

# Nicola Thompson Fraser SFM Plan Public Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

---

**May 30, 2019. Brambles Bakery, Merritt**

**Attendees:**

Gerry Sanford	Ted Tom	Reuben Irvine	Craig Hewlett
Larry Michaelson	Frank Etchart	Chris Lepsoe	Shawn Larson
Bert Parke	Matt Manuel		

**Facilitator:** Pat Salm

**Introduction, agenda review, safety:**

The meeting started at 9:30 am. The meeting began with introductions, meeting room orientation and a review of the meeting agenda. Additional items added to the agenda were Matt's email request to discuss opportunities to have archeological/cultural assessments on private forest lands, and secondly government's discussion paper on changes to forest legislation (request for public input).

**Action Items:**

Three items from the previous meeting were reviewed – discussion as follows:

1. 2019 SFM Plan: Pat had printed copies of the 2019 available at the meeting as per requests from the previous meeting. References to Canfor have been removed from the Plan, remaining participants in the advisory group process are Aspen Planers and Gilbert Smith.
2. Risk based watersheds for Kamloops TSA (SFM Target 24). Craig advised that there remains the possibility to adjust Appendix 8 in the SFM Plan that would consider fisheries sensitive watersheds. Updated action: Craig will stay on top of this and will bring a suggested revision to Target 8 back to the PAG at the next meeting.
3. PAG field trip. Pat was to connect with Dan at Canfor to see if they still planned to host the fall field trip. .As Dan was absent from meeting, Pat offered to contact him. Update: Dan advised that Canfor would not be hosting the field trip. As Aspen hosted the previous field trip, GSFP then offered to host the field trip this fall. One suggestion was to review forest management within riparian or lakeshore management zones. Please contact Craig if you have topics/concerns that would make a good field stop.

## **Review the 2018 SFM Monitoring Report:**

Reviewed the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) process, the tie that the Monitoring Report has to the SFM Plan and how these are aligned with CSA SFM Criteria and Elements of sustainability. The indicators and targets of the Report are aligned with these Criteria and overall performance can then be evaluated. The Monitoring Report provides performance against the targets in the SFM Plan. Reporting is a roll-up of all licensees performance (Aspen Planers, Canfor, Gilbert Smith), individual company reports are located in the Appendix. The targets in the plan were reviewed; advisory group members were asked to stop at any of the targets where they had a specific question or request.

### **Report sections 1-5:**

**Licensee reporting:** BCTS is no longer reporting into the plan, this does influence trends for specific targets.

**Highlights:** some additional information was provided in the highlights section – offering overall plan perspective (rate of harvest). A new target was added to the SFM Plan (#26) and this is the second year for reporting on that target. Targets were achieved on all 42 targets, very well done. There was some discussion amongst the group members on the accuracy/validity of all of the target reporting in the report. How can the public be assured that what is reported is correct? The licensees pointed out that they have reliable procedures in place so that they can report out consistently from year to year. These procedures on how/what is reported for each target are assessed by their 3<sup>rd</sup> party certification auditor. Any deficiencies in how a target is reported would be picked up by the auditor and included in their (publicly available) audit report. These audit reports are posted to our NTF SFM website. Advisory group members were also encouraged to attend these 3<sup>rd</sup> party audits to get an understanding of what auditors review and how deep they dig to assure themselves that the CSA standard is being met.

### **Section 5.1 Summary data:**

The advisory group agreed that they wanted to continue to see this section in the report. General feeling was that it provided good perspective and added value.

### **Report appendix 1: Detailed Reporting of SFM Targets**

**Target 1:** The improvement in target performance for Lillooet and Merritt was discussed. Shawn explained that the “improvement” was really their work to better capture all of the species present during field surveys. Craig mentioned that GSFP went through this same exercise a few years ago.

**Target 3:** It was noted that the inventories used in the SFM Plan have been updated as a result of recent Timber Supply Reviews in both the Kamloops and Merritt supply areas. As a result, one additional age class now meets the 8.5% target threshold.

**Target 6:** There was a question about Ungulate Winter Range for mule deer. Craig advised that there is still no Government Action Regulation (GAR) order for the Kamloops Timber Supply Area. Bert remains concerned that the LRMP guidelines are not adequate to manage mule deer. There was additional discussion regarding the result assessment in the report that stated that plan commitments were followed. Public members expressed a desire to better explain what some of the commitments for target 6d were – similar to the reporting done for target 6b. Matt advised that a study done in the Cariboo (that he feels has application to parts of the Lillooet TSA)

contains recommendations to manage fisher and wonders how such external studies can be brought into site plans.

**Target 11:** It was noted that the average time for seeding was roughly ½ of previous years reporting (seeding occurring within 3 months of disturbance). Licensees were not aware of any changes to the timing of seeding and speculated that it had more to do with the timing of road construction.

**Target 19:** It was noted how the year over year reporting has been influenced (particularly in the Kamloops and Merritt Timber Supply Areas) by BCTS's absence in the 2018 Plan.

**Target 26:** The newest target in the SFMP. Advisory group members were reminded of the work done to develop the Merritt TSA rare ecosystem indicator. In the end, there were no operations conducted in the identified rare areas and thus nothing else to report.

**Target 33:** The number of man hours worked at Aspen's timber processing facility in Lillooet went up substantially as a result of an extra shift at the mill.

**Target 35:** The target was reviewed – it was another example of how the target and results are directly influenced by those licensees that are participating. With BCTS leaving the plan (and Canfor not reporting in 2019), the 3 year rolling average will need to be viewed with that in mind. Matt also wondered if we could not get a bit more out of the target – paying attention not just to the number of working relationships but to the health of those relationships. His desire is to see more of the youth in their communities working in jobs at all levels in the forest industry – and not just entry level type of jobs.

**Licensee monitoring summaries:** The Aspen, and Gilbert Smith summary reports in the Appendix were quickly reviewed. Canfor, having decided to move away from CSA certification elected not to individually report. Pat noted there could be situations where an individual licensee did not achieve a target that was reported as being met collectively by the Licensees. Members were asked to contact the individual companies if they had any specific questions.

**General report feedback:** Overall, the report was well done. Companies were commended on their performance of meeting all 42 of the targets. The general feeling of the group was to retain the current report format where performance summarized at different levels. Reporting on targets over time to provide perspective was also valued and should be continued.

## Current DFA Issues, Summary, Wrap-Up

### Private Forest Land Management for Archeological and Cultural values

Matt spoke about his desire to have some way of ensuring that historic values are better respected on private lands. He spoke of a particular instance recently where this did not occur. While the SFM Plan is specific to the lands within the scope of the participating licencees (none of whom have included any private lands that they might have), there was further general discussion.

The first option could be to look into the PEFC Chain of Custody requirements for all uncertified wood entering the supply stream. This would include private forest lands and PEFC has a specific requirement for companies to ensure that wood is not originating from controversial sources. Craig offered to share that section of the GSFP wood purchase agreement that they use to manage for this requirement (below):

7. Certification	CSA	SFI	FSC	N/A	8. Chain of Custody Supplier Assertion: a) The seller hereby gives their assurance to GSFP that no logs sold or traded to GSFP originate from controversial sources as defined by the PEFC chain of custody standard (PEFC ST 2002-2013) or otherwise deemed to be of significant risk. b) The seller confirms all logs are harvested within Canada and operations will comply with all applicable laws. c) The seller further confirms that harvest activities did not result in forests being converted to other vegetation. d) If the seller becomes aware that any of the wood sold or traded to GSFP does not meet the above conditions, they will immediately notify GSFP and will provide GSFP access to the site.
				X	
Certificate # N/A	0 % PEFC certified.			Initials	

Pat offered to look into the definition for controversial sources – updated below:

- PEFC Chain of Custody requires avoiding raw material from controversial sources, defined as forest management which (in part) includes:
  - (a) not complying with local, national or international legislation, in particular related to:
    - management of areas with designated high environmental and cultural values.

Thus, there might be an avenue for Matt to pursue in this regard – and he might want to get in touch with PEFC Canada.

A second option was to look at the Private Managed Forest Land Act and see if there is any related content and what the opportunities were to introduce change.

Note: subsequent to the meeting, Bert noted that government announced that they were looking for [public input into possibly making changes to the Act](#), so there appears to be another avenue.

### FRPA legislative Changes

Pat noted that government is seeking public input into their possible improvements to the Forest and Range Practices Act. To help stimulate discussion, they have developed a [paper outlining possible changes and seeking input into these changes](#). Deadline for submission is July 15, 2019.

This led to other discussion regarding the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act. Public members wondered if there could not be a target for managing to the intent of the MBCA – something that would explain what is currently done to avoid birds and nests and set out a target assessing conformance to plans containing commitments to manage for migratory birds.

Action: Licensees to work on a draft target for the fall meeting. Licensees to invite one of their contract biologists used to conduct surveys to the next meeting as a guest speaker. Presentation

would be to explain the methods they use to conduct the survey and explain the types of recommendations provided once survey results are known.

### **PAG 2019 Field Trip**

Agreed that we should schedule a field trip – to occur this fall. Gilbert Smith offered to host the field trip. More detail can be found in Action Item 3 above. Pat to send out an email reminder and itinerary a few weeks prior to the date selected by GSFP.

### **Fall Meeting**

A tentative meeting date of Thursday November 21, 2019 was selected. Meeting to occur in Merritt at Brambles bakery.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm.