

**Comments and Review of the Recommendations Submitted by
Jaakko Poyry to the New Brunswick Government**

Presented to

The Legislative Assembly on Crown Forests, Campbellton, NB

**By: Brenda Kelley
Bathurst Sustainable Development
November 25, 2003**

**PRESENTATION BY BATHURST SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT TO
THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON WOOD SUPPLY
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2003, CAMPBELLTON, NB**

Bathurst Sustainable Development is a non profit community led environmental organization with a board of Director's of 15 citizens from across Bathurst and surrounding communities.

We find our selves in a situation where the industry says they are in ciao, running out of trees, give us access to more timber allocation or the industry will collapse. Environmentalists, conservationists, and some of our own DNR staff say an increase in harvest is unsustainable for the NB forests, eco systems and species.

Objective observations of the past two decades tells us that we have been basically been letting the forest companies do the majority of the modeling and management for several years now and obviously there must be errors in forecasts of wood supply or they would not find themselves in the situation they say they are in right now with a projected flat supply of future timber. Surely, the small portion of protected areas created could not be completely responsible for this impending crisis that they speak of. Where are the long term management plans for sustained supply? Are they incorrect? According to DNR, 72 percent of the Crown land is already available to the six big forestry companies for the exclusive purpose of cutting and growing more trees. If they cannot manage to financially stay in business with that allocation then that is our indicator that there is something very fundamentally wrong. But what?

Mechanized pulping of the forest is not sustainable.

The mouth of the pulp mill and its ability to reduce vast amounts of timber at a fast pace is limitless. The supply of raw timber is not. There are limits to both the available land area to the companies for growing more trees and the ability of the growth rate of those trees to keep up with the automated machines in the mills and forest operations. If we increase their harvest, and sacrifice our public values they will all be back in a handful of years crying about a shortage of wood again. 40- 50 years is a long time. That is how long they will have to wait to harvest the plantations, in order for them to be of enough volume to be of any value to them. Then what will they do? They will have pulped the natural forest, they will have pulped the plantations and they will be out of wood again? We have provided these industries with a more than generous 72% of the crown forest of NB which is at their disposal; they will need to live within these limits because they share the crown forest of NB with the public, and its goals and objectives are equally important. The government of NB has a legal binding requirement to ensure that the public's crown lands are protected Now and For the Future and are managed not only for the level of corporate profits and primary objective of wood supply but also for their social and ecological value. We are not willing to sacrifice protected areas, wildlife objectives, cultural, aboriginal, watershed, recreational, tourism, endangered and rare species areas. It is not sustainable, it is not in the best interest of current and future generations and it is not ecologically sound. Our understanding of ecosystem function and ecological processes tells that the Department of Natural Resources is right when they include objectives for biodiversity conservation, habitat and watershed conservation. These ecosystem requirements are just that, requirements, that science, logic and responsible management require. Reducing their protection

levels and increasing disturbance by the forest companies should not be open for negotiation. We are however in favour of the need to increase the winter sheltering areas for deer, the addition of migration corridors to be made part of forest management policy and an increase in the protected buffer zones of all surface waters.

In terms of the government of NB agreeing to be held legally and financially accountable if the forest companies do not get their quota, I urge you not to draw the citizens of NB into such a unwise decision. There simply are too many variables that could impact the availability of future timber supply both from plantations and from a natural forest that would be totally beyond our control that could happen such as disease, poor management of the forests by the companies, poor science used by the companies, freezing and thawing extremes, drought, floods, fires, pest infestations, hurricanes and tornados. We recommend that you do not accept any liability for supply to these companies for things that are beyond your control.

Over the years we have reduced our DNRE capabilities to supervise the management, and reduced our citizen and community involvement in how the crown forest is managed. This report is suggesting that we continue that decrease in management by DNR. That is unacceptable. What we need to do is take back more control of the management of the crown forest immediately or future generations may not have a crown forest that is an actual forest. We want to see the number of wildlife technicians, Forest Rangers and Enforcement personnel doubled.

We recommend that our DNR staff and our government enter into a joint Forest Stewardship Council agreement with all communities and all forest operations in the province, because there are real opportunities for increased biodiversity, long term ecological gains, expanded employment levels and increased economic value from the current harvest timber allocations under the FSC method of management. It is called diversification into value added products. The forest industry should be able to diversify now from a pulp based industry to value added products without increasing the harvest. They should be able to begin now the manufacturing of these products which they say they have identified within the current timber allocations.

If we were to accept and implement the Jaakko Poyry recommendations, 40% of the natural forested areas of NB will be converted to plantations. A plantation is not a forest; it is an agricultural plot of land, intensively harvested, changed in composition and intentionally drained of much of its surface water. Plantations come with a high ecological cost, diminished surface and ground water is one of them.

Plantations do not like to get their feet wet

Research is concluding that plantations grow best when they are planted in a dryer soil composition dryer than the composition in most natural forests. Therefore when a plantation is established it is drained of much of its surface water to make the soil dryer and allow for intensive management. Allowing any area of forest to be intentionally drained of its ground and surface water should be banned in this province considering the current threat levels to the availability of fresh water resources reported both here in NB and across the world. The science of converting the natural forest to replace it with intensive plantations will increase this dewatering. We find this unacceptable; it belongs to the old ways of the last century. In this century, we have a much greater respect for limits of available fresh water and for the

importance of the biological diversity of our natural forests. The suggestions and recommendations in this report are merely an attempt to access our remaining natural forest and pulp its logs, including its old growth and protected areas. We recommend the report be rejected.

Climate Change

The world has entered into a time of pivotal change and it's called Climate change. The one thing we all know for certain is that there is no certainty on how hard or how severe climate change will impact each of our communities, our natural resources, water supplies, agricultural operations, migration of species, including the migrations of the forest, which is already occurring, the impact on weather, climate, and the severity of extreme events. 2000 scientists of the United Nations have reached the consensus, after 20 years of research that we are being impacted now, scientists are continuing to confirm that these impacts will continue at varying degrees of intensity and forms for years to come. They are recommending adaptation and that we allow for a wide berth of error in our assumptions currently used to assess the impacts of our decisions on the natural world and the ability of our species to survive these changes. What allowances for these uncertainties has this report allowed in its synthesis and projections? We see none and we also see no data to support any conclusions and recommendations the report is making and no reference to credible current scientific research.

When trying to convince your Provincial environmentalists, conservationists and citizens, government and industry must always publicly release their data and research because the public is intelligent, they can read and they can understand technical documents. If there are such supportive technical documents we ask that they be released to the public and a copy sent to our office. We actually made this request directly to Jaakko Poyry and UPM when this report came out. To date we still have not received one supporting technical document. Therefore we cannot support the recommendations of this document and ask you not to support them either.

If the forest resource industry is in crisis it is not because the forest companies do not have enough timber allocation. It is because they have been over estimating the timber supply, under estimating the limits of the forest to meet these target amounts, underestimating the needs of wildlife for years and over harvesting with mechanized machines that out pace the regeneration and growth rate of the trees. The use of automated machines to harvest faster in order to be more competitive on a global market has brought economic gain only to the shareholders and owners. It has brought no gain to our people in Northern NB. Instead it brings negative economic and social devastation to families who are third generation foresters, who have always been able to support their families with an honest days work, manually from the forest. These family foresters, have been disregarded and cast aside by the forest companies operating in our region as insignificant casualties of corporate profits, forced off their own crown land, and financially ruined from the loss of their historical livelihoods. We recommend that in order to increase the employment levels in the forestry sector in this province, that there be a fair and equitable portion allocated to local, small, community forestry initiatives, so that they may operate at a more sustainable harvesting pace that is better in tune with the ability of the natural forest growth rate and so they may partake in their historical rights to earn a living within their community from their own crown lands. In an expert of the report "Pulping the South" which reports on the impact of plantation development in various countries all over the world, it states:

“For one thing, forestry activity, far from creating more employment, has directly caused the expulsion of small farmers and wage earners from rural areas. Censuses demonstrate that the areas with greatest plantation cover are those which have expelled the greatest number of rural workers, while at the other end of the scale, the agricultural areas of the central valley, which produce traditional crops, maintain their agricultural population (Leyton 1986).”

We have provided for you several chapters from this report and the online link to the full report.

We see nothing in this report from Jaakko Poyry that will result in a guarantee of an increase of community forestry and employment levels for our citizens.

As they say in Nfld: “She’s going the same way as the cod bye.”

When the government and industry finally accepted that the cod resource was collapsing, was their recommendation to increase the number of cod allowed to be harvested? Was their recommendation to increase the number of fishing licensees? No, the recommendation and implemented action was to reduce the catch, reduce the license allocations, give the cod resource time to regenerate and diversify the impacted labour force and industry to other means of economic activities. We have over consumed, over allocated timber harvest and the resource cannot produce the supply in the limited time we are asking it to. Scientifically one equation does not balance with the other. One is too fast, the other is too slow, it is not sustainable and a more sustainable rate of harvest and better value economically for each tree must be implemented. When the timber of our natural forest is gone, the multi-nationals will be gone as well. Since we believe the forest resource cannot sustain an increase in harvesting by the recommended methods and management techniques in the Jaakko Poyry report we will not support the report and we ask you to also not support it.

What this report is recommending is well documented in the stories of the impact on communities all over the globe where the same recommendations were mistakenly approved by leaders and implemented by multi national pulp companies such as their close global associate UPM Kymmee. This proposed plan of action by Jaakko Poyry in NB is just another in a long 40 year documented history of their recommending the pulping of the worlds natural forests and its conversion to plantations. We are gravely concerned about the similar pattern, timeline of events and activities we have observed being duplicated here since their arrival in NB. Their reputation precedes them and we are aware of their lasting impact on communities in their quest to fulfill their objectives and the objectives of their multi national partners. We have read many of the reports from communities all over the world who have experienced this clearing of their natural forest and the conversion to intensive plantations. We have included some of them with this presentation for you to read. Over all, they are reporting economic, employment and ecological losses. We will never be in favour of harvesting the old growth forest areas, never be in favour of intensive conversion of the natural forest to plantations, and never be in favour of the extreme pest management regimes required to maintain the plantations and suppress competing species such as our National Canadian Emblem, the Maple.

Management Committee Meetings- Ineffective

On the issue of the so called Management Committees, we would like you to know, that in our experience and the experience of several other organizations in our license region, the management committee activities consist of a yearly buffet dinner, where the company gets to check off the fact that they have met their requirement of a management committee by have one meeting and inviting us. This is an insult to the organizations and their communities. This entire process needs to be improved so that there are more meetings, with NGO input on the agenda, activities and subjects discussed should be agreed upon by the organizations, government and industries jointly.

Employment

The communities surrounding Allardville have been absolutely devastated by their removal from forest operations. Most, now on welfare, struggle to provide for their children, unable to continue to make their humble living from their own crown forest like their fathers and their fathers before them. They get to watch and listen as their forest is pulped with mechanical harvesters night and day and see the cash and profits sent to the shareholders leaving the people of Allardville and surrounding communities with nothing. Those men and women have forcibly, by our own forest industries been stripped of their ability to sustain their families without having to be on welfare. It is an absolute social injustice and totally inexcusable. We see absolutely nothing in the Jaakko Poyry report that ensures us that these people will be restored on a permanent basis to work in the forest or any plan to allow them access to forest areas so they can make value added products and earn a humble living. They are not even sure they will be allowed to collect enough fire wood to heat their homes, if these recommendations are implemented. The multi-nationals will not hire our people to do the planting of the plantations for long; in a short period they will begin to use mechanical planting machines to do it and lay the people off again. Since the report does not guarantee an increase in the level of employment in the forestry sector we ask you to reject it.

The Value of Old Growth Forest Eco Systems and the Adaptation of Species

I refer to the case in BC, of the Spotted Owl, listed as an endangered species. The spotted owl makes her home in the natural forest, in the old forest, where it is rich in species of insects, rodents, water, shelter, breeding and nesting areas, and biodiversity. Last year, wildlife technicians in BC caught a female spotted owl and kept her in captivity over the winter to ensure her survival. In the spring, banded for tracking, they released her in hopes that she would breed and bring forth a chick to help to keep the species from becoming extinct. 23 days after her release she died of starvation. Her home, the old forest that she knew and lived in, clear cut and gone. Nothing appeared familiar to her, she became disoriented. She, like most species, is unable to adapt quickly enough to the mechanized pace that the natural forest and the old growth areas are being cut and changed by activities of the forest companies. She, like most species, cannot find her food supply, water and sheltering in the plantations. It simply is not in the same format that she needs and it would take many years, if ever, for her species to adapt to the change. It is the same with most other species. We can read emails and memos notifying us of changes to our habitats and locations of our food supplies, these species cannot. We believe there will be an increased threat to wildlife, aquatic life, flora, fauna and rare plants such as the Ladyslipper if the Jaakko Poyry recommendations to double the harvest and convert to intensive plantations are implemented.

Assessing the Precautionary Principle

Take the 50% increase in harvest recommended and:

- Factor down 10% due to the impact that climate change will have on the forests in general, on plantations and protected areas, and keep in Mind: “What if the worst case scenarios happen?” “What if something we have not planned for happens?”
- Factor down 10% for the lack of employment increase from these recommendations,
- Factor down 10% for the reduction in fresh water resources from such a vast amount of the natural forest being converted to plantations,
- Factor down 10% for the habitats, endangered and at risk species that will be placed at greater risk or lost once they begin to clear more of the natural forest areas,
- Factor down 10% for errors in their predictions, assumptions and modeling conclusions
- You are left with zero. Zero is the benefit to NB from this report.

Adaptation is needed:

- We recommend that the forest industry begin their adaptation to diversified value added products now and that they allocate some of their current harvest for this purpose and begin to ease their way into these new activities,
- We recommend that a multi stakeholder working group, be implemented to develop an Adaptation Plan for the Forest Sector from Pulp Based to Diversified Products Based, to assist them with the impending collapse of the pulp based resource activities, and the impact of climate change
- We recommend that this working group study and develop adaptation steps of the Industry from raw fibre dependency to recycled materials dependency,
- We recommend that they make the adaptation from pulp production to diversified products production such as recycled building materials, combined wood and plastic building materials, furniture options, diapers, etc...
- We recommend that the policy of NB should be a requirement that a fair and equitable portion of the current annual allowable from the Crown lands always be allocated for community forestry to increase employment levels in remote and rural communities.

In closing:

It is our hope that these Crown Forest hearings will allow the industries, economic decision makers, businesses, governments and the people of NB, to better understand that the environmental and conservation organizations in this Province care in the most meaningful and sincere way for its communities and its people. They are highly respected nationally by their peers and are well connected on the ground and in the field with communities, researchers, educational institutions, environmental, conservation, health and other voluntary based organizations all over the world. Seasoned environmentalists, young environmentalists and the

citizens they represent, push hard for the right public process to happen, push hard to bring public attention to issues that need to be properly addressed and oppose decisions that they know are not in the best interest for our people and eco systems.

Unlike some, environmentalists are not here for the profits they hope to gain. They are here for the well being of the earth's eco systems, species, its people and their survival on this planet. Based on the endless hours they dedicate working for the earth and its people, their average pay scale ranges between 0 and \$5.84 per hour. Mary Ann Coleman from the NBEN spoke to you a few days ago about the conservation groups being given the suggestion of keeping a “low profile” during these hearings. This is referred to as “Managing Resistance” and “the suppression of the ecological voice”. What the NBEN told you is true, not only for this current forestry issue but also for other “hot” environmental issues currently happening in NB. We have been told this directly by the organizations themselves.

NB should be thankful that they have strong, intelligent, well informed environmentalists and conservationists to speak on these issues, for if it were not for these organizations in our communities and the organizations of the past years all over the world, man would surely have destroyed his own ability to sustain any life on this planet many years ago. Currently, all life support systems on this planet are moving towards or are already in a state of crisis by mans own hand. Air, water, land, sea, food supplies, the marine environment, eco systems, agricultural production, forests, all ravaged, impacted, threatened and some pushed to extinction by civilization, climate change, profits and toxins.

Environmentalists must always continue to speak freely, without intimidation, and must never be discouraged from doing so. You see they speak on behalf of those who all too often you never heard. They are the poor, the challenged, and the sick. They speak on behalf of those who are threatened and told not to speak, those who are too shy or too nervous to speak, those who are in a conflict of interest and cannot speak but wish they could. But the one group who cannot speak who environmentalists must always be allowed to speak of on their behalf, are the children of today, the children in the womb and the children not yet conceived who will be the civilization of tomorrow.

Thank you! Brenda Kelley, Bathurst Sustainable Development