

**Minutes**  
**Kamloops TSA Sustainable Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Advisory Group – Z809-08 SFM Revision Meeting**  
**Hoodoos Restaurant - Kamloops**  
**June 23, 2009**

**In Attendance:**

---

Dave Tremblay	Mike Bragg	Frances Vyse
Bert Parke	Dave Poole	George Brcko
Pat Salm	Kurt Freudenberger	
Mark Hopkins- Facilitator		

---

**The primary objectives of this session were:**

- Review and Approve Minutes of June 9<sup>th</sup> PAG Meeting
- Review Trends in Natural and Human caused disturbance and Water Quality and Quantity.
- Reconfirm status of existing Indicators for Criteria 6, 3 & 2
- Detailed Discussion of Criteria 4.
- Review “unaligned” Indicators for possible inclusion.
- Confirm timing/approach for subsequent meetings

**1.0 Agenda Review**

The proposed agenda was reviewed, there were no additions.

Pat S. Circulated the Following:

- New pages for the indicator section were inserted into the participant binders.
- Summary information outlining “Regulatory Requirements Related to Water Quality and Quantity”. This document summarized the applicable sections of the federal *Fisheries Act* and the provincial *Forest and Range Practices Act*

**2.0 Review of Minutes and Action Items from June 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

There was one revision to the June 9<sup>th</sup> minutes,

*Page 2, 4<sup>th</sup> point, last sentence* should be corrected to read:  
“Gilbert Smith may not want....”

In addition, the following actions/items from the previous were discussed.

### **Action Item #1**

A copy of a sample audit referral letter used by KPMG was supplied by BCTS and circulated for review. BCTS records show that a similar letter was sent to the Skeetchest'n Band along with others affected by BCTS operations.

### **Action Item #2**

Pat S had supplied and circulated electronically the TSA watershed report and list of candidate watersheds in advance of this meeting. Mike Bragg posted map of the "identified" watersheds.

### **Discussion Arising from Watershed Action Item**

Bert: The watersheds appear to have been identified/rated on the basis of both environmental and social issues. Which do you use?

Pat: The net down is done using the social criteria on top of the environmental

Bert: Not sure that's best—could be.

Pat: We are trying to focus on those areas where the 35% ECA triggers further analysis.

Bert: Doesn't think the report has sufficient information contained in it to support the use of the 35%.

Pat: These are independent issues. There is the list of watersheds and 35% trigger level.

Facilitator: Mentioned discussion with Rita Winkler (regional hydrologist) on the 35% level and the rationale for selecting this level.

Frances: Feels the 35% level is reasonable trigger point for further analysis.

Bert: I just see a lot of subjectivity in its application (the 35%).

Dave T: Indicated that in many cases, assessments are done well in advance of reaching the 35% threshold (where the specifics of the site make it prudent to do so).

Bert: Why are we doing all this then?

Mike B: It's a list....generated through a suitable process.

Bert: Wants to see the list/process revisited within a decade.

Mike B: Pine Beetle impacts alone may change the game before that.

Pat: Revision is part of the process (CSA) happens every year through review of the monitoring report.

Bert: There are already rumors of the rise in interest in the SFI certification, which is less rigorous.

**Action Item:**

Ensure that Hydrologic issues/assessments are incorporated into the Fall 2009 Field Trip.

### 3.0 Discussion Topics

Pat S: noted that there is still a discussion topic outstanding, specifically: Climate Change

**Action Item:**

Ensure that Climate Change and the implications for forest Management is included on the Agenda for the Fall 2009 PAG Meeting.

### Discussion Item – Water Quality and Quantity

Pat: Reviewed list (handed out) on regulatory requirements related to water management, primarily *sections 35(1), 20, 22, and 36(3)* of the federal *Fisheries Act* and a listing of the relevant portions of the *BC Forest and Range Practices Act - (sections 8, 8.2 Divisions 3, 4 and Part 5)*

Bert: Is DFO only involved where there are salmon?

Pat/Dave: There is a protocol Agreement between DFO and BCE on fish issues.

Bert: Is there specific legislation on the responsibility split?

Pat: Outlined the agreement between the two agencies and who is responsible for what and where.

Kurt: there is currently a “4-way” guidebook to stream crossings, which is an unusual collaboration on between all of the 4 relevant agencies for fish management.

Bert: Who is the SFM plan developed for? Who reads it? Are you trying to convince readers (customers) that you are certified to a certain standard?

Pat: Outlined the difficulties of international standards. Canada with it’s existing federal and provincial forest and environmental legislation already has a very high standard to manage from.

Bert: Should there be a reference to the legislation?

Pat: The standard (CSA-SFM) requires that we discuss it.

Bert: The low level of public participation is a concern.

Pat: The auditors have generally shown this as an OFI (opportunity for improvement). It should be noted however, that neither SFI nor FSC have any requirement for a public advisory group.

Bert: Why are the other standards gaining in the marketplace?

Dave P: mainly due to a lack of marketing. CSA does not see its role as a marketer of the standard, just as a certifier/producer of standards.

Pat: Some companies are funding marketing of the CSA standards directly (brochures, websites, etc.). In contrast, the CSA sees its role as the development/refinement of the standard only – not marketing. Previously, CSA had initiated a forest product marketing group (2 people) which marketed the CSA SFM certification and it's associated Chain of Custody but that team was dropped a few years ago.

### **Discussion Topic - Trends in Natural and Human Caused Disturbance**

Pat: Referred/reviewed the information gathered by him on Trends in Natural and Human Caused Disturbance (previously distributed to the PAG as an insert to the PAG binder). The information supplied was substantially sourced from the *BC State of the Forest Report - Indicators 3-1 and 3-2*.

The report details some of the potential impacts of the pine beetle epidemic and various harvest and climate change scenarios. This material was also discussed as part of the discussion on Indicator 1 at a previous PAG Mtg.

### **4.0 Indicator Status - Reconfirmation**

Pages 1 of 4 to 4 of 4 (of the June 23<sup>rd</sup> handout) almost completely 'bolded' (*i.e.* agreed to) Indicators 5 and 6 mostly agreed to now.

### **Discussion Arising from the Review of the Watershed Maps at Coffee Break**

Bert: How is the averaging of hazard done? Is it pro-rated somehow?

Dave P: The variables looked at in each case include:

- Streamflow
- Riparian Function
- Vegetation

Bert: Are costs associated with the social impacts included in the risk rating?

Pat: Not sure about that...doubtful though.

Frances: Mentioned that there are both pros and cons of operating within watersheds. Additionally, she felt it was good to look at the provided maps and she has the sense that the process is on the right track.

Frances: Anything happening on the Weyerhaeuser TFL?

Kurt: Very little, some salvage activity.

Frances: Would that affect the hazard rankings (watercourse).

Kurt: Not likely as the assessment parameters are not generally affected by whether harvesting is active or not.

Bert: Feels the KLRMP is “stuck in the mud” relative to this watershed issue.

#### **Discussion – Criteria #4**

Pat: reviewed the provided draft 4.1.1 standard with guidance that leads you to analyze whether operations are a source or sink for Carbon output/uptake.

Bert: How does tree growth rate relate to harvesting?

Pat: The CFS Carbon Budget model is designed to align with the Kyoto accord and assumes that all carbon is released to the atmosphere as CO<sub>2</sub> when trees are harvested

Bert: Is concerned with the assumed immediate release of CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere.

Pat: Indicated that existing forests represent an existing pool of “banked” carbon.

Bert: What consideration is given to natural disturbance types in estimating forest growth and mortality?

Pat: Outlined the Chief Foresters TSR analysis and determination process.

Bert: has little confidence in the way socio-economic considerations are included in TSR.

Pat: BC forest inventory data does not fit well into the CSA carbon model – expensive conversions are required. The MoF is doing some carbon modeling at the TSA level right now.

Pat: Suggested that we wait for the MoF to complete their early analysis and in the meantime use the suggested target around fires occurring.

Pat: presented proposed indicator 4.1.1 (related to fire preparedness and adequacy of response)  
Following a discussion on the proposed indicator, the following was agreed to:

#### **Agreement:**

Remove reference to the proposed fire preparedness and adequacy of response indicator and instead use Existing Indicators on:

- Reforestation effectiveness
- Permanent Access Structures
- Forest Age Class distribution (revised to include all age – classes).

**Agreement:**

Add commitment to conduct (or utilize any existing) long-term Carbon Budget modeling to the text of the indicator matrix for 4.1.1.

**5.0 Review of Appendix 4 and “Red List” Indicators**

Pat: Provided “Appendix 4” from the Current Kamloops TSA SFM Plan to the PAG members for insertion into the PAG Binder. With Pat leading the discussion, this document was reviewed in detail to ensure that the existing values and objectives for each of the Criteria and Elements were appropriate and consideration given to the need for any changes to either the values or objectives.

The PAG also collectively reviewed the relevance of the current list of core indicators to see if there were other indicators needed to measure achievement of Plan objectives. The following “Agreements” were the product of the discussions:

**Agreement:**

Insert old #14 Indicator to Indicator 1.2 to add in – to become Indicator 1.2.4

**Agreement:**

Remove Aboriginal Reference from objective for Indicators 1.1 and 1.2. Insert the reference into Indicator 1.4.

**Agreement:**

Move old Indicators 7, 8, 9, 30 to new Indicators 1.3.1, 2, 3, 4

**Agreement:**

Keep broadleaf reference in Indicator 2.1 Objective and insert broadleaf percentage

**Agreement:**

Keep Indicator 2.2 Objective and bring in old Indicator #2 as new Indicator. Also insert the new “trapper” indicator and target

**Agreement:**

Move Indicator #14 (grass seeding) into Indicator 3.2.1

**Agreement:**

Remove “bullet” referring to water temperature from the Objective for 3.2, and add to Indicator #2 to 3.2 as 3.2.2. Add Old Indicator #14 as 3.2.3. Add text to SFM Plan on water quality, including water temperature.

**Agreement:**

For Indicator 4.1 do not adopt fire preparedness Indicator. Instead insert old Indicators 6, 10, and 22

**Agreement:**

For Indicator 4.2 - Insert old Indicators 10 and 11

**Agreement:**

For Indicator 5.1 Insert old Indicator #11, 12a, 12b, 19, and the new “trapper” Indicator.

Remove:

- “ traditional Public Use Trail Systems” listed under “Values”
- Old Indicator #24 and replace it with old Indicator #28

Add:

- Old Indicator #20 target

**Agreement:**

For Indicator 5.2, remove “local education opportunities” reference from the “Objective” and add old Indicators 11, 23, and the “old” indicators currently listed on the appendix 4 summary supplied at the June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

**Agreement:**

There were no changes to Indicator 6.1, 6.2, or 6.4. The new “Trapper” indicator and the new value-added Indicator should be added to Indicator 6.3

**Agreement:**

For Indicator 6.5 (information for decision making) add old Indicator #29 (research/extension), and the newly adopted Aboriginal AAC Indicator too.

**Red List – Unaligned Indicator Review**

As part of the review of Table 4, the Red List of “unaligned” Indicators (as per June 23<sup>rd</sup> PAG Binder handout page 4 of 4) was reviewed for either possible use in meeting the values or objectives of the revised plan, or removal from the plan. The following summarizes the agreement regarding these 8 Indicators:

**Agreement**

Indicator 1 – dropped in favor of reference to Old Growth strategy in text of new plan.

Indicator 2 – retained and inserted into Indicator 2.2

Indicator 14 - Retained and Inserted into Indicator 3.2.1

Indicator 15 – Removed from plan

Indicator 18 - Removed as an Indicator, but protected ecosystems to be described in the Plan text.

Indicator 21 – Removed from Plan

Indicator 29 – Retained and Added to Indicator 6.1

## **6.0 Parking Lot Review**

### **Agreement:**

With regard to parking Lot issues identified on page 12 of 12 (June 23<sup>rd</sup>), it was agreed:

- remove reference to Indicator 18 and 19 – Protected Ecosystems, and Trapper Indicator, respectively
- Remove Parking Lot items 1, 4 and the new road inspection frequency item.
- Retain: parking Lot Item #6 (CWD investigation)

### **7.0 Next Steps:**

Pat to re-write the SFM Plan over the summer and circulate draft plan by mid-October. One month in advance of the Fall PAG meeting.

### **Action Item:**

Dave Tremblay to select and circulate Fall field trip date asap.

### **Next Meeting:**

**The Fall PAG Meeting date is:**

**Thursday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**Location TBA**