

Minutes
Kamloops TSA Sustainable Forest Management Plan
Public Advisory Group – Z809-08 SFM Revision Meeting #1
Hoodoos Restaurant - Kamloops
May 26, 2009

In Attendance:

Dave Tremblay	Gord Todd	Mike Bragg
Frances Vyse	Kurt Freudenberger	Bert Parke
Dave Poole	George Brcko	Pat Salm
Mike Anderson	Rick Cooper	Jason Yates
Rob Kennett (observer)	Mark Hopkins- Facilitator	

The primary objectives of this session were:

- Review and Approve Minutes of May12th PAG Meeting
- Reconfirm status of existing Indicators for Criteria 1, 5, 6
- Detailed Discussion of Indicators for Criteria 5 and 6
- Confirm timing/approach for subsequent meetings

1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review

Following the self-introduction of participants, the agenda was reviewed, there were no additions.

Pat S. Circulated new pages for the indicator section which were inserted into the participant binders.

2.0 Review of Minutes and Action Items from April 28th Meeting

At Charlene Higgins request, the following amendments were made to the minutes of the May12th Meeting Text in *italics* indicates added wording - deletions are not shown

Page 2, bullet 2, last sentence

The standard recognizes this, *and this is why there are* indicators for aboriginal interests.

Page 2, second last sentence

Forest tenure holders are obligated to comply with federal and provincial *legislation* only.

Page 3, 7th point from end

This comment attributed to Charlene H. is removed from the minutes

Page 4, Indicator 25 Discussion, 1st point

Charlene: Indicator 25 would be more appropriate in section 1.4.2

Page 5, Indicator 30, 1st comment after “Agreement”

Charlene: How *will changes be tracked?*

Page 5, sent to last comment

Brian: What about *fishers?*.....

Page 6, 1st comment

Charlene: are *there* other GAR’s *that have impacts and implications on the SFM Plan?*

Page 6, 4th line from end of page (Frances V.)

Proposal – *Indicator 1.2.3.....*

Page 6, last comment

Charlene: *Provincial Stocking Standards may change to address some of the impacts of climate change.*

Page 7, 1st point after “Action Item”(Frances Vyse)

Proposal – *Indicator 1.4.2.....*

Page 7, “Agreement” at end of page (Frances Vyse)

...specifically designed to *manage* for culturally important...

2. Action Item Review

Agreement: Pat Salm provided the suggested wording to amend the proposed target for Indicator 1.1.4. The proposed wording (see May 26th Handout page 1 of 12) was approved by the PAG.

Agreement: The Facilitator presented the hardwood, and mixed wood, stocking standards from Ainsworth to the PAG. Following discussion, the proposed wording for the Indicator 1.1.2 (old 9) presented on the May 26th handout, page 5 of 12) was agreed to by the PAG.

The facilitator has yet to investigate the 3rd Action Item (relating to a possible error in the area of hardwood in TSR II and IV, as reported on the 2008 Monitoring Report)

Indicator 1.2.2. Degree of suitable habitat in the long term for selected focal species, including species at risk.

Pat S: Reviewed the proposed changes to Indicator 1.2.2. (as presented on the May 26th handout page 6 of 12)

Mike A: Commented that the MoE believes that many of the habitat requirements may be met through other processes.

Bert: the only legal guidelines are in the KLRMP (for moose and deer) which focuses on the critical habitat for these spp. There are maps in the KLRMP. Bert would like to see reference to the KLRMP included in the Indicator.

Pat: The reason for the inclusion of Caribou, as opposed to other ungulates, is due to the degree of habitat modeling done for this species. Mike Burwash has a lot of things “in the works” but they are not at a point for inclusion in the standard.

Mike A: Would like to see stronger language around moose/deer.

Agreement: The PAG Agreed that the proposed wording for 1.2.2 was acceptable with the proviso that the targets be periodically reviewed and updated to consider other focal species.

Gord T: The Reporting requirements of 1.2.2 could be replicated in Indicator 1.2.1

Agreement: Leave Indicators 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 (as proposed May 26th on handout, page 6 of 12) as is for now. Bring in Mike Burwash, or other appropriate expert by the end of 2009 for further discussion and possible amendment

Dave P: Does the reporting requirement relate only to the 5 listed species?

Pat: Yes it does.

Bert: Is there a map in the section 7 material?

Action Item: Pat: yes there is, I will send you the link to the section.

Indicator 1.2.3

Pat: Reviewed the proposed changes to the target to reference the *Stocking Standards* rather than the *Seed Transfer Guidelines*

Bert: What about climate change? Are licencees considering this when making reforestation prescriptions?

Pat: Yes, licencees looking at MoF advice on species selection.

George: Some Stocking Standards have already been change to reflect anticipated climate changes.

Mike B: At some point I will present a summary of the findings from the Future Forest Strategy collaboration between MoF and Tolko.

Bert: Are the recommendations being followed now?

Mike B: not yet, but the information is before the Chief Forester

Mike A: What about tree species selection, would like to see more diversity of species in the regenerate stands.

Mike B: we have already begun to change and target multiple species wherever possible.

Bert: Do all 3 species need to be present at free-growing to be included?

Mike B: No, the diversity is based not just on well-spaced trees, but on all species on the site.

Mike A: there seems to be a preponderance of pine (lodgepole) in the regenerated forests. How are we addressing this tendency to pine?

Pat: We have a broad range of indicators dealing with a number of aspects of this issue.

Bert: Where is the recruitment for OGMA's

Mike B: Good question, we don't know, it's an issue.

Parking Lot Item: Tree species allocation for harvest areas

Agreement: In summary, all Indicator targets proposed for Criteria 1 have been agreed to as presented on the handouts dated May 26, 2009

Criteria #5 Timber and Non-Timber Benefits

Pat: provided background on the discussion item.

Mike B: presented an overview of the key areas of expenditure and employment for Tolko in the Kamloops/Merritt region, the key points being:

- All logging done by local contractors
- Local employees and suppliers
- Logging (felling to truck) 34% of expenditures
- Hauling 20%
- Roads (constr & maint) 8%
- Reforestation 9%
- Indirect (8%)
- Stumpage 21%

Bert: How much is stumpage on dead pine vs. good logs? What is the range?

Mike B: ranges from \$0.25 to \$20 or \$30 depending on quality and location.

Mike B: in 2005 Tolko paid \$9million in local taxes; and \$241million across Canada. Other factors include: Income taxes paid by employees and donations such as the wildlife park, hospital and student scholarships and programs.

Bert: What about \$ going into research?

Mike B: Tolko is a member of FERIC and many other research organizations it supports (e.g. Forest Sciences Br. And FP Innovations)

Bert: Is this targeted research?

Mike: Some of our research includes things like: mill efficiency, species at risk, Herons, owls, and broadleaf management.

Mike A: how many \$ are going towards aboriginal communities?

Mike B: Don't have exact numbers but there are significant numbers of aboriginal logging and silviculture contractors as well as through the implementation of AOA's and PFR's First Nations also benefit from Tolko's support of hospitals, schools, etc.

Pat: We need all new Indictors for 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 to 5.2.4. In addition, he outlined the discussions with Brian Dack on trapping communications. Brian had acknowledged that some of the onus for communications has to come from the trappers.

Agreement: The PAG Agreed that in the draft Targets for Indicator 5.1.1 (May 26th page 9 of 12) the reference to “ranchers” should be removed. In addition, Indicator 6.3.1 (old #19) should be brought into Indicator 5.1.1 as well Finally, the new proposed indicator related to road maintenance should not be considered – other targets adequately support the indicator.

Dave T: Concerned that he does not know where the primary responsibility lies (in relation to 5.1.1)

Agreement: PAG agreed to the removal of the last paragraph of the proposed 5.1.1 (May 26th, page 10 of 12)

Communities and Sustainability

Comment: In relation to Indicator 5.2.1 - some private companies, Tolko and Gilbert Smith hold financial info close to chest.

Frances: do we need to define the term “initiatives”?

Pat: No, the Indicator is designed to be broad in scope and application.

Agreement: For Indicator 5.2.1 it was agreed that we use the target for Indicator 11(old) plus providing information within the text section of the indicator on average local spending percentages and wording around the amount of log trade agreements.

Agreement: for Indicator 5.2.2 the PAG agreed with the proposed Indicator targets subject to the following amendments:

Part 1 – remove the word “worker” and replace it with the word “contractor”

Part 2 – amend to read: “Percent of woodlands employees trained in accordance with training plans.

In both cases the target level is to be initially set at 90% compliance

Discussion on draft Indicator 5.2.3

Mike B: Are we ignoring the mills in this Indicator?

Pat S: Yes, there is a deliberate woodlands focus.

Agreement: for Indicator 5.2.3 it was agreed that the first part should be amended to read: “Number of direct woodlands employees on payroll”. It was further agreed that companies would report employee numbers as FTE’s (full time equivalent). There was no change required to part 2 of the draft Indicator.

Agreement: For Indicator 5.2.4 It was agreed that both the 1st and 2nd parts of the proposed Indicator will be adopted.

Criteria 6 - Discussion

Mike A: Concerned that First Nations do not have access to the resources to identify their areas of interest.

Mike A: Would like to see expansion of the interaction between Bands and the 3rd party CSA auditors.

Agreement: For Indicator 6.1.3, the PAG agreed that the recently revised Indicator #12 target should be used.

Agreement: The PAG agreed to the use of the current Indicator 19 target (without revision) for Indicator 6.3.1. In addition, the PAG agreed to the use Indicator #20 as described on the May 26th handout (page 6 of 12) for Indicator 6.3.1.

Agreement: It was further agreed by the PAG that the proposed Trapper Indicator should be added to 6.3.1

