

**Minutes**  
**Kamloops TSA Sustainable Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Advisory Group – Z809-08 SFM Revision Meeting**  
**Hoodoos Restaurant - Kamloops**  
**June 9, 2009**

**In Attendance:**

---

Dave Tremblay	Mike Bragg	Frances Vyse
Bert Parke	Dave Poole	George Brcko
Pat Salm	Mike Anderson	Rick Cooper
Pat Callahan	Mark Hopkins- Facilitator	

---

**The primary objectives of this session were:**

- Review and Approve Minutes of May26<sup>th</sup> PAG Meeting
- Reconfirm status of existing Indicators for Criteria 1, 5, 6
- Detailed Discussion of Indicators 6.4.1, 2 & 3; 6.5.1 & 2  
Criteria 2, 3, and 4
- Discussion on Soil productivity and Seasons of Operation.
- 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 May 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

There were no revisions to the minutes, the following actions items from the previous were discussed.

**Action Item #1 Update (Page 3)**

Pat Salm had sent the requested *Section 7* map to Bert Parke, Bert is still waiting for more information from the Ministry of Environment. Bert would like to see reference in the SFMP to the critical habitat identified in the Kamloops LRMP.

**Indicator 6.3.1 Discussion**

Pat: distributed the draft wording for the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> indicator (bullet) for Indicator 6.3.1

Dave T. How does Indicator #20 relate to 6.3.1?

Frances: Indicator #20 provides evidence that the public view of operations is considered.

Dave T: Is the proposed indicator just a summary of the number of relationships or are we naming the initiatives and partners? Gilbert Smith may now want to make its customer list public.

Rick: BCTS has no control over where the logs off of its bid-sales are going – making it difficult to report.

Frances: likes the Tolko approach (in reference to similar indicator provided by the facilitator, and currently used the Okanagan SFM)

Bert: Do we need a better definition of “value –added”? not really clear what it is.

Pat: The auditors will certainly look to confirm the numbers provided by the companies.

Mike A: Would like to see some breakdown as to the types of sales by the licencees.

**Agreement:**

Slightly adjust indicator to state “Support local communities by maintaining...”

Licencees will report on:

- the total volume of logs sold within the TSA
- the log-volume equivalent (m3) of any lumber sales within the Kamloops TSA (using the appropriate conversion/recovery factor)
- the number of parties logs/lumber sold to.

BCTS will report on:

- The number of value-added scale-sites and related volumes within the TSA receiving logs from Sales within the TSA.

Frances: What about “other forest users” e.g. fishers, recreationalists, hunters, etc.? The criteria makes reference to them too.

Pat: we have the new “trapper-related” communications indicator.

Mike: Some of the “other-users’ are covered in indicator #28.

**Indicator 6.4.1**

Pat: outlined the current PAG satisfaction survey.

**Agreement:** The PAG agreed that the current PAG Satisfaction Survey (Indicator 26) was appropriate for Indicator 6.4.1

## **Indicator 6.4.2**

Pat: reviewed the 4 bullets in the current plan.

Frances: Should we drop reference to the KLRMP? (following discussion it was agreed the reference should be kept). Frances also noted that the LRUP's seem to have "fallen off the table".

Dave T: LRUP meetings were well attended and appreciated by attendees. (Sentiment echoed by Bert & Frances).

**Agreement:** Indicator 6.4.2 was agreed to by the PAG (as presented by Pat S. on Page 7 of 12, June 9<sup>th</sup> document)

## **Indicator 6.4.3 Discussion**

Dave T: How does this relate to 5.2.2?

Dave P: It's part of "capacity building".

Pat: We've already agreed to 5.2.2 we could split out First nations as well.

Mike A: Do we know what "working relationship" really means? Some of the current relationships are not satisfactory.

Mike B: If a company claims to have a "working relationship" with a First Nations group, this is something that the auditors would seek to verify.

## **Action Item:**

Rick C. to send sample copy of the First Nations referral letter used by the auditors to Mark for distribution to PAG

Mike A: Where is the trickle-down from paper plans to fulfillment of commitments to First Nations?

## **Agreement:**

New draft Indicator 5.2.4 should refer to instances where First Nations is the Licence holder

Agreement: Eliminate draft Indicator 5.2.2 as it is difficult to track and report

Bert: Still wondering what exactly "promoting capacity development" is referring to?

Mike B. participating in these sorts of processes related to forestry is capacity building. Your own participation in this committee is enhancing your capacity.

## **Indicator 6.5.1 Discussion**

Frances: When Foresters go into the schools do you mention the SFM Plan/

Mike B: Not typically, usually a focused discussion on a specific topic.

Frances: would like to see the SFM plan mentioned, at least briefly, at school presentations.

**Agreement:**

Indicator #24 to be retained in Indicator 6.5.1 as proposed on the June 9<sup>th</sup> summary.

**Indicator 6.5.2 Discussion**

Pat: Indicator #16 only partly meets the content requirements of 6.5.2

**Agreement:**

Indicator #16 to be dropped from 6.5.2 as it is of no additional benefit.

**Agreement:**

Indicator #27, as presented, to be retained in indicator 6.5.2

**Discussion – Soil Productivity and Seasons of Operation**

Mark H. distributed and discussed the key elements of the FPC Guidebook, *Hazard Assessment Keys for Evaluating Site Sensitivity to Soil Degrading Processes*.

Dave P: Distributed and discussed summary of key soil implications to Seasons of Operation. Questions arising from the papers/presentations included;

Bert: What about road-related erosion? I've seen lots of issues out there related to the maintenance of waterbars and ditches.

Mike B: yes, certainly there are mistakes made, but generally we are using very experienced crews to make the best possible decisions.

Pat: Outlined a typical EMS program and the continual review and improvement process.

Bert: I've seen instances where an operator has been told to "waterproof" a road and a couple of years later it look awful.

Mike B: We're certified, but we have constant problems. It is how you approach the problems that is certified.

Bert: Convinced that a better job could be done in many cases. Is there a program to inspect the roads after maintenance or building?

All: the process of risk-rating and inspection frequency was discussed.

**Indicator 3.1.1 (old 13) -Discussion**

**Agreement:**

Insert Indicator #10 into 3.1.1 (as well as Indicator 13)

**Parking Lot:**

There should be further discussion on the determination of Inspection frequency

**Indicator 3.1.2****Agreement-**

It was agreed that Indicator #5 should be used for Indicator 3.1.2

Mike A: wants to see more coarse Woody debris (CWD) left on-site after logging, rather than burned- it's part of the soil building process.

Bert: would like to see this item re-visited from time-to-time. Wants to see government policy changes.

Rick: There is currently a process to allow the salvage of "waste" from logged areas by third parties. Generally at \$0.25 stumpage.

**Parking Lot:**

Investigate ways and means of establishing ratio between "dispersed" and "piled" CWD

**Indicator 3.2.1** ( no current applicable Indicator)

Pat: Outlined Proposal as per June 9<sup>th</sup> binder notes. Technical committee felt this indicator necessary to deal with both volume and timing of waterflow.

Bert: At one time 35% ECA was the max- period.

Licencees Collectively: no it has historically been the point at which further analysis is required.

All: there was considerable discussion on the appropriateness and completeness of the proposed watershed supplied by Pat.

**Agreement:**

It was agreed that the 35% ECA level will be the "trigger point" for further watershed assessment before additional harvesting

**Action Item:**

Any PAG member or licensee who feels there is a more appropriate list of watersheds to which the 35% rule should apply should present it at the next meeting for review and consideration.

**Action Item:**

Pat S. will forward PDF file listing of candidate watersheds and the study they are part of (attached to these meeting minutes)

Michael Bragg to bring map of high risk watersheds (spatial identification).

**Indicator 2.1.1**

Following brief discussion agreement was reached on this Indicator

**Agreement:**

Current Indicator #6 is accepted by the PAG for Indicator 2.2.1

**Indicator 2.2.1**

Pat suggested the approach of speaking to the additions/deletions to the land base in the text of the Plan.

**Agreement:**

The PAG Agreed to the use of Indicator #10 for the purposes of Indicator 2.2.1

**Indicator 2.2.2**

**Agreement:**

The PAG agreed to the use of Indicator #11 for the purposes of indicator 2.2.2

**Discussion Topics for next meeting:**

1. Mgmt. practices for water quality and quantity
2. Trends in natural and Human caused disturbances (see discussion item material produced by Pat Salm – follows “Silvicultural Regimes and Tools” in your binder)

**Action Item:**

PAG Members or Licensees should bring along any material they feel relevant to the above topics to the next meeting.

**Next Meeting:**

- Review Criteria 4
  - Review “red-list:” Criteria (on June 9, 2009 handout)
  - Review appendix sheets for #3 (produced by Pat)
- Review alignment of new indicators with old values and objectives in the plan

**Tuesday, June 23rd, 2009  
9:30 am to 3:00 pm  
HooDoos Restaurant**