

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

**Meeting Summary  
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, Dec 5, 2006**

	<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
✓	Dave Doubek	Stu'wix
✓	Elizabeth Salomon de Friedberg	Merritt
✓	Frank Etchart	Merritt
	Franz Reuter	Merritt
	Gerry Sanford	Merritt
✓	Gord MacDonald	BC Timber Sales Program (Kamloops)
	Heather Thomson	Merritt
✓	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	Ardev Wood Products
	Tom Scott	Merritt
✓	Wayne Schindler	Woodlots/ranching, Merritt
✓	Wendy McKinney	Tolko

## 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 to the indicators for the 2007 SFM Plan. As there were a few new faces, introductions were made.

## 2. Action Items from previous meeting

Pat went through the Action Items from the March 29, 2006 meeting. A summary of the discussion of each can be found below.

### *a) Monitoring and Reporting requirements for Indicator #8 to be revised*

At the March 29, 2006 meeting it was decided that this indicator was in need of revision because it was worded “*Percent of areas revegetated with grass seed that is graded acceptable*”, but the data reported was the *kilograms* of seed purchased and applied which did not allow for the calculation of a percentage.

The proposed change to the wording was “*Percent of seed purchased for the purpose of revegetating disturbed areas with grass seed that is graded acceptable*”. Elizabeth felt that the proposed wording was still problematic because the percent of *seed* purchased and the percent of *areas* revegetated with seed graded acceptable were not the same thing. She elaborated that the indicator wasn’t seeking the *percent of grass seed* that was graded acceptable, but the *percent of areas* that were revegetated with acceptable grass seed. The group discussed possible alternate wordings and decided to revise the indicator as follows:

#### **DECISION:** *Revise the wording of Indicator #8 to:*

*“Percent of grass seed applied for the purpose of revegetating disturbed areas with grass seed that is graded acceptable.”*

### *b) Re-examine Target for Indicator #26 for 2007 SFM Plan*

Pat informed the group that he didn’t think that anyone had looked at this indicator. He suggested that it be left for discussion at the end of the meeting or tacked onto next meeting’s agenda.

### *c) Refine Power Point Presentation and send to Advisory Group for review*

Jerry informed the group that the Power Point presentation had been refined by licensees and that he thought it had been sent out to the Advisory Group. Several members of the group stated that they had not seen the revised version. The group discussed various options for viewing a copy of the presentation (i.e. e-mailing, sending hard copies out), and decided that posting it to the web page would be best.

**ACTION:** *Jerry to send the revised version of the Power Point presentation to Jennifer for linking to the Sustainable Forestry web page. Link to web page to be included in the minutes.*

**SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY WEB PAGE:**

**<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/dcs/SustainableForestry/SustainableForestry.htm>**

**3. SFM Plan changes for 2007**

***a) Summary of Changes Document***

A "Summary of Changes" document has been put together to summarize the changes that had been made to SFM Plan indicators since 2004. The document explains what the change was, when it occurred, and the rationale. Bruce noted that the document was drafted in response to auditors' comments that there was a need to demonstrate alternate strategies for indicators. He emphasized that the document shows that SFM Advisory Group is continually looking at alternate strategies and provides a record of how the indicators have changed from year to year.

***ACTION:***  "Summary of Changes to the Merritt SFM Plan" document to be mailed out with the minutes.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0",  
Hanging: 0.88", Space Before: 12

***b) OGMA text update***

Gord MacDonald put together some revised wording for the OGMA section on page 11 of the SFM Plan as it was out of date. Copies of the revised wording were circulated around the tables (see paragraph below). Proposed wording was as follows:

***Maintain Representative Old Growth Forests***

*"Strategies for biodiversity include direction to landscape unit planning, identifying areas where conservation is a priority through assignment of biodiversity emphasis options. A strategic land use plan will assign biodiversity emphasis options to each landscape unit in the plan area. The Merritt TSA OGMA Rational Report describes the process that describes the change made to the Landscape Unit Planning Guide where the "old first" selection has been changed to the selection of areas with long term high biodiversity values. Indicator scores include selections using biodiversity values, structural stage representation, BEC representation and costs to the tenure holders land base. Since the land base has few old forest, mature stands were recruited with higher biodiversity values. These high value mature forests have become the draft OGMA's for the TSA."*

The group reviewed the wording and noted that First Nations values were not mentioned and that they were a large part of the OGMA process so should be included. Jerry provided the group with some background on the OGMA process. It was suggested that a link to the OGMA report be included in the SFM Plan.

***DECISION:***  Adopt revised OGMA wording for page 11 of SFM Plan, with the addition of "First Nations values" to the third from last sentence of the paragraph.

***Revised sentence to read:***

*"Indicator scores include selections using biodiversity values, First Nations values, structural stage representation, BEC representation and costs to the tenure holders land base."*

It was suggested that the acronyms in the OGMA paragraph should be spelled out.

***ACTION:***  Spell out acronyms in revised OGMA paragraph for SFM Plan.

Gord informed the group that the BCTS minor non-conformance in regard to this indicator had been closed off. He elaborated that BCTS had been given the non-conformance because the auditors didn't think there was an indicator relating to sites of biological significance.

***c) Mountain Pine Beetle Update***

Pat informed the group that the "Area Affected" paragraph under the Forest Health section of the SFM Plan needed to be updated with revised figures for the 2007 Plan. Jerry reported that he had spoken to the Regional Entomologist and had some of the revised numbers, but the overview report for 2006 was not yet complete. He informed the group that there had been a 1.9 fold increase in Mountain Pine Beetle since the 2005 flight and there were 141,000 hectares of new Red Attack.

The group discussed whether the 2006 data should replace the 2005 data, or whether the 2005 data should be kept in the report to show the cumulative effect.

***DECISION: Incorporate 2006 Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) figures and retain the 2005 MPB data in SFM Plan to show the cumulative effect.***

Copies of the 2004 and 2005 Mountain Pine Beetle reports were circulated for those interested to review. Pat noted that copies of these reports were probably available from the District office.

***ACTION: Jerry to put together a paragraph regarding the Western Spruce Budworm revised MPB figures and send to Jennifer via e-mail.***

***ACTION: IFPA Beetle Summary Report to be presented at the spring Merritt SFM Advisory Group Meeting.***

***d) Proposed Changes to Indicator #10***

Licensees examined changing a few indicators for the 2007 SFM Plan in response to concerns from the Tolko audit that indicators did not go beyond the legal requirements. In regard to Indicator #10, the idea of benchmarking the percent of area that was free-growing on the early free grow date in 2007 was put forward. Pat suggested a target could be set after it had been tracked for a year or two. The emphasis for reporting will be on "achieving" rather than "declaring" free growing. Brian noted that Weyerhaeuser no longer had early free grow dates in their plan, so they would have to come up with another way of determining this for Weyerhaeuser blocks. It was suggested that some kind of interpretive wording could be included i.e. 5 years after planting.

***DECISION: Add the following wording to Indicator #10:***

***Target:*** Benchmark in 2007 cutblocks where free growing was declared and the percentage of those (by area) where it was achieved on the early free growing date.

***Annual Monitoring & Measurement:*** Licensees will report the percent of area where cutblocks were free-growing on their early free growing date. Where no "Early Free Grow date" exists, licensees will report area which achieved free growing 5 years after planting.

***e) Proposed Changes to Indicator #12***

Revising the target for indicator #12 to 6% was proposed because licensees have been under the 7% target for a number of years. The 6% figure was chosen because due to the nature of some licensee's operations the goal was a stretch, but still achievable. Individually, licensees range from 2% to 6.5% on this indicator. Bruce elaborated that the variation was largely to do with cutblock size, i.e. the larger the cutblocks, the lower the permanent access structure percentage.

***DECISION: Revise target for Indicator #12 to 6% with no variance.***

***f) Proposed Changes to Indicator #36***

Consideration was given to improving this indicator by providing the Mean Annual Increment (MAI) figures for fir and spruce, in addition to pine. Pine makes up 56% of the timber harvesting land base, while fir and spruce make up another 35%. Bruce Beech looked into how readily available MAI figures were. MAI figures are derived from the Timber Supply Review (TSR), and Bruce found that they were not easy to obtain so hired Forsite consultants to come up with the figures. Bruce informed the group that the pine MAI figure that Forsite came up with was 2.18 m<sup>3</sup>/yr/ha, which was significantly higher than the 1.52 m<sup>3</sup>/yr/ha which was quoted in the SFM Plan. Pat commented that the licensees would have to look further into this issue.

***ACTION: Licensees to further examine discrepancies between the two MAI figures for pine.***

There was some discussion around the value of MAI figures as a measure of ecosystem productivity if the same figures were used for 5 years. It was explained that MAI figures were derived from the TSR which was conducted every 5 years. MAI figures don't change significantly from year to year.

***DECISION: Revise Indicator #36 to include MAI figures for pine, fir and spruce.***

Pat asked the group whether there were any other proposed changes to indicators for the 2007 SFM Plan. None were mentioned.

**4. Terms of Reference Review**

The group reviewed the Terms of Reference. A proposed change was to insert some new text under "Roles and Responsibilities" formally recognizing the role of active members of the Advisory Group and partial participants (i.e. those who only want to receive the reports). The group discussed the term "partial participants". Some felt the term was problematic as they didn't feel receiving reports was the same as participating. Several alternative terms were discussed and the group decided to re-name partial participants "interested parties".

***DECISION: Revise Terms of Reference to include new paragraphs under the "Roles and Responsibilities" section regarding "active members" and "interested parties".***

Another proposed change to the Terms of Reference was to remove the words “an independent” in the first sentence of the third paragraph under “Roles and Responsibilities” because the group hadn’t been using an independent facilitator for several years.

**DECISION:** *Remove the words “an independent” in the first sentence of the third paragraph under “Roles and Responsibilities” section. New wording to read as follows:*

*“Merritt TSA licensees will engage a facilitator who is knowledgeable about the CSA certification process to assist with the SFM Advisory Group in its work.”*

**ACTION:** *Terms of Reference to be added to the SFM Plan as an appendix.*

## **5. Communications Sub-committee Report**

The Communications Sub-committee is looking for another member. Will Sloan has given notification that he will no longer be able to be involved in the SFM Advisory Group. Current members of the group are Paul Willms, Al Clarke, Elizabeth Salomonde-Friedberg and Jerry Canuel.

One of the comments coming out of Aspen’s audit was that the Communications Sub-committee was not effective. Jerry commented that he had been caught off guard by this remark as he felt the sub-committee had accomplished a lot in the past year (i.e. PowerPoint presentation, Shaw Cable video, radio ad. campaign). It was emphasized that another key component of the communications strategy was personal contacts and that all members of the Advisory Group were encouraged to invite someone new to attend a meeting. Some felt that this was the most effective tool for generating interest in the SFM Advisory Group. However, it was noted that coming in “cold” to a meeting of this sort can be overwhelming for newcomers. It was suggested that some sort of orientation package be developed for prospective new members.

Elizabeth commented that the Shaw Cable video was originally supposed to be about 10 min, but ended up much shorter than that. She felt that to be effective it should be longer and suggested that the Sub-committee approach Shaw Cable about revising it. She also mentioned that she felt the sub-committee needed to meet more often. It was suggested that a Terms of Reference be drafted for the Communications Sub-committee.

**ACTION:** *Communications Sub-committee to draft a Terms of Reference and present it back to the group at the next meeting..*

## **6. Recap Audit Results ( Weyerhaeuser, BCTS, Aspen)**

Brian reviewed the Weyerhaeuser Audit Summary with the group. He highlighted a number of “noteworthy comments” from the report including recognition of the efforts of the Communications Sub-committee. No non-conformances were found.

Bruce asked the group whether they wanted to receive a summary report or a full report following licensee audits. The group felt the summary reports were sufficient.

***DECISION: Summary Reports (rather than full report) to be distributed to the PAG following licensee audits in the future.***

Jerry reviewed the Aspen Planers Audit Summary with the group. He mentioned that one of the opportunities for improvement suggested was that the PAG should meet more than twice a year. The group asked what the basis of the recommendation was. Jerry explained that the auditors felt the Merritt SFM Advisory Group met far less than other PAGs. A question was posed as to whether the group would like to meet more often. The group felt that there was no point in meeting just for the sake of meeting. Group sentiment was that two meetings and one field trip per year was fine as long as they were accomplishing what they wanted to accomplish.

***DECISION: Continue to hold two Advisory Group meetings and one field trip per year.***

Gord informed the group that the 3 minor non-conformances identified in the spring BCTS audit had been "closed off" through the surveillance audit. No new non-conformances were found in regard to the CSA standard. However, BCTS was given a major non-conformance in regard to their EMS. The non-conformance was in regard to a bladed skid trail which had been upgraded to a road and no water management had been done. The result was sedimentation to an S2 creek. Some restoration work has been done and a Geotech will be brought on site in the spring.

***ACTION: Gord to put together a 1 pg. summary for the PAG regarding the BCTS EMS major non-conformance.***

Gord informed the group that for future BCTS audits, the auditors won't be calling each PAG member for an interview. BCTS will send PAG members a letter notifying them that an audit is coming up and requesting that they contact them if they would like to set up a meeting with the auditors. Elizabeth commented that she would prefer to only be interviewed once by the auditors as she has the same comments for each audit (i.e. nothing is licensee specific).

## **7. Upcoming SFM Activities**

Tolko Audit – week of June 11, 2007 (tentative)  
Weyerhaeuser Audit – July (tentative)  
BCTS Audit – November (tentative)  
Aspen Planers Audit – October-November (tentative)

More specific dates and times to be discussed at the spring meeting.

***ACTION: Licensees to provide dates for their next audit to Pat so that they can be included in the discussion at the spring meeting.***

***ACTION: Schedule the next SFM Advisory Group meeting for a Thursday.***

***ACTION: Re-examine Target for Indicator #26 for 2008 SFM Plan.***