

Minutes
Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan
Public Advisory Group Meeting
Benvoulin Heritage Church
February 11th, 2010

Attendees:

Keith Boulter	Paul Ross	Darcie Annesley
Mike Watkins	Rob Kennett	Grant Thompson
Don Guild	Kerry Rouck	Dave Gill
James Moller	Colin Pierre	Clive Johnson
Lorne Bradley	Pat Salm (Consultant)	
Mark Hopkins (Facilitator)		

1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review

Following Introductions the following amendments to the minutes of the Jan 28th meeting were agreed to:

Page 8, Indicator 21 and 22 Discussion

The first “Agreement” should be amended to read:

Retain “old” indicator 21 and re-number it as 3.2.3 Add reporting of the percent permanent roads (by risk category) to the target - where licencees have management responsibility

The second “agreement” should be amended to read:

Retain “old” indicator 22 and re-number it as 3.2.3

2.0 Action Items

Soil Disturbance: It was clarified that at the on the spring field trip it would be desirable to look at “benchmarking” soil disturbance. (i.e. visit sites where the level of soil disturbance has been measured).

Discussion arising from the minutes:

Mike: Concerned that the minutes leave the issue of monitoring grass seeding for success was left “hanging” in the minutes. Mike would like to see a greater commitment to resolve the issue – so it doesn’t get lost.

Pat: Resolved to put the issue of grass-seeding as a “parking-lot” issue in the text of the plan – so not lost.

Mike: Would like to see some sort of time frame applied to resolving the issue.

Paul: It's probably worth going back to the people directly involved in this issue for their input.

Action Item: Add grass-seeding issues to the list of items to be looked at in the field on the spring field trip (Tolko hosting).

Action Item: Add Grass seeding issue to the agenda for the Fall 2010 PAG meeting.

Clive: Grass-seeding success becomes a more difficult issue where cows have access to it.

Pat: Led the group in inserting the updated material into the PAG member binder.

2.1 Review of Draft Indicator 3.2.1 – Water Quality and Quantity.

[draft indicator supplied to PAG by e-mail after last meeting]

Note: The single-page distributed by Pat at the meeting has the correct wording (it differed slightly from the wording in the insert update material).

Lorne: Still concerned that the Community Watershed (CW) designation is no longer available for “new” watersheds. There are still a large number of watersheds where domestic water is drawn but there is no protection similar to CW.

Kerry: we always map domestic water licences outside of CW's. Generally they have a 200m management zone. Manage for water quality – no so much for quantity.

Clive: water referrals, like most forestry related referrals, get very little response from the public.

Rob: we need to find some way to limit the number of assessments required. Too onerous to conduct everywhere.

Paul: we also can't control who responds to the referrals.

Kerry: Described the FSP approach to the issue. Separation of planning and practices.

Pat: There are lots of other indicators in the plan which address water outside of CW's (e.g. green-up, grass-seeding, etc.)

Rob: We have done watershed assessments outside of CW's – wherever we believe there is an issue to be addressed.

Paul: The goal is always to move from high to moderate or to remaining the moderate category.

Mike: Are the assessments always conducted by a hydrologist?

Licencees: Yes, but the initial calculation of the Equivalent Clearcut Area (ECA) may be conducted internally.

Agreement: Proposed Indicator 3.2.1 is accepted by the PAG (as written on the single-page hand-out supplied by Pat at the meeting)

2.2 Indicator 3.1.1 – Level of Soil Disturbance

Following limited discussion, it was agreed by the PAG that:

Agreement: As described in italics on the Feb 11, 2010, page 2 PAG binder insert, for the purposes of Indicator 3.1.1 a statement that Licencees will report the percent of areas harvested where the maximum allowable soil disturbance level was 5% will be added to the current requirements of “old” Indicator 19.

Kerry: It should be noted that for Indicator 12 the 6% allowance is lower than the provincial standard.

3.0 Criteria #5 – Economic and Social Benefits

3.1 Indicator 5.2.3 – Level of Direct and Indirect Employment

Pat: Proposed the adoption of “old” Indicator #25 – Harvest the AAC over the cut-control period.

Dave: BCTS is different. High stumpage considered a good thing.

Paul: we could look at the amount of wood (logs) retained within the TSA.

Dave: Overall the Okanagan TSA is a net importer of wood

Grant: [to Pat] What was the intention of this indicator when it was considered at the national Tech. comm. level?

Pat: You could easily argue that log costs and local breakdown are sufficient to meet the requirements.

Kerry: Could we simply insert some text into the plan on jobs in general. Rather than having it as an indicator?

Clive: Believes we should track employment “down” to the stump level (planning, harvesting, etc.) Beyond that it should be tracked separately.

Agreement: For the purposes of Indicator 5.2.3, “old” indicator 25 will be used and in addition, general information on the following will be inserted into the text of the SFM plan:

1. The number of woodlands staff and contractors serving the DFA
2. The number of manufacturing and sales staff and employees within the DFA.

Action Item: Licensees to provide Pat with above information for inclusion into the Plan.

3.2 Indicator 5.2.4 – Level of Aboriginal Participation in the Forest Economy

Pat: should we revise “old” indicator 32 to be more qualitative?

Rob: It’s difficult due to the TSA vs. DFA differences.

Grant: Some of the allocations to First Nations numbers floated around are misleading. Some bands have been allocated NRFL’s which cannot be operated on economically.

Agreement:

For the purposes of 5.2.4, “old” Indicator 32 is adopted and in addition, agreed to a new target reporting on the volume (%) of AAC offered to First Nations (indicating the potential opportunity) and the volume(%) accepted by them (indicating what has been realized). Even though target is largely outside the control of licencees, agreed to retain the suggested 10% of the total allocation offered to First Nations (potential opportunity).

Grant: More details are desired internationally on the level of involvement in the forest industry by First Nations.

4.0 Review of “Red-List” Indicators

4.1 Discussion - Old Indicator #3: clearcuts by total area and size categories.

Mike: My recollection as to how this indicator came about is that Juergen Hansen felt people just didn’t like large clearcuts. A lot of that is moot now, due to the pine beetle issues.

Clive: Feels large clearcuts are still not desirable from a wildlife perspective.

Pat: Feels Juergen wanted to know the % clearcut vs. uneven-aged silvicultural systems. (i.e. commitments on reserves, WTP’s, etc. were his issue).

Clive: Anything over 40 ha is “big” from my value perspective. I would also like to know how many are less than 5ha in size.

James: Concerned about wildlife impacts, would like to see a breakdown of harvesting by silviculture system.

Clive: would find harvest system reporting useful. Likes the idea of reporting activity by Biogeoclimatic (BGC) zones, rather than by Natural Disturbance Type (NDT).

Agreement: Add a new indicator under ecosystem diversity (1.1.5) that will report annually on the area harvested by silviculture-system (even-aged, even-aged with reserves, uneven aged) by Biogeoclimatic Zone.

4.2 Discussion - Old Indicator #4: Riparian Management Areas.

Pat: Feels the “negative only” reporting is not desirable. Only reporting when there is a problem.

Rob: We had some problems last year with reporting out on this indicator. It is targeting riparian infractions within/adjacent to harvest areas only. We had some problems with roads.

Clive: Does this include the extra 10,000 ha of budgeted riparian protection as part of the reporting? [note: through the OSLRMP/KBLUP) process]

Kerry: Yes it does.

Paul: Would like to see us reporting on the implementation of measures prescribed to address problems – rather than just reporting that there was a problem.

Pat: It is important to note where there have been infractions, but not necessarily in the SFM plan. Really more of an EMS issue.

Mike: Is block layout done when riparian vegetation is clearly evident?

Paul: layout may be done on snow, but it is always checked in a snow free period prior to harvest commencement.

Agreement: Add a new indicator under water quality and quantity (3.2.6) that will report on the number of environmental incidents related to riparian areas and for those incidents, reporting on the action items and timeframes to restore the area and/or prevent it’s reoccurrence. The target will be to complete 100% of (all) action items within their prescribed timeframe.

4.3 Discussion - Old Indicator # 10 – Protected Ecosystems

Pat: As the DFA is smaller than the TSA, this is just an “information” indicator. Suggested that we remove this (#10) as an indicator, but add similar information and content to the text of the plan.

Clive: Does this cover areas outside of the parks?

Mike: Yes.

Agreement: Move the content of “old” Indicator #10 to the text of the plan. [dropping it as an indicator]

4.4 Discussion - Old Indicator # 15 – Harvest Priorities Related to Forest Health

Pat: Do we need this?

Rob: there was a desire to target 70% [percentage of harvest related to forest health issues]

Agreement: Remove “old” Indicator 15 from the plan completely.

4.5 Discussion - Old Indicator # 24 – Number of Reportable Spills

Pat: Every Licencee is currently doing EMS incident reports. Do we need to report this within the SFM plan?

Mike: What’s in your management plans regarding this?

Kerry: same as the EMS process Pat just described.

Clive: Are fuel delivery trucks included under spills by licencees?

Kerry: That issue is covered under the Transportation of Dangerous Goods regulation.

Rob: Contractors to Tolko have to inform delivery drivers of the Tolko standards.

Pat: If I see a spill I will assume it belongs to a licencee, until proven otherwise.

Agreement: Remove “old” indicator #24 from the new 2010 plan

5.0 Review of existing Values and Objectives (relative to indicators)

Element 2.1 Reforestation Success.

Pat: Suggested adding the target from “old” indicator #7 (3 or more species) as it augments 2.1.1 well.

Agreement: It was agreed that the target from “old” indicator #7 will be added to the previously agreed to 2.1.1.

Element 2.2 Ecosystem Productivity

Pat: reviewed suggested wording changes to 2.2 (as outlined on Feb 11 PAG binder inserts).

Mike: Why the change to the wording?

Don: Believes the new proposed wording is better. However, nothing addresses the potential for species changes overtime, particularly non-tree species.

Agreement: It was agreed that the current wording for the 2.2 Objective should be revised by removing the words “a full range of timber and non-timber values”.

And in addition the following changes made:

1. Include the previously agreed to “new” stocking standard as an Indicator for 2.2
2. Add Indicator #16 (planting performance) as a new Indicator for 2.2

Element 4.2 Forest Land Conversion

Mike: Concerned that the removal of “land base” is not appropriate. Concerned with ingress of forests into what has historically been grasslands.

Pat: This came up in discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee. Page 52 of the Standard addresses this issue (also 6.2.2.3 page 48). The committee recognized that in some cases expanding, even maintaining, the forest land base is not the best course.

Agreement: It was agreed to add the word conserve but to retain old wording (forest land base).

Action Item: Pat will look through the current SFM Plan for anything which addresses this issue; and add appropriate text if required.

Note: Pat has confirmed that there is wording (pg 71 in the Range Section) that references this. Additionally, it appears in the Parking Lot (Appendix 2) as an item first discussed in 2006.

Element 5.2 Communities and Stability

Following limited discussion, the following changes were agreed to regarding Appendix 4, Element 5.2

Agreement:

Add Indicator #18 to address “and access to the forest resource” portion of the objective.

Add Indicators 28 and 33 to address “local interested parties” portion of objective.

Add Indicator #25 (number of employees)

Element 6.3 Forest Community Well Being and Resilience

Agreement:

Add indicator #25 (Harvest level) to better address the objective (sustainable supply of timber)

Note: 5.2.3 “Level of Direct and Indirect Employment” was essentially moved to 6.3 under the new standard.]

Element 6.5 Information for Decision Making

Kerry: suggested adding “old” Indicator 30.

Agreement: Remove *italicized* text from 6.5 table (Feb 11th, 2010) and insert target for “old” Indicator #30 (Educational and Research Initiatives).

6.0 Next Meetings:

- Next PAG Meeting- to review draft SFM Plan and 2009 Monitoring Report
Thursday, May 27th, 2010
Location TBA
- Spring PAG Field Trip – Hosted by Tolko
Thursday, June 10th, 2010
Details TBA