



## **Behind BC Forestry with Dr. Peter Wood Part 1**

**Janet Sumner**

Welcome to the ClearCut

**[Music]**

**Janet Sumner**

Hi, I'm Janet Sumner, Executive Director at Wildlands League

**Kaya Adleman**

And I'm Kaya Adleman, Carbon Manager at Wildlands League

**Janet Sumner**

Wildlands League is a Canadian conservation organization, working on protecting the natural world

**[Intro]**

**Janet Sumner**

For this episode, we had the pleasure of speaking with Dr. Peter Wood. Someone who has a lot of experience in the forestry space, specifically, in BC.

**Kaya Adleman**



You can't really conceptualize Canadian forestry without talking about British Columbia. The industry has a very long and contentious history there, and its usually ground zero for the extreme climate change induced wildfires that we're seeing every year.

### **Janet Sumner**

As necessary as this discussion was, we thought, who better to speak to B.C. forestry than Peter. We also just want to add here that at the time of recording this episode, Peter was senior corporate campaigner at the Non-Profit Organization Canopy Planet and an adjunct professor in the UBC faculty of forestry, but since then Dr. Wood has moved to a full time position at UBC.

### **Janet Sumner**

Maybe you could just start by introducing yourself, Peter, to our listeners and letting them know a little bit more about you, and some of your history. Some of the very interesting things that you've done on FSC, reporting with IISD, and of course your degree in forestry or your degrees. And your teaching at UBC.

### **Dr. Peter Wood**

I live in Vancouver and I'm here on the traditional territory of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh peoples. I've got a bit of a long and convoluted career path that's sometimes a little bit difficult to explain, but I guess it all started right after undergrad. I started working for the Ministry of Forests in a joint program with the Ministry of Trade and it was called The Trade and Sustainable Development Unit. Basically they were looking at forest certification as it was emerging, this is way back in 1999, and they were looking to see how to implement this new emerging policy influence and trying to make sense of it. So they had me do a bunch of reviews of existing forest policy, how it might be affected by forest certification, specifically FSC, and looked at what it would take to implement them. And in the end they ended up sort of favoring the development of industry led systems such as the Canadian Standards Association's version of Forest Certification and the American Sustainable Forestry Initiative, which really favored the status quo practice and not reducing harvest volumes.

### **Kaya Adleman**



At that point, Peter left and went to work for West Coast Environmental Law, and coordinating a coalition of environmental groups that were negotiating the draft BC FSC standards.

**Dr. Peter Wood**

That led me to want to know: who cares? who cares about forest certification? what's actually happening on the ground? And so I had the opportunity to do my PhD at the University of Toronto, Faculty of Forestry. Looking at, you know, what exactly happens when these forest certification standards are implemented and what the companies have to change. But what ended up being the most interesting question wasn't what the companies were doing, it's where FSC requirements started to rub against governments requirements and what did government do when they were challenged to change in order to accommodate these new higher level certification requirements.

**Janet Sumner**

Peter then took a class on international law

**Dr. Peter Wood**

and this is one of those kind of dumb luck incidences that kind of change your life. But I wrote a term paper that my law professor really liked. It was on hard law versus soft law when it comes to Forest Management International Forest Convention. And she took my paper and she took it to an international conference, and somebody got a hold of it and really liked it, and they invited me to come on board a delegation that was going to Geneva to a big forest summit.

I started to get involved with more sort of international processes like Climate COPs and Biodiversity COPs (conferences of the parties). I was recruited to be a reporter for the International Institute of Sustainable Developments, Earth Negotiation Bulletin, which is basically just a journal that reports on summits that happen at the international level. And I ended up doing this for quite a while, almost 17 years, reporting on, I think about 40 or 50 environmental summits over that time.

**Kaya Adleman**



I gotta say, the fact that Peter has been to 40 or 50 environmental summits over the years makes me a little jealous. That sounds like an amazing learning opportunity.

**Dr. Peter Wood**

I ended up working at the United Nations in New York for about a year looking at gaps, overlaps and conflict between different international rules, when it comes to forests, between the different international agreements. And I went to go work for Global Witness. It's an organization based out of the UK when the phenomenon of REDD or REDD+ started taking hold, REDD stands for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation. So this is a multibillion dollar program that was launched to try to control deforestation in the Global South, and I was involved in the negotiation of the terms of that agreement for about four years, as well as some field work in the Congo Basin and Borneo where we looked at on the ground, what was the impact of industrial logging on local communities?

**Janet Sumner**

Then Peter came home and worked for CPAWS and the David Suzuki Foundation and Canopy. At Canopy

**Dr. Peter Wood**

I've been working on looking at corporate supply chains and trying to prevent primary forests from entering those supply chains. So that's a that's maybe a very long version, I realize that it's a bit meandering, but when I think about all those steps along the way, each part was pretty important to how I arrived at where I am right now.

**Janet Sumner**

Well, and I think it's really good for our listeners to understand who we're talking to, because you do have a wealth of experience and it's good to mark all that down. I didn't even know some of that, so thanks for doing that.



**Kaya Adleman**

I was really glad to be able to sit down and hear what Peter had to say about Forest Management in B.C., and how it hasn't really changed over the years. Many listeners may be familiar with the Clayoquot Sound Protests in the 90's, but there are a few other events of significance, such as the Sloan Commission and the Pierce Commission that really encapsulate the public struggle to better protect forests in B.C. and the lack of industry and government actions to make long term, concrete reforms. As we'll learn, forestry in B.C. has been in conflict for a long time.

**Dr. Peter Wood**

Well, I would say that you know very little has actually changed in forest management in BC. If you look at the fundamentals in terms of the intensity of the harvesting, and overall you know despite numerous commissions that have been initiated over the years to have a big reform of the industry, overall, we continue on fairly steady as she goes. The only difference I would say is we are being forced into more marginal areas that previously were considered no go zones for being too steep or in community watersheds or too remote from a port. We're seeing this this more extreme logging being required. And as you know, in BC we have, especially on the coast very mountainous terrain, and so that can lead to some incredibly steep logging. It can lead to very hazardous logging just in terms of the on the job accidents that are happening. So, you know, I think that's the main difference is you look at the history of BC over time, we've gone from the easy to harvest trees all the way through to now, sort of more extreme terrain. And some of the efforts that have been initiated over the years, whether it be the Sloan Commission post WWII, The Pearse Commission 1970s, there's been the Clayoquot Sound scientific panel, in the wake of the Clayoquot Sound protests in the early 90s. There's been these successive waves of attempts to reform the industry, and it's incredible how the industry has very effectively deflected any of these attempts to rein it in. And it really has continued on with a very high rate of cut the AAC, the annual allowable cut, which really is the dominant consideration in determining forest management practices.

**Kaya Adleman**

Even in the wake of the massive protests around the Clayoquot Sound in 1996, Peter goes on to say



### **Dr. Peter Wood**

we had the introduction of the BC forest practices code, that was a major development attempted to rein in some of the more intense aspects of forest harvesting, but it was never really allowed to take effect. There was this cap on the percentage of volume that some of these considerations could ever be allowed to reduce the AAC by. So they would say, you know, fantastic we recognize all these values. We recognize fisheries, and we recognize slope stability and preventing erosion. They would pay lip service to all of these new values we were going to recognize, but ultimately there was this cap of a handful of percentages that you would be able to reduce the cut by before they would say 'now that's enough, we're not actually going to reduce the cut more than that'.

### **Janet Sumner**

So as Peter is saying, it seems like there's been a lot of attempts over the past century to rein in the activities of forestry companies in B.C. The [post-WWII Sloan Commission](#) sought to end 'devestation logging' and turn towards the sustained yield model, ensuring that the province would be able to maintain a suitable amount of commercially viable trees for many years to come. [The Pearse Commission](#) in the 1970s recommended policy changes to increase competition amongst forestry companies and reassess how the AAC (annual allowable cut) was calculated. The Clayoquot Sound Protests and [the following scientific panel](#) in the 90's prescribed a "holistic" approach to forestry, to incorporate ecosystem values and cultural values such that decisions are focused on ensuring 'sustaining forest ecosystems' as opposed to 'sustaining output levels for forest products'.

Despite all this however, the amount of wood that companies were actually able to harvest, supposedly the most important consideration in protecting forest health, did not decrease by much. And as Peter says, this is resulting in companies having to go into more remote and dangerous areas as the forest disappears.

### **Kaya Adleman**

And in 2001, there was another shift in B.C



[Music]

**Janet Sumner**

That concludes part 1 of our conversation with Peter, up next is part 2, where we talk about Sustainable Forest Management and the thinking behind that.

**Kaya Adleman**

Part 2 is available now, wherever you get your podcasts.

**Janet Sumner**

Thanks for listening

---

## **Behind BC Forestry with Dr. Peter Wood Part 2**

**Janet Sumner**

In part one, Dr. Peter Wood walked us through the various failed attempts over the past century to rein in the activities of forestry companies in B.C. First there was the post WWII Sloan Commission, followed by the Pearse Commission, up to the Clayoquot Sound Scientific Panel in the 90s. These all attempted to consider additional values in forest management decisions.

Despite this however, the amount of wood that companies were allowed to harvest, the AAC never decreased by much. This resulted in companies going into more remote and dangerous areas as our forest resources dwindled.

**Kaya Adleman**

Then there was another shift in B.C., a shift to reduce regulation of the industry.



**Dr. Peter Wood**

The BC Liberals came in in 2001 and completely changed the outlook for the industry. Really reduced a lot of the regulation of the industry and effectively handed over much greater control to a handful of major large companies. We saw the consolidation of the industry to a smaller number of very powerful groups. We saw the deregulation in the sense that there is more reliance on the professionals that were hired by the company as opposed to hiring enforcement officials from government. They put the onus on professional reliance and said 'OK, we trust you as registered professional foresters' and they said 'we're not going to prescribe how to log we're not going to tell you how to build that road, but if there's a failure, if there's some kind of something that goes wrong and a bad outcome from that logging, we will hold you accountable, but we are not going to do any of this prescription of forest practices'. And that really had a very negative effect, because ultimately these professionals were hired by the company, were employed by the company, and it really led to ultimately a deregulation of the industry. And at the same time forest certification was emerging, and while initially government was going to sort of oppose this because this could threaten the sovereignty of you know, a government be able to make forest practices and enforce them. They soon realized that this could actually be to their benefit, where they had these industry-led systems that would give sort of like a green stamp of approval on these products. It could actually serve them to market these products and they could also back away from the very expensive business of actually having to enforce government rules and government laws. There was this inclination to sort of defer to, you know, if this company is getting certified, well, maybe we don't have to look at them too closely because they abide by these third party rules. So this all happened, kind of in the 2000s, kind of in the last 20 or so years. We've seen a gradual increased focus on relying on the forest certification, increased reliance on this professional reliance model. And all to say, you know, we really are a bit removed from what's actually happening in the woods. And I think we are a very urban province overall, we have a lot of people moving to this province, but largely still in the big cities, and I think people are quite surprised when they get out onto a logging road, and they see the intensity with which we've been going after our few remaining, high quality forests. But it doesn't take much. Everyone's got access to Google Satellite view, and I encourage everyone, take a tour in satellite view of, say, you know Vancouver Island. Or even anywhere in the interior around Merritt, or you know, Princeton, some of these areas that faced massive landslides recently. Take a tour in Google and see what you see it. It's really remarkable just how fast and how intense the logging has proceeded in in those areas.





**Janet Sumner**

So in B.C., the 'state of play' if you will is that despite these numerous attempts to reign in timber harvesting- the various commissions and public protests, it seems that in actual fact the government has turned towards industry through what Peter calls a "professional reliance model" to manage the forest.

**Kaya Adleman**

So, instead of the provincial government overseeing forest management decisions, its up to the companies themselves to employ people, who on their payroll will determine whether or not their boss is following best practices. Seems like a little bit of a conflict of interest to me or an abrogation of the duty of the government to manage our public resource.

**Janet Sumner**

And as you can imagine, this doesn't have an overall net positive impact on forest health. In fact, anyone can see the damage across the province simply by using google earth. As Peter says:

**Dr. Peter Wood**

We're running out of the easy to access large volumes of of timber at the especially the low elevation valleys, which are the most productive sites. So you know, I was up in East Creek on North Vancouver Island where we saw the most extreme road building, you can imagine. It's actually featured on some reality TV show for being like 'extreme logging,' uses dynamite for blasting trees off of the side of the mountains, because it's too steep to go in there with a chainsaw. You really are looking at what the industry calls the guts and the feathers. So we are down to the last of the last.

**Kaya Adleman**



What I'm curious about, is how what we're seeing in practice in B.C. fits into the larger, current quote Sustainable Forest Management unquote paradigm. We asked Peter about that:

### **Dr. Peter Wood**

You know this attempt to kind of rebrand what kind of forestry we're doing, rebranding as sustainable forest management was quite a coup for the industry, because it allowed them to say that what they were doing took into consideration you know all these multiple values. That it was this sort of very broad term that allowed everybody to read into it what they wanted to see, and it was very difficult to challenge. There's nothing wrong with that term. Everyone likes the idea of being sustainable. The idea that you can manage something is very attractive. The truth is, we don't really know how to manage old growth in terms of maintaining the values of old growth that makes old growth old growth. The very small number of examples that I can think of operate on a very small scale that have been successful by virtue of being very low volume, low intensity and small scale. But overall, this sustainable forest management became a mantra through the 90s and into the 2000s. And yeah, being so hard to disagree with it, it kind of was allowed to set the tone for how we were going to do forest management. But as it turns out, it really has not been much different in practice. And so this leads to where we are right now which is, you know, there's been an outcry for needing a profound shift, a paradigm shift in the way that we manage forests. It has led to nearly [1200 I think arrests being made at Fairy Creek](#) trying to protest the logging of one of the very last stands of old growth in in BC, but it's also a protest about the larger forest policy in BC. So it really has come to bear that people are seeing through this lip service and it's starting to really come to a head. But nevertheless industry continues to lean on the forest certification and this veneer of lip service paid to sustainable management because it allows them to continue what they are going to be doing anyway. And if you actually look at the actions and not just the words that are used functionally, they're looking to get as much as they can out of these few remaining areas. Because the truth is there's nothing like BC old growth in the market. You look at real old red cedar, clear red cedar or the beautiful Douglas fir old growth without any knots in it. Like they're not growing that in the southeast US, right? So that's our niche. We have this small amount of differentiation in the market that allows us to be competitive and for whatever reason we are allowing ourselves to sell those precious woods for you know, much less than they're actually worth. And we're doing it at a rate that is much higher than can be sustained.

### **Janet Sumner**



So despite not real changes to the volume or amount of wood they log, forestry companies were able to brand their practices as 'sustainable' because they made claims that they were going to manage or consider the other values- for example carbon or caribou. All in all, the sustainable forest management frame just allows them to keep doing what they're doing.

### **Kaya Adleman**

Right, as someone who studied greenwashing in school, this is definitely what that sounds like.

### **Janet Sumner**

But how did this all come to be? If 'sustainable forest management' is just a green veil, what is the predominant thinking that underpins forest management in B.C.?

### **Dr. Peter Wood**

Post WWII there, in the Sloan Commission, there was this idea that emerged that what we need to do is we need to get rid of all this decaying old inefficient old growth and we need to convert it to this vigorous, fast growing second growth that is going to be nice and orderly. We can have very predictable models of how the yield is going to come up, and the model was actually called the liquidation conversion model, and that's what we've been following since WWII is the liquidation of this decadent old growth and trying to turn it into these younger, faster growing stands. And hitting these sort of sustained yield markers, and trying to get the most sort of economic cubic meters per hectare per year that we can possibly achieve. But what we've effectively done is we've taken forests that previously were very resilient to shocks to the system, whether it be pine beetle infestation or now with the emerging pressures of climate change. We've now converted it to this very fragile, vulnerable second growth that absolutely is more fire prone. That is more likely to be vulnerable to stresses like pest outbreaks. And we're seeing more landslides and flooding events because we don't have the same giant sponge that the old growth represented that would absorb water slowly and let it out slowly. This converted forests into this more intensively managed forest, as it turns out, is not as good at performing those functions, and we're seeing the results of that now. Specifically, you know in the past year, we've seen heightened increase in the amount of flooding which you may have heard of in November last year, as well as the intense forest fires that followed the heat dome we had



here last summer. A large part of that was all based on just poor forest management that has made those forests more vulnerable to those impacts.

### **Janet Sumner**

So Peter, when I hear you say that there's been an actual program to liquidate the old growth forest in BC and turn that into a different type of forest that has a high yield and you can sustain a yield or an allowable cut every year, it seems to me that that's more like agriculture. Like basically we've got a crop, let's call it trees, and we're going to harvest it that way, and we're going to grow what we need to grow. And we're not really thinking about the natural world. We're thinking about growing a crop that's essentially logging trees.

### **Dr. Peter Wood**

That that's essentially where we began and if you look at the Tenures System in BC, we call them tree farms, not all of them. We have a volume-based system which allows companies to harvest a certain number of cubic meters and then we have TFL's tree farm licenses that are sort of spatially explicit areas that a company might be allowed to harvest, and they have a requirement to replant. And this really is the mindset we have a farm, we have a tree farm license, so this is a perpetual growth of trees over time and that really is reflective of a paradigm, right? That's a way of thinking of the world. And you know this is increasingly out of step with what we know about how a forest works, whether it be the complex understanding of the mycorrhizal fungi networks that underpin communication amongst trees and you know sharing of nutrients that [Doctor Simard](#) and others have brought to light. Right, whether it be our understanding of the very specific requirements that old growth dependent species have, whether it be lichen for Caribou or clear cold streams required for our endangered salmon populations. This is really an outdated model to think that we can manage like an agricultural system something that is so complex, as we try to have, reestablish a new relationship with First Nations peoples and we try to enter into a dialogue around reconciliation, this type of industrial agricultural approach to forestry is just fundamentally out of step with that.

So I'd say the exciting thing that's happening now is the recognition that we need to change. The government commissioned this report. I think it's called [A New Future for Old Forests by Gary Merkel et al.](#) And you know this is a report that clearly lays out a new future, that a new paradigm that's required and that that paradigm is very different than an agricultural model. In the TFL agricultural model it would say 'we want to achieve this maximum volume per year and



we're going to first set that out and then we'll look at some of these values that we'll try to take into consideration as long as it doesn't affect us too much'. And that's a fundamentally different view than a more ecosystem-based approach where you say 'OK look, we want to have these forests forever, we want to have these Old growth values forever, we want to be able to harvest trees, but we will only do so if it doesn't compromise those values and the health of a functioning ecosystem'. And so that is the next step I think for the province, is really leaning into the recommendations that are in that report, reestablishing a new dialogue with First Nations, recognizing indigenous knowledge and rights and title as a part of that paradigm. And you know, I think it's been at least a couple of years now since that report's been out. I would like to see some life being breathed into that as we reconsider how we're going to move from a more volume driven model to health of the ecosystem model.

#### **Janet Sumner**

I just want to follow up on that. So if the model is going to change, and I'm going to actually reference some of the work that you're doing now with Canopy. And if it's not about getting the most fiber out at the highest volume possible, in your worldview, what's the new model look like? It's not the tree farm, it's perhaps this Merkel report. But in addition to that, and maybe speak to some of the work you're doing with Canopy.

#### **Dr. Peter Wood**

Well, I think it really amounts to having a long view. We know that these companies that are currently taking profits and investing them in southeast US. They are not going to be the ones that will look out for our long term interest so, we got to think as British Columbians, what is in our best interest in the long, long term? We are facing a climate change scenario where a lot of our forests burn and don't come back in the Interior. They may switch over to sagebrush country. We're looking at possible fire prone ecosystems where there never used to be fire, right? So what kind of forests do we want to best withstand these coming pressures? We really have to think about that. What can we do to maximize employment per cubic meter? So not looking at maximizing cubic meters, but maximizing the value we get for every tree. And we know that there's areas even within Canada, they get up to five times the number of jobs per cubic meter...that idea is not going to come from the major forest industry. They are primarily based on volume and they will continue to advocate for that, and so that's their job. Their job is to advocate for maximum volume and we need to think about how are we going to make sure



that our own interests are taken into priority first and not and not those of these corporations that are currently 1 foot out the door looking to invest this in other places.

In terms of Canopy's work, you know, we work through supply chains, getting commitments from brands and looking at ensuring that the ancient and endangered forests don't enter into that into that stream. So it's kind of a neat model because you talk to a brand, a brand that may have a very public facing image and you can get them to commit to, you know, not wanting to have this risk of ancient and endangered forests in their supply, and based on that commitment then we can work through the supply chain and make sure that that commitment is upheld and it really works. We're up to 500 brands now. I think totaling, about a trillion dollars in commerce goes through there. It changes the conversation when you're talking to governments about, you know, the creation of a protected area or changing policy when you're able to bring to bear a large amount of purchasing power that is backing that request.

And the second thing I think that has canopy standing out is they really spend a lot of time thinking about solutions and alternatives. So if you're going to advocate for ditching supply coming from ancient and endangered forests, what are you advocating for? So they are looking at sources of cellulose that is for maybe, making packaging, as well as viscose, which is a fabric that's made out of tree fiber traditionally. Well, it turns out you can make that from just about anything with cellulose. So we've been quite instrumental in getting startup companies to ramp up their production of non-tree fiber. So that comes from agricultural waste, making paper and packaging. Recycled cotton T-shirts even can be made into viscose. And so there you're not only reducing the pressure on forests, but you're also reducing landfill waste, you're reducing the amount of agricultural waste that's burned and creating a lot of air quality problems specifically in Asia.

I think about 50% of our harvest in Canada goes to, you know, pulp and paper<sup>1</sup>, and that at the very least we can be doing a lot better job of recycling everything from newsprint to cardboard. That is no reason why we need to have a slow growing boreal tree in order to make a roll of toilet paper like that should just be outlawed. It's just ridiculous and I think until we get to that point where it's just considered wrong, we will continually be sort of reacting to the next forest management plan that's going to punch a new road into a previously intact area.

---

<sup>1</sup> based on using kraft conversion % and softwood weight, would mean that it takes 63.4 billion cubic meters of wood to make the 14.3 million tonnes of pulp (this does not include newsprint and paper), as opposed to 65.7 million meters cubed in wood products (lumber, OSB, plywood). <https://cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/statsprofile/>



### **Kaya Adleman**

So in order to create better outcomes for nature and climate in B.C., it seems what Peter is saying is that we need to reshift the rationale for forest management in a way that sees the forest as an ecosystem rather than an agricultural plot. As well, we need to start actively working towards a transition, to rethink what inputs go into our fibre supply, and ask ourselves if we need to harvest B.C. old growth to produce pulp and paper.

### **Dr. Peter Wood**

I think that they've taken a few strong steps in the right direction here. One of which is just taking stock of what's left. The argument over 'should we stop logging in old growth forests' is very different if you have [3% left](#) versus if you have 30% left. And that was the level of disagreement up until recently where the government has [commissioned its own study](#) and we now know that for the really high productive old growth and the value, the bottoms we have 3% left. So that's a conversation that now I can talk to industry and say, what's your plan? You know, you've got 97% of that ecosystem available to do good forest management to do second growth restorative management. Why should I trust you with that last 3% if you haven't achieved sustainability while logging 97% of that ecosystem? So I think that it really helps to have this agreed set of facts and, I'm hoping that government will see the need for a transition plan. We have expectations that government looks out for our benefit, we can expect government to have a plan. That's what I would ask them is with, you know 3% left, what is your plan to transition to second growth management? Because right now I'm not seeing it. I don't see that they are adequately planning for that transition, and it's going to take some money. We're going to need to have funding for forest dependent communities including First Nations communities that are currently dependent on old growth revenues. And the benefit sharing we are going to need to have skills transition, new mill types that are capable of focusing on value added products as opposed to this volume. There's a lot of great roles for government to play in this transition, and it's time for some leadership from them.

### **Janet Sumner**



Thanks Peter. This has been a really good conversation, and I think that final figure you delivered which is 3% left of the old growth is a really chilling figure, and your suggestion that if you haven't managed sustainably to date, how can we trust that you will in the future?

**[Music]**

**Kaya Adleman**

In addition to the sobering 3% left of old growth figure, what did you think of our conversation with Peter, Janet?

**Janet Sumner**

Well, as always it's a deeply illuminating conversation anytime I've had the chance to sit down with Peter. Over the years it's been fantastic to always talk with him, and it was again another wonderful conversation with him. But at the end of the day, kind of disturbing that so many commissions have gone on, so many protests. I've seen colleagues and friends fighting for the forests in British Columbia. I've travelled there many times. I have relatives who live in the province. And I know that it makes many people heartsick to see the damage, just as you even drive through the mountains and you see the sides of mountains that have been eroded over time, and have lost their forest that are there for protection. So as Peter talks about this, it just makes me very sad that we haven't been able to readjust and create a more sustainable model.

**Kaya Adleman**

I think what really stood out to me was that the rationale or underpinnings of forest management policy in B.C. is based off viewing the forest as an agricultural plot to be harvested- and for that way of looking at it to continue throughout the years, and today being disguised as 'sustainable' is a little troubling to me. Especially because if we want to make progress on ensuring a climate safe future and preserving our forests and their ecosystems, we have to stop living in the delusion that the fact that we have 3% of old growth left and cutting more of it down is sustainable.





**[Music]**

**Janet Sumner**

If you liked this episode of 'The Clear Cut: Conversations on Forestry,' stay tuned for new episodes.

**Kaya Adleman**

Updates about the podcast, and our other work at Wildlands League can be found on social media.

**Janet Sumner**

That's @Wildlandsleague on [Instagram](#), [Twitter](#), and [Facebook](#)

**Kaya Adleman**

See you next time!