

**Weyerhaeuser/Tolko
Okanagan-Shuswap and Boundary Regional
Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

**Meeting Summary
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, March 17, 2005**

Meeting Attendance

√	Amanda Bridge	√	Morrie Thomas
	Bernie Kaplun	√	Pat Salm
	Berthold Hettrich	√	Paul Ross
√	Cam Leadbeater		Peter Wise
	Darcie Annesley		Real Rousseau
	David Allingham	√	Renee Clark
	Earl Overland		Ron Racine
√	Ed Sims	√	Scott Smith
	Grant Furness	√	Ted Allingham
√	Jim Bryan		Terry Kineshanko
√	Juergen Hansen		Tom Chapman
	Larry Broadfoot	√	Murray Wilson
√	Michelle Mercer	√	Les Laithwaite
√	Mike Watkins		

**Weyerhaeuser/Tolko
Okanagan-Shuswap and Boundary Regional
Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

DRAFT AGENDA

SFM Advisory Group Meeting

Date: Thursday, March 17, 2005
Time: 11:00 to 4:00 PM (lunch provided)
Place: Eldorado Hotel, 500 Cook Road, Kelowna

Meeting Objectives:

- Review licensees 2004 Monitoring Report & Audit results
- SFM Plan updates/improvements

Agenda Topics:

1	Introduction and Agenda Review	11:00 to 11:10 a.m.
2	2004 Monitoring Report & Licensee Re-certification Audit	11:10 to 12:30 p.m.
	<i>Lunch</i>	12:30 to 12:50 p.m.
3	Action Items from Nov 25/04 Meeting Summary (see following)	12:50 to 1:20 p.m.
4	Pine bark beetle presentation	1:20 to 2:05 p.m.
5	Water Quality Objectives (Ted Allingham)	2:05 to 2:25 p.m.
	<i>Break</i>	2:20 to 2:35 p.m.
6	Indicator 8 revision (see following)	2:35 to 2:45 p.m.
7	Review Parking Lot (SFM Plan Appendix 2) items for change of status or action (See following)	3:05 to 3:25 p.m.
8	Options for Advisory Group Survey development (Indicator 33)	3:25 to 3:45 p.m.
9	Summary and Wrap-up	3:45 to 4:00 p.m.

1) Introduction and Agenda Review

Introductions made

Draft agenda agreed to without change

2) 2004 Monitoring Report & Licensee Re-certification Audit

Monitoring Report

- The report details Weyerhaeuser and Tolko's performance against the SFM Plan performance framework (values, objectives, indicators and targets)
- The licensee summaries in the appendix do not necessarily match the information in the main body of the report. The summaries focus on the individual licensees highlights, while the main report provides the combined results in the DFA.
- The Group confirmed the main report should focus on combined versus individual results.
- There were no comments or questions regarding the performance reported.

Licensee CSA Z809 Re-certification Audits (February 2005)

- A recertification audit is required every three years
- Both licensees have been recommended for recertification to the CSA Z809-02 standard based on audit results
- There appeared to be increased focus on the SFM Plan, and contractor and staff awareness of the plan compared to previous audits
- Tolko distributed the audit report they received from QMI. This is new, as historically only an overview of the audit result has been provided the PAG. Copies of the audit report, or additional information, can be obtained from Paul Ross.
- Weyerhaeuser had not yet received their audit report. It will be distributed to PAG members.
- Three levels of opportunities identified in an audit report:
 - Non-conformance – must be rectified before certification
 - Opportunity for improvement (OFI) – expected that the auditee (licensee) will assess the recommendation and determine course of action (no action to fully adopt)
 - Opportunity for improvement to consider – no licensee requirement, an opportunity for licensee to be aware of other ideas/approaches
- Auditors noted the Advisory Groups focus on indicator improvement
- Auditor feedback – saw the PAG as healthy, happy, full of energy
- The next audits will be surveillance audits in 2006; an objective will be to schedule these audits for the summer (2005 audits were in winter).

Public participation on the audits

- The licensees arranged for public members of the advisory group to observe the audit. An opportunity that will be available on future audits. The public participant was impressed by the thoroughness/comprehensiveness of the audit procedure
 - It included harvesting, contractor and staff training, safety, fire preparedness

- Machine operators were tested for understanding of the operational map, their location on the block, and the location of sensitive areas
- Several members were also interviewed by phone. Discussions included:
 - The AAC uplift for beetle
 - Need for the CSA to provide background/context when updating the standard
- Both companies are prepared to take group members to the field during the year if there is some area, practice, or other item of particular interest they want to observe or better understand.

BC Timber Sales

Recently certified to ISO 14001

Some concern the public or customers might equate ISO to CSA SFM Plan certification – this is a possibility

In BC Timber Sales case, it is their intent to now pursue CSA certification

3) Action Items From Previous Meetings

1. Canadian Forest Service work in regard to BC's carbon balance:

- ⇒ Nothing new, Weyerhaeuser is still beta testing in Saskatchewan. The model will be considered when testing is complete.
- ⇒ Potential BC implementation options and challenges discussed: possibly tie to BC provincial indicator initiative; BC data base would have to be converted for compatibility with the model; funding sources (Kyoto?) may be available; a national one size fits all model (coarse) but does have climate input
- ⇒ Advisory group interested as it could be an indicator that gets directly to forest functionality (water cycling etc).

Action: Pat Salm will update the group on the model at the fall 2005 meeting

2. Element 3a: Physical Environments -- Why was this Element dropped?

- ⇒ Minutes kept during updating of Z809 to the 2002 version are not adequate to provide understanding of the change.

Action: Weyerhaeuser has a person on the technical committee who will ensure this issue is addressed for the next version – that a “decision with reasons” is provided

3. Indicator 40 (Now Indicator 10) - Provide a summary of Protected Areas including Goal 2, Parks and ecological reserves specific to the DFA.

- ⇒ Table 1 on page 3 of the 2005 plan was updated to provide DFA numbers
- ⇒ Old growth management areas (OGMAs) are supposed to be finalized this year, and will be added to Table 1. A committee including government, licensees and interest groups is identifying the OGMAS.
- ⇒ The Advisory Group would like a column added to Table 1 in 2006 that provides percent by land classification.
- ⇒ Some Okanagan TSA numbers that the licensees have derived:
 - Total Okanagan TSA – 2.25 million hectares
 - 46% of the TSA is included in the timber harvesting land base (THLB)

- 10% of the 46% is set aside for OGMAs and enhanced riparian management
- Formal protected areas are 13.9% of the total TSA area. Have to report at the TSA level as strategy is managed at the TSA level. Numbers do not add up at the DFA level; i.e. how much if any of an adjacent park should be assumed to be in the DFA?

Action: Table 1 to be updated in the 2006 plan to include OGMAs and percent by land classification.

4. **Forest Health -- Complete:** Included in 2005 SFMP
5. **Forest Health - current mountain pine beetle situation -- Complete:** See agenda item 4
6. **Indicator Improvement**

Proposal: Weyerhaeuser/Tolko discussion has resulted in concept that Indicator improvement focus on “areas” of improvement as opposed to focus on individual indicators or isolated aspects of a bigger picture. The idea is to focus on each of the following “areas” as a whole:

- ⇒ Landscape level biodiversity
- ⇒ Stand level biodiversity
- ⇒ Silviculture practices (regeneration performance)

The concept is to take the individual indicators in these areas and build a better more effective/stronger indicator.

Licensees would do the legwork

Discussion

- ⇒ Focus should not be on amalgamation but on building and improving indicators
- ⇒ Addressing all three areas is probably too ambitious for one year. What is the priority? There is a real desire by the group to improve the landscape level, to look at and manage for the bigger picture outside the block. However it may be more practical to start with stand level (better handle on it & an easier pilot) and work up. The landscape level is more difficult to address.
- ⇒ Do not get hopes up too high that there is a “silver bullet” indicator.
- ⇒ There was general agreement with the concept that the licensees presented, the licensees will decide which “area(s)” to focus on first

Action:

Licensees will determine focus area(s) and start work. They will circulate a product in draft form before the fall field trip. There may be an opportunity to demonstrate/observe some of the ideas contained in the draft at one or more of the field trip stops. Intent would be to agree to a final version at the fall PAG meeting.

7. **SFM Plan --** Duplication of text in the plan a concern. **Complete** in 2005 Plan
8. **Options for Advisory Group Survey. Complete** – agenda item 6

4) Pine bark beetle presentation

The presentation provided information on the mountain pine bark beetle biology and life cycle and provided a Provincial, Regional, District and DFA perspective.

Current status and modeling forecasts for the next 20 years were provided. It is expected at least 80% of the pine stands in the southern part of the Province will succumb to the beetle over this 20 year time frame.

Licensees will be managing within a very large natural disturbance. Strategies/priorities are going to be driven by where the most good (timber and other values, regional economy, etc) can be achieved by taking some action: “biggest bang for the buck”. All affected areas will not be addressed.

Does this make the PAG and its work with the SFMP insignificant? Not at all! Stand level indicators (WTPs, CWD, riparian management) are still relevant as are road management and silviculture activities addressed by several indicators. Most indicators continue to provide direction for both licensee forest management practices and for licensee relationships with the community, other stakeholders and the Advisory Group.

What is the risk with continuing to plant pine? Pine stands in the future will be more diverse in age. Will that be enough? Potentially. More species are being planted. Despite this, pine ingress and growth rates typically result in pine overtaking many sites.

It is intended this presentation will be made available to other audiences in the Okanagan. Once presentations are scheduled, PAG members who missed this presentation will be notified of times and locations.

5) Water Quality Objectives

The history and current status of water quality monitoring in the Okanagan was presented to the group. Highlights include:

- Several monitoring stations were established in the mid 1990s with the intent of determining the effects of harvesting on water quality and quantity, primarily with FRBC funding
- Generally these sites were maintained for three years; typically 1996 to 1998, years which included a variety of weather and snow pack conditions. The sites were located upstream of community water intakes. Generally level of flow, PH, turbidity, temperature and conductivity were monitored.
- In addition some sampling was carried out in the major storage areas/reservoirs; some of the sampling was continuous monitoring and some was grab samples.
- Most (community) watersheds in the Okanagan have established objectives. These objectives do not have legal standing, they are not based on legislation or regulations. Initially the intent was to set objectives that met the Canadian and BC drinking water standards but it was apparent some standards could not be met (i.e. turbidity). Notes are included where the standards could not be achieved.
- Water purveyors (community water boards etc) do use the Canadian and BC drinking water standards. They use the source monitoring information to help develop water treatment strategy and to identify priority areas for focus on

landbase management practices. Their goal is integrated water management. This is their main motivation for participating on the PAG.

- Some monitoring is continuing. Source monitoring goes to the Interior Health Authority (IHA). IHA is not likely aware of the standards.

The potential for the SFM Plan is that some combination of historic and additional monitoring could be used to develop measurable SFMP indicators, instead of the proxies for water quality and quantity currently being used. Costs involved are \$25,000 for the equipment (apparently some is sitting in government storage and may be available) and about \$500/month to maintain (including data management).

Questions/comments:

- Generally 2 to 3 years is not long enough to set a base line
- How effective is water quality/quantity monitoring in detecting/measuring the effects of logging and road building? Particularly considering the large natural variability?
- What are the alternatives to monitoring stations?

Action:

Subsequent to the meeting, Weyerhaeuser and Tolko have advised the facilitator that, as this topic has significant interest to the Advisory Group, they will seek answers to water monitoring questions/concerns prior to the fall meeting. The licensees support the development of indicators that are based on measurable forest land attributes. They have reservations in considering water monitoring until answers to the following questions are obtained and considered:

- How effective is water monitoring at detecting/measuring the effects of forestry operations?
- How practical (cost/benefit) would water monitoring be?
- What is the cost?
- What are the alternatives to water monitoring?

This work will be part of the overall initiative described in Agenda item 3 (Action Item 6 – Indicator Improvement). The licensees will keep Ted Allingham, Renee Clark and Amanda Bridge informed as to progress and will seek their feedback as appropriate.

Action: If appropriate based on licensee work, invite Les Swain, Water Quality Network Specialist, to provide an overview of water monitoring in the province (focus Okanagan) at the fall meeting.

- What is being done in landscape water quality/quantity monitoring?
- What can be learned/used from these monitoring initiatives relative to forest management practices?
- What is involved – costs, logistics, timeframes etc?
- What does the future hold for the provincial water monitoring program?
- Other opportunities?

6) Indicator 8 revision

Revision was agreed to as proposed and the 2005 SFM Plan is amended accordingly. Page 31 of your copy of the SFM Plan should be noted as follows:

Target	Progress towards Maintain a stable forest age class distribution on the timber harvesting land base. Each where each age class to 100 years old [1 (0 to 20), 2 (21-40), 3 (41-60), 4 (61 to 80) and 5 (81 to 100)] occupies at least 10% of the timber harvesting land base. <u>Three age classes meet this target within 50 years.</u>
---------------	---

7) Review Parking Lot (SFM Plan Appendix 2, pages 95 & 96)

The agreed to changes, and any subsequent updates, will be reflected in the 2006 plan. Following are the agreed to actions.

1. Future Indicators

Genetic Diversity & Ecosystem Changes – Action: Ongoing. These items are a component of the indicator improvement process (Agenda item 6 -- stand level, landscape level) The improvement process cross references the Parking Lot and these items.

Global Carbon Modeling – Action: Ongoing. This item is being addressed as an action item: See meeting summary 3.1

~~FPC Contraventions Relating to Resource Features~~

- ~~Develop possible indicators to address conformance with Identified Wildlife Management Strategies.~~ – **Action:** Complete. Addressed by indicator 2

2. Other Parking Lot Information

~~Definitions for Element 1a~~

- ~~Well balanced ecosystems~~ – **Action:** Complete. Not required by PAG
- ~~Full range of seral stage distribution~~ – **Action:** Complete. See SFM Plan glossary

~~Definitions for Element 4b (now Element 1.2 in Z809-02)~~

- ~~Maintained at endemic and sustainable level~~ – **Action:** **Scott Smith** will develop draft for PAG to consider (either a definition or a change to wording)

~~Element 5a~~ – **Action:** Complete. Element was not carried over to the CSA Z809-02 standard. (Juergen Hansen indicated he has some ideas around the topic he will develop and present to the PAG)

~~Element 4.2~~

- ~~Forest management and lack of fire is resulting in ingress of forests on to grasslands. Grasslands should not be infringed on – a “thought” to keep in mind. Potentially flag to CSA regarding the necessity to maintain grass lands.~~ – **Action:** **Mike Watkins** will develop a draft note to CSA that will be circulated with the fall agenda and be considered at the fall meeting.

8) Options for Advisory Group Survey development (Indicator 33)

The revised survey distributed March 10'th was reviewed. Two drivers behind the proposed revisions:

- A survey that effectively identifies how well the PAG is functioning
- Documentation of CSA requirements

The revised survey was agreed to and will be used in January 2006 to assess 2005 Indicator 33 performance as part of the Annual Monitoring Report.

A revision to the Indicator 33 target was proposed and agreed to. As written previously, any comment made on the survey had to be addressed as an action item, even if it was a “well done” or just a general observation. The intent of the target is to address perceived issues as action items. Page 58 of your copy of the SFM Plan should be noted as follows:

Target	Participant Satisfaction Survey 33a. 80% of responses “3” or better 33b. All written comments <u>are reviewed and considered</u> , and all line responses averaging less than 3 become action items
---------------	--

9) Summary

Next Meeting: 2005 fall field trip
Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2005
Time: To be determined
Place: Vernon – exact meeting location to be determined.
Focus: Mountain pine beetle
Landscape and stand level biodiversity