

**Weyerhaeuser/Tolko
Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

**Meeting Summary
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, April 5, 2006**

Meeting Attendance

√	Albert Hanson	√	Pat Salm
√	Barry Beadman		Patti Meger
√	Cam Leadbeater	√	Paul Ross
√	Darcie Annesley	√	Peter Wise
√	Dave Keeler		Real Rousseau
	David Allingham		Renee Clark
√	Ed Sims	√	Richard Toperczer
	Grant Furness	√	Rob Kennett
√	James Moller		Ron Racine
√	Jim Bryan	√	Scott Smith
	Jody McCall	√	Sean Ardis
√	John Friesen	√	Steve Viszlai
√	Juergen Hansen	√	Ted McCrae
	Larry Broadfoot		Terry Kineshanko
√	Les Laithwaite		Tony Baptiste
√	Mike Watkins	√	Wayne Cunneyworth
	Morrie Thomas		

**Weyerhaeuser/Tolko
Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

DRAFT AGENDA

SFM Advisory Group Meeting

Date: Wednesday April 5, 2006

Time: 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM (lunch provided)

Place: Eldorado Hotel, 500 Cook Road, Kelowna

Meeting Objectives:

- Review licensees 2005 Monitoring Report & Audit results
- SFM Plan updates/improvements

Agenda Topics (refer to following pages for any supporting information):

1	Introductions	10:30 to 10:40
	A minute to reflect – Ted Allingham	
	Agenda Review	
2	2005 Monitoring Report	10:40 to 12:10
	<i>Lunch</i>	12:10 to 12:40
3	Action Items from previous Meeting Summary	12:40 to 1:10
4	Management of areas after fires -- regeneration	1:10 to 1:40
5	SFM Plan Updates	1:40 to 2:20
5b added	Licensee roles/involvement with the Forestry Ombudsman.	
	<i>Break</i>	2:20 to 2:35
6	Parking Lot (SFM Plan Appendix 2)	2:35 to 2:55
7	Summary and Wrap-up	2:55 to 3:10

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Agenda Review

Seven new members of the Public Advisory Group were welcomed. One new member was not able to attend. The meeting started with introductions, which were followed by a quiet moment to reflect on the loss of Ted Allingham.

One additional Agenda item (5b) was added; Licensee roles/involvement with the Forestry Ombudsman.

Agenda Item 2: 2005 Monitoring Report

General Discussion: There is little concern with the Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) in the report; little mention?

- Focus of the Monitoring Report is the previous years accomplishments, not the current years challenges. There was little expansion in 2005. Indicator 15 (page 12 of the Monitoring Report) provides a summary of proactive steps taken.
- Why so light? Wait, it is coming!
- Attack in young stands: a “sink” as there is no survival, occurs where attack levels are intense
- Choice of species for regeneration
 - 40 to 60 percent replanting of pine has been noted, should there be alternatives?
 - Do not have all the answers
 - Mixed species (versus pure PI) stands tend to be the incubators of MPB
 - Cannot necessarily force species change
 - There may not be a problem if pine is harvested at 70 to 90 years.
 - Believe there is a report out (**Action: Paul Ross** to provide highlights at the fall meeting)
 - Indicator 7 supports multi species regeneration.
 - **Action: Licensees**
 - to find out what is being prescribed and where
 - consult with Lorraine Maclauchlan regarding what current practices are creating for the future
- Are forestry operations sustainable?
 - Martin and other PL stand based animals are being severely impacted.
 - Need to see/understand what is going to hold wildlife values
 - Is there an indicator that could capture this?
 - Could a “trappers” questionnaire capture trends? This survey was discontinued in the mid 90s.
 - Also, what is happening with water? Is there a potential indicator? Bases for a potential water quality indicator was discussed at the fall 2005 meeting and will be further discussed as Part 3 of Agenda Item 3.

- A parking lot item (page 93 of SFM Plan – Ecosystem changes) notes the need for an indicator for wildlife populations
- Recreational activities are also putting pressure on wildlife.
- First priority, an indicator for wildlife populations. Second priority is to understand “why” if trends show population changes.
- What value are current stand level practices providing? On the right track or not?
- Need to consider ecosystems as a whole, not just one species (i.e. martin). Trend information the objective.
- A desire has been identified for a wildlife “population” indicator. Licensees re-emphasized their concerns with using wildlife populations as an indicator in the SFM Plan. Because of the many factors influencing populations, licensees feel indicators related to habitat are better suited. Trapper survey “may be part” of the solution.
- **Action: Licensees**
 - Review Trapper’s Survey as a bases for developing information on trends. (work with Pete Wise and BC Trappers Association)
 - Most appropriate questions to be determined.
- There is no “silver bullet” indicator. A suite of indicators is required.
- Fuller understanding of current initiatives for indicator development is probably a good place to start. Two current initiatives are:
 - Provincial indicator development initiative
 - FRPA resource evaluation/monitoring
 - Resource Stewardship Monitoring Program
 - 11 Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) objectives
 - Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR) starting work in the Okanagan monitoring two objectives: riparian and stand level biodiversity
 - Two additional objectives will be monitored each succeeding year; next up will be wildlife and water.
- **Action: Les Laithwaite** to invite John Dunford to the fall PAG meeting to provide perspectives on the Provincial indicator development initiative including status and next steps. Request a focus on genetics and ecosystem management.
- **Action: Ted McCrae** will provide an update on the Resource Stewardship Monitoring Program at the fall PAG meeting.
- What is the value of the Monitoring Report to the licensees?
 - Provided a wake up call for Tolko. Tolko now a larger operation; groups have been assigned indicators for ownership. There is now increased awareness and enthusiasm in the office.

Indicator 10:

- Have licensees considered the potential implications of a National Park in the South Okanagan?
 - The Okanagan LRMP Monitoring Committee is being kept informed by the Federal Gov't
 - Licensees have not looked at it in detail but are keeping in touch with progress, and are taking full advantage of any opportunities to provide feedback.

Indicator 16 and 17

- How many blocks will meet the stocking standards with the new higher maximum density? If anything, the change will increase the number of blocks meeting the stocking standard. The new standard will increase diversity and is a closer reflection of natural processes.

Agenda Item 3: Action Items from previous meeting

2. **Action** - Parking Lot – element 4.2 – draft note to CSA regarding ingress of forests on to grasslands – refer to Agenda Item 6.
3. **Action – Licensees:** review and evaluate the information presented regarding water quality indicators, follow up where necessary, consider options and provide feedback to the PAG at the spring meeting.

Update¹:

Tolko and Weyerhaeuser met with Brian Carson's to further discuss his operator based stream crossing evaluation system. Focus is sediment and sediment delivery. Outcome is management of turbidity based on stream crossing management (location, ditches, etc). It provides a consistent way of assessing and communicating about stream crossings.

Licensees have tentatively scheduled time in June for Brian to come up and work with Weyerhaeuser and Tolko supervisors and equipment operators. The system will be assessed for potential use. If a "go", then crossing assessments will be initiated. If the system is implemented there will be a relevant water quality indicator developed for the SFM Plan.

This year's goal: understand the process and what is being achieved. Will be able to "roll out" the system on the fall field trip.

Good job!!

A great approach! Members of the PAG support it.

Who is monitoring operators? Logging and roads supervisors review plans with the operators and monitor progress. MOFR Compliance and Enforcement (C&E) monitors and inspects operations. Other users are also observing operations and reporting when there is a problem.

¹ November 17, 2005, Agenda Item 3 Meeting Summary is provided at the end of this meeting summary to provide background

What if something goes wrong/happens? It is addressed through inspection and maintenance processes.

Suggestion: buffers should be larger than 10 meters and variable; overall they are not big enough and are blowing down. Comments included; provide feathering and variable width, feathering effective on uneven aged stands but not even aged, big spruce should be harvested and reduce fetch distance. All of these comments are considerations when determining harvest strategies.

Agenda Item 4 – Management of areas after fires -- regeneration

Tolko Summary

- Cedar Hills Fire – 174 ha. logged in 2004 – planted in 2005: 36% Douglas fir, 35% Lodgepole pine, 29% Yellow pine
- Okanagan Mountain Park Fire – 46 ha. logged – planted in 2005: 51% Larch, 36% Douglas fir, 13% Lodgepole pine
- Okanagan Park Fire – Salvage Non Replaceable Forest Licence (SNRFL) with Okanagan Indian Band – 300 ha. logged – MOFR to reforest and plans not known
- Nesbitt fire in 2003 -- Funded through Section 108 of the Forest and Range Practices Act (FPC Sec 162.2) -- 9 ha. replanted – all spruce.
- Forests For Tomorrow (FFT)
 - MOFR is using FFT funding for replanting areas burnt by the fires, including previously regenerated areas.
 - Not much has happened yet, primarily surveying and developing work plans

Weyerhaeuser Summary

- Salvage harvested damaged timber on the Vaseaux and Okanagan Park fires
- Areas are naturally regenerating – approximately 600,000 stems per hectare at present (95% Pl). At some point in the future these stands will require spacing. The intent during spacing will be to maximize mixed species.

Agenda Item 5 – SFM Plan Updates

1. Overlapping licenses in the DFA

- A concern that operations carried out by overlapping tenures within the Defined Forest Area (DFA) could put achievement of the SFM Plan performance measures (indicators and targets) at risk.
- BC Timber Sales (BCTS) is included within the DFA on TFLs 15 and 49.
 - BCTS reports against indicators 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 36 on these TFLs.
- Non Replaceable Forest Licences (NRFLs)
 - The requirement to report performance against the SFM Plan indicators and targets is now included in the licence document. NRFLs will report against the same indicators as noted above for BCTS.

- 1 previously issued NRFL (Monte Lake) has no provision for reporting (approximately 5 years of the original 10 year term remaining)
- Small Scale Salvage Program (SSSP)
 - Reporting against indicators is being discussed with the Ministry of Forests and Range
 - Will not happen for 2006 activities. Plan to report against 2007 activities.
 - Concern noted that trappers are not receiving adequate notification of planned operations by the SSSP
- 2. Sale of Weyerhaeuser private land
 - Weyerhaeuser's private land is included in the DFA and the company reports activities against all indicators except 2, 7, 9, 25, 29.
 - The private land is being sold, there are only two lots left
 - Logging practices being carried out by the purchasers are a concern to the PAG.
 - If Weyerhaeuser or Tolko bought the wood from these lots, and considering CSA certification, how would it be marketed? As the CSA certification is for the DFA, and not products, there would be no lumber marketing considerations.
 - A small proportion of wood used by the licensees comes from private land.
 - **Action: Licensees** will ask their log purchasing groups if forest management is a purchase consideration.
- 3. Bill 28: resulting changes to the DFA (pages v and 4 of the plan)
 - Bill 28 has resulted in allowable cut, and a proportionate amount of operating area, being taken back from the licensees for use by BCTS and other small tenure holders.
 - Harvesting of approved but unlogged blocks, and outstanding silviculture obligations, will be completed by the licensees according to the SFM Plan's performance measures. These activities will be included in the Annual Monitoring Report.
- 4. A new AAC determination was effective Jan 06 –Regional Forecasting section (page 21 of the plan) and Indicator 25, Forecast section (pg 48 of the plan)
 - Not an uplift? No, it is an actual AAC determination.

Agenda Item 5b – Licensee Roles/Involvement with the Forestry Ombudsman

- The Forestry Ombudsman has a forest worker safety focus.
- One of the Ombudsman’s roles:
 - Public/woods contractors can report concerns directly to the Ombudsman versus talking to the applicable licensee
 - With proactive safety programs and encouragement, Weyerhaeuser and Tolko anticipate that contractors will come to them directly
- Weyerhaeuser is involved with the Task Force for Safety and Tolko has a senior manager on the Task Force. BCTS is taking an active role.
- The program is still being developed.
- Information is available at <http://www.bcforestsafe.org/index.asp>
- Will the safety mandate be changed for Weyerhaeuser?
 - Not likely, the existing standard is high.
 - The Weyerhaeuser safety program will have no problem meeting the preliminary requirements identified.
- Tolko
 - has completed a woodlands safety audit and a report is being prepared.
 - is reviewing its contractor safety program
 - if you are not safe, you are not working.
- Road radio use is a concern. It is one area licensees are focusing on.
- Action: Darcie** will provide the group an update of BCTS’s participation at the fall meeting.

Agenda Item 6 –Parking Lot

1. Proposed Parking Lot addition “Suggest the primaries and the TFL15 operators actively manage ingress on grasslands”

Discussion & Action: agreed to; to be added to the 2007 plan.

2. Review Parking lot items for action or updating

1. Future Indicators

Genetic Diversity

- *Develop indicators to measure genetic diversity in the plan area*

Discussion & Action:

- Current focus is on water, no action yet
- Retain

Ecosystem changes

- *Develop indicators to measure:*
- *Wildlife population census*
- *Changes in landscape capability/suitability (habitat suitability index)*
- *Site index productivity measures*

← - - - - Formatted: Space Before: 6 pt

← - - - - Formatted: Space Before: 6 pt

Discussion & Action:

- Work being done with Site Index (SI) as part of the Okanagan Innovative Forest Practices Agreement (IFPA) may tie in
- **Rob Kennett** will review for potential to develop an indicator
- *Extent to which disturbance exceeds natural range of variability*
- *Forest fragmentation and connectedness (patch size)*
- *Retention of natural forest attributes in managed forests*

Discussion & Action:

- What is the point of trapper questionnaire?
 - Potentially obtain an indication of what retained stand attributes are positively influencing biodiversity
 - The Trapper Association is willing to work with licensees.

Global Carbon Modeling

- *Determine the extent to which forested areas in the DFA are a source or sink*

Discussion & Action:

- Currently a test model that is at least a couple years from application in BC.
- Retain item and schedule an update in the future.

Overall Indicator Development Discussion & Action:

- Intent is to improve indicators over time, to develop more robust indicators
- There is lots of information and research out there, but what next?
 - A challenge, how do you analyze? Perhaps from the provincial initiative? John Dunford may provide ideas.
- At some point expertise needs to be engaged to develop options and outline them for the group.
- Need a long term perspective and trends.
- Is there LRMP information that can help indicator development? Not much information, primarily strategies.
- How do we measure ourselves towards the end results? What are the end results we want?
- Consider land use objectives:
 - Maximum timber or maximum ??
 - The Okanagan SFM Plan has included applicable LRMP objectives

2. Other Parking Lot Information

Definitions for Element 1b (now Element 1.2 in Z809-02)

- *Maintained at endemic and sustainable level*

Discussion & Action:

Change Element 1.2 objective to “*Maintained at ~~endemic and~~ sustainable levels*”

Element 4.2

- *Forest management and lack of fire is resulting in ingress of forests on to grasslands. Grasslands should not be infringed on – a “thought” to keep in mind. Potentially flag to CSA regarding the necessity to maintain grass lands.*

Discussion & Action:

Formatted: Space Before: 6 pt

- Letter sent to CSA technical committee
- Technical committee has confirmed they will acknowledge receipt of input.
- Retain this item until a response is received from the technical committee

Overlapping Licenses

Non-Replaceable Forest Licenses (NRFLs) and Licences to cut – Small Scale Salvage Program (SSSP) operations occur within the DFA. Tolko and Weyerhaeuser are working with the MOFR to capture reporting of performance against indicators for licenses issued to third parties within the DFA. Progress will be discussed at the 2006 Public Advisory Group spring meeting.

Parking Lot process:

Add notes from meeting summaries to the Parking Lot items being retained.
Intent is to add perspective at future reviews.

3. Additional Parking Lot Items

Two additional items added to the Parking Lot

- Local workers underrepresented
 - Large scale long term contracts are limiting opportunities for participation.
 - Potential to adjust the tendering process?
- Indicator 5: stems per hectare too low
 - Need to consider this is also future CWD
 - Indicator should be reworded to “.. contain at least an average of 2-5 stubs or standing trees per hectare...”

7) Summary and Wrap-up

New Public Advisory Group (PAG) members’ feedback:

- Great to see comments received in an open minded fashion.
- Impressed with the plan and discussions.
- Very good!

The field trip is scheduled for September 14th.

- Stream crossings
- Stand level retention
- Stops Renee may request (opportunity for PAG member to influence trip agenda)

Excerpt From November 17, 2005 Meeting Summary

3) Water Quality Indicators – Brian Carson

Background

At the spring PAG meeting Ted Allingham suggested that developing improved water quality indicators for the SFMP could be a priority for the group, and that water quality objectives and monitoring might be a possibility. The Advisory Group requested that the licensees follow up; consider possible improvements to water quality indicators. Jim Bryan also took the initiative to pursue possibilities. Jim's follow up led from Provincial water quality standards to work being done to develop water quality indicators for FRPA. There was significant support (email) for this initiative by other members of the group and as a result Brian Carson was invited to make a presentation. Brian is a consultant working with government to develop the FRPA indicators.

Presentation

Old watershed assessment procedure (IWAP) is in part, a math exercise measuring ECA and road density. It does not provide any benefit to licensees who do a better job. The FRPA assessment procedure and Pierre Beaudry's Stream Crossing Quality Index (SCQI) both quantify the quality of stream crossings.

Turbidity is the water quality factor the forest industry has the most ability to influence. In the interior, roads provide the most significant sediment sources available for erosion into streams. While a standard has not yet been set for turbidity, Brian provided a chart depicting some of his ideas.

Verification sampling has been carried out for both the FRPA and SCQI systems to confirm results. While results are not exact, they provide information to an order of magnitude.

The FRPA rating system is forestry equipment operator friendly (i.e. cat driver) and effectively supports continuous improvement from planning through to completed operations.

With the FRPA system, data collected at sites does correlate with downstream results. On the other hand, it is very difficult to know what "base of watershed" turbidity readings mean without upstream information.

The FRPA model includes snow melt in the interior. Focus is the road drainage system: ditches, cross drains and stream crossings.

Brian distributed some copies of a computer disc "Results Based Forest Management to Maintain Water Quality in Coastal Watersheds". He is sending additional copies. Please let me know if you would like a copy.

Action – Licensees: review and evaluate the information presented, follow up where necessary, consider options and provide feedback to the PAG at the spring meeting.