior to the Christmas break.

The peer review process is relatively straightforward. You identify a reviewer who meets the guidelines: an ABCFP member with no conflict of interest and competent in the area of review. A meeting followed when the review took place and forms from the website were completed and submitted to Jim Crover. The documents are as follows;

- Form 1: Interpreting and Documenting the Responses
- Form 2: Combining a Peer Review With Another Type of Previously Completed Review
- Form 3: Self-Assessment and Professional Development Evaluation
- Form 4: Peer Review Professional Development Plan
- Form 5: Peer Review Declaration of Completion

We found that this took about one day by the time you have your meeting, look at a few examples, professional diaries, tracking tools, etc. and then type up the results and submit the forms to the ABCFP. As a recommendation to the ABCFP there are two different versions of Form 1 on the website; if all the peer review links on the site took you to one location this would be eliminated.

We all managed to get our peer reviews completed in December and by March had received word from the association that they had been reviewed and accepted. Overall I think the process worked well. There are a few items that we felt helped the process. The first is that we all understand the lingo of our office; for example, when I say that I “TRIM” the e-mail, everyone knows that means electronic filing. As well, we all work together in the same office so it was easy to talk about local issues and to schedule. Being that this was a voluntary process, everyone was willing to put the time and effort in, both as peer reviewers and participants.

For those members who have not been involved in a peer review, I would recommend that you take the time to participate in one. From both sides it is a worthwhile process. Being reviewed allows you the opportunity to look at your work though some else’s eyes and sometimes just explaining what you do to a second party gives you a different insight into your job and the process, and forces you to answer, “why?” As a peer it gives you the chance to see how others approach their work. In both cases it may stretch your thinking on why you do what you do.

For me personally, as a peer reviewer, I was introduced to a different way to track training and learning opportunities that I have now adopted. Overall I would have to say that it was time well spent!

Clinton Reiter, RFT, has worked in the forestry field for 31 years, the last 25 of that with FLNRO. Clinton has worked in both the north and south regions in a wide variety of roles, from silviculture and recreation to protection and pricing. He is currently working out of the Thompson Rivers District in Kamloops as a tenures/authorization technician.
The New B.C. Roadside Naturalist:  
A Guide to Nature Along B.C. Highways

By Richard & Sydney Canning  

This profusely-illustrated and readable guidebook describes, in some detail, the geology and landforms along all of BC’s major highways (and also some minor ones), recounts the tree species to be encountered and notes lesser vegetation, birds and animals that may be seen. The many sidebars add depth and interest. Observers are led, in sequence, along the Trans-Canada, Island, Crowsnest, Coquihalla, Yellowhead, Tsawassen/Patricia Bay, Chilcotin, Stewart-Cassiar, East Kootenay, Okanagan/Cariboo, John Hart, Alaska and Sea-to-Sky Highways. Some, like the Alaska Highway, are dealt with in more detail than others. Descriptions of fauna and flora clearly relate occurrence to the influences of topography and local climate — elementary ecology. A useful introductory summary leads off each highway traverse.

Travellers who take an interest in their countryside will derive enhanced pleasure, understanding and appreciation of their surroundings from the Cannings’ work and even those who hurry from start to destination could become better informed. The style and absence of taxonomic names or bibliography suggest that the book has been written for lay readers rather than for professionals but even they can learn from it.

The book would have been improved by more rigorous editing: the numerous anthropomorphisms become irksome after a while — “...the highway travels...[or] swings...”, “...trees join...[or] ...drop out...” and so on; “the Rocky Mountain Trench, some 1,600km long, is claimed to be the world’s longest geological fault but it is dwarfed by the 6,000km East African Rift Valley and its extension into the near east; the massive 1965 Hope Slide doesn’t match the 1903 Frank Slide when 82 million tonnes of rock fell from Turtle Mountain killing nearly 100 people.”

There are also a few surprising omissions: driving along the Chilcotin Highway you will pass Lee’s Corner, the starting point for an heroic but disastrously unsuccessful attempt to drive a herd of cattle north to feed the Yukon gold miners. The Alaska Highway passes the renowned Sign Post Forest at Watson Lake and, later, Aishihik underground power station, the first built north of the Arctic Circle in the western world. Boundary Bay is noted along the Sea-to-Sky route but not its internationally-recognised and threatened significance as an Important Bird Area and the main river is the Little Campbell to distinguish it from its bigger namesake on the Island. These features warrant a passing mention at least. Perhaps a future edition will correct these flaws and so enhance the undoubted merits of the guidebook.

Review by Roy Strang, PhD, RPF, Ret
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Review by Roy Strang, PhD, RPF, Ret
A recent decision of the British Columbia Supreme Court has given an unexpected boost to the status of BC’s Forest Practices Board (Board). In Western Canada Wilderness Committee v. British Columbia, two environmental advocacy groups (referred to as WC2), challenged the Minister of Environment’s decision not to issue ‘Section 7 Notices’ under the Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (Regulation) in relation to Coastal Douglas Fir (CDF).

Among other things, section 5(1) of the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA) requires that before the Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (FLNRO) may approve a forest stewardship plan (FSP) to authorize timber harvesting activities, the FSP must specify intended results and strategies in relation to “objectives set by government.” In turn, various objectives set by government are specified in the Regulation. The government’s objective for wildlife under section 7(1) of the Regulation is “to conserve sufficient wildlife habitat … for … the survival of species at risk.”

Since FRPA requires an FSP to include intended results and strategies to conserve sufficient wildlife habitat for the survival of a species at risk, and since there was no dispute that CDF was a species at risk, WC2 was presumably of the view that any FSP with areas of CDF must preserve that CDF. However, government hedged its bet with respect to wildlife habitat protection: section 7(2) of the Regulation provided that before the objective specified in section 7(1) applied to a FSP, the Minister first had to give a so-called ‘Section 7 Notice’ to the person required to prepare the FSP. The Minister had not issued any Section 7 Notices with respect to CDF, so the substantive issue in this case was whether the Minister was required to do so under the circumstances.

All statutory discretion, such as that at issue in this case, is subject to review by the courts one way or another. If, as in this case, there is no statutory right of review or appeal that is specific to the exercise of discretion at issue, then a procedure called ‘judicial review’ is potentially available. Essentially, if a party has a sufficient legal interest in the exercise of a statutory discretion, and no specific right of review or appeal is otherwise available, then that party may apply under the Judicial Review Procedure Act to have a court review the exercise of discretion for legal validity.

Importantly, here can be no “adequate alternative remedy” (that is, some other way to challenge the decision at issue). Traditionally, an ‘adequate’ alternative remedy has meant an ‘equally effective’ alternative remedy, and if an applicant for judicial review failed to pursue any available adequate alternative remedy, the court would decline its application.

Getting back to the Board, FRPA contemplates that the Board will (among other things) investigate public complaints and make recommendations to government based upon its investigations. The Board cannot bind the government to the Board’s recommendations, or otherwise lawfully compel the government to take any particular action. It can only recommend.

On the other hand, a court may make orders in a judicial review proceeding that does compel government to act in a particular way. While courts will rarely order government to take any particular positive action, courts will often strike down the government’s exercise of a statutory discretion, or make formal declarations as to the legality of the government’s conduct, and government is compelled adhere to these decisions.

Since government often does listen to recommendations of the Board, the court nevertheless held in this case that a complaint to the Board was an adequate alternative remedy to judicial review, and that WC2 was required to pursue a complaint to the Board before it was entitled to seek judicial review (ultimately, in the name of judicial efficiency, the court went on to determine the substantive issue against WC2 in any event). The court’s conclusion that the Board’s public complaint process is an adequate alternative remedy to judicial review would seem to suddenly make the Board into a much bigger watchdog.

Jeff Waatainen is an adjunct professor of law at UBC, has practised law in the forest sector for over 15 years, and currently works in the Forestry Law Practice Group of Davis LLP’s Vancouver offices.
In Memorium

It is very important to many members to receive word of the passing of a colleague. Members have the opportunity to publish their memories by sending photos and obituaries to editor@abcfp.ca. The association sends condolences to the family and friends of the following members:

Michael Zachary
RPF #276
January 16, 1921 – December 23, 2013

Michael was born in Zalaniw, Ukraine. His early life was shaped by tremendous personal hardship and geopolitical tumult, having started from the humblest of beginnings and having to survive under both Stalin and Hitler.

Education was essential to Michael. Imagine a cold, dark and snowy Ukrainian winter morning. A lone young village boy, wearing shoddy shoes, walks to school six kilometres away. He arrives at 3 am because he does not have a clock at home. Overcoming all challenges Michael eventually graduated with a forestry degree from the University of Freiburg in Germany.

Immigrating to Canada in 1949, Michael earned his Canadian forestry degree from the University of Toronto. Michael was deeply attached to nature and took great pride in his profession. In Toronto, he met his beloved wife Olga. Coming to Victoria in 1952 he worked in the Survey Division of the BC Forest Service where he organized the first all-female survey crew using summer students. He also was the first to hire First Nations men for fire suppression crews. Michael worked later with the City of Victoria as boulevard supervisor. In addition to his regular job, Michael and family established an 85 hive apiary, producing honey under the “Island’s Finest” brand. He also owned, managed and maintained several rental properties.

Michael enjoyed collecting books, music and local art. When possible he would attend art galleries, live stage and musical performances, auctions and flea markets. He read widely and experienced music with his heart. Michael had a genuine zest for life and somehow found time to experience it fully and on his own terms. He was delighted to meet and talk with people of all ages and callings. His greatest source of pride and pleasure, however, was his family. They lived together with love.

Michael never forgot his Ukrainian roots even as he cherished Canada for its freedom and justice.

Predeceased by his son Dennis in 1976, Michael is survived by his wife of 62 years Olga; his children Jerome and wife Kannika, and Peter; his grandchildren Nick (Stephanie), Natalie and Tony.

Michael’s friend and fellow RPF, Jack McLellan, was a pallbearer at the funeral. Jack was handsomely attired in an original woollen BC Forest Service uniform.

Submitted by the Zachary family
Don MacLaurin passed away May 8, 2014 after a lengthy illness. Don was 85 years young and had a very fulfilling and wonderful life. Don obtained his Bachelor of Science in Forestry from the University of New Brunswick in 1955. He commuted from New Brunswick to BC on his Triumph motorcycle during his summer student years. He had a long and varied forestry career working for the BC Forest Service in Vancouver (10 years) followed by 24 years at BCIT. Don was a BCIT pioneer and his infectious enthusiasm certainly had an influence on prospective and enrolled students. Don played an important role in launching the Fish, Wildlife and Recreation program and was one of the first members of the forestry department. He also became one of the inaugural leaders in distance education at BCIT.

Don was an RPF in BC and was elected to the ABCFP council where he served for many years, contributing greatly to his profession. He retired to Whistler where he was a guiding light behind the Whistler Demonstration Forest. He was involved with many forestry and mountaineering organizations and clubs such as the BC Mountaineering Club, Federation of Mountain Clubs of BC, Outdoor Recreation Council, Port Moody Parks and Recreation Commission, Whistler Advisory Parks and Recreation Committee, Whistler Forest and Wildland Advisory Committee, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Association and many more. Don was also a great Rotarian and took on many local and international community projects for Rotary.

Don worked for the Resort Municipality of Whistler for many years, undertaking forest management projects, and treating thousands of hectares of second-growth Douglas-fir plantations. He built trails, educational signs, and the Whistler Interpretive Forest for all to learn about the forest. He always worked as a team player and pulled many people together. He promoted the idea of a community forest surrounding Whistler for many years, and his dream came true in 2009.

Don was also a long-time active member of the CIF, involved with the Vancouver Section and the FACT educational charity. He was awarded the CIF’s Canadian Forestry Achievement Award in 2000. Don was always willing to get involved in worthy causes and help others. We will miss Don very much.

*Prepared by Candace Parsons, RPF, and Peter Ackhurst, RPF*
### Membership Statistics

**ABCFP — April 2014**

**NEW REGISTERED MEMBERS**
- Carmen Alicia Augustine, RPF
- Christopher Hal Boulton, RPF
- Matthew William Brine, RPF, ATC
- Alexander Dean Burkshaw, RPF, ATC
- Cory Martin Byron, RPF
- Holly Jean Christie, RFT
- Christopher Robert David, RPF
- Michael Leigh Davis, RPF
- Joanna Grace DeMontreuil, RPF
- Gavin Lee Dykshoorn, RPF
- Andrew David Flegel, RPF
- Prem Gurung, RPF
- Janelle Christine Hale, RPF
- Benjamin Peter Harper-Heir, RPF
- Maxime Ovide Lépine, RPF
- Daniel Lewis Macmaster, RPF
- Robert Gordon Nash, RPF
- Dwayne Joseph Maurice Paradis, RPF
- Rueben James Schulz, RPF
- Blake Philip Threlkeld, RPF
- Jonathan William Van Barneveld, RPF

**NEW ENROLLED MEMBERS**
- Megan Elizabeth Barry, FIT
- Kevin Vander Boom, TFT
- Conor Richard Howard, TFT
- Paul Justin Kairys, FIT
- Darcy Allan Macleod, TFT
- Max Rennie Marshall, TFT
- Emily Marie Outram, TFT
- Erik Sauli Piikkila, FIT
- Staci Lynn Potratz, FIT
- Daniel John Scholey, TFT

**REINSTATEMENTS (REGISTERED MEMBERS)**
- Richard Turgeon, RFT
- William H. Graham, RPF
- Scott Grant Muir, RPF

**REINSTATEMENTS (RETIRED MEMBERS)**
- Roger Victor Ennis, RPF(Ret)

**REINSTATEMENTS (ENROLLED MEMBERS)**
- Brynmor Lloyd Williams, TFT

**REINSTATEMENTS FROM LEAVE OF ABSENCE (REGISTERED MEMBERS)**
- Todd Michael Yakielashek, RPF

**REINSTATEMENTS FROM LEAVE OF ABSENCE (ASSOCIATE MEMBERS)**
- Daniel Palonio, ATC

**DECEASED**
- Tony W. Wideski, RPF(Ret)

**TRANSFERRING FROM FIT TO TFT**
- Keiko Arakawa, TFT

**TRANSFERRING FROM FIT TO TFT**
- Sean Corey Fogarty, FIT

**THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE ARE NOT ENTITLED TO PRACTICE PROFESSIONAL FORESTRY IN BC:**

**REMOVALS FOR NON-PAYMENT (ENROLLED MEMBERS)**
- Carrie Ann Lee Breisch, TFT

**ABCFP — May 2014**

**NEW REGISTERED MEMBERS**
- Jake Alexander Hussey, RFT

**NEW ENROLLED MEMBERS**
- Ashley Rozalia Adamczyk, FIT
- Qcengcen Cai, FIT
- Scott Matthew Howard, TFT
- Helene M. C. Marcoux, FIT

**NEW ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**
- David Edward Craven, ATC

**REINSTATEMENT FROM LEAVE OF ABSENCE (REGISTERED MEMBERS)**
- Todd Michael Yakielashek, RPF

**DECEASED**
- Adolf R. Kokoshke, RPF

### TD Insurance

You’ve paid your dues. Start paying less with TD Insurance.

Request a quote today
1-866-269-1371
melochemonnex.com/abcfp
A Moment in Forestry

Submit your Moment in Forestry photo to Doris Sun at: editor@abcfp.ca

Gliding in Tranquil Waters

By Megan Hanacek, RPF, RPBio

A Neucel Mill export ship leaving Quatsino Sound, near Port Alice, on northwestern Vancouver Island.
Paper-Free Forms for your Operation!
Let us modernize your paper checklists, inspections, and audits!

Cloud Syncing
Deploy forms for mobile employees and sync data seamlessly without a trip to the office.

Smart Devices
Ready to run on your iPads and iPhones or Android devices.

Works Offline
Ensure accessibility of your forms without internet connectivity.

Complete Data Collection
Enhance your forms with photos, voice clips and GPS coordinates.

TESTIMONIAL
“In the field SNAP has saved us time and simplified field surveys by summarizing sampling data and calculating confidence levels. In the office it has saved us a significant amount of staff time through its ability to summarize and compare data, generate reports and transfer and compile information from other district offices.”

Ricardo Velasquez,
District Silvicultural Forester
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

Call today or visit us online for more information or to schedule your free demo.
Toll Free 1-800-535-2093 · www.snapdcos.com