

Minutes

Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan

Public Advisory Group Meeting

Tolko - Vernon Office

January 28th, 2010

Attendees:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Keith Boulter | Paul Ross | Randy Hardy | Mike Watkins |
| Rob Kennett | Grant Thompson | Don Guild | Renee Clark |
| Richard Toperczer | Dave Gill | Scott Smith | James Moller |
| Barry Beadman | Colin Pierre | Patti Hansen | Clive Johnson |
| Ted McRae | Lorne Bradley | Pat Salm (Consultant) | |
| Mark Hopkins (Facilitator) | | | |

1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review

Following the self-introduction of the PAG members, the agenda was reviewed. Two items were added to the agenda:

- Review of the process for electronic distribution of PAG Mtg. Minutes.
- Proposed spring field trip dates.

2.0 Review of Minutes and Action Items from Dec 10th, 2009 PAG Meeting

The following revisions were made to the minutes of the Jan 7, 2010 PAG mtg. minutes:

Jan 7th PAG Mtg Minutes – top of page 7- highlighted text is inserted

Agreement: For the purposes of Indicators 6.1.2 and 6.1.3, old target 29 (c) is to be retained as revised (removing the word “available”). The new 1.4.2 (as previously agreed to) is retained in this sections as well.

Jan 7th PAG Mtg Minutes – bottom of page 7 - highlighted text is inserted

Agreement: The new target for indicator 6.3.1 is:
100% conformance with Site Plan commitments to manage for trails
In addition, the other “old” indicators will continue to apply to these criteria, specifically: 11, 18, 26 and 27

Jan 7th PAG Mtg Minutes – top of page 8 - highlighted text is inserted

Following some discussion amongst the PAG members there was no agreement at this meeting on how best to measure, track, report and/or reapply grass seed where there was little or no “take”. This remains an outstanding issue to be addressed at a future date and will be added to Appendix 2 of the Plan (Information for Future Consideration).

“100 Percent of contractors conducting on-the-ground work that are SAFE Company registered and/or certified, or that carry an equivalent safety program”.

The following Action Item from the previous meeting was completed:

Action Item (Jan 7th): Mark to Establish link to *Planet Friendly Canada* website from SFM page

Clive/Dave: both brought samples of maps depicting both protected ecosystems and OGMA’s these were made available for members (as per a previous action item).

Pat: Reviewed new material for insertion into PAG member binder.

3.0 Criteria 3 - Soil and Water - Discussion

Members were advised, in advance of this meeting, which background reading material should be reviewed prior to today’s session, specifically (for Criteria’s 3 and 5):

- Seasonality and Forest Harvesting: How to Minimize Site Impacts Throughout the Year
- Sourcing Local: Building Durable Partnerships and Strong Local Economies.
- FREP Report #18 Review of Forest Stewardship Plan Results and Strategies for the Cultural Heritage Resource Value.
- Bio-energy News release
- Extension Note #'s 91 (BMP’s for Soil Conservation) and 88 (MPB, Forest Practices and Watershed Management)

Discussion arising from the reading:

Clive: would like to see Indicator requiring inspection of roads blocks in early spring. Run off while ground is still frozen can be problematic. Nothing in pre-reading addresses this.

Pat: In previous meetings and contained within the existing SFM Plan we talked about permanent and temporary road inspection indicators addressing that issue for roads.

Clive: Yes, but not on the blocks.

General discussion occurred on areas harvested and the timing of subsequent surveys or inspections of recently harvested areas that would identify any water quality issues as a result of operations. Surveys and inspections include:

- measuring of waste materials, assessment of appropriate site preparation method,
- inspections on the quality of site preparation, assessment of the block for planting or natural regeneration,
- inspections on the quality of the trees planted,
- surveys to ensure harvest areas are adequately reforested.

3.1 Criteria 3 Soil and Water – Indicators

Criteria 3.1.1 – Level of Soil Disturbance

Pat: Outlined, in a general sense the suite of “old” indicators felt to be applicable to Criteria 3.1.1, specifically: 12, 14, and 19. Also, pat described the process of setting soil disturbance limits in SP’s.

Scott: How are the percentage disturbance numbers measured? Transects?

Paul: No, it’s based on compliance with the calculated disturbance limits in the SP; as compared to post harvest inspection reports. Sometimes there are silvicultural access issues.

Rob T.: Soil disturbance levels are also followed-up on through audits by MoF Compliance and Enforcement staff. Generally, it is very difficult to find any excessive disturbance with the MoF District.

Pat: There has been some correlation testing done between ocular assessments and actual disturbance levels; thereby establishing ocular benchmarks.

Randy: Gorman’s conducted an in-house workshop on this topic (calibrating ocular assessments to actual measured levels).

| |
|---------------------|
| Action Item: |
|---------------------|

| |
|--|
| Randy to send Mark material on the workshop to forward to the PAG |
|--|

Scott: Indicator seems to require actual measurement. Not on the roads, but on the blocks.

Richard: typically ocular measurements are done first, if things are “close” then more detailed measurements are taken.

Paul: Ruts are typically a much bigger issue in terms of water diversion. Paul described the silvicultural (planting) implications.

Scott: What is it about the disturbance that makes an area unplantable?

Paul: Compaction and puddling - standing water.

Clive: Don’t you do soil assessments in advance? This all seems after the fact. You need to consider the effect of slopes, sedimentation, and in some areas uranium levels in the soil. Thinks 10% disturbance in some areas is too high and that the standards need to focus on specific areas.

Pat: The maximum 5% soil disturbance limit in legislation is specific to those sites where soils are sensitive, based on factors such as soil texture, soil moisture and slope gradient. Other less sensitive soils generally have a 10% soil disturbance limit and these are maximum targets. The prescribing professional will make a commitment to the actual disturbance limit in the SP and it is the achievement of this number that is reported on in the SFM Plan.

Mike: We really need to look at, and focus on soil and water issues – not silvicultural issues.

Rob: When writing an SP you are prescribing measures which will protect the soil, water, and other issue as well.

Grant: the logging supervisor will have to sign-off as having complied with the SP. Water is always a prime consideration.

Mike: I'm happy to know that the prescription includes these issues.

Renee: How soon do the silvicultural workers come in? Is there a detrimental time lag between completion of harvesting and the commencement of silvicultural operations?

Pat: possibly on some winter-logged blocks. Not generally so much a soil issue – more of a waterflow issue.

Clive: What is the post-harvest inspection process?

Rob: Described the check-list process used by Tolko. Generally signed-off by a Forestry Technician.

Clive: So a “qualified” type signs off.

Lorne: A couple of years ago we had about 8 slides in the Seymour Arm area – one particularly large one. Just shows you what a little inattention can do.

Clive: described the long-term impact of a slide which went into Jones Lake –

Scott: In Agricultural soil disturbance issues, it was concluded that you can only come up with a determination of the risk of impacting soil quality. Could/should we develop a risk-based Indicator?

Paul: We do that now (Paul described the process)

Scott: 10% disturbance on a steep slope is certainly more “risky” than on flat ground.

Paul: We could report out on the “high” and “very high” risk categories as separate items. By cut-blocks or hectares?

Scott: Believes the report should reflect the relative risk categories.

Clive: Very difficult to see what's going on with the soil under field conditions. Concerned with soil mixing and feels there should be sample pits established.

Pat: We do review soil productivity ultimately in the determination of the mean annual increment (MAI) that is used in Timber Supply Review.

Grant: Takes exception to Clive's reference to “rampaging” loggers. - went on to describe the whole process of managing the soil resource during harvest.

Clive: It's been a while since I've been involved in logging, but I was still seeing these (soil) issues in '95.

Pat: Licencees will have to consider the issue of risk category reporting (compatibility issues). Suggested that licencees report out on "old" indicator 19 - expanding it to include breakdown by risk categories.

Paul: Described possible stratification of reporting.

Action Item: Spring Field Trip to include soil disturbance issues if possible.

Clive: Is there any way to evaluate soil disturbance not caused by the licensee (i.e. recreationalists, ranchers, etc)

Scott: No, not really, we can and should focus on those things which we have control over.

Action Item: Licencees will review information pertaining to indicator #19 and propose alternate wording to the Facilitator. The proposed wording will be circulated to the PAG (prior to Feb 11th mtg.)

Scott: Don't Licencees have road-rating systems in place? Is reporting on the number of roads in the various risk categories feasible?

Paul: Yes, we did look at this last year sometime. The licencees have similar, but not identical risk categories and it was concluded at the time that there was little benefit to trying to standardize them.

Scott: Couldn't you just report each licensee's numbers as they are. Do they need consolidation?

Dave: We (BCTS) could report the information without much trouble.

Agreement: For the purposes of Indicator 3.1.1

- "old" indicators 12 and 14 are accepted as they are.
- "old" indicator 19 is accepted - subject to additional wording that would provide the reporting of harvested area where soil sensitivity was determined to be very high (maximum 5% soil disturbance level). Shown as a percent of the total, this reporting over time would give an indication of the potential risk to soil from operations.

Scott: I would like to see a tally of road-risk categories over time.

Renee: I would like to see risk-based reporting as well.

Scott: Tracking actions is always better than just tracking inspections.

Pat: Described the following issue with regard to tracking “actions”. High priority issues a dealt with immediately, and often are never entered into plans. As a consequence, only low priority issues end up tracked in the plans.

Randy: One complication is that under Gorman’s system all new roads are considered as high risk until they have time to stabilize.

James: If the issues being dealt (the high priority ones) are not going into the activity tracking systems, how are future plans being made?

Richard: We want to report the result – not the process (i.e. landslides, not inspections)

Agreement: For the purposes of 3.1.1:

“Licencees will report annually on the number of km of permanent road, by risk category, where they hold management responsibility”

Note: later in the meeting it was agreed that this reporting would be included under Element 3.2 (Water Quality and Quantity) within former SFM Plan indicator 21 (inspections of permanent roads).

Criteria 3.1.2 - Level of Downed Woody Debris

Pat: reviewed the two indicators (6 and 36) which he felt were appropriate for the purposes of Indicator 3.1.2.

Richard: isn’t #6 contained within #36?

Pat: For the most part, “yes” but it was a special request from a previous PAG mtg. The objectives are a bit different, indicator 36 was quite specific to improving martin habitat.

Rob: From a reporting perspective, it is probably easier to report #6 and #36 the way they are currently set up.

Paul: #6 is really directed at the “dispersed” CWD.

Mike: Is the current interest in bio-fuel changing the way things are done with respect to CWD

Paul: Bio-fuel seems focused on processor debris for the most part [note: roadside material – not dispersed].

Rob: We would not be altering plans to remove more CWD from the site.

Agreement: For the purposes of Criteria 3.1.2, “old” Indicators 6 and 36 are adopted as targets

Element 3.2 Water Quality and Quantity

Pat: Described the history of “old” Indicator #13 and the fact that it does not fully meet the requirements of 3.2.1. Suggested new target related to ECA (included in Jan 28 binder package).

Rob: Which watersheds? How big would the ones focused on be?

Pat: I am suggesting some sort of risk ranking to limit the watersheds needing further assessment. Could be just Community Watersheds.

Lorne: There are lots of people getting their water from outside of Community Watersheds and the MoE is not entertaining the issuance of new Community Watershed designations.

Renee: Completed assessments need to be utilized/recognized. The MoE has a list of completed assessments.

Mark: explained the origin of the 35% ECA. The proposed “trigger” point for further hydrologic assessment before further operations occur.

Renee: Sees the ECA calculation more as a water “quality” issue. We operate more as supply and demand managers.

Paul: Is there a connection between the supply and forestry operations?

James: It’s very difficult to quantify – too many variables.

Richard: can we use a simple target like “are you compliant with your plans?”

Scott: Likes Pat’s proposal, but do we need to include a strict 35% trigger point?

James: How do we initiate quality mitigation measures when there are increasing ECA’s (for natural disturbance)?

Paul: Summarized Dobson Engineering study findings for the group.

Mike: Why do we need to use 35%? on specific watersheds? (the top 25?) How many existing assessments are currently out there?

Renee: Of about 60 identified domestic watersheds about 10 have existing assessments (source water assessments).

Scott: Are ECA calculations expensive?

Grant: Yes. Not so much the ECA calculation itself, but the complete assessment is.

Clive: At the LRMP this was an issue. Clive thinks the Tolko FSP approach is good [description of when where an assessment will be completed] but believes a “trigger” number is appropriate.

Mike: We need to remember that we are managing water for the resources sake, not just for specific purveyors or users.

Scott: Is it the role of the PAG to “trigger” anything? We shouldn’t be driving practices.

Ted: Agrees with Scott’s comment.

Action Item: General agreement for a target specific to community watersheds where harvest operations were occurring – to at least report the current ECA level for each. Mark and Pat to refine wording on target for 3.2.1 when and where watershed assessments will be conducted. This will be circulated to the PAG for comment before the next meeting.

Agreement: Keep Old #13 as additional indicator and target for (numbered 3.2.2)

Indicator 21 and 22 Discussion

Pat: Indicated that old indicator 21 and 22 are not required to meet the requirements for core indicators – but they can be retained if the PAG feels they have application in assessing sustainability commitments related to waster quality and quantity. General agreement to continue reporting on these. Also agreed that reporting of the percentage of roads by risk category (see Agreement earlier in the minutes related to 3.1.1) should occur with the reporting of old indicator 21. Pat to add a line item in the monitoring report template for this to occur.

Agreement: Retain “old” indicator 21 and re-number it as 3.2.3. Add “by risk category” to the end of the target.

Agreement: Retain “old” indicator 22 and re-number it as 3.2.4. Add a reporting of the percent permanent roads where licencees have management responsibility “by risk category” to the target.

4.0 Criteria 5 – Economic and Social Benefits

Facilitator: Allowed for general questions on the discussion item topics arising from the reading or other sources. As no specific comments arose, it was agreed to proceed directly to the targets themselves.

Criteria 5.1.1 – Timber and non-Timber Benefits

Agreement: Following limited discussion, and for the purposes of indicator 5.1 1, it was agreed to retain “old” indicators 25 and 26 as targets.

Pat: reviewed the current and proposed suite of targets for Criteria 5.1.1

Agreement: It was further agreed that in addition to the inclusion of targets for old indicators 11, 18, 27 and 30:

- the newly revised “trails” target (also found in 6.3.1) and the target for sacred and culturally important sites (also found in 1.4.2) should be added to 5.1.1
- the “old” indicator 28 should not be included in 5.1.1.

Grant: The purpose of SFM registration is to demonstrate consideration of a range of benefits.

Agreement:

Ensure text of SFM plan addresses the referral process, how other tenure holders are contacted, how the broader public has opportunity to participate in land use and forest management decision making and the fact that there is no exclusion from the landbase. A summary of this text information could be referenced in the indicator text

Criteria 5.2.1 - Communities and Stability

Pat: Described correlation between harvest volumes and local spending.

Rob: Supplied the following breakdown on expenditures by Tolko Woodlands:

| | | |
|----------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| Logging | 37% | of Log Cost – 100% local |
| Hauling | 20% | of Log Cost – 100% local |
| Roads | 7% | of Log Cost – 100% local |
| Reforestation | 9% | of Log Cost – 60% local |
| Indirect (Sal./fees) | 11% | of Log Cost – 9% local |
| Stumpage | 16% | of Log Cost – provincial |

Weighted Average 70% local

Weighted Average (less stumpage) 83.5% Local

Grant: Presented similar numbers to the Westbank First Nation Council. 80% of cost stays in Band. 100% stays in the Okanagan valley.

Action Item: Gorman’s and BCTS to provide Pat with logging phase cost breakdown, similar to the above. Mainly looking to see if these numbers are vastly different between organizations. They will then be averaged and included in the text information surrounding Indicator 5.2.1.

Agreement: Retain old indicator 25,26 as suggested and include text information related to the cost of sourcing logs and how much of those costs are retained locally.

Indicator 5.2.2 – Level of Investment in Training and Skills Development.

Pat: Suggested removal of “old” target #23 and proposed the new more inclusive target included in PAG binder (Jan 28 update). The new proposed targets are more inclusive. There are two parts; one directed at contractors, the other at woodlands employees.

Agreement: For the purposes of Indicator 5.2.2. the inclusion of the two proposed new targets is agreed to as suggested: (see Jan 28th PAG binder insert – page 10)

(new) Percent of DFA forest contractors having both environmental training, including invasive plant awareness, and safety training (90% target).

(new) Percent of woodlands employees trained in accordance with training plans (90% target).

5.0 Next Meeting:

9:00am – 4:00pm

Thursday, February 11th, 2010

Kelowna, BC

Location: to be announced.