

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

**Meeting Summary
SFM Advisory Group Meeting,
March 29, 2006**

	<i>SFM Advisory Group Member</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
	Al Clarke	Radio NL Merritt
	Bob Chambers	Ranching/woodlot, Merritt
✓	Andrea Inwards	Merritt Sunrise Rotary Club
✓	Brian Drobe	Weyerhaeuser (Princeton)
✓	Bruce Beech	Tolko
	Chris Lepsoe	Merritt
✓	Dave Doubek	Stu'wix
	Dave Walkem	Nicola Tribal Association
	Dennis MacDonald	ArdeW Wood Products
✓	Don Embury	Ministry of Forests
✓	Elizabeth Salomon de Friedberg	Merritt
✓	Frank Etchart	Merritt
	Franz Reuter	Merritt
✓	Heather Thomson	Merritt
✓	Gerry Sanford	Merritt
✓	Gord MacDonald	BC Timber Sales Program (Kamloops)
✓	Jerry Canuel	Aspen Planers
✓	John Henry	Princeton
✓	Katharine Shewchuk	Merritt
✓	Ken Taylor	NVIT, Merritt
✓	Lennard Joe	Nicola Tribal Association
✓	Leona Antoine	Nicola Tribal Association
	Norm Hansen	NMV Lumber
✓	Pat Salm	Weyerhaeuser (Kamloops)
✓	Paul Willms	NVIT, Merritt
	Pete Wallis	BC Timber Sales Program (Kamloops)
	Rod Gatenby	Nicola Tribal Association
	Steve Borcsok	Upper Similkameen Indian Band
✓	Todd Chamberlain	ArdeW Wood Products
	Tom Scott	Merritt
	Wayne Schindler	Woodlots/ranching, Merritt
✓	Wendy McKinney	Tolko
✓	Will Sloan	Merritt

Guests:

Rod Deboice, Provincial Bark Beetle Coordinator
Mike Alexander, KPMG Auditor

1. Introduction and Agenda Review

Pat Salm called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM and circulated the agenda to those without copies. Pat stated that the primary objective of the meeting would be to discuss the 2005 Monitoring Report. It was noted that there were a few new faces around the table. Pat welcomed the new people to the new meeting and asked members of the group to introduce themselves. Following that, the group was asked if there were any additions to the agenda, none were mentioned.

2. Review of Action Items from previous meeting

Pat reviewed the action items from the December 1, 2005 meeting and asked for an update on each. A summary of the discussion is outlined below.

a) Communications Sub-committee Update

Jerry provided the group with an update on the progress of the Communications Sub-committee. He informed the group Will Sloan had developed a Power Point presentation and Shaw Cable had produced a video to help raise public awareness and interest in the Sustainable Forest Management process and role of the Advisory Group.

Will went through the Power Point presentation and played the Shaw Cable video for the group. Overall the group was quite impressed by both, but a few suggestions were made for improvement. Bruce suggested that the slide presentation needed clarification that it was the wood, rather than the forest that was being certified. Katharine noted that an apostrophe "s" was missing from slide #2. She also suggested re-sizing the photo of the deer on the first slide to make it more proportional with the other photos on the slide. Pat commented that he had a few ideas for improvement as well, and suggested that the licensees further review and refine the presentation and then send it out to the Advisory Group for review.

ACTION: *Licensees to further review and refine the Power Point presentation and send out to the Public Advisory Group for review.*

ACTION: *Power Point presentation to be posted to the Sustainable Forestry Website once finalized.*

Jerry informed the group that the Communications Sub-committee would be starting up radio ads again closer to National Forestry Week and the Fall Field Trip. There are some issues regarding the timing of National Forestry Week as, nationally, it has been moved to September. It is uncertain whether the local National Forestry Week committee will follow suit, or continue to celebrate National Forestry Week in May.

b) Representation from Princeton for SFM Advisory Group

Brian reported that he had brought John Henry from Princeton (China Ridge Ski Club) to tonight's meeting. He noted that he had taken some time prior to the meeting to give him some of the documents and bring him up to speed on the process.

c) Fall Field Trip Summary

Pat informed the group that Todd had been working on the Fall Field Trip Summary, but it was still a “work in progress”. Once completed, it will be posted to the website.

ACTION: *Fall Field Trip summary to be posted to website upon completion.*

3. SFM Plan performance for 2005

Pat asked the group if there was anyone that didn't have a copy of the 2005 Monitoring Report. Copies of the Monitoring Report were circulated to those without copies. Pat proceeded to walk the group through the various sections of the report. He asked whether there were any parts of the report that the group wished to discuss. In specific, he asked what the group thought of the new format for the Performance Summary on page 7.

Overall, the group felt the Performance Summary section was pretty good, however, Elizabeth felt that the “Percent Achieved” column in the first table was confusing and should have been labeled “Percent of Indicators Achieved”. The group agreed that this was something that should be done if this format was to be retained in next years report.

Pat asked whether there were any other sections that the group wished to discuss. A question was raised regarding the meaning of “Mean Annual Increment” in Indicator #36. It was noted that “Mean Annual Increment” did not have a lot of meaning to the average person. Pat informed the group that the meaning was outlined in Section 6.0 of the 2005 SFM Plan.

Elizabeth raised an issue regarding Indicator #26, First Nations Involvement in the Nicola Similkameen Innovative Forestry Society. It was pointed out that the assessment results were the same as last year and it was suggested that there should be a way of showing change over time. Pat felt that this was a good point and that the target should be refined for this indicator. Leona suggested that it might be more meaningful to mention something in the indicator regarding licensee obligations to report to First Nations.

ACTION: *Target for Indicator #26 be re-examined for the 2007 SFM Plan.*

Gerry commented that he felt that the assessment results for Indicator #2 were worded very poorly. Jennifer explained that the wording had been provided to her by the licensee. She noted that when she prepared the report she tried to keep the explanations as close to verbatim as possible so as not to misconstrue the meaning. Gord commented that he had been the one who had prepared the explanation.

Elizabeth stated that the target and assessment for Indicator #8 didn't match the Indicator. The Indicator is worded “*Percent* of areas revegetated with grass seed that is graded acceptable”, but the data reported is the kilograms of seed purchased and the kilograms of Canada #1 or equivalent seed applied. There is no way of calculating a percent from this data. The group decided that this indicator should be revisited for the 2007 SFM Plan.

ACTION: *Monitoring and Reporting requirements for Indicator #8 to be reviewed and revised to generate a “percentage” for the 2007 SFM Plan.*

A question was raised in regard to how “Bone Dry Units” (Indicator #19) were measured. Bruce explained that it was a volume measurement. Jerry added that there were very detailed tests that were done on the chips to measure this. Significant penalties apply if the standards aren’t met. Todd commented that he thought that “bdu” had recently changed to something else. He agreed to look into it and report back to the group.

ACTION: *Todd to find out whether the measurement for chips, shavings and hogfuel has been changed from Bone Dry Units (bdu) to something else.*

RESULT: *Subsequent to the meeting, Todd confirmed that the unit of measure has changed to Bone Dry Tonnes (BDT).*

ACTION: *Revise unit of measure for chips, shavings and hogfuel (Indicator #19) to Bone Dry Tonnes (BDT) for future SFM Plans and Monitoring reports*

In regard to the highlights on page 6, John asked how it was determined that 100% of harvest commitments toward Mountain Pine Beetle were achieved. Jerry responded that licensees look at where the beetles are, then conduct a risk assessment and put plans together to minimize the risk. The figure is a measure of how licensees have done against their plans.

A question was raised as to whether individual companies were required to send out their results to everyone. Pat replied that the Monitoring Report was supposed to serve that function. It was noted that the licensees had the obligation to send out their audit results to the Advisory Group, but that was a separate process. Pat emphasized that there was a distinction between the Merritt TSA SFM Plan and the individual certification of each company. He explained that the Merritt SFM Advisory Group was formed to reduce the demand on members of the community to attend meetings by establishing one committee.

Lennard asked whether all 15 of the cutblocks mentioned in Indicator #15 were within the same watershed, or various watersheds. It was noted that this information was not provided through the reporting process, but that it might be beneficial to amend the indicator to include this data in the future.

ACTION: *Revise the 2006 SFM Plan reporting requirements for Indicator #15 to include information regarding which watersheds the cutblocks with ECA’s exceeding 35% were within.*

4. Recap CSA Audit results and future plans

Pat asked the group whether they liked the format that they had been following for distributing and discussing audit results, or whether they would prefer the results to be posted to the website. Some commented that they liked receiving hard copies, while one member was receptive to the idea of obtaining the results from the website as long as they were informed that they had been posted.

DECISION: *Hard copies of audit results to be mailed out to Advisory Group members. Timing for the mail out should be just prior to the Advisory Group meeting to allow a chance for review.*

ACTION: *Licensees to discuss the possibility of having Audit results posted to the SFM website.*

Bruce informed the group that Tolko's QMI audit was scheduled for next week. He reported that auditing would be conducted by telephone and e-mail on Tuesday, followed by a field visit on Wednesday (April 5th). Bruce invited members of the Advisory Group to attend the field portion of the audit. He noted that the focus of the field trip would be on the indicators and seeing those indicators out in the field. The office portion of the audit will be conducted on Thursday, which will include a short interview with interested Advisory Group members. Those interested in attending either the Field Trip or office interview should contact Wendy or Bruce.

Pat informed the group that Weyerhaeuser Princeton's audit was scheduled for around June 8-9 (dates still to be confirmed). He noted that the Advisory Group would likely be invited to attend the field portion of this audit as well.

An idea was put forth about posting upcoming opportunities for the Advisory Group to the website. The group discussed the idea and it was decided that this could be an attachment to the meeting minutes.

ACTION: *Attach an "Upcoming Activities" list to meeting minutes.*

Gord informed the group that the BCTS audit was currently underway, noting that he had brought along their auditor, Mike Alexander, from KPMG. BCTS has opted to do a 6 month periodic assessment and has another audit scheduled for September. The last BCTS audit (reported on at last meeting) found one major non-conformance which was in regard to the Small Scale Salvage program. This issue has been tackled, but the minor non-conformances involving elements 1.4, 2.2 and 1.1 in reference to indicator improvement, have yet to be addressed.

Wendy asked the group whether there were any questions regarding the audit summary which had recently been mailed out by Tolko. One member of the group asked for an update on the progress which had been made on the recommendations on the last page. A brief update was provided for each recommendation.

Pat asked the group whether they had any questions regarding the revised SFM Plan which had been mailed out at the end of January. No questions were raised. Copies of the plan were distributed to new members of the group.

5. Mountain Pine Beetle Update

Rod Deboice gave the group a Power Point presentation on the current beetle situation in the province, the Merritt TSA and his role as Provincial Bark Beetle Coordinator. He informed the group that information in his presentation came from the Magnitude Survey which was available on the COFI website. A progress report on the Mountain Pine

Beetle is expected to be released in April. This report will be available from the website: http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/mountain_pine_beetle/ . The advisory group was interested in the types of research being done related to the Mountain Pine Beetle. Rod provided some information regarding this. Subsequent to the meeting, the Government released a backgrounder detailing some of the projects funded (appended to minutes).

6. Current DFA Issues, Other Business and Summary and Wrap Up

As the meeting was running a half hour late, Pat stated that he would put together a short information summary on what the CSA Technical Committee has been doing.

ACTION: *Pat to put together a summary on current DFA issues for distribution with the minutes.*

Pat's Summary:

The Technical Committee (TC) had agreed to respond to all those providing feedback to the questionnaire sent out in the fall of 2005 (asking for ideas on changes needed for the next version of the CSA Standard). The response was to both acknowledge receipt and to advise what types of concerns and ideas were raised by those responding. The response should be out shortly. Currently the TC is spending time incorporating the ideas into the next version of the standard.

The TC also spent time debating whether there should be some baseline indicators included in SFM Plans across Canada to provide better consistency as to how the standard is applied. There was general agreement to have someone from outside the TC further examine this, perhaps using the indicators from Canada's model forest program as a guide.

The group briefly discussed the fall field trip. It was decided that Brian (Weyerhaeuser) would host this year's trip. The group was asked to put forward ideas for topics. One suggestion was an explanation of "hydrological assessment audits".

ACTION: *Brian to organize fall field trip for sometime during the last two weeks of September.*

ACTION: *Advisory Group members to forward topics for the field trip to Brian.*

7. Upcoming Activities

June 8, 9 2006 Weyerhaeuser CSA Audit (Princeton)

Meeting Adjourned at 8:30 PM