

**Merritt Defined Forest Area
Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

**Meeting Summary
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, April 8, 2010**

	<i>SFM Advisory Group Member</i>	<i>Background/Affiliation/Location</i>
	Al Clarke	Radio NL Merritt
	Aline Lachapelle	Aspen Planers
	Andrea Inwards	Merritt Sunrise Rotary Club
✓	Barbara and Tom Hamilton	Allison Lake
	Bob Chambers	Ranching/ Woodlot, Merritt
	Brian Drobe	Weyerhaeuser (Princeton)
	Chris Lepsoe	Merritt
	Christian Guay	BCTS (Merritt)
✓	Corey Kuromi	Ardeu Wood Products
	Dennis MacDonald	Stu'wix
✓	Elizabeth Salomon de Friedberg	Merritt
	Frank Etchart	Merritt
✓	Franz Reuter	Merritt
✓	Gerry Sanford	Merritt
	Ian Black	BCTS (Kamloops)
	Jan Stadey	Ardeu Wood Products
	Jed Anderson	Merritt Herald
✓	Jennifer Reid	BCTS (Merritt)
	Jerry Canuel	Aspen Planers
✓	Katharine Shewchuk	Merritt
	Ken Taylor	NVIT, Merritt
	Len Marsh	Cascades Forest District
	Lennard Joe	Nicola Tribal Association
	Leona Antoine	Merritt
✓	Lyle Leclair	Stu'wix
	Mark and Susan Dixon	Allison Lake
	Marc Piche	Merritt Herald
✓	Michael Bragg	Tolko
✓	Norm Hansen	Merritt
✓	Pat Salm	SFM Advisory Group Facilitator
	Paul Willms	NVIT, Merritt
✓	Rick Cooper	BCTS (Kamloops)
	Steve Borcsok	Upper Similkameen Indian Band
	Todd Chamberlain	Stu'wix
	Wayne Schindler	Woodlots/ Ranching, Merritt
✓	Wendy McKinney	Tolko

1. Introduction and Agenda Review

Meeting called to order shortly after 4:00 pm. All participants were welcomed to the meeting and members of the group were asked to introduce themselves. Refer to previous page for attendance. Pat reviewed that the main objectives of the meeting.

- Review 2009 SFM Plan performance
- Discuss merger of Kamloops/Merritt/Lillooet DFA and SFM Plans
- Discuss timing for updating SFM Plan to new CSA standard
-

The remainder of the agenda was reviewed with the group. A discussion of Tolko's CSA audit results was added to the agenda.

2. Action Items from previous meeting

Pat briefly reviewed the action items resulting from previous meetings (appended at the end of the summary). Action items are retained and brought forward at subsequent meetings until they are completed or the group feels they are no longer important.

Aline was not in attendance to provide information related to action item 2. Pat to check to see if there is any work done to date that could be shared with the PAG. Item left as incomplete and will be brought up at the next meeting.

<p><u>Action:</u> (deferred from previous meeting) Aline will work with Andrea to determine what is available and appropriate for reporting on level of fibre utilization (biofuel focus).</p>
--

3. 2009 Monitoring Report

Discussion on the report began with Sections 4 and 5, reviewed to provide a broad perspective of how Companies did relative to the performance targets in the SFM Plan. The indicators and targets found in Section 6 of the report were reviewed as requested/selected by those in attendance at the meeting. This review resulted in a few suggested changes to the report – either to correct grammar or to update reporting numbers or inconsistencies found in the report. The group agreed that new reports would not be printed but the posted report (on the website http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/dcs/sustainable_forestry/sustainable_forestry_DME.htm) would be updated. The following is a summary of specific indicator discussion:

Indicator 2 Level of conformance to Riparian management area commitments contained within licensee plans.

The use of acronyms and abbreviations (found in assessment results) should be avoided. Agreed Pat would make changes to eliminate these and update the 2009 Report.

Indicator 3 Percent of harvested blocks greater than 5 hectares that have individual wildlife tree/stubs and/or associated wildlife tree patches.

Question was asked if there was any follow-up done to assess if trees retained after harvest remained standing. While monitoring was not done within the context of this report, the Ministry of Forests' Forest and Range Evaluation Program (FREP) were looking at this and reporting findings back to Licencees. Companies also advised that wind firmness was one of the considerations in determining the location of a wildlife tree patch.

Indicator 5 *Percent of harvested areas that are regenerated with species ecologically suited to the site.*

Reporting for this indicator was not accurate as some licencees were correctly reporting on areas (cutblocks) and others were providing area (hectares) information. The revised figure for reporting on the number of areas was changed from 1560 to **375**.

Indicator 8 *Percent of areas revegetated with grass seed that is “graded acceptable”.*

Discussion on how this indicator could be improved if it was to be retained – opportunities to focus more on effectiveness of the certified grass seed that is applied. Has it resulted in a reduction in the amount of invasive plants?

Indicator 15 *Percent of watershed that is equivalent clear cut area (ECA).*

PAG looking for more information in the future on those areas where additional assessments occurred – location of watersheds, details of the hydrological assessment, recommendations. Agreed that this needs further discussion as revised SFM Plan is developed (some form of this indicator/target will be retained as there is a core indicator specifying something similar to this). Also discussed how the 35% threshold was a conservative value at which point disturbance begins to affect water values. Topography, soil properties, vegetation types and climate all influence the sensitivity of a watershed to disturbances and thus threshold ECA levels vary considerably from a baseline figure such as 35%. Jennifer referred to some recent work on the Effects of Mountain Pine Beetle on ECA and agreed to forward the link to the article for inclusion in the minutes:

http://www.forrex.org/streamline/ISS42/Streamline_Vol13_No2_art5.pdf.

Indicator 17 *Percent of area prescribed for planting that is completed before or during the third growing season; and, percent of natural regeneration area meeting natural regeneration delay.*

Discussion on this indicator occurred in combination with indicators reporting on area harvested and area declared free growing. PAG had questions on why these numbers varied (ie. why such a difference between area reforested (plant plus natural regen) and area harvest). Explained that the discrepancy was a result of the sequencing of the activities in a reporting year – areas planted were areas harvested 2-3 years previously, areas reported having met regen delay were likely harvested 5-7 years previously.

Reporting over a longer period of time (say 10 - 20 years) will help to smooth out these differences in reporting. Pat prepared figures for the past 5 years and 9 years (when reporting first commenced):

	Area harvested (ha)	Area reforested (ha)
2005-2009	47,504	50,034
2001-2009	70,628	72,438

Indicator 19 *Total output of forest products (lumber, chips and other) from sawmills within the TSA.*

An error in reporting the total of other forest products was made, dramatically inflating that number. Weyerhaeuser advised that 176,366 m³ was actually sawdust and hog fuel and should have been reported in the second reporting category. The corrected data for the indicator is as follows:

The total lumber output from sawmills within the TSA in 2009 was 728,881,000 board feet.
The total chip, shavings and hog fuel output from sawmills within the TSA was 700,974 bone dry tones (1.7% increase from previous year).
The total of other forest products output from sawmills (posts, dowels, grape stakes, tree stakes) within the TSA was 26,469 cubic metres (down from a five year average of approx. 35,000m³).

Indicator 22 *Percent of cutblocks in known scenic areas with visual impact assessments completed.*

PAG wished to understand the number of circumstances where exemptions were granted or justified in approved Forest Stewardship Plans where visual objectives were not met as a result of forest health concerns. Agreed if indicator retained in revised SFM Plan that this discussion should occur.

Indicator 32 *Amount of time for road cut and fill slope grass seeding application.*

PAG members had a desire to understand the effectiveness of the grass seeding application (was germination successful, did efforts reduce sediment transport into streams?)

Indicator 35 *Advisory Group Participant Satisfaction Survey*

Reviewed survey results, in particular results of survey questions 14, 15 where the scoring was at or slightly above 3.0. Advisory group balance and membership will need to be looked at as plans to merge SFM Plans and advisory groups (Kamloops Lillooet, Merritt) occur.

Action: Pat to update 2009 Monitoring report with changes indicated above and have it reposted to the website.
--

4. Tolko CSA Audit Results

Wendy shared the results of the external CSA audit conducted by QMI/SAI Global on March 24-26, 2010. Key opportunities for improvement were reviewed. It was felt there was nothing for the advisory group to take action on for the first 3 items. For indicator specific opportunities, the PAG felt that indicator 4 and 9 should have more discussion at upcoming meetings to revise the SFM Plan to the new standard. Pat to ensure that discussions consider these (done - added to materials prepared for upcoming meetings).

5. Merging SFM Plans, Advisory Groups and Updating the Plan to the revised CSA Standard

Jerry was not in attendance at the meeting to advise of his meeting with the Lillooet PAG held in Mid March. Licencees advised that Aspen was interested in having the Lillooet Plan combined with the Merritt and Kamloops Plan during the re-write of the Plan, and that the PAG was ok with joining a larger combined group, but did have some concerns with getting swallowed up and lose their autonomy. We did not really have much in the way of info on the Lillooet SFM Plan and PAG so could not respond to questions about if/how/when they will fit into a larger PAG and a more encompassing SFM Plan. PAG is still awaiting Jerry's definite decision on bringing the Lillooet PAG and Plan

Pat reviewed a handout indicating what is involved in aligning the Merritt Plan to the revised standard, and an initial page that indicated how discussions could occur on targets – looking at both the existing content of the Merritt Plan and what was included in the 2010 Kamloops Plan. We set our first meeting date tentatively as Wednesday, May 5th in Merritt, a daytime meeting (9:00 am – 3:00 pm) with specific location details to follow. In the interim Pat will prepare information in advance of the initial meeting (Lillooet plan review /comparison still required). We were hopeful that this date would also work for the Lillooet and Kamloops PAG groups, should they be interested in attending. Agreed that Jerry and Michael would advise the PAG's of the meeting date with an invitation to participate. Michael indicated that there would likely be some participation by other Kamloops licencees in the meetings.

Action: Jerry to advise that Aspen definitely wants to move ahead with including the Lillooet Plan and the PAG into the public process beginning on May 5th.

Action: Jerry and Michael to advise Kamloops and Lillooet advisory group members and Licencees to advise of initial meeting on Wednesday, May 5th.

Action: Elizabeth to check into suitability/availability of a meeting room for May 5th at NVIT, Jennifer to do the same for Brambles (bakery) and to let Pat know. Pat to advise the group of initial meeting location once selected.

In updating the Plan to the revised Z809 Standard, Elizabeth expressed a desire to review the Group's Values and Objectives for each of the Criteria. Pat explained that this was not done specifically in the Kamloops Plan, other than to look at Values and Objectives relative to the associated core and local indicators – then to make changes to either the Values/Objectives or adding Indicators to make these align. Some discussion occurred on the order of discussion (initially before core indicators or at the end following agreement to core indicators). There was also recognition that that this might take a considerable amount of time at meetings away from other items so we will need to find a way to cover this off in a meaningful and efficient way. It was unclear how different the Values and objectives were from one another (Merritt vs other SFM Plans). Pat agreed to pull together a comparison of these for the meeting on May 5th.

Action: Pat to compile values and objectives for Kamloops and Merritt in a format so they can be reviewed at May 5th meeting.

6. Field Trip

Richard Cooper offered BCTS as hosts to the field trip this fall. In anticipation of a combined advisory group, the meeting date of Thursday, September 23rd was selected (fits with tentative date set by Kamloops).

7. Current DFA Issues, Summary, Wrap-Up

Agreed that with Weyerhaeuser dropping out of the process, that references to a TSA SFM Plan needed to be reviewed – area to be defined by those participating in the SFM Plan and process. More to come on this as Plans from other locations merge.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Merritt SFM Plan - Advisory Process Action Items

Item	Initial Date	Action Item	Lead Person	Date Due	Comments
1	03-Apr-08	Look to revise target and variance for indicator 15 (Equivalent Clearcut Area) when updating Plan to new standard.	Pat Salm	Complete with plan re-write	New standard does require something along these lines
2	02-Apr-09	Aline to work with Andrea to see what kind of data in currently available that could be used to satisfy reporting on wood fibre utilization of material that would otherwise be burned.	Aline Lachapelle Andrea Inwards	31-Mar-10 (re-scheduled to next meeting)	Reporting would occur at the broad level - possibly TSA. Information would not be part of an indicator/target but reported as a collective number into the text of the annual monitoring report. Reporting to commence in 2010?
3	02-Apr-09	PAG desire to include a coarse woody debris and/or waste residue target	Pat Salm	Complete with plan re-write	New standard has a CWD indicator. Potential indicator above related.
4	03-Dec-09	Review indicator text (strategy, forecast, means of achieving objective) for Indicator 25 when updating Plan to new standard.	Pat Salm	Complete with plan re-write	