

**Minutes**  
**Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Advisory Group Meeting**  
**Ramada Inn – Kelowna**  
**April 10, 2008**

**8:00am Pre-Meeting Summary for New Participants:**

Prior to the commencement of the full Public Advisory Group (PAG) meeting, a short orientation session was held for a new members of the Okanagan PAG. In addition to a verbal outline on the history and development of SFM certification systems in general, and the development of the SFM process in the Okanagan specifically; each new participant was provided with an orientation package including the following materials:

- Canadian Standards Association SFM brochure on the CSA system (doc # 095-21(VI-10/07).
- A copy of the Okanagan PAG Terms of Reference (as revised December 7, 2006)
- Flow chart showing the respective roles of the PAG members and participating Licencees.
- Brochure entitled, “*Summary Comparison of Forest Certification Standards in Canada*”.
- A copy of the Z809-2 Standard

The above noted documents were introduced to the new members and the highlights touched upon. Terminology was reviewed as part of the review of *Annex C* of the Z809-2 document. Questions were answered as they arose.

**9:00am Full Public Advisory Group Meeting - Attendees**

<u>Reg Volk</u>	Don Guild	<u>Grant Thompson</u>
Paul Ross	<u>Randy Hardy</u>	<u>Kerry Rouck</u>
<u>Peter Kerr</u>	Mike Watkins	<u>Brian Drobe</u>
<u>Dave Gill</u>	<u>Rob Kennett</u>	Keith Boulter
Peter Wise	Patti Hansen	John Friesen
Ellen Simmons	Ed Sims	<u>Lorne Bradley</u>
Ted McCrae	Karl Wabnegger	

Facilitator: Mark Hopkins

(Note: underlined individuals above were also present at the “pre-meeting”)

**1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review**

Following the self introduction of all participants, the agenda was reviewed; no changes were requested or made.

## 2.0 Action Items from Previous Meeting (December 3, 2007)

See attached table for status of Action Items (AI's) completed and outstanding

## 3.0 2007 Monitoring Report Review

Following the review of the summary tables in the report, the following Indicator specific discussions/questions ensued:

### **Indicator: (1) Representation of Seral Stage distribution by Natural Disturbance Type**

Results reviewed, non-conformance in NDT4 was noted. Similar in scope to last years results, despite the inclusion of the Gorman Bros. DFA in the 2007 results. Significant volume in the Mature category which will "fill" shortage of "old" in coming years.

Q: What about the role of OGMA's in the retention of "old" forest types?

A: Licencees collectively responded that in instance where OGMA is harvested for any reason, a similar area of similar make-up is selected to replace it. Also the 2008 plan has been altered to require reporting of OGMA incursions.

Q: What about the positioning of Old growth on the landscape, the lack of connectivity is a problem for many animal species?

A: companies have in many cases been trying to aggregate OGMA and other dispersed Wildlife Tree patches to minimize amount of "edge" and related blow down. Issue recognized, but problematic

### **Indicator: (2)**

- **Incidents of harvesting in rare ecosystems**
- **Non-compliance with the Identified Wildlife Management Strategy (IWMS)**  
**Non-compliance with OSLRMP/KBLUP strategies for identified wildlife.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: Is this a sham? Is anything ever going to be declared as "known" and therefore entitled to protection?

A: There are a number of areas which may be declared "in the works" but nothing yet. Expectation is that there will be a number of areas coming soon.

**AI:** we should look at revising the term "rare ecosystem" in plan to be more consistent with current requirements.

It was noted that there seems to be decreasing support from government of the requirements of existing LRMP's (mainly due to lack of original aboriginal involvement)

### **Indicator: (3) Report on Total Area of Clearcuts by Size Categories.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

The results do not convey the problem of fragmentation on the landscape. Even with small clearcuts they may be extensive in a given area.

**Parking Lot:** Consider ways and means of incorporating connectivity into an indicator.

Q: Does roll-up of results cover up the results of the poorer operators?

A: Each of the licencees felt that the rolled-up results were generally indicative of their own operations. . It was noted that harvest results from Timber Sale Licences (TSL's) are required to give complete picture.

**AI:** This issue was identified as a topic for discussion at the Fall field trip.

**Indicator: (4) Riparian Management Areas (As Per The FPC, FRPA and the Approved OSLRMP/KBLUP) for Wetlands, Lakes and Streams.**

Results reviewed, including elaboration on the specific details of the two incidents of non-conformance. Mainly a document management issue (wrong map version)

**Indicator: (5) Percent of Cutblocks Requiring a Site Plan with Associated Wildlife Tree Retention (Patches and/or Individual Trees)**

**Percent of harvested cutblocks that contain an average of 2-5 stubs or standing trees per hectare, giving consideration to spatial distribution**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: is it appropriate to assume that WT attributes are available in surrounding area?

A: Only in the case of intact forest or reserve.

Q: where did the 2-5 stubs/ha target come from?

A: provincial target, based on loose science, based mainly on the requirements of birds.

**AI:** should the target be revised in light of record of significantly surpassing the 80% of blocks stub requirement

Comment made that generally, licencees seem to be doing a good job on this indicator.

**Indicator: (6) Percent of Cutblocks where Management of Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) is Consistent with Plans.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

The definition of CWD was described, for the benefit of new members. CWD recognized as an important issue for fur bearers (*esp.* Marten/Fisher) and there prey *spp.* Concern was expressed that burning of forest debris (co-generation) may create more demand for material that would otherwise be left behind as CWD. Generally felt that logging is too clean although lots of debris was noted on last Fall tour.

**AI:** Seek to identify suitable expert for presentation on topic at Fall mtg. also include as part of Fall field tour if possible.

**Indicator: (7) Percent of Harvested Cutblocks Having Three or More Tree Species Identified in the Free Growing Inventory.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: Are other species being tried where appropriate?

A: Yes, within the limitations imposed by regulation and ecology of the area.

Comment: Biodiversity is key for squirrels and other small animals, don't want to knock everything down and start over where not necessary (beetle areas in particular).

**AI:** for consideration by licencees - is it possible to refine the report to be more informative on the types of reserves included in blocks. This topic too should be addressed during field trip if possible.

**Indicator (8) Forest Age Class Distribution**

Results reviewed, no discussion ensued as the data was taken directly from TSR III.

**Indicator (9) Percent of Planted Area for the Current Planting Year Regenerated in Accordance With Seed Transfer Guidelines.**

Results reviewed, no specific discussion ensued

**Indicator: (10) Protected Ecosystems**

Results reviewed, no specific discussion ensued as data taken directly from current TSR report.

**Indicator: (11) Amount of Time for Road Cut and Fill-Slope Revegetation Application (Control of Noxious Weed)**

Results reviewed, no specific discussion followed on the specifics of the results. The comment was made that many licencees seem to be expanding the width of R/W's on some roads, by removing brush or trees. Licencees noted that in many cases this has been done for safety reasons related to the number of roadside snags brought about by Pine Beetle tree mortality.

**AI:** Paul Ross will look at the effectiveness of the R/W clearing in relation to safety objective.

**Indicator: (12) Annual percent of opening areas in permanent access structures.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: is there any follow-up on seeded areas to make sure that the seed "took"?

A: Licencees include this assessment as part of the regular road monitoring program.

Q: why has the percentage in roads and landing fallen, despite the increase in harvest area?

A: As block size has increased, roads can access the area more efficiently.

Paul Ross notes that Tolko is looking at the relative effectiveness of total rehab on tree growth as compared to less aggressive treatment.

**Indicator: (13) Managing Water Quality**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Tolko noted that most of the roads mentioned were re-construction, not new roads in Community Watersheds. Similarly, there was very little that could be done regarding "high" ratings due to constraints of original construction.

Q: what sort of extraordinary measures were taken?

A: depending on circumstance, could be cross drains, hay bales, seeding, silt fence etc.

Q: Who has the long-term responsibility for these roads?

A: Whoever holds the Road Permit, Road Use Permit or Cutting Permit, some roads may be transferred to the crown, some may become “wilderness roads” with no-specific responsibility, but not until any required risk-reducing mitigation is completed.

**Indicator: (14) Number of induced slides resulting from forest management activities (>.1 ha) originating in or adjacent to harvested areas or inspected permanent roads**

Results reviewed, no specific discussion arose:

**Indicator: (15) Percent of harvest priorities related to forest health completed by date set out in strategies**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: Where did the 70% target come from?

A: 70% is the TSA target for licencees collectively.

**Indicator: (16)**

- **Percent of cutblock area planned for planting is completed before or during the second complete growing season**
- **Percent of naturally regenerated cutblock area not meeting the natural Regeneration delay**

Results reviewed, it was noted that it is difficult to reduce reforestation delay by any further amount. Particularly for BCTS, where awarded TSL’s may be legally harvested anywhere within a 2 year window.

**Indicator: (17) Percentage of cutblock area that meets free growing requirements on or before the latest date.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: is there any specific brush species targeted for herbicide use?

A: a mix depending on location, some herbaceous, some brush, some deciduous tree

Q: Can we do anything to reduce the amount of herbicide use?

A: All other alternative treatments are considered, herbicide only considered or used where no viable alternatives exist.

**AI:** Licencees will consider tracking the use of herbicides over time.

**Indicator: (18) Report on access management commitments contained in forest development plans (FDPs)/Forest Stewardship Plans (FSPs).**

Results reviewed, no discussion specific to the indicator ensued

**Indicator: (19) Percent of cutblocks harvested in which soil disturbance exceeds level specified in plan**

Results reviewed, no discussion specific to the indicator ensued

**Indicator: (20) Incidents of non-conformance with government direction on recovery plans for regionally significant species**

Results reviewed, Weyerhaeuser elaborated on the specific species management area for Williamson's Sapsucker

**Indicator: (21) Percent of permanent status roads that have had inspections completed as per plans.**

Results reviewed, the following discussion arose:

Q: Is this the reporting item that needed improved coordination amongst the licencees

A: Yes, most of the issues resolved.

**Indicator: (22) Percent of temporary status roads inspected at least once per year until road has been rehabilitated.**

Results reviewed, facilitator explained the result indicating achievement over 100%.

No further discussion specific to the indicator ensued.

**Indicator: (23) Percent of the licencees' forest operations employees and primary contractors trained in Spill Preparedness and Response procedures.**

Results reviewed, the non-conformance was noted. The responsible licencee noted that the issue was not so much one of staff/contractors receiving the training; rather it was the incomplete documentation that the training had occurred. Required improvement noted.

**Indicator: (24) Number of legally reportable spills.**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (25) Harvest level.**

AI: Error noted in results table, facilitator will revise and circulate errata.

**Indicator: (26) Report annual initiatives/partnerships.**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (27) Level of compliance with preservation, retention and partial retention of visual quality objectives in licensee plans.**

Results reviewed, there was some further discussion on the relaxation of VQO's in the case of salvaging "damaged" timber.

**Indicator: (28) Report on:**

- OSLRMP committee involvement
  - Number of Forest Development Plan/Forest Stewardship Plan meetings attended
- Number of stakeholder meetings attended**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (29) Incorporation of traditional knowledge, non-timber resources, and cultural and spiritual values in forest planning, where available.**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (30) Report educational and research initiatives**

Results reviewed, limited discussion ensued:

Q: Where is Flammulated Owl study?

A: Believed to be in the Westside area of Okanagan Lake

**AI:** Rob Kennett will find out status of provincial SFM initiative

**AI:** Kerry R. will talk to Tom Sullivan (small mammal expert) about participation in Fall field trip and/or fall meeting

**Indicator: (31) Percent response to written communications received.**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (32) Report annually on the number of First Nation partnerships.**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (33) An effective Public Advisory Group**

Results reviewed, including chart in appendix, no further discussion arose.

**Indicator: (34) Educational forums**

Results reviewed, no further discussion arose:

**Indicator: (35) Public awareness of the SFMP**

Results reviewed, questions arising include:

Q: How open is the PAG group, how widely has it been advertised?

A: It was advertised widely upon commencement but recent membership has largely been targeted to cover specific forest management interests, both geographically and issues wise. As each new licensee has been added the PAG has expanded.

**AI:** licensees should consider ways and means of expanding/ improving representation on the PAG.

**Indicator: (36) Percentage of cutblocks where coarse woody debris piling is necessary to achieve silviculture activities that a proportion was then retained in loose piles or windrows within 50 meters of timber edge or riparian management areas.**

Results reviewed, questions arising include:

Q: can accumulations of debris be tracked by volume? Is there some way to track the volume/proportion which is burned?

**AI:** this issue will be considered by the licensees.

## **4.0 Upcoming Audit Season**

The licencees note the following upcoming audit dates, PAG members are welcome to participate on the audits.

<b>Gorman's</b>	September 24 – 26
<b>Tolko</b>	Week of August 25 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Weyerhaeuser</b>	Week of October 4 <sup>th</sup>
<b>BCTS</b>	Audit completed Feb, 2008

## **5.0 Upcoming Meeting Dates:**

Please note the following upcoming PAG meeting dates:

- **2008 Fall Field Tour – BCTS Hosting**  
Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008
- **Fall 2008 PAG Meeting**  
Thursday, November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2008

**Okanagan Sustainable Management Plan - Public Advisory Group Action Tracker**

<b>Action #</b>	<b>Creation Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
AI -1	27-Nov-07	Circulate copy of Don Dobson Risk Assessment amongst Licencees	ReneeClark	31-Dec-07	Complete	
AI-2	27-Nov-07	Licencees will circulate Road Risk rating System amongst themselves for possible standardization	Paul Ross	31-Jan-08	Complete	Information circulated, standardization not yet complete
AI-3	27-Nov-07	Revise summary table for Indicator 8 to include both "Gross" and "THLB" areas for the DFA. Expand TSR info in body of report	Licencees	31-Jan-08	Complete	The table was revised in the revised in 2008 Plan
AI-4	27-Nov-07	Update Plan and Monitoring report text for outdated administrative references (e.g. Forest Practices Code)	Mark Hopkins	March 31, 2008	Complete	Completed as part of revisions to 2008 Plan. Reference to FDP removed except where appropriate in historic context.
AI-5	27-Nov-07	Have draft proposal for possible re-wording of Indicator #21 available for Spring monitoring meeting.	Scott Smith	March, 2008	outstanding	
AI-6	27-Nov-07	Strive to schedule future meeting dates on Thursdays	Mark Hopkins	N/A	completed	All scheduled meeting dates are currently on Thursdays.
AI-7	April 10, 2008	Should look at revising the term "rare ecosystem" in plan to be more consistent with current requirements.	Licencees	July, 2008		For discussion prior to fall Mtg.
AI-8	April 10, 2008	Look at distribution of Clearcut areas relative to the indicator objective as part of Fall 2008 Field trip	Licencees	Sep. 4, 2008 Field review		

AI-9	April 10, 2008	should the target be revised in light of record of significantly surpassing the 80% of blocks stub requirement	Licencees	Sep. 4, 2008 Field Review	For discussion presentation at Fall PAG meeting
AI-10	April 10, 2008	Seek to identify suitable expert for presentation on topic at Fall mtg. also include as part of Fall field tour if possible.	Facilitator/ BCTS	By Sep 4 <sup>th</sup> Fall field Trip	In prep for possible inclusion on Fall field Trip
AI-11	April 10, 2008	for consideration by licencees- is it possible to refine the report to be more informative on the types of reserves included in blocks. This topic too should be addressed during field trip if possible.	Licencees	At fall Filed Trip	BCTS to include in Field tour if possible, and subsequent discussion prior to Fall PAG meeting
AI-12	April 10, 2008	As part of Indicator #17 Licencees will consider tracking the use of herbicides over time.	Licencees	October 31, 2008	In time for discussion/presentation at Fall PAG meeting
AI-13	April 10, 2008	Indicator #25 Error noted in monitoring results table, facilitator will revise and circulate errata.	Facilitator	April 18, 2008	ASAP
AI-14	April 10, 2008	<b>AI:</b> Rob Kennett will find out status of provincial SFM initiative	Rob Kennett	By October 31, 2008	In Prep for presentation at Nov meeting
AI-15	April 10, 2008	<b>AI:</b> Kerry R. will talk to Tom Sullivan (small mammal expert)	Kerry R.	July, 08	In prep for possible inclusion on Fall field Trip

		about participation in Fall field trip and/or fall meeting				
AI-16	April 10, 2008	Licencees should consider ways and means of expanding/improving representation on the PAG.				
AI-17	April 10, 2008	Can accumulations of debris be tracked by volume? Is there some way to track the volume or proportion which is burned? <b>AI:</b> this issue will be considered by the licencees.				

