

---

## FFP Peace River Workshop, 2008 03 11 - Results of Scenario Discussions

Forest Futures Project of the Sustainable Forest Management Network

Transcribed from flipchart notes and workshop recorder files by Peter Duinker, Project Manager

---

### Scenario A - Goods from the Woods

#### Possible Inconsistencies:

- can water sustainability happen by privatizing water rights?
- societal values and sector values are at odds with biodiversity re: protected areas
- what you get paid for is what you stand up for
- water conflict vs. poor public participation seems odd. How can that be?
- reforestation is already discounted as carbon credit so why is this a future issue?
- ramping up production increases water and soil problems
- doubling production will cause invasive species

#### Main Messages:

- economy drives majority of decision regarding the forest
- all is good: protected areas up; species at risk is only an issue in the south
- everybody is making money. Some stresses but nothing serious
- "dark shadows" but no one cares right now. But if something changes, watch out! Change will be quick!
- biofuels significant!
- whole new market: big shift in the market to social/ecological services instead of wood products
- mild climatic change, soft political change, relatively benign
- market is stable or improved
- there's a lack of public engagement
- all values are up for sale
- political positions are not clear- needs a better explanation
- there is an increase in private land ownership

#### Regional Implications:

- shift in product makeup from traditional to value added.
- tenure/regulatory system may not support this shift
- water discussion is confusing! How do we develop what we already have
- no management expectation from other industry users. How come no plan from them? We are still fighting.
- there are more uses of the forest besides growing trees
- good for business
- value added products

---

### Scenario B- Peace in the Woods

Possible Inconsistencies:

- global round wood increases but in Canada, it decreases? This is not consistent with potential for future. Because bioenergy and carbon not offset
- reforestation potential = increased productivity
- small increase in oil- lower consumption
  
- Canadian population increase requires shelter (especially with increased storm events) therefore, shouldn't oil prices increase?
- what about consumerism in other emerging 3rd world countries?
- what about global consumer demand?
- what assumptions are being used and what are the extremes?
- volunteerism vs. employment levels (job quality levels)?
- environmental conscience vs. rural living (bigger footprint)
- more woodlands recreations vs. peaceful conflict resolution?
- cheap oil vs. lots of nuclear and renewable energy (carbon tax?)
- AB and NE BC w.r.t. AB lands?

Main Messages:

- adaptive solutions (innovation)
- is smaller better? Where is the evidence for this? Smaller more easily controlled and safer but innovation is not stimulated by small
- there's a shift to provincial/local/FN governance (a socialist agenda) how did this happen in AB
- fragmentation - why?
- problems are inter-provincial
- AB moving too fast to fit this scenario, unless global energy collapses
- needs stronger commitment to say things being run well (markets)
- stability invites investment (Laugheed)
- lots of positive shifts

Regional Implications:

- increased recreation time in N. AB
- increased access would require an increase in maintenance and policing
- shift from mill industries to other
- conservation offsets
- wood has more value standing due to social values
- forest sector as we know it is gone
- managing forests for other values and will offset Oilsands destruction
- legislation will have to respond to access concerns, biodiversity, market access
- Shell buys DMI
- bad for FP industry
- shift in jobs to NFP
- still a big ecological footprint from AB oil (economics of expensive oil not there?)
- lots of rural development in N. AB

- more protected areas less land for oil and gas
- big rise in agriculture, crops and cattle in Northern AB (with water issues)

---

### **Scenario C- Turbulence in the Woods**

#### Possible Inconsistencies:

- why is cut so high when there is high fire and mortality? Could an increased cut be sustained?
- wood products industry not equal to industry profitability (both doing well)
- implies that U.S. is leading this
- currently, there are checks and balances that exist to prevent this scenario
- it is basically coherent
- demographics- immigrants may largely be displaced Aboriginal people from other continents- new politics, increased politicization, value clashes
- middle class would be missing, lower and upper only (possible?)
- would we let neo-feudalism happen?

#### Main Messages:

- short-term surge
- breakdown in adaptability
- shift in ownership/commodity
- continuation of status quo
- neo-feudal forest governance and bio-refining industry combine for gloomy future
- forests out of sight, out of mind; people are disconnected

#### Regional Implications:

- not sustainable
- boom and bust cycles increase volatility
- nomadic/rotational forest industry
- portable mills
- pressure from U.S.
- forest management plan is threatened by oil and gas industry
- tenure reform
- planning players difficult
- a change in the type of tree species people grow
- access management is difficult
- no winter sports
- zonation of landscape
- Peace River explodes in population
- water quality is poor
- Aboriginal populations increase
- increased conflict, especially Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal
- sawmill industry diminished
- rise in businesses associated with bioenergy

---

## Scenario D- Restoration in the Woods

### Possible Inconsistencies:

- why shift away from bioenergy? Nuclear power? Why no explanation?
- no interest in management in forest yet money is being pumped into doing just that by whom?
- why is there agricultural expansion into forest land?
- public concern about forest yet agriculture is worst offender how could this happen?
- restoration is more about management. If forest companies don't do it, who does?
- is conservation possible with extreme climate change? Should it be adaptation instead?
- focus on needs of immigrants. Changes societal values (health, housing)
- foreign ownership of companies in Canada needs more explanation
- private ownership needs more detail
- absence of water detail

### Main Messages:

- when times get tough public rallies around the forest
- shift from mitigation to adaptation
- bioenergy is a fad
- public willing to pay for environmental services
- we feel guilty about environment we are not prepared to give up on fossil fuel use!
- full steam ahead into oblivion!
- deck chair on the Titanic with a front row seat
- restoration looks bleak
- will continue to be lack of leadership
- immigration will be big economic and societal driver

### Regional Implications:

- heightened interest but not much can be done
- nature will take its course and we get to watch the show
- government takes back forest management
- capacity building for Aboriginals
- forests of Northern AB is more productive and there is a retreat of northern species
- boom and bust of towns / up and down markets
- improved technology
- untapped opportunity for Aboriginals will continue