

Nicola Thompson Fraser SFM PAG

November 24, 2011. 9:30am Hoodoos Restaurant, Kamloops

Attendees: Mike Bragg, Gerry Sanford, Katherine Shewchuk, Dave Dobi, Jim McCormack, Dave Poole, Francis Vyse, Jan Stadey, Glenn Foss, Jenn Reid, Bert Parke, Rick Cooper, Aline Lachapelle, Graham Everett

Facilitator: Pat Salm

Minutes: Rick Cooper

Meeting started at 9:30AM. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting agenda.

Previous meeting follow-up:

Website: A copy of the website analysis report was sent out previously with meeting agenda. Reviewed the website metrics, discussed bounce rates, referral sites, and location of visitors. PAG were interested in seeing a copy of this analysis annually, particularly if this years metrics could be compared to next year. Just a reminder that the website is shared, so results include visitors to the Okanagan advisory group process as well.

Historic fire Map: Aline brought in map showing recent fires in the Lillooet TSA. This is all the data that Aspen Planers had. Discussed the current initiative to save fire lookout towers around BC. PAG would like to see more data regarding historic fires in entire plan area.

Action: Mike to contact Kamloops Fire Center to see if they have more data to provide to PAG.

PAG surveys: A copy of a proposed survey was sent out previously with meeting agenda. The PAG had no specific changes to the proposed survey other than those highlighted by Pat. Reviewed new question on audit result and annual report (something that is included on the KPMG audit questionnaire). Agreed to include this question. Discussed redundancy on other questions. Question 12 and 16 appear very similar. Talked about communication with PAG members, should it be proactive? Should it be new information only? Is question 13 relevant? Most meetings are devoted to this. Agreed to remove questions 11 and 13, but retain Question 12 (communication between meetings). Question 16, should we remove the word 'new' are licensees only questioned about 'new' information they provide? What about timely, but not new? Also, it is often the facilitator that provides this information so survey question should reflect this. No disagreement, survey to be changed.

Action: Pat to update survey and post to the members section of the website. Pat to send out at year end (again using the web based Survey Monkey) to all public PAG members.

Parking Lot Items:

Pat explained the origin of the Parking Lot in the SFM Plan, and how it is to be revisited from time to time to see if items there should remain, be removed or acted upon. The entire list of parking lot items were reviewed and the following notes summarize this discussion.

Coarse Woody Debris: Discussed CWD size target? Do we need a target for size? Is it possible to meet on some low volume sites? Reviewed the proposed new text for the 2012 SFM plan (Indicator 3.1.2) regarding size. Agreed to text although decided to move location of the text within the Strategy section to immediately follow "...channel stability." Decided not to have a target specific to CWD size, and instead rely on the prescribing forester to deal with as he/she deems appropriate for the site. Prescribing forester must also consider the Chief Forester's guidance on CWD. Agreed to remove CWD from the parking lot, it is effectively covered off in the Plan.

Action: Pat to remove CWD from parking lot.

Action: Pat to add CWD text to Indicator 3.1.2 of the SFM Plan.

PAG asked if text could be added regarding small piles for small mammals. Canfor already has a Best Management Practice that is used on its operations. Tolko currently attempts to do as well while minimizing impacts on plantable spots. Jim M. to provide Pat with Canfor Best Management Practice regarding CWD and small piles – for distribution to PAG.

Action: Pat to add in text regarding small piles to 'Means of Achieving' in SFM plan.

Action: Pat to distribute Canfor BMP with meeting minutes.

Future Considerations: Aline made contact with TRU, they will be meeting to discuss the list directly. TRU often presents work/research that it is involved in through formal sessions such as the educational lecture series. TRU will be reviewing graduate student essays to see if any of these are on the PAG's list of Topics of Interest. Aline also reviewed the environmental science seminar series and the faculty of science seminar series. PAG was also interested in other workshops. PAG agreed that we should make use of TRU seminars wherever possible. At this point will retain this item in the parking lot.

Action: Aline to continue discussions with TRU regarding our list of Information for Future Consideration and see if they can provide any information on these topics.

Action: Aline to look into the possibility of PAG members signing up to a TRU email distribution list specific to these seminar/lecture series.

Road/Soil Erosion Target: Aline discussed with Simon and Simon is okay with the wording of the current 2011 slide/soil erosion target. Aline distributed the Aspen Planers SOP on road inspections as a sample of what all licensees do. Agreed to remove this from the parking lot.

TSA description: Section 2 of the SFM Plan had additional ecosystem information provided by Frances. This information was added to the draft 2012 SFM Plan that was posted to the website prior to the meeting. Pat agreed to take a second look at these changes. Licencees thanked Frances for her effort. Economic section of the Plan (to be done by Aline) remains to be completed.

Action: Pat to send revised draft of Section 2 of the Plan to Frances for another look.

Action: Once reviewed, Pat to add include revision into 2012 draft SFM Plan.

Action: Aline to complete the economic section of DFA (at TSA level) , especially showing the impact of forestry to the region.

Rare ecosystems: New addition to the parking lot (carry over from May 19th 2010 meeting) . Possibly have Alan Vyse come talk to PAG regarding isolated natural stands of larch.

Action: Aline to add Merritt Lw to list of Information for Future Consideration.

Website: Reviewed how to access the NTF website, especially how to make use of the members area, which people were having trouble accessing. Reviewed the archived area which contains old audit reports and the separate TSA SFM plans.

Action: Pat to talk to webmaster about having a more intuitive process to access the members section of the website.

Update: Access is now easier! The Web provider made a few design changes that are more intuitive. Now to access the members section you click on the NTF webpage and get the menu bar that includes member login. Once you have entered your email and password the page will reset and the member login will be replaced by members access. By holding your cursor over members area you will see a drop down box that lets you select the members only webpage.

Risk Assessment: Reviewed the Risk assessment that Pat completed for the NTF plan area. Within that plan area, only 6% of the volume is not CSA or SFI certified, or reporting into the NTF plan. The risk of these operations affecting our plan is low. They are still required to meet legislative minimums. Pat reviewed suggested text to the SFM Plan (section 2) recognizing that this work was completed – agreed to by PAG.

Action: Pat to add risk assessment to public members section of the website.

SFM Plan targets: Discussed the relationship between existing SFM targets and legal requirements. While legal requirements can become a target, there is always opportunity to discuss and possibly agree to targets that go beyond legal requirements. Pat indicated where 6 of the first 20 targets go beyond legal requirements (targets 2, 5, 6, 16, 18 and 20). All of the “conformance to the operational plan” targets fit into the category of exceeding legal requirements – as plans must specify at a minimum that the law is met but often the prescribing professional will include requirements that exceed legal. The example of a riparian reserve zone ribbon boundary was given where the law might require a boundary at 10 metres from a stream. The prescribing forester must ensure the boundary line always be a minimum of 10 metres away but often other site factors result in the boundary being located beyond this. Conforming to the plan means that the boundary, wherever it is located in relation to the stream must be respected.

2012 Plan changes: Reviewed proposed changes to the 2012 NTF plan not previously covered in the meeting. Reviewed the specific indicator/target changes to deal with forecasting for selected indicators (1.1.1, 1.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.3, and 6.1.1). The group understood that most of the targets do not lend themselves to quantitative forecasts and are satisfied with the forecast sections as revised. Providing additional information such as FREP findings or predictive work by the Kamloops Future Forest Strategy was deemed appropriate and helpful and should be extended where possible to other indicators.

Also reviewed the strategy sections of these indicators where it was indicated the scale at which the forecast, indicator and target applied – such as at the TSA level or at the entire SFM Plan area level. Agreed to these changes and the need to extend this to the remaining indicators so that the 2011 SFM Plan targets could also be reported in this fashion. Discussed making these changes to the 2011 monitoring template so licensees could report their findings at the TSA level where necessary.

Reviewed the proposed change to the variance for target #20 (riparian). Agreed.

Discussed the publishing/printing of the 2012 NTF plan. PAG agreed to hold off printing until March/April 2012, when the current status section can be updated based on the 2011 monitoring report. Printed version will be created following our chance to review these additions at the next meeting planned for the spring of 2012. In the interim, Pat will produce a digital version of the 2012 SFM Plan with changes as agreed to at this meeting. A copy will be posted to the website and replaced by the March/April 2012 version once further updates (current status) are made and agreed upon.

Action: Pat to continue to update strategy and forecast sections for remaining indicators.

Action: Pat to revise monitoring template to indicate if target reporting is to occur at the TSA or SFM Plan area level.

Action: Pat to develop the 2012 SFM Plan based on draft plan and agreed upon changes.

Action: Pat to update the 2012 SFM Plan with current status information once monitoring report has been completed.

Climate Change Video: video titled “Forests and climate change: a convenient truth” was viewed during lunch. Climate change was one of the CSA Standard discussion items identified as being in need of further discussion/awareness.

CSA Audit Reports: Companies handed out copies and discussed their recent audits. Most companies had audits since the last PAG meeting. Some PAG members attended several audits. BCTS had findings from 2010 that remain open regarding current status, forecasting, the plan area risk assessment, and the scale of reporting (TSA vs DFA). Tolko had finding regarding PAG membership, the PAG terms of reference, and a safety indicator. Aspen Planers had findings regarding the riparian indicator, and suggested changes (see 2012 Plan Changes section of the minutes). Aspen also had findings on grammatical errors within the plan – these changes were made to the draft plan that was reviewed by the PAG. Aspen also explained their finding related to visual quality objectives on some cutblocks. Ardeu had very similar findings to that of BCTS. Canfor had no findings it needed to discuss, but noted that their findings were likely different from others as they were being audited to an earlier version of the CSA Standard. Gilbert Smith had their previous audit in January, 2011 and these findings were discussed in the March meeting held earlier this year. All of this years external audits are available on the NTF website.

PAG business: Discussed the number of meetings. Do our public members want more meetings, more meetings of a shorter duration, less meetings, more information? Members commented that all day meetings were had for them to concentrate and stay focused but understood the desire to avoid additional travel to extra meetings. Members felt that if additional meetings were to occur, that they might be field oriented to discuss issues and to learn more about the licencees business and the steps they take to manage environmental issues. Discussed lack of attendance of 2011 field tour, and possible times to get more attendance. Agreed to keep field tour in late September. Bert and Frances were very appreciative of Tolko’s taking them on a personalized field trip.

Nicola Similkameen Innovative Forestry Society: NSIFS has a new forestry plan, and is giving the PAG an opportunity to review and comment. The invitation and summary documents will be posted to our website (members section). The minutes will provide a link to the NSIFS website for the full forestry plan document.

Action: Pat to post letter and summary to our NTF website.

NSIFS Website: <http://www.nsifs.bc.ca/news¬ices.php>

PAG Open Discussion: Frances asked how all the companies are doing? Are the mills all running? The newspapers are talking about the start of a recovery, how are licensees in the NTF area doing? Tolko still running 3 shifts, Aspen just re-opened Lillooet and Savona. Canfor just re-opened Vavenby. Overall things are getting back to normal and going well in the NTF plan area.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.