

# Minutes

## Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group Meeting Benvoulin Heritage Church, Kelowna, BC January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010

### Attendees:

Keith Boulter	Paul Ross	Randy Hardy	Mike Watkins
Rob Kennett	Grant Thompson	Don Guild	Ellen Simmons
Richard Toperczer	Dave Gill	Darcie Annesley	Kerry Rouck
Bert Put	Colin Pierre	Charlene Higgins	Darcie Annesley
Mahrusa Sherstobitoff	Ted McRae	Reg Volk	
Mark Hopkins (Facilitator)	Judie Steeves (Reporter)	Pat Salm (Consultant)	

### 1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review

Following the self-introduction of the PAG members, the agenda was reviewed. There were no additions/alterations to the agenda.

### 2.0 Review of Minutes and Action Items from Dec 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PAG Meeting

The following Action Items from the previous meeting were addressed:

**Action Item (Dec 10<sup>th</sup>):** Paul will bring some sample documents depicting the flow of information from FSP to Site Plan. Paul will include the legislative requirements for this as well.

Paul: brought a broad sample of documents which capture the flow of Information from one planning step to the next. These were available for review by PAG members throughout the day.

**Action Item (Dec 10<sup>th</sup>):** Lisa to send an e-link on the process to Mark for distribution to the PAG.

Lisa: sent Mark the e-link to the Weed Act update process, this was distributed to PAG members and posted to the SFM website. Several copies were made and available at today's meeting as well.

**Action Item (Dec 10<sup>th</sup>):** Paul to follow-up with seed suppliers on the GMO grass seed issue.

Paul: contacted the supplier of seeds used in re-vegetation efforts by Tolko (and most other S. Interior companies) they confirmed in writing that no genetically modified seeds are included in the supplied seed.

**Action Item** (Dec 10<sup>th</sup>): Pat will collect more information on the work Canfor has done as well as general carbon management info for BC. He will also see if he can access the data behind the Okanagan TSA slide on carbon stock change (source Werner Kurtz information) and present info at the Jan 7<sup>th</sup> PAG mtg.

Pat: contacted Werner Kurtz (developer of CFS carbon Model) on Carbon related issues and distributed handout. The model basically predicts which forests are acting as sources vs. sinks. Also distributed:

- a copy of the recent *BC Professional Forester* magazine entitled: *Carbon Source to Carbon Sink: Ways to Manage BC's Forests for Carbon Storage*.
- A summary of means by which Using Wood Products can be used to reduce Global Warming.
- BC MoF publication on Facts about reforestation in BC (Oct 1, 2009).  
A Carbon and climate change related Fact Sheet from *Planet Friendly Canada*.

**Action Item (new)**: Mark to Establish link to *Planet Friendly Canada* website from SFM page

## 2.0 Criteria #4 - Carbon Uptake and Storage

The current suite of agreed Indicators for Criteria 4.1.1 was again reviewed with the PAG. These are old Indicators/targets 8, 12 and 16

## 3.0 Charlene Higgins - Presentation

Pat: Introduced Charlene and outlined her role on the CSA SFM Technical Advisory Committee.

Grant: Outlined the route by which she was invited to speak at today's meeting. Grant, like many others, initially thought that the FSC standard was more First Nations friendly. Closer review of the new CSA standard indicated that was not necessarily the case and wanted to explore the standard further- hence his request to invite Charlene. WFN council is supportive of certification but it cannot compromise other important issues.

Charlene Presentation:

- Has been trying to ensure better First Nations participation in forest management for the last 14 years. She was involved with development of the CSA SFM standard since 1999.
- The new standard is not above the law, she pointed out why a new standard with higher aboriginal inclusion is better, not scary.
- The new standard contains aboriginal aspects in all elements.
- Believes the new standard is as good, or better, than the FSC standard from an aboriginal perspective (she also worked on some aspects of the FSC standard).

- Not a perfect document – but much better than the old standard.
- The definitions included in the document are defined by the courts (see section 5.1)
- Emphasized section 5.2 of the standard and its importance to First nations involvement

Pat: Noted the inclusion of the First Nations component in the new standard which has been captured in the updated Terms of Reference.

Paul: Does Section 5.2 mean that anything said by First Nations in the course of participating in the standard cannot be held against them?

Charlene: Yes.

Paul: In the past the problem has been that the First Nations representative you may be dealing with is often hesitant to say anything for fear of compromising other politically sensitive issues.

Charlene: This section (5.2) essentially affirms that First Nations participation does not affect these other issues.

Charlene - Comments on Core Indicators in General

- Very importantly the new standard recognizes that cultural diversity is part of biodiversity.
- Spiritual areas should generally be a “no-go” area whereas most other areas can be dealt with through management prescriptions of one sort or another.
- Water too, is very important to First Nations

Charlene - Comments on Criteria #6

In reference to Section 6.1, page 53 of the Z809-08 standard made the following points.

- This section addresses what is essentially an intellectual property rights issue – what is confidential and what is not.
- Information sharing agreements between participating parties are critical to safeguarding the integrity of aboriginal knowledge. (see section 6.2 of the standard)
- The phrase “where available” is a critical statement in the standard (in reference to aboriginal knowledge) a component of sections 6.1.1, 6.1.2, and 6.1.3
- The phrase “best efforts” is important as well – communication is more than just a letter or a phone call.
- Section 6.2 reflects inclusivity and the importance of Information sharing.
- “willing aboriginal communities” is also an important addition to the standard.
- The inclusion of section 7.2 ( c) *Respect and recognize Aboriginal title and rights and treaty rights* was a topic of extensive discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee, but eventually ended up in the standard.

- Similarly, section 7.3.3 Rights and Regulations and subsection ( c ) *demonstrate that aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights have been identified and respected*, in particular was also widely debated at the Technical Committee level.

Mike: What is meant by the term “willing participant”?

Charlene: It is a tough term to define and I wouldn’t want to do so. In a sense “willing” is tied to “best efforts”, may not get to “willing” with some communities.

Paul: We’ve invited a number of First Nations groups to get involved with this SFM process. We’ve had a number of drop-ins but no sustained involvement. Perhaps we should send out a summary of the changes to the different bands showing where the standard has been changed to include their interests. You’re (Charlene) are looking at this from a different angle than we typically have in the past.

Charlene: I think historically the lack of participation by First Nations has been due to two things:

1. A perception that nothing ever changes, and
2. The process does not address First Nations interests as well as the FSC standard.

Mark: Are you (Charlene) aware of any difference in the level of aboriginal participation in the SFM process east of the Rockies (where there is a much greater number of treaties in place) as compared to BC where there is little in the way of settled treaties?

Charlene: Not really. Many of the treaties are headed back to the courts in the rest of the country as well.

Pat: The summary of changes from the old standard included in annex “C” of the new standard does not really address the changes that were made to address aboriginal issues.

Don: Is there a more comfortable format for aboriginal involvement than sitting down with a committee of non-aboriginal, “mainstream’ members?

Paul: Should we be approaching First Nations communities in a different way? What’s holding back participation?

Charlene: I think you should start with striving to understand the issues and interests of local First Nations. Make sure you’ve got the complete picture.

Paul: If we could do an inventory of values currently addressed in the plan(s) We could circulate these to local First Nations for comment.

## **4.0 Ellen Simmons – Upcoming Conference / Workshop Announcement**

Ellen: provided the following information on an upcoming conference which she has helped organize.

Indigenous Earth Conference  
March 9-12, 2010  
Penticton, BC

*[note: Subsequent to this mtg., Convention details and Call-for-Proposals information was sent to Mark by Ellen and sent by e-mail to the PAG Members]*

The first three days of the conference are focused on works-in-progress with the last day looking at the implementation of knowledge

Grant: When I looked at the new standard I didn't see any huge hurdles to overcome. I like the new focus on First Nations, but it is certainly not well advertised.

Pat: CSA sees itself as the “developer” of standards, not as the promoter of them. The SFM standard is one of the few CSA standards which is available free of charge (paid for by the participating companies) – to make it as available as possible to the public.

Pat: referred to the CSA SFM user group website which can be found at [www.csasfmforest.ca](http://www.csasfmforest.ca)  
Brochures could be developed on any number of topics which need to be focused on.

Charlene: Start local, market local and make it local.

Kerry: The SFM user group could develop the “boilerplate” information/brochures which could then be adapted for local circumstance.

## **5.0 Criteria # 6 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights**

Pat: Suggested that for the purposes of indicator 6.1.1, old indicator #29 could be used. However part “c” of 29 could be dropped.

Richard: thinks this Indicator is really refers to the understanding of aboriginal Rights and Title, and suggested the following Indicators pertaining to 6.1.1:

1. Demonstrated knowledge of Band history and ethnography
2. Self-assessment process used by RPF's
3. Cultural awareness strategies.

Pat: The difficulty is in measuring progress towards the achievement of these targets.

Richard: Could use the RPF self-assessment as evidence of understanding.

Rob: the background information t the self assessment process makes it difficult for anyone to be an expert in anything.

Charlene: This indicator (6.1.1) is all about understanding local communities. It really deals with identifying those who claim title.

Mike: I don't see this as a legal issue/definition – really up to the auditors to decide if the approach meets the standard.

Charlene: I agree – it's not a legal issue.

Paul: Described the process of gaining and incorporating aboriginal knowledge into forest management plans.

Pat: We need to have a target, but we also need to know that we are sending the information to the right people/communities.

Darcie: Should we include the 'drive' towards establishing information sharing agreements?

Paul: so there's really three parts to this:

1. Make sure the information is going/coming from the right people.
2. Use an open approach to information sharing
3. respond to requests for information.

Richard: How do you know your sending information to the right Band?

Paul: The auditors will look for evidence that the companies are using the correct information.

Pat: Suggested that a revised 29 ( c ) state that licencees will have a record of Band interest areas.

Paul: Communication between Bands has improved over the last few years; often there is agreement that a particular Band will represent the interests of another band where there is overlapping interest.

**Agreement:** Revised wording for 6.1.1 ( a ) (old 29 ( a )) is as follows;  
"Open communication with affected aboriginal communities will occur in advance of harvesting, road building, herbicide application, or broadcast fertilization activities 100% of the time".

Old Indicator 29 (b) is to be retained as an indicator for 6.1.1

**Agreement:** Following limited discussion it was agreed that for the purposes of Indicator 6.1.2  
Old 29 (a) will be retained as revised under 6.1.1. (above)  
Old 29(b) will be retained as is  
Old 29 ( c ) will be retained as is - with the exception that the word "available" is removed

Mahrusa: can we expect to see more information forthcoming from First nations in the future?

Pat: Where you agree to disagree with a First Nations group these should not contribute towards the target.

**Agreement:** For the purposes of Indicators 6.1.2 and 6.1.3, old target 29 ( c ) is to be retained as revised (removing the word “available”)

### **Indicator 6.2.1 – Evidence of Understanding and Use of Aboriginal Knowledge....**

Charlene/Reg: both believe there should be some reference to the “level” of management referred to. (e.g. protection vs. management)

Pat: proposed that address this concern, that the newly agreed to targets for 1.4.2 be adopted for the purposes of Indicator 6.2.1.

**Agreement:** utilize the new target, previously agreed to for Indicator 1.4.2, as the new target for Indicator 6.2.1. Old indicator 29 is to be removed, and in addition the following targets will be used:  
Old 29 (a) will be retained as revised under 6.1.1 (a) above.  
Old 29(b) will be retained as is  
Old 29 ( c ) will be retained as is - with the exception that the word “available” is removed

### **Indicator 6.3.1. – Evidence hat the Organization has cooperated with other...**

Currently have a suite of 4 “old” Indicators related to this 6.3.1., specifically:

- 11 – dealing with soil
- 18 – related to access
- 26 – partnerships and value-added
- 27 – Visual Quality objectives

Don: What about trails, wildlife viewing areas, etc. FRPA regulation sections 56 and 57 relate to “official” trails but there are lots of others out there.

Mark: Could you simply report o the number or percentage of trail management commitments made in SP’s which have been met?

Pat: Not sure how easy that is to do.

Following some discussion amongst the licencees on the feasibility of tracking trail commitments, the following was agreed to.

**Agreement:** The new target for indicator 6.3.1 is:  
100% compliance with Site Plan commitments to manage for trails

Mike: What about re-application of grass seed when the initial application is not successful?

Following some discussion amongst the PAG members there was no agreement at this meeting on how best to measure, track, report and/or reapply grass seed where there was little or no “take”

**Indicator 6.3.2 – Evidence of Cooperation with DFA Related Workers and Their Unions...**

Pat: outlined the history of the indicator; a significant push at the national technical committee level. The intent is to focus on “on the ground” forestry activity rather than the clerical positions.

Darcie: within BCTS we have issues with out-of-province contractors who are not part of the BC SAFE program. Difficult to tell when a certification is “equivalent”

**Agreement: Indicator 6.3.2** Pat’s proposed new wording for Indicator 6.3.2 target was altered and agreed to as follows:  
“100 Percent of contractors conducting on-the-ground work that are SAFE Company registered and/or certified or equivalent”.

**Indicator 6.3.3** - Evidence that a Worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved

Following review of Pat’s proposed target, the following discussion ensued:

Darcie: How can Indicator lead to improvement?

Pat: through the annual cycle of audit and revision.

Charlene: Not all operators are licencees, especially First Nations.

**Agreement: Indicator 6.3.3**  
The revised wording agreed to for the Indicator 6.3.3 target is:  
“100% of CSA SFM participating licencees will be SAFE Company certified”.

**Indicator 6.4.1** - Level of Participant Satisfaction with the Public Participation Process.

Pat: Described the current PAG questionnaire process.

**Agreement:**  
The PAG agreed to the continued use of old Indicator 33 as the target for Indicator 6.4.1

**Indicator 6.4.2** - Evidence of Efforts to Promote Capacity Development and Meaningful Participation in General

Pat: Described the current suite of related Indicators, specifically 28, 31, and 34 and noted that the language needs to be updated to reflect the current planning process.

Richard: Reference to the LRMP could be an issue with First Nations as they were not involved in the process.

Pat: from a participation in the SFM process, don't see this as an issue given the non-prejudicial nature of participating in the SFM.

**Agreement:**

Add old Indicator #35 to the list of targets for Indicator 6.4.2

**Indicator 6.4.3** - Evidence of Efforts to Promote Capacity Development and Meaningful Participation for Aboriginal Communities.

Charlene: suggested that the proposed tracking of AAC Allocated to First Nations would be better suited to Indicator 5.2.4

**Agreement:**

For Indicator 6.4.3 drop reference to old target 29 (a), and add target 29 (c) as previously revised.

Charlene: Is training still tracked and reported?

Dave: can we simply adjust target 32 to include training?

**Agreement:**

For the purposes of Indicator 6.4.3, alter old target #32 by inserting "including training" after the word "opportunities" in the stated target.

**Action Item:**

Pat: to revise monitoring report template in new plan to reflect the agreed change stated above. Suggested that could just add "list other capacity initiatives".

**Indicator 6.5.1** – Number of People Reached through Educational Outreach  
Following limited discussion, the PAG agreed to the following:

**Agreement:**

For the purposes of Indicator 6.5.1 retain old target #34 (educational forums).

**Indicator 6.5.2** – Public Awareness of the SFMP

Following limited discussion, the PAG agreed to the following:

**Agreement:**

For the purposes of Indicator 6.5.2, retain old target #35 and add "...or other means" to the end of the target statement (i.e. don't limit means to website).

**Next Meeting:**

9:00am – 4:00pm  
Thursday, Jan 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010  
Tolko Head Office  
Vernon, BC