

**Merritt Timber Supply Area  
Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

**Meeting Summary  
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, April 3, 2008**

	<i>SFM Advisory Group Member</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
	Al Clarke	Radio NL Merritt
✓	Andrea Inwards	Merritt Sunrise Rotary Club
✓	Bob Chambers	Ranching/ Woodlot, Merritt
✓	Brian Drobe	Weyerhaeuser (Princeton)
✓	Bruce Beech	Tolko
✓	Chris Lepsoe	Merritt
	Cory Kuromi	Ardev Wood Products
✓	Dave Doubek	Stu'wix
	Dennis MacDonald	Stu'wix
✓	Elizabeth Salomon de Friedberg	Merritt
✓	Frank Armitage	Princeton
	Frank Etchart	Merritt
	Franz Reuter	Merritt
✓	Gerry Sanford	Merritt
	Heather Thomson	Merritt
	Ian Black	BCTS (Kamloops)
✓	Jerry Canuel	Aspen Planers
✓	Katharine Shewchuk	Merritt
✓	Ken Taylor	NVIT, Merritt
	Lennard Joe	Nicola Tribal Association
✓	Len Marsh	Cascades Forest District
	Leona Antoine	Merritt
	Lyle Leclair	Stu'wix
	Nelson Patry	Princeton
✓	Norm Hansen	Merritt
✓	Pat Salm	SFM Advisory Group Facilitator
✓	Paul Willms	NVIT, Merritt
✓	Rick Cooper	BCTS (Kamloops)
✓	Steve Borcsok	Upper Similkameen Indian Band
✓	Todd Chamberlain	Ardev Wood Products
✓	Wayne Schindler	Woodlots/ Ranching, Merritt
✓	Wendy McKinney	Tolko

## 1. Introduction and Agenda Review

Pat called the meeting to order shortly after 4:00 pm. Frank Armitage of Princeton was welcomed to the meeting and members of the group were asked to introduce themselves. Pat stated that the main objective of the meeting would be to review the 2007 Monitoring Report. He proceeded to review the agenda with the group.

## 2. Action Items from previous meeting

Pat briefly reviewed the action items from the December 6, 2007 meeting. It was noted that all action items had been completed, except one (report on communications initiatives) which was on the agenda.

## 3. SFM Plan performance for 2007

Pat informed the group that the Monitoring Report summarized how licensees performed against the indicators in the 2007 SFM Plan between January and December 2007. He noted that all major licensees except Stu'wix and BCTS report on all 34 of the indicators. Stu'wix and BCTS report on 32 indicators because they do not have manufacturing facilities. In addition, the Small Scale Salvage Program reports on a smaller subset of the indicators, because many of the indicators are not applicable.

Pat reviewed the pages 6 and 7 of the Monitoring Report with the group. He explained that the Performance Summary tables on p.7 showed how the licensees were doing overall against the CSA criteria. A question was raised in regard to why the percentages in "Percent Achieved" column in the first table were so different than the second table. Pat explained that the percentages in the first table were a reflection of how many indicators relating to a criterion were achieved, whereas the second table showed performance level for each indicator where the target was not met. For instance, the first table shows that 4 of 5 indicators relating to "Maintenance of Forest Ecosystem Condition Productivity" were achieved which translates to 80%. It was suggested that, in the future, this might be better represented by numbers. Others agreed.

**DECISION: Use numbers rather than percentages to show performance against criterion in Table 1 of the Monitoring Report in the future.**

Pat informed the group that indicators 10, 15, 16 and 22 were not achieved by licensees during the 2007 reporting period. He proceeded to review these indicators in detail with the group.

### ***Indicator #10 Free Growing***

Ninety nine percent of harvested areas met free growing requirements on or before the late free growing date. Fifty eight hectares did not meet the target for this indicator because they were surveyed after the late free growing date. If they had been surveyed on time, they would have been found to be free growing.

### ***Indicator #15 ECAs exceeding 35%***

Two cutblocks with ECAs greater than 35% did not have further hydrological assessments because they were major expedited salvage for mountain pine beetle. Although assessments were not carried out for these areas, the licensee implemented measures that would have come out of an assessment. Recommendations of hydrological assessments are usually quite generic in nature e.g. road reclamation, removing culverts etc.

It was noted that there would be a lot more of this in next year's report given the current beetle situation. Pat posed a question to the group as to whether they felt the target or the variance for the

indicator needed to be modified. The group discussed this and decided to leave the indicator alone until the new CSA standard had been released.

***ACTION: Revisit the Target and Variance for Indicator #15 once the new CSA Standard has been released.***

***Indicator #16 Road/ Structure Inspections and Maintenance Action Items***

The targets for this indicator were not met because one road inspection and one maintenance action item was not carried out. The inspection that was missed involved a 40 metre dead end spur of road. The action item that was missed involved culvert near Lawless Creek where the fill over the culvert was starting to erode. The culvert was either to be removed or extended, but they ran out of time so it was not completed. The action item has been rescheduled for 2008. A question was raised as to whether the stream was fish-bearing. It was noted that it was not.

***Indicator #22 Visual Impact Assessments (VIA)***

This indicator was not achieved because one VIA was not conducted. The area involved 1 hectare of a block falling within a scenic area with a Visual Quality Objective of "Modification". A VIA was not conducted because the SP (dated 1998) did not acknowledge that it was within a scenic area. There was no negative impact to scenic quality as a result of this because the area was so small.

Pat informed the group that he had received an e-mail from Elizabeth with a couple of other comments regarding the 2008 SFM Plan and the 2007 Monitoring Report. He mentioned that Elizabeth had raised a question as to why pg. 7 of the SFM Plan refers to "14 licensees", while the Monitoring Report (p.5) states that there were thirteen forest licensees that developed the initial SFM Plan. Pat explained that both statements were correct because when the SFM Plan was originally drafted, there were only thirteen licensees, however, now that Stu'wix has come on board there are fourteen. Some felt that this was confusing and that changes should be made to make the reports consistent with one another.

***ACTION: Revise statement on pg. 7 of the SFM Plan to reference "14 licensees" for the 2009 edition.***

Another observation made by Elizabeth was that page 5 of the Monitoring Report under the topic of Continual Improvement makes reference to "34 targets". She noted that the statement was incorrect as there were 34 *indicators* and 42 *targets* for those indicators. Pat affirmed that the terminology would be revised to "indicators" for next year's Monitoring Report. It was noted that there would only be 33 indicators for the 2008 Monitoring Report.

***ACTION: Change terminology on page 5 under "Continual Improvement" to "33 indicators" for 2008 Monitoring Report.***

***Advisory Group Evaluation Summary***

Pat reviewed trends of the Advisory Group Evaluation Summary (data from Indicator #35 found in Appendix 2). He noted that survey questions 2 and 3 pertained to values and objectives, while questions 4 and 5 pertained to indicators and targets. He observed that, over time, it seemed questions 4 and 5 were getting a higher ranking than questions 2 and 3. He surmised that this might be because the group had been spending more time on indicators and targets than values and objectives. It was noted that values and objectives hadn't been revisited since the original plan was developed. With upcoming changes to the new CSA standard, the group felt that a review of values and objectives was not urgent at this time.

Question #14 (Advisory Group representation), which had historically ranked lower than the rest of the questions, was slightly improved this year. However, the PAG still does not have much representation from the southern half of the TSA, so probably more work is required. Paul Willms

mentioned that Gordon Prest, who is of aboriginal ancestry, had indicated that he would be interested in attending SFM meetings. Pat welcomed the idea and encouraged Paul to get him to hook up with one of the licensees to obtain background information on the SFM process.

***Additional input to Monitoring Report***

Elizabeth commented that she felt that the Monitoring Report was a good report and appreciated the introduction of graphs showing trends over the years. She noted that she still would like to see some type of graphic representation for Indicators 19 and 20 in the future. In regard to Indicator #12 (permanent access structures), she commented that she felt numbers would be more meaningful than percentages for the graph. In regard to Indicator #3, she stated she felt that stand level biodiversity was missing from the reporting. In regard to Indicator #27b (TSA Licensees will keep members of the public informed by... maintaining a website, circulating SFMP and other information) she commented that the information didn't seem to be included in the report.

Some discussion regarding Indicator #27b followed. It was noted that it was difficult to provide details regarding this as the reporting format was set up as a "yes" or "no" question for the licensees. Details regarding the public information initiatives undertaken during the reporting year are not currently provided through the existing reporting format. It was suggested that this could be modified for future reports.

A question was raised in regard to BCTS Timber Sales and how they dealt with sales that received no bids. A discussion followed regarding how Timber Sales were tendered. It was suggested that a guest speaker regarding BCTS sales could be arranged if there was sufficient interest. The group agreed to place this idea of a guest speaker for BCTS sales on the "Parking Lot" for future consideration.

Pat mentioned that Jack Woods had been slated to give a presentation on Forest Genetics at the last spring meeting, but had been unable to attend. He posed a question to the group as to whether they were interested in rescheduling his presentation. He stated he would provide a link to the website with the presentation Jack Woods made to the Lillooet SFM group.

***ACTION: Pat to provide link to Jack Woods' Forest Genetics presentation to the Lillooet SFM Group.***

*Follow the link [www.for.gov.bc.ca/dcs/sustainable\\_forestry/sustainable\\_forestry\\_DLL.htm](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/dcs/sustainable_forestry/sustainable_forestry_DLL.htm). Once there, click on the document titled "Presentation on Gene Resource Management in BC."*

***ACTION: PAG members to provide feedback to Pat re: whether they are still interested in inviting Jack Woods to give a presentation to our group.***

Paul Willms informed the group that NVIT would be bringing in a number of guest speakers (one of whom is Les Josa) and that SFM Advisory Group would be welcome to attend. He stated that he would try to keep the SFM group informed about these presentations.

Wendy reported that the National Forestry Week Committee was organizing an Open House at the Merritt Civic Centre for June 3<sup>rd</sup>. All licensees in the Merritt TSA will be setting up information booths and they are considering setting up a CSA booth. Todd noted that Mel Camilli would be the guest speaker.

***ACTION: Wendy to confirm details with Jennifer regarding National Forestry Week events for inclusion in minutes.***

*Following the meeting, Wendy confirmed that the Open House would be held June 3<sup>rd</sup>. The CSA Display Booth has now been booked for the event. Tickets for the luncheon speaker (Mel Camilli) are \$10 and can be obtained from any of the licensees.*

#### 4. SFM Plan Comments

Pat informed the group that Elizabeth had taken the time to carry out a detailed review of the SFM Plan and had provided him with some comments. Pat reviewed some of Elizabeth's key points with the group.

The first paragraph on page 9 under "Links to other Planning Processes" makes reference to the LRMP. Elizabeth raised a question as to whether an LRMP was still scheduled for the Merritt TSA or whether another planning process had taken its place. No one knew whether an LRMP was still planned.

***ACTION: Revisit the first paragraph on pg.9 re: LRMP for the 2009 SFM Plan.***

Page 12 of the SFM Plan discusses wildlife. Elizabeth has expressed that she would be interested in a guest speaker regarding the ecosystem approach that addresses the needs of many species at a landscape level.

Under the topic of "Water and Riparian Habitat" on page 12, the "Cascades District policy on lakeshore management" is referenced. Elizabeth asked whether the guidelines were still being followed. Licensees verified that the policy was still valid and was being followed.

Page 14 of the SFM Plan references the NSIFS website. Elizabeth tried to access the "library" and "contact us" menu and got blank pages. Pat asked the group whether the reference to this website should be removed from the Plan. Jerry informed the group that the NSIFS was in the process of having a company out of Kamloops clean up the website. He projected that the website should be up and running by the end of the month.

***ACTION: Determine whether NSIFS website is functional when SFM Plan is being updated. If it is not functional, remove references to NSIFS website in 2009 edition of the SFM Plan.***

Under the discussion of "Provincial Forecasting Related to the SFM Plan" on page 38, Elizabeth raised a question as to how licensees determined whether their plans met the short term provincial timber supply impacts. Pat explained that this was not a block by block evaluation. The laws implemented by the Forest Practices Code are applied on a provincial scale. The numbers have not changed as a result of the uplift. Len informed the group that a new TSR was coming up this summer.

***ACTION: Update "Provincial Forecasting Related to SFM Plan" on page 38 of SFM Plan upon completion of the TSR.***

#### 5. Ardeew Audit

Todd reported that the auditors had identified 4 Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) during their audit relating to input received from PAG members. One OFI was that PAG meetings were either too short or that there should be more meetings.

Pat posed a question to the group as to whether the group felt more meetings should be scheduled or meetings lengthened. A lengthy discussion followed. Some concern was expressed that it was difficult for public members to develop a good understanding with only two meetings a year. It was suggested that it might be beneficial to arrange for some educational speakers to help PAG members develop a better understanding of the information. Some felt that they shouldn't just meet

for the sake of meeting and that there should be a purpose to meeting. Some licensees expressed concern regarding the cost factor associated with meetings at a time where companies are struggling to survive. Pat mentioned that there would be a need to meet more frequently when the new CSA standard was released. He noted that it could happen as early as this fall, but most likely not until next spring.

Todd reported that another point raised by PAG members to the auditors was that at times licensees pushed their opinions on the group. He commented that they received a strong message from the auditors that they needed to work on their relationship with the public. The last two Opportunities for Improvement identified by auditors were in regards to Ardew's internal audit process and a typographical error. Overall, the auditors were impressed by public participation in the PAG.

**Upcoming Audits:** Aspen Planers – October 2, 2008

***ACTION: Jerry to confirm Aspen's audit date with Jennifer for inclusion in minutes.***

Jerry suggested that the group look to see if there is a way to streamline licensee costs associated with audits. Pat mentioned that licensees had put in a request to CSA to have registration audits on a 5 year cycle (currently they must be conducted every 3 years). Surveillance audits occur annually between registration audits and licensees were also hoping to have the return time lengthened where good performance was demonstrated.

## **6. Follow up to CSA Standard Revision**

Pat informed the group that Jennifer had sent comments in to the CSA website on behalf of the PAG. He thanked those public members (Elizabeth, Katherine and Jerry) who assisted in preparing the comments. The public review and comment period for the CSA Standard revision has now been extended to April 14, 2008. The Technical Committee will be meeting in early May to start reviewing the comments received. There are 55 PAGs across Canada, so there probably will be a lot of information for the Technical Committee to work through. Optimistically, the new standard might be ready for October.

## **7. Communications Update**

Pat reported that the Communications Sub-committee had been dissolved at last meeting. He asked licensees to provide a summary of communications initiatives since last meeting.

Todd reported that an Open House had been scheduled for National Forestry Week in Merritt in June. The intent of the open house was to incorporate the CSA process with FSPs. There will be newspaper ads and radio ads associated with this event. It was uncertain if any events had been planned for Princeton as Princeton coordinates its own National Forestry Week events.

The Interior Logging Association is celebrating its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary on May 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops. The event will involve displays and a career fair.

The Council of Forest Industries is setting up displays for the public at the Grand Okanagan on April 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>.

## 8. Fall Field Trip (host, timing, topics)

Stu'wix and Ardew agreed to co-host the Fall Field Trip. The date has been tentatively set for Wednesday, September 24, 2008. Some ideas the group put forth for topics for the field trip were; First Nations, Culturally Modified Trees and non-timber forest products.

***ACTION: Todd to invite the media to attend the field trip (i.e. newspapers, Shaw Cable)***

## 9. Current DFA issues, Other Business, Summary and Wrap up

Pat summarized discussions from earlier in the meeting regarding whether additional SFM Advisory Group Meetings were required. He recapitulated that what he had heard from the group was that additional meetings should be considered, but not just for the sake of meeting, there should be a purpose. In addition, the meetings should attempt to tie in with other events (e.g. NVIT guest speakers). The next meeting for the SFM Advisory Group will be the Fall Field Trip.

Pat asked the group if there were any other issues to discuss. Chris Lepsoe asked if some one could explain the term DFA. Pat explained that DFA, or Defined Forest Area, was a term that was defined within the CSA Standard as the "area under the plan to which the certification applies". In a broad sense and for PAG discussions, the area under the SFM plan is the TSA, however, licensees are certified individually so licensee specific operating areas would be their DFA.

Bruce reminded the group to obtain travel expenses forms from Wendy. Wendy said she would e-mail the form to Jennifer for distribution to the group.

***ACTION: Wendy to e-mail travel expenses form to Jennifer for distribution to the group.***

*Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.*