

Nicola-Thompson-Fraser PAG

June 24, 2010

Ashcroft River Inn

Facilitator: Pat Salm

Attendees: Bert Parke, Graham Everett, Jim Baker, Elizabeth Salomon-de-Friedberg, Gerry Sanford, Katherine Shewchuk, Wendy McKinney, Leona Antoine, Frank Etchart, Aline Lachapelle, Jan Stadey, Rick Cooper, Simon Warhurst

Objectives: Finish criteria 6 and old plan indicators/targets that are not linked directly to the core indicators, great job so far.

Pat handed out copies of Kamloops 2010 SFM plan to provide PAG with a flavour of the new plan. A “here is what it may look like”, with additional changes to bring in the combined DFA’s as well as company specific DFA information for their certification requirements.

Review of minutes from June 16 meeting:

Action item: Criteria 1.4 Jan discussed Ardeu’s process for finding and identifying geological features, includes office review of known information, field review of known information, then reconnaissance occurs. If something is found it will be managed by size and value. Experts may be brought in if needed. Karst features are caves and cave terrain. Examples of geological features could include, karst formations or petrified forests.

Discussed various possibilities for the indicator, list special geological features protected, with at target of 100%. Or report on the number of special geological features found and what we did.

Who monitors for compliance with legislation, SFM plan requirements. C&E, professional foresters, and company staff. Field foresters are onsite for lots of time, and if they are outside their scope of practice they are required to seek outside help.

<p>Agreement: Add an additional indicator (numbered 1.4.3): Management and or protection of special biological features. The target (reporting only, no specific target) was agreed to as: Report the special geological features that were identified and managed. Additionally, licensees will report the management activities that they undertook for each special geological feature.</p>
--

Indicator 4.1.1 agreement to use target from indicator 1.1.3 needs to be updated (is correctly stated in the Appendix 3 document) as follows: “Progress towards a stable forest age class distribution on the timber harvesting land base where each age class to 80 years old [1 (1 to 20), 2 (21-40), 3 (41-60), and 4 (61 to 80)] occupies at least 8.5% of the timber harvesting land base in each of the 3 TSA’s (Kamloops, Lillooet, Merritt).”

Discussed the Agreement for indicator 5.2.4 (old Kamloops indicator 28) “maintain or increase the number of business relationships with FN”. Can licensees maintain even after beetle? Do the licensee want to change to account for a possible downturn after? Will licensees provide a breakdown of the type, where they happen-operations, management, marketing, etc.? Kamloops currently reports on a 3 year rolling average.

Agreement: leave at ‘maintain’ and provide a rationale if not met. Reporting will be similar to that being done in Kamloops.

Reviewed Appendix 3: Last meeting 1.3 targets, 4.1 indicators and targets, and all of criteria 5 were completed.

Roads: is there a process to block roads, to ensure they are maintained properly? Some roads are maintained by local user groups. Who has responsibility for roads? There are 3 categories of roads, industrial, general use, and wilderness roads. Roads are either permitted to a licensee (who then look after maintenance responsibilities) or are maintained by the Crown.

New Business:

Criteria 6: Society’s Responsibility

Value for Criteria 6.1 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights:

Reviewed current three values. All 3 values are very similar. Language in Kamloops is consistent with supreme court language. Element 6.1 aboriginal and treaty rights should be changed as well. CSA probably not going to change.

Agreement: The value for 6.1 is “Aboriginal title and rights and treaty rights.”

Objective for Criteria 6.1 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights:

Reviewed the three objectives from current plans. Can BCTS live with these, as they are part of the crown? Yes, because statement in text, that it is without prejudice to negotiations or other processes.

Agreement: The objective for 6.1 is “Recognition of Aboriginal title and rights and treaty rights as related to forest management.”

Criteria 6.1 Indicator: reviewed all current possible indicators. Kamloops 23 appears to be the best fit. Merritt had some problems because there was uncertainty on all licensees reporting the same.

The wording for target 23.b: Should we add in word “Participating licensees respond to all written requests for communication and information from First Nations? Yes.

Agreement: Include the targets from Kamloops: “Open communication with local First Nations will include an understanding of traditional territories and other aboriginal rights including cultural and spiritual values” and “Participating Licensees respond to all written requests for communication/information from First Nations.”

Does this include FN as participating? Small scale is covered under this plan? What if non-certified wood goes through mill? Does that count as SFM wood?

Items to add to the Parking Lot of the SFM Plan:

Non-reporting/participating licensees in TSA. Do they meet the intent of the plan for this indicator? What can be done to provide assurance the Plan is being achieved overall?
Potential discussion item for winter meeting: Chain of Custody.

Criteria 6.1.2 Indicator: Same targets could work for this one as last one. Does open mean ‘open as in beginning something’, or does open mean ‘open as in transparent’? Open means open, as in transparent. Would SSS in all districts would report on 23a? Yes.

Agreement: Include the targets from Kamloops: “Open communication with local First Nations will include an understanding of traditional territories and other aboriginal rights including cultural and spiritual values” and “Participating Licensees respond to all written requests for communication/information from First Nations.”

Criteria 6.1.3 Indicator: reviewed Kamloops 23 c) what is reported every year by licensees? Also looking at a type of activities. Could we not use 1.4.2 indicator? Instead of Kamloops 23c? If we use that, what does the reporting say? If we use, probably want to use the list information that currently exists for Kamloops 23c. If we use 1.4.2, do we need something else for sites vs. traditional knowledge. Or do we need more information in the reporting? Do we need ‘traditional knowledge’ in the target, or do we need ‘traditional knowledge’ in the text of the indicator ie. Strategy?

Agreement: Include the targets: “Open communication with local First Nations will include an understanding of traditional territories and other aboriginal rights including cultural and spiritual values” and “Participating Licencees respond to all written requests for communication/information from First Nations.”

Also include target from 1.4.2 “100% protection of culturally important, sacred ,and spiritual sites that have been identified and mapped or 100% conformance to all plan commitments specifically designed to manage for culturally important, sacred, and spiritual sites that have been indentified and mapped.” In text of target include traditional knowledge- explanation and how to incorporate traditional knowledge in forest plans.

Value for Criteria 6.2: Respect for Aboriginal values, knowledge, and uses

Reviewed all 3 TSA SFM Plan current values. Decided to use same as value from 6.1 but adding traditional knowledge.

Agreement: The value for 6.2 is “Aboriginal title and rights, treaty rights and traditional knowledge are respected.”

Objective for Criteria 6.2: Respect for Aboriginal values, knowledge, and uses

The PAG reviewed all 3 TSA SFM Plan objectives currently used. Reviewed Kamloops objective but discussed removing archaeological and added to sub bullet. Discussed “protection of” and maybe replace with “managed” as something being managed could include protection.

Agreement: The objective for 6.2 is “Manage and/or protect important archaeological sites (as interpreted by First Nations)

- Cultural , archaeological, and heritage sites and values, including spiritual.
- Use of traditional knowledge.
- Meaningful and informed participation of First Nations.”

Criteria 6.2.1 Indicator: reviewed all current possible indicators. Could also use 1.4.2 from new agreed to plan. Kamloops may not be able to use AOA process indicator. Agreed to include similar targets as for 6.1.2.

Agreement: Include the targets: “Open communication with local First Nations will include an understanding of traditional territories and other aboriginal rights including cultural and spiritual values” and “Participating Licencees respond to all written requests for communication/information from First Nations.”

Also include target from 1.4.2 “100% protection of culturally important, sacred ,and spiritual sites that have been identified and mapped or 100% conformance to all plan commitments specifically designed to manage for culturally important, sacred, and spiritual sites that have been indentified and mapped.” In text of target include traditional knowledge- explanation and how to incorporate traditional knowledge in forest plans.

Supper break:

Value for Criteria 6.3: Forest Community Well-being and Resilience:

Reviewed all 3 TSA SFM Plan current values. The value is talking about forest based communities and not specifically forest companies. Some of this is outside the control of the forest companies as are the global market forces that dictate profit/loss and whether businesses remain open.

Agreement: The value for 6.3 is “Economic benefits to society”.

Value for Criteria 6.3: Forest Community Well-being and Resilience:

The PAG reviewed all 3 TSA SFM Plan objectives currently used. It was decided that the current Merritt works best with the chosen value.

Agreement: The objective for 6.3 is: “A prosperous forest based economy with a sustainable supple of forest resources”.

Agreed to work through the remainder of Values and Objectives prior to moving on to their respective indicators.

Value for Criteria 6.4: Fair and Effective Decision-Making:

Possible combination of Merritt and Kamloops. Based on definition in criteria, do we use Lillooet? Kamloops based theirs on values that are recognized. Kamloops value is 'values are recognized.' Values recognition, shared knowledge, and informed decisions. Do we need to include consensus decision making process in the value? It already exists in the Terms of Reference.

Agreement: The value for 6.4 is "Recognition of advisory group values, shared knowledge, and informed decisions".

Objective for Criteria 6.4: Fair and Effective Decision-Making:

what is public awareness of the SFM process? Does inviting the press to the field trip count as public awareness? The first part of the Kamloops objective is great.

Agreement: The objective for 6.4 is: "Engaged, dynamic public participation process".

Side Agreement : Jerry Canuel to write a book "SFM for dummies" for new members. (PAG on post-dessert sugar high and going crazy!)

Value for Criteria 6.5: Information for Decision-Making:

Merritt and Lillooet are very close, but Merritt includes shared knowledge. Focus of criteria is the sharing of information and educational opportunities, and the value should be more towards educational opportunities. Opportunities to increase knowledge and understanding were suggested by PAG member. PAG added clauses onto end, for public decision making, for relationship building. This criterion was built by CSA for public participation, not just for PAG workings.

Agreement: The value for 6.4 is "Opportunities to increase knowledge and understanding."

Objective for Criteria 6.5: Information for Decision-Making:

The group liked Lillooet objective, although their was also a desire to include the elements of adaptive management.

Agreement: The objective for 6.5 is: "A wide range of public educational opportunities. Adaptive forest management is responsive to research, experience and public input."

Criteria 6.3.1- Indicator- very similar to Core indicator 5.1.1, targets could be used again. Kamloops has some very specific targets related to specific values. Some are similar between the different TSA's. The beetle has changed the emphasis for VQO's but it was agreed to continue with it regardless. Group like old Kamloops targets 21 (rancher communication), 22 (trapper communication), 25 (visual quality), Merritt target 30 (business initiatives). Also include the public communication target from 5.1.1.

Agreement: Include the targets:

“Where forest operations are planned within range units, the forest licensee will communicate with the rancher in advance of those operations to minimize impact to affected ranchers.”

“Communication of forest operations to occur with trappers 100% of the time in advance of operations.”

“100% conformance to strategies in plans designed to achieve preservation, and partial retention visual quality objectives.”

“Report business initiatives and partnerships.”

“TSA licensees will demonstrate efforts by participating in public multi-stakeholder meetings at both the strategic and at the local level. Licensees will report on the number of community meetings held or attended. Licensees will also report on the number of communications with concerned and engaged recreational users.”

Criteria 6.3.2 Indicator- new core indicator based largely on input from union representative who participated at CSA standard revision meetings. No current indicator in Merritt and Lillooet. Need a verb in the Kamloops sentence as currently worded. Reviewed Safe Companies program. Worksafe BC is something different entirely. Discussed changing indicator to 100% with a 20% variance but in the end decided to leave it at 80% for now and monitor results with the idea of changing it as needed.

Agreement: Include the target: “A minimum of 80% of contractors conducting on-the-ground work are SAFE Company, or equivalent, registered and/or certified. And for BCTS, that a minimum of 80% of the licenses or contracts awarded were SAFE Company, or equivalent, registered and/or certified”

Criteria 6.3.3 Indicator: this is for the companies' workers, not the union workers.

Agreement: Include the target: “All forest companies/organizations subscribing to the SFM Plan are SAFE Company, or equivalent, certified”.

Criteria 6.4.1 Indicator- all TSA's already have a survey to measure the satisfaction of the advisory group process. The surveys will need to be merged into one - a work item that can be done later in the year. Wondering if another indicator is needed to track PAG participation, versus survey scores? Or add a clause, send survey to those that attended in the previous year.

Items to add to the Parking Lot of the SFM Plan: Surveys need to be updated.

Agreement: Include the target: "a. 80% of survey responses "3" or better b. All written comments are reviewed and considered, and all line responses averaging less than 3 become action items." Also, add text to target about survey going only to those public members that attended one of the meetings in the previous year.

Criteria 6.4.2 indicator: could use 5.1.1- TSA Licensees will demonstrate efforts...

Agreement: Include the targets: "The TSA licensees will maintain educational support that leads to a balanced and broad-based understanding of forestry. One focus is forestry programs at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. Target 40 action per year in each of the Merritt and Kamloops TSA's, and 10 actions per year in Lillooet TSA." The above target will separate reporting for First Nations, where visit or activity is targeting FN's specifically.

"TSA licensees will demonstrate efforts by participating in public multi-stakeholder meetings at both the strategic and at the local level. Licensees will report on the number of community meetings held or attended. Licensees will also report on the number of communications with concerned and engaged recreational users."

Criteria 6.4.3 indicator: Reviewed all 3 TSA SFM Plan current applicable targets. Could use 6.4.2 target related to educational support. It was felt best to include Kamloops 29 target as a reporting indicator, given that licencees have little control over this.

Agreement: Include the targets: “The TSA licensees will maintain educational support that leads to a balanced and broad-based understanding of forestry. One focus is forestry programs at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. Target 40 action per year in Merritt and Kamloops TSA’s, and 10 actions per year in Lillooet TSA.” The above target will separate reporting for First Nations, where visit or activity is targeting FN’s specifically.

“Open communication with local First Nations will include an understanding of traditional territories and other aboriginal rights including cultural and spiritual values”

“Participating Licencees respond to all written requests for communication/information from First Nations.”

“Maintain and/or increase the number of working relationships with First Nations.”

“Report annually, the percent of the TSA’s AAC that has been allocate to First Nations ventures.”

Criteria 6.5.1 Indicator: The target should not be just around what is done in the schools, needs to be more general. Does it include upgrading forest recreation sites or public education signage? Can licensees do something outside their comfort level every year? Can they do something that is innovative that would target the general public. Target is 40 visits for Kamloops. That may be a stretch target for other TSA’s.

Agreement: Include the target: “The TSA licensees will maintain educational support that leads to a balanced and broad-based understanding of forestry. One focus is forestry programs at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. Target 40 action per year in Merritt and Kamloops TSA’s, and 10 actions per year in Lillooet TSA.” The above target will separate reporting for First Nations, where visit or activity is targeting FN’s specifically.

Criteria 6.5.2 Indicator: Merritt 27a does not really fit. And Kamloops 29 does not really fit. Has PAG thought about adding a newspaper ad to summarize results? No targets for any of these, just reporting what has been done. Retain Kamloops target 35a. Merritt website does not have information on issues of concern to the public. Kamloops has it now. PAG would be interested in having this extra flexibility with a website that provides for this – is this going to occur?

Agreement: Include the target: “Licensees will keep members of the public informed of TSA strategies being developed, and planning occurring by:

- Maintaining a website
- Circulating the SFM plan and other information to the public at least annually (news release/leaflet/open house/Local Resource Use Plan. etc.)”

Review of Non-core indicators remaining in the Merritt and Lillooet SFM Plans.

Merritt #2. Already brought in. Merritt 14, 33 already brought in. Lillooet 13 or Merritt 16 are important to the PAG (road maintenance), do want to bring something in. Lillooet 13 could be a sub reporting number used in that TSA only. But, may be important to see how many soil erosion events were picked up, not by inspections.

Agreement: Include the following indicator/targets (add under Element 3.2):

“All permanent status roads and associated structures will have inspections and related maintenance completed as scheduled.”- report this separate for all 3 TSA’s.

“Percentage of road-related soil erosion events identified in annual road inspections and satisfactorily treated by plan proponent.”-report only in Lillooet TSA, 100 percent target. Simon to work with Aline to help define what constitutes a soil erosion event.

Action item: Public members to take a second look at remaining “unused indicators/targets” (see page 31 of the Core indicator section within the binder). Then to let Pat know if there is a desire to include any more non-core indicators.

All done. Congratulations everyone, great job!!

Next Steps:

Thursday, Sept 23 is our field trip. BCTS still hosting. Please let Rick know if you have anything specific that needs to be included in the field tour.

Action item: Pat will get new SFM plan out two weeks before a planned review that has been scheduled to occur on September 30, 2010. by Sept 16. No paper copies, will be sent to everyone digitally or placed on a website for review. No desire to print copies until PAG has reviewed and we agree to any further changes. Bring your comments with you.

Thursday, Sept 30 is date for next NTF PAG meeting. Location is Ashcroft. Start at 3PM. Expected to end at 7PM or so. Final details will come out as we get closer to the meeting.