

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

**Meeting Summary
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, December 6, 2007**

	<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	ArdeW Wood Products
√	Dave Doubek	Stu'wix
	Dennis MacDonald	Stu'wix
√	Elizabeth Salomon de Friedberg	Merritt
√	Frank Etchart	Merritt
	Franz Reuter	Merritt
√	Gerry Sanford	Merritt
√	Heather Thomson	Merritt
√	Ian Black	BCTS (Kamloops)
√	Jen Hodson	BCTS
√	Jerry Canuel	Aspen Planers
√	John Henry	Princeton
	Katharine Shewchuk	Merritt
√	Ken Taylor	NVIT, Merritt
	Lennard Joe	Nicola Tribal Association
√	Len Marsh	Cascades Forest District
	Leona Antoine	Nicola Tribal Association
	Lyle Leclair	Stu'wix
	Nelson Patry	Princeton
√	Norm Hansen	NMV Lumber
√	Pat Salm	Weyerhaeuser (Kamloops)
√	Paul Willms	NVIT, Merritt
	Rod Gatenby	Nicola Tribal Association
√	Steve Borcsok	Upper Similkameen Indian Band
√	Todd Chamberlain	ArdeW Wood Products
√	Wayne Schindler	Woodlots/ranching, Merritt
√	Wendy McKinney	Tolko
√	Zoran Boskovic	BCTS (Kamloops)
	SFM Advisory Group Guest	Affiliation
√	Mike Alexander	KPMG auditor

1. Introduction and Agenda Review

Pat Salm called the meeting to order and extra copies of the agenda were circulated around the table. He stated that the main objective of the meeting would be to discuss changes for our 2008 SFM Plan. As there were a few new faces, introductions were made.

Unfortunately our guest speaker (Jack Woods) was unable to make it, but definitely would like to come speak, so we will look into getting him in the spring.

Pat suggested moving Licensee Audit Results to number 3 as it would flow nicely into SFM Plan changes for 2008. Everyone was in agreement.

Mike from KPMG would like to take a few minutes before dinner to talk to the PAG, so we will adjourn 15 minutes before dinner. This will allow the PAG to speak freely to the auditor while the licensees wait in the dining area.

2. Action Items from previous meeting

Pat went through the Action Items from the March 29, 2007 meeting. All action items had been completed, except for Action item #6 & 8.

There was a non-conformance in BCTSs CSA Audit around requiring approval for changes to documentation (ie: SFM Plan, Terms of Reference, etc.). During our March 29, 2007 we agreed to some changes to the Terms of Reference around PAG Orientation. This had not been documented that it was approved, therefore there was no proof it was approved.

In the future we will better document approvals so this does not happen again. We will review the Terms of Reference later on in the meeting.

Action Item #3 was completed, but there were a few errors. The errors were fixed at the meeting and a new list will be circulated with these minutes.

Action Item #6 – some discussion around Indicator #26 and whether it was still relative or not.

- The NSIFS does have it's own annual reporting, where it reports out communications, First Nations employment etc. There was discussion that indicator 26 was duplicative of the annual report. And since the indicator is one of simply reporting that a link could be provided to the NFIFS website within the SFM Plan.
- It was also suggested that we add more wording about the NSIFS in the SFM Plan to explain more about the society, it's role, and what goes on.
- We reviewed the matrix in the SFM Plan to see if we would be leaving a hole in the indicators associated with CSA elements if we removed this indicator. After quite a bit of discussion on the process of our "information exchanges" to the First Nations, it was agreed that other indicators cover off the elements without indicator 26.
- Brian Drobe suggested that we expand on Indicator #25 instead. Revamp it to expand beyond FMPs and FSPs and drop Indicator #26
 - Because we were already proposing changes to Indicator #25, it was agreed that revamping it to expand the information exchanges would be a nice fit.
 - There will more discussion further down the agenda with regards to this indicator.

See action items under Section 4 (Indicator 25) for agreed to steps related to the above discussion.

Action Item #8 – Review Communications Sub-Committee Terms of Reference.

- We will be discussion the Communication Sub-Committee further down the agenda, so will discuss this action item then.

3. Licensee Audit Results

All the Licensees gave a snapshot of their CSA Audit results over the past year. Most of the audits were circulated prior to the meeting, so the PAG could review and prepare any questions they may have.

Weyerhaeuser – Brian Drobe

- There were no non-conformances.
- There were some opportunities for improvement (OFIs).
- One of the OFIs was to keep the website up to date. There were some issues this year with the updates not happening in a timely manner. There has been some discussion with the Ministry and this should not be an issue from now on.
- There was a suggestion to limit the landslide indicator to current road building and within 5 years of operations. The licensees decided that they thought the PAG would want to know about all landslides (operational or not). There was no disagreement from the PAG.
- There was a question asked with regards to the suggestion to improve on Indicator #19 – lumber product output. The licensees had discussed it and thought that we were producing all the numbers we could with regards to our product output.

BCTS – Ian Black

- There was one minor non-conformance in the BCTS audit.
- This was the non-approval of the revised Terms of Reference. These changes had been reviewed, but the agreement/approval was not documented in the minutes.
- The Terms of Reference were re-circulated to everyone at the meeting and re-reviewed.
- The question was asked does anyone not support the Terms of Reference changes. There were no objections.
- It was determined that silence was consent.

APPROVED: The Terms of Reference (revised December 2007) have been agreed upon.

ACTION: Terms of Reference to be changed and included with the 2008 SFM Plan.

Tolko – Bruce Beech

- There were no non-conformances.
- All OFIs were discussed at Licensee Meeting and determined that changes were not required. There were no objections from the PAG.
- There was a question for clarification with regards to the auditors comments on FSP timelines. Bruce explained the process a bit. There is a 60 day timeline with FSP referrals, but in reality usually we go beyond the 60 day referral.
- Pat also added that there may have been some confusion by the auditors on timelines with FSP advertising and the timelines/actions that may be present within the FSP itself.

Ardeew – Todd Chamberlain

- Ardeew is in the process of being audited as we are meeting. Mike from KPMG is attending the meeting. So far everything is looking good.

Aspen – Jerry Canuel

- There were no non-conformances.
- There were some OFIs that we will be discussing in our next agenda topic.

Are there any more questions? None.

ACTION: Jerry to get a copy of their audit results for Wendy to circulate with meeting minutes as the summary was not mailed out previously.

4. SFM Plan Changes for 2008

Based on some audit opportunities for Improvement there were some suggested changes to some of the indicators. The licensees met discussed each one and brought forth some suggested changes to the indicators for review.

- Indicator #22 – the OFI suggested that we reference our operational commitments as there is no reference mentioned.
- Target was revised to include “in accordance with plan commitments.”

APPROVED: The change to Indicator #22 was agreed upon and approved.

ACTION: Changes will be made to the 2008 SFM Plan.

- Indicator #25 – had some suggestion on clarifying what a consultation meeting encompasses. After some discussion at the meeting it was agreed that we should change it to “information exchanges” thus encompassing all forms of communications to First Nations.
- After our earlier discussion with regards to Indicator #26 it was agreed that we should expand on Indicator #25 further and then eliminate Indicator #26.
- It was discussed that we change “Forest Development Plan/Forest Stewardship Plan” to “First Nations Values and Uses”, as well as change consultation meetings to “information exchanges and communications” throughout the Indicator (Target, Basis, and Monitoring).

APPROVED: *The change to Indicator #25 was agreed upon and approved. As well as removing Indicator #26.*

ACTION: *Changes will be made to the 2008 SFM Plan.*

ACTION: *Jerry to modify NSIFS summary in the SFM Plan to include more information with regards to the society as well as a link to their website and send the revision to Pat.*

- Indicator #3 was a finding because we had a variance written right in our target “90% of cutblocks...” The auditors picked up on the fact that technically we were outside our target because we were achieving 100%. So we discussed adding “At least” to the target.

APPROVED: *The change to Indicator #3 was agreed upon and approved.*

ACTION: *Changes will be made to the 2008 SFM Plan.*

- The Mountain Pine Beetle section of the SFM Plan will require updating for the past year.

ACTION: *Len Marsh has agreed to update this information.*

- There is a wording update for noxious and invasive weeds. It should be now called invasive plants.

ACTION: *Pat Salm will do a word search and replace and update the Plan.*

5. Communications Sub-Committee (next step)

Had some discussed on the Communications Sub-Committee, it's values and objectives, it's necessity within the group, etc.

- It was agreed that the Licensees had dropped the ball on this one and whether or not it was a ball that should be dropped.
- It did serve it's purpose by helping us create a powerpoint presentation and a shaw video was created.
- There was a question asked on whether there was a requirement through the standard to get information out there and if so, then maybe the subcommittee should still stand.
- Pat explained that there is no actual requirement in the standard itself that requires us to do this, but the question still remains...is it of value?
- There are other avenues we could take (ie: articles in the paper prior to PAG meetings). Could piggy back on some of the Kamloops TSA articles and run them in our paper. Heather said that this would not be a problem to get these articles in. These types of things could be done without a sub-committee.
- There was a suggestion to put photos in the paper at the time of articles, to put a face to the group. This would help if people had questions, they could turn to someone that they might know.

- There is still a need for more awareness, but does not need to come from a sub-committee. Licensees felt they could get the message out with tools already developed and with news articles.
- Licensees to report at next spring meeting on what has happened so far.
- Because it was agreed that we will dissolve the sub-committee, there is no need to review the Terms of Reference for review (action item from previous meeting)

APPROVED: *It was agreed and approved that the sub-committee will dissolve.*

ACTION: Licensees to report at next spring meeting on communication that occurred.

6. CSA Standard Update

Every 5 years the CSA Standard is reviewed and revised. The new standard should be out by the middle to end of 2008.

- There will be a suite of new indicators (34). Once the Standard is approved, we will have to review all of our indicators to see how well they align with the core indicators. If there is no alignment (gap), then new targets will need to be developed for the new indicator.
- The Standard should be advertised for review in January/February. There will be a 60 day review, which we will be entitled to review and comment.
- Also new to the standard will be discussion points that will need to be addressed. We will have to go back through previous minutes to see if those discussion points have been reviewed and discussed.

7. Mountain Pine Beetle Update – Len Marsh

Len Marsh talked a bit about the 2007 Mountain Pine Beetle Update. He produced a TSA wide map showing the red attack. He produced some very interesting numbers for everyone.

- The district is ~1.2 million ha in size. About 225 000 ha was attacked this year.
- Our district is about 70% pine, 55% of that is mature, and 20% of that is smallwood. We are one of the larger pine districts.
- The forest service is predicting that by 2011 the beetle will have run its' course and all our pine will be hit or dead.
- There are other opportunities being looked at for all this wood, but nothing concrete.
- Prior to beetle uplifts our district was at 1.8 million m³ AAC. We will probably be going up at 3 million, then after 2011 it will drop to 900 000.

ACTION: *Jerry Canuel to do update to Mountain Pine Beetle section of the Plan.*

NEXT MEETING: *April 3rd, 2008.*