

Nicola Thompson Fraser SFM Plan Public Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

April 5, 2018. Brambles bakery, Merritt

Attendees:

Liis Jeffries	Crystal Wallace	Harley Wright	Gerry Sanford
Lorne Wood	Andrew Lavigne	Chris Lepsoe	Reuben Irvine
Bert Parke	Matt Manuel	Brent Turmel	Craig Hewlett

Facilitator: Neil Fletcher

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. There were no additional items added to the agenda.

Action Items:

Four items from the previous meeting were reviewed, all had had been completed prior to the meeting..

Review the 2017 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, 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: Tolko 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 first year for reporting on that target. Targets were achieved on 41/42 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 form year to year. These procedures on how/what is reported for each target are

assessed by their 3rd 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 3rd 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 3: GSFP noted that they had an opportunity for improvement in their last audit that pertained to the target (Kamloops TSA). The question was whether the target remains valid and on track following the latest timber analysis – given the influence of the recent fire and beetle salvage. It was felt that the timber analysis in the latest Timber Supply Review would be able to provide this information. Craig agreed to look into this and confirm validity, then report back to the group at the next meeting.

Action: Craig to review timber analysis information from the latest TSR and report back at the next meeting.

Target 6c: There was a question about the terminology used in the report – what is a “masked species”? It was explained that this was a situation where mapping indicated that there was a red/blue species identified but the specifics of the species and exact location were not publicly available (to protect the species). This triggered further discussions to attain the specific information to manage the species/habitat.

Target 11: During their audit, Aspen had been asked if this target met the mark (average time to seed) as opposed to trying to report out on how quickly following disturbance and area is seeded. This was discussed and the consensus was that while seeding immediately after should be the general goal, there were situations (such as being in the midst of a drought period) where immediate seeding would not be desirable. In the end, it was felt that the existing target and reporting provided the PAG with the information they desired.

Target 19: It was noted how the year over year reporting has been influenced (in the Kamloops and Merritt Timber Supply Areas) by Tolko’s absence in the 2017 Plan.

Target 25: This was the one target that had not been met. The advisory group felt the rationale for not meeting the target was quite valid. The group suggested that in these cases where the inspection target was NOT met, that it would be useful to understand if the inspections not made were high risk road inspections. The feeling was that this would be more of an issue than if they all the road inspections not completed were moderate or low risk road inspections. Licensees felt this data would be available and could be reported on in the event the target was not met.

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 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 Tolko leaving the plan (and BCTS not reporting in 2018), the 3 year rolling average will need to be adjusted to recognize that.

Target 41: The target is another one with a hard number- that again will be influenced by the number and size of the licensees that are participating. With Tolko and BCTS not reporting for 2018, it was agreed to reduce the targets in the 2018 SFM Plan. The new targets are Kamloops – 10 actions, Merritt 5 actions and Lillooet 5 actions. Pat to make adjustment in the Plan.
Action: Pat to revise target 41 in the 2018 SFMP and repost the Plan on the NTF SFM website.

Licensee monitoring summaries: The Aspen, BCTS, Canfor and Gilbert Smith summary reports in the Appendix were quickly reviewed. 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.

General report feedback: Overall, the report was well done. There were no concerns with layout or how the data was presented.

Wetland Presentation – Neil Fletcher

Neil is the wetlands program manager for the BC Wildlife Federation (BCWF). Neil introduced BCWF's Wetlands Educational Program *that* builds the capacity of individuals and groups to assess their wetland assets, and, using this new knowledge, increase the capacity of communities to steward wetlands in their own backyards. There are more than 100 types of wetlands in BC, and to varying degrees all these wetlands contribute to sustainability. Neil noted how wetlands contribute to flood protection, water quality, plant and animal community stability and carbon capture and storage.

Neil also explained how he is working on the development of a field card that will help evaluate the effectiveness of how wetlands are being managed under the Forest and Range Practices Act (part of the Forest and Range Evaluation Program assessments). A draft of the card was reviewed and there was interest in the PAG to review further drafts of the evaluation card. Neil was to provide this information to Pat who could then re-distribute to advisory group members.

A copy of the presentation will be posted to the NTF SFM website. The advisory group thanked Neil for his presentation.

Current DFA Issues, Summary, Wrap-Up

PAG 2018 Field Trip

Agreed that we should schedule a field trip – to occur this fall. Aspen Planers volunteered to host, public members desired a meeting that was in proximity to Merritt. Agreed that Aspen should look at the window between September 17th and September 28th, 2018. Members felt that field trip stops could include examples of small stream management practices, and also a review of how targets are reported on for a recently harvest cutblock. PAG members are to contact Brent if there is anything you specifically want to review in the field that day. Pat to send out an email reminder and itinerary a few weeks prior to the date selected by Aspen.

Fall Meeting

At this point it is uncertain as to how much change might be needed for the 2019 SFM Plan. Should such a meeting be necessary (to review and agree upon proposed changes) a tentative meeting date of Thursday November 22, 2018 was selected. Meeting to occur in Merritt at Brambles bakery.

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm.