

**Minutes**  
**Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Advisory Group Meeting**  
**Ministry of Forests, Lands & Natural Resource Operations - Vernon**  
**June 16, 2011**

**Attendees:**

|                            |                   |              |     |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----|
| Paul Ross                  | Richard Toperczer | Mike Watkins | Rob |
| Kennett                    | Grant Thompson    | Don Guild    |     |
| Dave Gill                  | Ted McRea         | Randy Hardy  |     |
| Lorne Bradley              | Patti Hansen      | Scott Smith  |     |
| Mark Hopkins (Facilitator) |                   |              |     |

**1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review**

Introductions were foregone as all members were regular participants. The draft agenda was reviewed and revised to bring the gap analysis discussion ahead of the Monitoring Report review. Discussion related to Forest and Range Evaluation Program (FREP) - led by Rob Kennett, and a review of changes to the SFM Plan were added to the agenda

**2.0 Action Items**

The following Action Items from the Nov 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010 mtg. were reviewed:

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:** The facilitator is to amend the PAG TOR to reflect the PAG member removal process as agreed to at the previous PAG Mtg.

**Update June 16, 2011** – Completed and amended TOR included in 2011 update to SFM Plan

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:** Future Monitoring Reports will consolidate the information regarding Indicators not met into the Summary table

**Update June 16, 2011** – Completed, a summary table is now included in the 2010 SFM Monitoring Report

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Agreement:** The PAG agreed to revise the language of the Indicator to restrict it to forestry related operations only

**Update June 16, 2011** – Completed, the Facilitator reviewed the existing text of the Indicator, no amendments were required as the current text appears to explicitly state this.

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:**

At the next update to the Plan, specific reference to the legal rights of third parties will be specifically recognized.

**Update June 16, 2011-** Completed, a sentence to this effect was added to Section 3.2 of the 2011 SFM Plan

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:**

Amend SFM Plan to include a statement that a summary of the management reviews will be included in the annual Monitoring Report.

**Update June 16, 2011-** Completed, a paragraph to this effect directing the reader to the Monitoring Report appendices has been added to the 2011 SFM Plan

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:**

Add management review summary to each of the individual licensee audit reports which form part of the Annual Monitoring Report

**Update June 16, 2011-** Completed, a paragraph indicating that the individual licensee Monitoring Report Summaries (included in an appendix to the annual Monitoring Report) now contain a summary of the management reviews has been added to section 3.1.1 the 2011 SFM Plan

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:** Rob Kennett to circulate proposed new wording to the other licensees and forward agreed version to Mark for distribution/comment to PAG. **By January 31st**

**Update June 16, 2011-** Completed, This action item refers to the grass-seeding indicator/target.

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:** Dave Gill will produce a “matrix” summary of the Gap Analysis report with comments and circulate the information the licensees for consideration and development of recommendations to the broader PAG. **By December 15<sup>th</sup>,**

**Update June 16, 2011 -** Completed

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:** Licensees will have reviewed the information supplied by Dave and developed proposals for the PAG **by January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

**Update June 16, 2011 -** Completed

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Items:**

The following tasks have been assigned as follows:

Kerry Rouck: To contact CBC Radio about PAG promotion

**Update June 16, 2011-** Kerry was not at the June 16 mtg. status unknown

Dave/Richard: To collectively work on a press release about PAG

**Update June 16, 2011** -No progress

Mark: To make contact with both UBCO and FORREX about possible cross-promotion.

**Update June 16, 2011** - So far, no response from a number of e-mail inquiries to UBCO natural resource faculty. Forrex inquired as the willingness/ability of OKSFM licencees to join the organization as a partner. This would make linking simpler. Mark will circulate details on joining to PAG companies

Licencees: Are all to include invitations to join the PAG process with all referrals

**Update June 16, 2011** - There has been sporadic implementation of this approach.

*(from Nov 25<sup>th</sup> 2010 mtg.)*

**Action Item:**

Licencees will endeavor to provide as much advance notice of audits as possible

**Update June 16, 2011-** ongoing, either directly from the companies to the PAG members or through the facilitator

## **2.0 Grass-Seeding – Update from the Nov 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting – Rob Kennett**

At the Nov 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010 PAG meeting the licencees were tasked with reviewing the current Indicator 3.2.5 (Target 24) which tracks the timeliness of re-vegetation of road rights-of-way. The concern raised at the meeting was that although seed application was tracked and reported, the success rate was not.

Following extensive discussion amongst the licencees following the Nov 25<sup>th</sup> meeting the licencees concluded that the current Indicator should not be changed. Tolko has chosen to alter their Standard Operating Procedures related to road inspections to track the success of grass-seeding on a yes/no basis.

Mike: How often do inspections happen? Once a year?

Rob: Depends on the Risk Category

Mike: I don't think once/year is adequate – a little disappointing.

Grant: The annual inspections are typically done during the spring freshet, when germinating grass is evident and the conditions are appropriate for re-seeding failed areas.

Randy: Definitely more practical to do inspections in Spring when something can be done.

**Action Item:** Licencees will bring the results of their 2011 inspections related to grass-seeding to the next PAG meeting for review and discussion

### **3.0 2010 Audit “Gap Analysis” Update – Dave Gill**

- Following the BCTS KPMG Audit in 2010 the auditors produced a “Gap Analysis” of issues related to the Okanagan 2010 SFM Plan. They Identified 1 area of concern.
- Subsequent to the Okanagan “Gap Analysis” a similar exercise was conducted on the Kamloops BCTS operations by a different audit team from KPMG. They identified 7 areas of concern.
- The question was raised as to why there were 6 more issues in Kamloops as it is very similar to the Okanagan Plan (both drafted by P. Salm)
- The discrepancy was raised with KPMG, who commenced an internal investigation in the difference in findings. KPMG has subsequently retracted the original analyses and issued a new report (dropping any reference to a “Gap Analysis”).
- The new analysis identified 4 non-conformances, as follows:

#### **Non-Conformance #1- Non-participating Licencees:**

There are several licensees (NRFL's) that operate on the DFA, not all of which are required to implement the SFM Plan or report on their performance under it. Participating licensees have yet to conduct a formal assessment to determine the risk posed by the forest management activities of non-participating licensees

The auditors suggested two possible resolutions of the issue, as follows:

Option:

- 1) Risk-rate "Other" Tenures? What are the criteria? i.e. Who manages it, AAC, etc?
- 2) In the test expand on "shared areas", explain these are minor, some managed by participating licensees, and all have reporting out requirements.

Discussion: Currently BCTS includes the requirement to report on certain indicators in the Tender documents for Timber Sales.

Paul: referred to section of the SFM plan which describes the DFA as being confined to the limits of participating licensee operations (basically licensee roads and cut-blocks).

Richard: I believe we made the decision years ago that Small Scale Salvage Operations were too small to worry about.

**Action Item:** Richard to send a copy of the current version of the BCTS bid-package language which refers to the successful bidders reporting obligations to the facilitator. This is to be included in the next (2012) update to the SFM Plan. Note: Richard supplied the phrase prior to this meetings conclusion.

The phrase reads as follows:

“...In addition, as this Licensee is within a Defined Forest Management Area under the Sustainable Forest Management Plan for CSA (Canadian Standards Association) Certification, the licensee will be requested to participate in the Sustainable Forest Management process within the Okanagan-Shasta Forest District. Activities may include supplying summary information on logging activities and attending CSA Sustainable Forestry Management meetings. A sample list of annual CSA reporting requirements for NRFL licensees is included in Section 7 of the Particulars.”

**Non Conformance #2- Plant Communities at Risk:** A gap was identified in relation to CSA SFM element 1.2 (Species Diversity). The SFM Plan includes 3 targets (7, 8, and 9) in relation to species at risk. The targets noted above do not currently address the identification and protection of rare plants.

Re-word Target 7 to read: "100% conformance to site plans to manage for and/or protect important habitat for IWMS species, and plant community and animal species identified as rare in the OSLRMP and KBLUP

Discussion:

Dave: The auditors would like to see the indicator expanded to include Plant Communities, not just animals.

Scott: would the suggested inclusion be of benefit o the plan?

Paul: This should be a similar process to that used for the animals.

Scott: I'd like to see some detail on which plant communities this would extend too as part of the discussion.

**Action Item:** Licencees to craft a possible amendment to this Indicator and forward the proposed change to the PAG for consideration prior to issuance of the next update of the SFM Plan

**Non-Conformance #3 Current Status of Some Indicators:-** The current status of Indicators 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.4.1, 3.1.2, and 5.2.2 has not been assessed and documented

Discussion: Will be complete with the 2010 Monitoring Report

**Non-Conformance #4 –Criteria 1 Forecasting:** In relation to Criteria 1, the SFM Plan currently lacks forecasting information as to the effects of the defined actions on ecosystem diversity and wildlife habitat over time. Also, because the SFM Plan encompasses both the Arrow and Okanagan TSA's (with their own TSR's), forecasting assumptions may not be directly applicable with respect to the data and actions developed for the maintenance of wildlife habitat.

**Action Item:**  
Review existing Forecasts for Criteria #1. Propose new wording and present to PAG at Fall 2011 meeting

**Action Item:** Facilitator to contact Pat regarding any forecasting discussions in the Thompson/Nicola/Fraser DFA

**Action Item:** Facilitator to check on the definitions of “forecast” used in the Z809-02 standard vs. the Z809-08 Standard. Are they the same?

#### 4.0 Monitoring Report Review

The preamble to the plan and all 43 Targets were reviewed by the PAG. Specific comments/discussion on individual targets was as follows:

##### Target #6 – Wildlife Tree and Stub Retention

It was noted that the relatively low performance reported by Tolko was due to the fact that they had a number of very small blocks without commitment to the normal 2-5 stubs/ha. approach. They are not functionally required on such blocks. Such small blocks carry the same “weight” as much larger blocks in calculating performance. Measuring performance by area may be more indicative of performance.

**Action Item:** Licencee’s will look at possible modifications to this Indicator/Target for presentation to the PAG at the next meeting.

Note: There was an error noted on the charted results for Target 6. The performance level for Wildlife Tree retention was 99.1%, not the indicated 94%. This error will be corrected in the electronic version of the Monitoring Report and posted to the SFM Website.

### **Target #7 – Conformance to Site Plans for Identified Wildlife**

Grant: There was an error in the information supplied for the report. We should have indicated that we had two blocks with commitments for Identified Wildlife and that we met the commitments in both cases.

**Action Item:** Facilitator to make the correction to the e-version of the Monitoring Report, available on the SFM Website. A more explanatory title will be added to the tables as well.

### **Target #8 – Wildlife Habitat Conservation**

Don: Are there not Flammulated Owls within Gorman’s operating area?

Randy: Not within the areas where we are currently operating.

Don: I have some information which I can supply which I think shows there is.

**Action Item:** On the next Monitoring Report, clarify the relationship between the areas reported by the Forest District and those reported by licences. (i.e. inclusive or additive?)

### **Target 11 – Protection of Culturally Important, Sacred and Spiritual Sites**

Scott: It appears that you are getting lots of information/cooperation from First nations.

Paul: Varies with the capacity of the Bands.

Dave: The flow of information seems to be best in cases where there are Service Agreements in place.

### **Target 13 – Reforestation Success – Free-Growing Achievement**

Ted: There is a fair bit of information being collected through FREP looking at what is happening to these stands once they have achieved free-growing status. The Okanagan TSA is one of the test cases – there are some issues.

**Action Item:** Ted to forward the facilitator relevant FREP information for distribution to the PAG.

Facilitator: Although the Herbicide Application Target was dropped during the 2010 re-write of the SFM Plan, I believe this was an oversight and I was supplied the information so I inserted the graph into the report anyway.

All: Agreed that the omission was likely an oversight and that the herbicide Indicator should be re-instated to the plan.

**Action Item:** The facilitator will amend the next SFM Plan, and Monitoring Report template, to re-instate the target related to tracking and reporting herbicide use.

Scott: I notice that a lot of the language relating to reporting is in future tense, when it should be present or past. Why?

Facilitator: The text in the Report was copied from the SFM plan which was written in future tense as things were yet to be done. Now they are.

**Action Item:** The facilitator will evaluate and amend as appropriate the “tense” used in both the Plan and Report

## **Target 20 – Harvesting within Community Watersheds**

Patti: Why are the ECA percentages so much lower than what I am use to seeing for some of these drainages?

Rob: likely due to the fact that we are using the whole watershed area, not just that above the “snow level”

**Action Item:** Licences will evaluate revision to this indicator for presentation to the PAG at the next meeting. Revision to reflect ECA within an appropriate subset of the watershed area. (e.g. above a certain elevation, forested area only, etc.)

**Action Item:** A few watersheds were listed twice. This will be amended in the e-version of the Monitoring Report available on the SFM website.

Scott: the ECA area information is great to see. Good Work

## **Target 21 – Stream Crossings in Community Watersheds**

**Action Item:** Add percentages to the breakdown of high, med, and low risk categories.

Rob: There is a fair bit of FREP information available looking at the percentage breakdown by risk categories. Based on 31 samples in the Okanagan area they found High – 2% Moderate – 31% Low – 40% Very Low 27%  
This breakdown appears fairly consistent across the landscape.

### **Target 22 – Permanent Road Inspections**

Scott: Why is there such a difference in the Risk Category breakdown between the different licences?

Randy: In Gorman’s case all newly built roads are automatically rank as high to trigger appropriate inspections. The risk ranking may change in subsequent years.

|                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Action Item:</b> Licences to evaluate means of making the reporting more consistent between licences. Present to PAG at next meeting</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Grant: WFN will be completing inspections shortly. The results will be included in the next Monitoring Report.

### **Target 23 – Temporary Road Inspections**

Dave: Although BCTS reported 100% compliance for this target, it is problematic in that BCTS cannot dictate the location and duration of temporary roads constructed on timber sales issued by them. A tedious process.

### **Target 24- Re-Vegetation of Roads and Landings**

Rob: Clearly Tolko’s results are improving, but a long way to go. Based on the large amount of seed used compared to the reported length of road seed, this appears to be a tracking/reporting issue, rather than a performance issue.

### **Target 28 – Visual Quality Objectives**

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Action Item:</b> Licences to ensure consistency of approach to VQO assessments. Particularly with regard to “exemptions” for beetle and fire damaged landscapes. Look to FREP form which may elicit consistency.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### **Target 31 – Environmental and Safety Training**

|                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Action Item:</b> facilitator to amend the reported allowable variance from 10% to 0. The target is correct at 90%. The web-site e-version will reflect this amendment.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### **Target 35 – Participation in Higher level Planning.**

**Action Item:** The SFM Plan, reporting template and Monitoring Report will be amended to remove reference to the Okanagan LRMP. (no longer supported).

### **Target 42 – Communications with the Public**

Facilitator: The tracking and reporting of hits to the SFM website has been removed from the plan, probably by omission. Suggested that the web-site traffic report be added back into the plan and the Monitoring Report

**Action Item:** The tracking and reporting of SFM web-site traffic will be added back into the plan and report.

### **Appendix II- Corporate SFM Monitoring Report Summaries.**

At the time of publication, only Tolko had completed it's management review and reported it in their summary. BCTS, Gorman, and WFN summaries will be available shortly.

### **FREP – Biodiversity – Rob Kennett**

Rob: provide the highlights of the FREP inquiry into biodiversity – results seem quite good.

**Action Item:** Ted to forward the FREP information to Mark for distribution to PAG via SFM website.

## **5.0 Next Meeting**

The next PAG meeting is scheduled for:

**Thursday, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2011**  
**Location TBA (Kelowna Area)**