

Nicola Thompson Fraser PAG

June 16, 2010. 9:30 am Ashcroft River Inn

Facilitator: Pat Salm

Attendees: Bert Parke, Gerry Sanford, Elizabeth Salomon de Friedberg, Katherine Shewchuk, Wendy McKinney, Rick Cooper, Simon Warhurst, Graham Everett, Mike Bragg, Frank Etchart, Aline Lachapelle, Francis Vyse

Review agenda: Hope to finish criteria 4 and 5 today, leaving clean-up and criteria 6 for next meeting.

Review of the minutes from June 2 meeting

Action items identified in the June 2nd meeting were discussed.

What does native species mean? Native to SFM plan area, or native to the province? Aline presented research done by licensees on creation of a species conversion indicator. Licensees did not find a reliable set of data that licensees can report out on and thus will not be developing a secondary target for indicator 1.2.3. Question regarding 1.2.3 if we use current indicator, how we are meeting the 'native' requirement with regards to stocking standards. Does that mean native to BC? SFM standard states "a species that occurs naturally in the plan area."

Concern raised with planting monocultures, dealt with by our 3 species at FG indicator. Concern raised about planting ecologically suited species, ie. Coastal larch or Coastal Douglas-fir. Reviewed the seed transfer guideline rules that provide for movement of tree seed.

Agreement: Definition in SFM plan needs to reference stocking standards and needs to expand definition of native species as outlined in the CSA Standard to include all those species identified within approved stocking standards.

June 2nd Action Item: Ardeu will write up their process and submit to licensees and PAG at next meeting. Process will be discussed with the idea of including as text within the Plan. As neither Jan or Corey were present at the meeting, item deferred to next meeting

Slide definition: slide is defined from a reportable event if it has an impact outside of road clearing event, causing serious damage to a road, on a road above usual maintenance, any slide that causes significant damage to roads, cutblocks, plantations, and also has definition of relative sizes, .5 small slide, and 5ha is a large slide. Or 50 cubic metres is a small and 500 cubic metres is a large.

Agreement: SFMP will define a slide with a size limit of 0.1 ha or as one having a significant environmental impact (could be less than 0.1 ha). Licensees will follow the SIR landslide and erosion reporting document and any slide greater than 0.1ha.

Appendix 3, reviewed work done to date. Element 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4 completed. All criteria 2, and last meeting discussed criteria 3.1 and 3.2. Also discussed value for 4.1 and 4.2.

Value and Objective for Element 3.2- Concern raised with the suggested bullet “clean water”. Current watershed conditions may not support clean water and the group did not want the value to suggest it was a responsibility of forest companies to provide clean water. Agreed to drop this from the value and to adjust objective to maintaining pre-existing conditions value change minutes to “maintain pre-existing conditions, and remove second clause that ‘force licensees to clean up’”.

Agreement: The value for water quality and quantity is “Conservation of water quality and quantity.”

Agreement: The objective for water quality and quantity is ““water quality and quantity that maintains pre existing conditions and supports communities (human and ecological) and aquatic life.

Element 1.3- Value for Genetic Diversity:- reviewed all three currently existing- discussed genetic engineering, not allowed in BC Chief Foresters stocking standards and BC Chief Foresters standards for seed use. It is occurring, but cannot be used operationally in BC. Discussed genetic testing of species looking at genetic diversity. Work has been done by MFR research branch.

Are we talking about genetic diversity of all plant types or only trees, criteria states trees only? Maybe mostly dealing with trees, but how do licensees deal with non tree species?

What about genetic engineering? Should we include? CSA standard is rewritten every 5 years, in future years it may allow GMO’s. The CSA Standard and the Province do not currently allow it to occur. Agreed it does not need to be in the Plan.

Agreement: value is “Genetic diversity within all native tree species”.

Element 1.3 Objective for Genetic Diversity - reviewed all 3 current ones.

Are we looking at various types of diversity- WTP’s and planting?

Agreement: objective is “Maintain genetic diversity of all tree species native to the DFA.”

Element 1.3 Indicators/Targets:

Pat reviewed some suggested indicators that are currently within the June 16th Appendix 3 as possibilities for indicators/targets for genetic diversity. (Indicators 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 2.2.3). 2.1.1 reforestation of 3 or more species at FTG. Can we use here?

Agreement: Include 1.1.2 indicator and targets: “70% of cutblocks harvested will have 3 or more tree species in the free growing survey (2 or more species for ESSF).

Can we accept 1.2.1?- rare species and critical habitat, can we include here?, if our value and objective is focussed on trees? We are gaining a bit more by including here.

Agreement: PAG mostly agreed to not include 1.2.1 from 1.3 as an indicator. Bert disagreed with the rest of the group, wanting to see it included. As a result, group decided it was not a good fit and elected not to retain it here.

There was discussion that an indicator not suggested – Indicator 1.2.3 related to conformance of stocking standard would be a good fit here – builds on the genetic diversity within the government’s seed tree registry.

Agreement: Include 1.2.3- 100% of trees planted will conform to plan commitments related to the species requirements within approved stocking standards.

2.2.3- riparian conformance-does it fit? If you clearcut does it fit? Does WTP indicator work better? These are more stand level decisions and there is not much consideration given to improving the genetic diversity of trees in the decisions in the field. Is there a better connection between maintaining OGMA and genetic diversity? The group felt that OGMA’s that are much larger in size and have been located at more of a landscape level would be better than riparian.

Agreement: Include the second part of indicator 1.1.3 “Maintain the existing old growth management area (no net loss)”.

Do not include 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 2.2.3, as originally suggested in appendix 3.

Element 4.1 Carbon Uptake and Storage: already agreed to value and objectives for 4.1 at last meeting. Discussion items covered in notes (below).

Discussed that there will be an inclusion in the indicator text related to an assessment of carbon uptake for the area (see note in Appendix 3). What indicators have we already agreed to that we can use to demonstrate a positive contribution to carbon uptake?

Agreement: Include the indicator from 1.1.3 “Progress towards a stable forest age class distribution on the timber harvesting land base where each age class to 100 years old.

Agreement: Include the target from 2.2.1 “Less than 6% (7% in Lillooet), on average, of harvested areas will be in permanent road sand landings.” Also retain targets for 2.1.1.

What about carbon credits? Carbon neutral? Discussion paper looks at total impact from cradle to grave. Total carbon outputs- embodied energy, impact to environment, compared to other building products like steel and concrete. Should we have an indicator to track wood bio-products. Forests may be carbon neutral, on a global level. Bio-energy industry likes to say it is carbon neutral.

Can we build an indicator to show volume not burned and used for forestry purposes instead? Does Tolko get credit for burning in its cogen plant? Maybe something anecdotal in SFMP versus a hard target. Something that indicates volume diverted from burning.

Are there ways we can reduce the amount of fibre in the slash piles? Can we leave more in the block? Reforestation is easier to remove all slash. Is there a carbon balance difference between slash burning in a pile and slash burning in a cogen plant? While the cogen facility assists in using alternative fuels, fossil fuel is expended to process and transport the material. There are ongoing studies to assess these types of situations – from a cost and environmental perspective.

Agreement: Add this item to the SFM Plan Parking lot and wait until more information available.

Agreement: Will include information from Kamloops plan around carbon, carbon management, and carbon cycles.

Lunch

Element 4.2 Value for Forest Land Conversion:

Discussion around the area specified - DFA? THLB? Non-productive? Lillooet does not cover low productive land. Kamloops does not cover forest land. Merritt appears the best one. Who has control over the allocation of licences? Who can determine uses of forest land? Licences have limited ability to control the land base. Most is public land, and government controls.

What does productive mean? Commercially productive, ecologically productive?

Agreement: The value for Element 4.2 “Maintenance of the forest land-base”.

Element 4.2 Objective for Forest Land Conversion:

Reviewed the 3 current objectives. Do we need to define the scope, as productive or commercial land base? We can minimize to impact on non-forested land as well.

Agreement: “Minimal loss of forest land within the DFA”.

Element 4.2 Indicator (uses core indicator from 2.1.1).

The core indicator for 2.2.1 has been assigned here by the standard. We have already completed the target for this 2.2.1 (additions and deletions to the forest area). The group felt that there was no need for further indicators/targets.

Criteria 5: Timber and non-timber benefits

There were no specific discussion items requiring the attention of the group for this criteria.

Values for Element 5.1 Quantity and Quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products and services produced in the DFA:

Reviewed the existing values from the 3 TSA's. Merritt does not appear to be a value as currently written. Lillooet appears good. Kamloops has a good detailed list but does not include timber values. Kamloops objectives may work as a value for the NTF plan.

Agreement: The value for Element 5.1 is "A sustainable flow of timber and non-timber benefits that contribute to quality of life "

Objectives for Element 5.1 Quantity and Quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products and services produced in the DFA:

Discussed the Kamloops objectives, is it reasonable even if forest industry is not prosperous at a point in time. Group agreed this was best fit.

Agreement: The objective for Element 5.1 is "Conserve or enhance non-timber values while managing forests for timber values and prosperous forest-based industries. "

Indicators and targets for Element 5.1

Reviewed Core Indicators page in SFM binder, looked at targets from all 3 current plans.

Discussed similarities between many of the indicators. Discussed some that are used elsewhere.

Using the AAC indicator will meet the timber value, but what else would we include to meet the non-timber indicator? Could we include 1.4.2- first nations? How much do we want to include to meet the criteria?

Kamloops 23- First Nations communications. Who does what? Licensees make first contact and attempt to meet the requirement of meaningful communication. DM will review and will make the ultimate determination if sufficient information was exchanged, if concerns were addressed, if logging can occur.

Merritt 25- reporting how many times we talked with FN. Kamloops 23- #meeting and meaningful communications, and # of information exchanges.

How do we improve FN communications? Do we ask the licensees to attempt meaningful FN communication? Do we include Kamloops 23.c? FN input in Kamloops re-write suggested 23.c would fit better elsewhere, not here.

Agreement: Include the target agreed to for indicator 2.2.2 “Harvest the cut allocation for the year consistent with the Cut Control Regulation and Policy.”

Agreement: Include the target from Kamloops- old 23 a and b (slightly modified) “Open communication with local First Nations will include an understanding of traditional territories and other aboriginal rights including cultural and spiritual values” and “Licencees respond to all written requests for communication from First Nations”.

Agreement: Include the target from Kamloops- old 24 (slightly modified) “ TSA licensees will demonstrate efforts by participating in public multi-stakeholder meetings at both the strategic and at the local level. Licensees will report on the number of community meetings held or attended “

Agreement: Include the target from Kamloops- old 25 “100% conformance to strategies in plans designed to achieve preservation and partial retention visual quality objectives.” Note: also agreed to include text in the SFM Plan that describes how landscapes are managed for visual quality – and what is expected of preservation and partial retention objectives.

Recreation- a reporting number not a target. MoTCA now controls the old MoFR recreation program. Is it related to all requests for information, or just for written requests . What if there was an inclusion to track discussions with recreational users (no target)? What is the threshold of reporting. PAG decided to let licensees determine threshold.

Lillooet 21- discussed the process for making trails known. Should we include trails that are known?

Agreement: Include old Lillooet target 21 (slightly modified): “100% of known pre-existing recreational trails retained for continued recreational use on areas harvested in the reporting period.”

Agreement: Include (as part of old Kamloops #24 (see above) “Licensees will also report on the number of communications with concerned and engaged recreational users.” Indicator text to document that this will generally exclude the phone calls or passing comments of an individual wondering how the fishing is or if road is open.

Also agreed to add old Merritt indicator 29 – reporting business initiatives and partnerships.

Agreement: Include old Merritt target 29: “Report business initiatives and partnerships”.

Values for Element 5.2 Communities and Sustainability

The group reviewed 3 TSA values. Kamloops value okay but wondering about the specific reference to First Nations or whether they are part of local communities. Does stability infer sustained? Agreed the second part of the Kamloops value is not needed.

Agreement: The value for Element 5.2 is “Sustained social and economic stability and vitality of all local communities.”

Objectives for Element 5.2 Communities and Sustainability

The group felt the best fit for the objective was to use the existing one from Merritt.

Agreement: The objective for Element 5.2 is “A productive forest resource that maintains a continual and balanced flow of benefits”.

Indicators and targets for Element 5.2

Indicator 5.2.1.

After much discussion as to what made sense for reporting on initiatives that contribute to community stability, the group agreed to the target for indicator 2.2.2 related to harvest levels and AAC, Merritt manufacturing indicators (old indicators 19, 20) as well as Merritt’s business initiative target (old indicator 29). Should we report at the TSA level for these or as one defined forest area (combined)? Group thought these indicators (relating to communities) should be reported separately by TSA.

Discussed Lillooet 27- contract value, can we include in plan. What do we report? Local contract address, local workers? Do we look at silviculture? Do we limit to logging? There are local benefits to out of town contactors-hotels/restaurants, etc. Decided not include Lillooet indicators/targets 24 and 27.

Agreement: Include the target agreed to for indicator 2.2.2 “Harvest the cut allocation for the year consistent with the Cut Control Regulation and Policy.”

Agreement: Include old Merritt target 19 “Report the board feet and chip volume produced by sawmills within the TSA.”

Agreement: Include old Merritt target 20 “Report number of timber processing facility operating days, the total number of man hours worked and the number of mill employees on payroll. Report separately for each TSA.

Agreement: Include old Merritt target 29: “Report business initiatives and partnerships”. Provide list by TSA.

Indicator 5.2.2- include a requirement for an apprentice program? BCFSC requirements? No other training requirement that are desired? If using the suggested Kamloops target, should we aim for 100% target and 10% variance?

Agreement: Include Kamloops target 26 (slightly modified) “100% of DFA forest contractors will have both environmental and safety training”. And “100% of woodlands employees are trained in accordance with training plans.” Provide for a 10% variance for each. Report based on TSA.

Indicator 5.2.3- Kamloops target #16 (used in Indicator 2.2.2) does not measure employment directly. But text of Kamloops plan makes the link that the each 1000 cubic metres employees 4 people- 2006 Natural Resources Canada stat. Are figures accurate? Are they current? Is the multiplier correct for BC? In a broad sense these figures are accurate and will certainly be able to demonstrate employment trend information. Will contractors show up as a number? No, they will show up as a volume and the text will give the multiplier.

Agreement: Include the target agreed to for indicator 2.2.2 “Harvest the cut allocation for the year consistent with the Cut Control Regulation and Policy.”

Agreement: Include old Merritt target 19 “Report the board feet and chip volume produced by sawmills within the TSA.”

Agreement: Include old Merritt target 20 “Report number of timber processing facility operating days, the total number of man hours worked and the number of mill employees on payroll. Report separately for each TSA.

Indicator 5.2.4- How much of TSA is allocated to FN? Merritt is at 32% using figures from the Aboriginal Affairs Branch of the MoRF. Regional manager apportions the cut that is set by the Chief Forester. Could include as a monitoring number and not a target. Most FN volume is uplift volume, through FRO and FRA's. Use volume AAC, not logged volume, a lot of volume has not been logged. Best to use as a reporting without a target. Do not include short term uplift volumes. No idea when FN may log their volume.

Agreement: Include Kamloops target 28 "Maintain and/or increase the number of working relationships (partnerships, joint ventures, co-operative agreements, business contracts) with First Nations.

Agreement: Report annually the percent of the TSA's AAC that has been allocated to first Nations ventures.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30PM.

Next meeting: June 24th. Ashcroft, 3:00PM