

Okanagan SFM Plan

Public Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

June 14, 2017. MoFLNRO office, Vernon

Attendees: Renee Clark, Suzan Lapp, Trevor Jolleys, Paul Ross, Clive Johnson, Patti Meger, Scott Smith, Mike Watkins, Tony Zanotto, Nancy Paul, Don Dobson, Keiko Parker, Bob Swite, Don Guild, Pat Salm

Meeting started at 9:30am with a safety/orientation briefing of the meeting room, introductions and a review of the meeting agenda. One additional item was added to the agenda – a discussion regarding the prior work done on a better target pertaining to water and hydrological recovery.

Action Items from previous meeting:

Stream Crossing Evaluation form

Paul was to work with his staff to further define what “material below average” meant (for consistency of reporting). Once complete Paul to share with BCTS and Westbank.

Paul reported that this work was completed.

Mandatory discussion items

Pat was to send these out with March 15, 2017 meeting minutes and topic was to be tabled at next meeting. Action completed, topic is on today’s agenda.

SFM Plan update

The more substantive items were to be reviewed and discussed at the next meeting. Once agreed to and completed, Pat was to send out 2017/18 SFM plan to the group. Topic is on today’s agenda.

Tolko Certification Decision

Paul spoke to the email sent out previously to advisory group members where Tolko will begin transitioning to the SFI standard. The link to the SFI website is as follows: <http://www.sfiprogram.org>

This will likely mean Tolko's involvement in the advisory group process will stop once the transition is complete (estimated at 6-12 months from the time of the initial announcement in). Tolko has engaged KPMG to assist them with the transition. The SFI certification does not require active on-going public engagement like that required by CSA. Paul promised to keep the advisory group updated and does plan to host the fall meeting where a further update can be provided. Many of the advisory group members spoke to how they valued this public process and expressed concern over the lack of opportunities such as this to be engaged in the management of Crown forests. Advisory group members see the pull-back of major licensee participation and the possible demise of the advisory group as a real loss. There were questions about some of the other (range, water) meeting events that have been occurring and if there might be some way to better co-ordinate and perhaps broaden these. With only a limited number of licensees participating in this process, it was again felt that there might be value in opening up the forest district licensee steering committee to include the public, particularly on field trips. Paul offered to take this back to the district manager.

Westbank First Nation reported that they want to continue on with the CSA SFM framework and would be happy to report out on their progress against indicators and targets. BCTS reported that they have yet to make a decision on whether they will continue on with CSA (and this public process) or move to SFI.

Review of the 2016/17 SFM Monitoring Report

The Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management (OK SFM) Plan contains indicators and targets that help to assess sustainability against the Criteria and Elements set out in the CSA certification standard. The Monitoring report is a roll-up of the participating licensees performance against the targets in the SFM Plan. Highlights of the Monitoring report were covered. In total, 39 out of 42 targets (93%) were fully met.

The Monitoring Report contains a bit of perspective information (Section 5) with tables/charts indicating plan area statistics and relating them to what occurred in the reporting period. Based on the data reported the gross harvest area was 9083 ha. When compared to the total timber harvesting land base area, this amounted to 1.4% of the total area of 652, 442 ha. The report also provided a quick look at how the indicators and targets tie back to the SFM Criteria and Elements in the CSA certification standard (Table 6.1). Each of the targets and the performance against these is then shown in the second table. It was noted that some targets are used to measure multiple indicators – thus achievement or non-achievement of a target can have a cascading affect throughout the Plan. Pat also noted that table 6.2 (monitoring report results by target) had an error with respect to target 22 (107% should actually read as 99.3 %). The detailed information around target 22 was correct at 99.3%.

Pat asked the group to stop at any specific targets that they would like to discuss as we worked through some select targets of the Monitoring Report.

Target 4- Tree Species Diversity in Reforestation

Pat noted that diversity of species is being measured at the time of the free growing survey, which provides not natural species ingress on planted cut blocks. The target of 70 % of blocks having 3 or more tree species was easily met (over 90% of surveyed blocks had 3 or more species). Also interesting to note was that the primary species accounted for just under 52% of total tree species indicating a good mix of secondary and tertiary species.

Target 9- Reforestation – Mountain Caribou Habitat

While no harvesting has occurred in mountain caribou habitat for any of the past 5 years, it was noted that companies could be moving into these area in the near future. The group felt this target should be retained.

Target 16- Soil Disturbance Limits

Paul explained how this target was missed on 2 cutblocks where the contractor did not shutdown his operations, resulting in excessive soil disturbance. Paul noted that the harvesting contractor was invoiced for the rehabilitation efforts and Tolko's silviculture will be reforesting these areas along with the rest of the cut blocks.

Target 22- Road Inspections

Road inspections were discussed at length. Monitoring of roads is felt to be extremely critical to the management of water. Planned road inspections are based on risk factors with higher risk roads receiving more scrutiny than lower risk roads. WFN and Tolko explained their circumstances around inspections not completed as planned.

Target 25- Environment Incidents within Riparian

Paul explained what occurred with an area where an S3 stream was crossed inadvertently. The issue began with a pre-work meeting completed in the office (as compared to the normal method of completion done directly on site). Immediate actions were taken to minimize sediment deposits into the stream. Because of the timing of the event, snow prevented all action items to be planned and completed during 2016.

Target 28- Visual Quality Objectives

Paul reviewed what occurred on the one block (LL7020) that failed to meet the visual objectives.

Other Business

Mandatory Discussion Items

Pat reviewed the discussion items table that was sent out with the minutes of the previous meeting. While there were no objections to the conclusions that Pat had on which discussion items should be visited (or re-visited), the group agreed that Pat would quickly send the table back out for one last chance for input prior to developing a schedule for their review. Also agreed that the new discussion

items would be scheduled/reviewed first. As an example, for the wetlands item, the group felt what might be needed was an assessment of how existing legislation and policy applies to wetlands and the adequacy of it to manage wetland function. It was also noted that an overall strategy for all wetlands (much of which would be outside of the SFM Plan area) was being developed by the OBWB. A draft of that strategy might be available later this fall and it might be of assistance in our review of the wetland discussion item.

Action: Pat to send out discussion item table for final feedback (update: completed following meeting).

Action: Pat to develop schedule for the review of discussion items (conversations to occur at regularly scheduled meetings over the next 2 years). Include schedule in meeting minutes. (update: completed)

Discussion item schedule (four items identified):

1. role and importance of wetlands. (2018)
2. proportion of naturally disturbed area that is not salvage harvested. (2018)
3. role of forest ecosystems and their management in the global carbon cycle. (2019)
4. the significant vulnerabilities for community sustainability linked to forest and timber supply conditions over time. (2019).

SFM Plan Changes to meet CSA Z809-16

Pat reviewed the SFM Plan change process; where at the previous meeting the 2017/18 Plan was changed for all of the housekeeping related items. These changes were necessitated to bring the Plan into alignment with the revised CSA Z809 SFM Standard.

The current meeting discussion was focused on the remaining changes needed in the SFM Plan. The Appendix 4 document (posted onto members page of our SFM website) was used to highlight the additional discussion and change needed to the Plan's values, objectives, indicators and targets.

Changes made to the document were captured in the Appendix 4 document, discussion on these summarized below:

1. Element 1.4 has included sites of geological significance. The group felt these features were infrequent in the DFA and were generally adequately managed in the existing planning processes. While no additional targets were felt necessary, it was agreed to add existing targets 6&7 to indicator 1.4.1.
2. Element 2.1 – agreed to remove former (non-core) indicator 2.2.3. Targets remain elsewhere in the Plan.
3. Element 5.1 – core indicator contains extra requirement for conflict resolution. Agreed to add to target 40 an additional expectation that efforts made to resolve disagreements are documented.
4. Element 5.2 – agreed to remove old non-core indicator 5.2.5. Targets remain elsewhere in the Plan.
5. Element 6.2 – agreed to adjust value and objective as proposed.
6. Element 7.1 – core indicator contains extra requirement for conflict resolution. Agreed to add to target 36 an additional expectation that efforts made to resolve disagreements are documented.

Pat to revise remainder of SFM Plan (to align with these changes to the values, goals indicators and objectives) and then produce the updated 2017/18 SFM Plan. Plan to be posted to the SFM website. Printed copies could be produced and made available to active advisory group members (on request).

Current DFA Issues, Summary, Wrap-Up

Target 20 - update

After a brief review of what the water sub-committee had completed earlier (see older meeting minutes for detail), Don provided a bit of an explanation of what is currently taking place and what we might expect in the way of outcomes. Some of the discussion included:

- [Extension note 116](#) (revised snow recovery curves) was released in September 2015
- [Extension note 118](#) (ECA as an indicator of hydrologic recovery) was released in January 2017
- There remains a provincial initiative to better define how watershed assessments are conducted. Jamie Skinner (Tolko) s part of a small group working on this but nothing has been made available at this point.
- ECA and peak flow hazard are not unique indicators of water issues, but two of a suite of indicators of estimating hydrological hazard potential. Other indicators for a watershed include elevation range, aspect, size, flow (volume, timing) and channel stability,
- A goal of future work is to be able to predict hydrological hazard for watersheds and then categorize that risk into broad classes such as high, moderate and low.
- Should this occur, the advisory group could then look to adjusting target 20 to better assess watershed health.

The group agreed that until new information can be reviewed within the context of the Okanagan SFM Plan, Target 20 on watershed ECA's and managing peak flows would remain.

2016 External Audit Schedule

Licensees had no determined dates for 2017 audits. Contact Tony or Jason at BCTS for the possibility to participate in an internal audit later this year.

2017 Field Trip

Paul (Tolko) has committed to hosting the field trip. The group liked the idea of going east into the Monashee mountains. No date was confirmed although Paul was going to advise on which of September 14th or September 28th might be best for their operations group. If possible, the group would like to see active cable harvesting operations. Please let Paul know if there are any specific topics that you would like to see in the field.

Meeting minutes will be posted to the documents page of the OK SFM Website.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.