

DRAFT Barriere LRUP Notes, February 19, 2007

The following is a summary of the Barriere LRUP meeting held at the Barriere Community Hall (Lions Hall) on February 19, 2007. The Open House commenced at 17:00, with about 25 attendees prior to the meeting. Meeting started at about 18:30 and ended at about 21:30. Minutes prepared by Kathryn Zacharatos and reviewed by Karen Raven and John McQueen.

Attendees:

Karen Raven, Kamloops Forest District, Range Agrologist. Meeting co-chair	Norm Fennell, Forester, Tolko. Meeting co-chair
Kathryn Zacharatos, Kamloops Forest District	Jo-Ann Fox, Southern Interior Weed Management Committee
John McQueen, Kamloops Forest District, Stewardship Forester	Leith Mckenzie, Kamloops Forest District, Stewardship Forester
Jeff Leahy, Kamloops Forest District, Operations Manager	Dana Manhard, Forests For Tomorrow
Darren Bennett, Front Counter BC, Natural Resources Officer	Brent Olsen, Kamloops Forest District, Stewardship Officer
Cory Yurkowski, Weyerhaeuser	Ernie Maynard, Integrated Land Management Bureau
Wes Bieber, Weyerhaeuser	Steve Maricle, Ministry of Environment
Kurt Freudenberger, Weyerhaeuser	Jeff Denomey, Kamloops Snowmobile Assn.
Toby Jeffries, Gilbert Smith	Dave Sigsworth, Kamloops Fly Fishers
Zoran Boskovic, BCTS	Wim Houben, Barriere TV Society
Doug Lewis, Ministry of Environment	Larry Loney, Caverhill Lodge
Phil Youwe, Kamloops Forest District, Range Officer	Al Neratini
Cardell Dumais, Kamloops Forest District, Range Agrologist	Bob Black, Barriere
Steve Schell, Protection, Kamloops Fire Zone	Ed Salle, Salle Ranch
Hugh Murdoch, Protection, Kamloops Fire Zone	Craig Mann, Woodlot 1595 Bea Mann, Woodlot 1595
Percy Folkard, Ministry of Forests and Range	Murray and Joanne Livingstone
Ian Mitchell, Mitchell Cattle Co Inc.	Drew Cleaveley, East Barriere Lake
Karl Rainer, Rainer Farms	Ludie Proulx, Rancher
Bud Fennell	

Introductions and Expectations:

Went around the room and everyone introduced themselves and stated expectations for the meeting:

- Concern around general access issues, road blockages, block access, lakes access.
- Discuss range fencing issues.
- Forest For Tomorrow Funding
- Grass seeding and site preparation.
- Front Counter BC letter regarding horseback riding on range.

- Concern regarding decking of non-merchantable wood on landings, and worry about these sites not being cleaned up.
- ATV access in the alpine.

Operations Manager Presentation – Shift to FRPA – Jeff Leahy

The following was inserted from Jeff's presentation

- Vision of stewardship – finding the right balance based on 3 considerations
 - Sustainability of timber supply
 - Adequate conservation and protection of non-timber resources
 - Economic interests of tenure holders
- Command and control not working
- Trigger was public concern

A Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) is an operational Plan for forest agreement holders; sole document requiring approval under FRPA; areas within which harvesting and road building may occur; must be approved before any cutting/road permits issued; may be approved for up to 5 years

- Map showing forest development units
- Results and or strategies
- Stocking standards and regeneration and free growing dates
- Signature of person required to prepare the plan
- Advertise the plan
- Make available for public review and comment
- Meet with First Nations
- Collect written comments
- Consider comments
- Minister conducts the approval process(ie: consult with FN, cutting permits and road permits already in effect are deemed approved, conducting approval tests, requesting information if required, approve or reject with rationale)
- Transition period to have FSPs in place extended to March 31,2007
- Transition period for woodlot and range tenure holders has been extended one year, to Dec. 31, 2007.
- We are transitioning to the FRPA world
- Govt and industry significantly different roles in the FRPA world vs FPC
- How does the role change impact these sessions
- Forest tenure holders are likely to find themselves interacting more with the public.

Handout provided for “Be Heard: Get Involved in FSP Review”

Question regarding going from RUP (Range Use Plan) to RSP (Range Stewardship Plan), what is the process?

Answer:

- There is an application process for applying for a range use plan.
- RUPs have a 5 year term.

Who is referee in issues between stakeholder and licensee in the Forest and Range Practices (FRPA) world?

Answer:

- For FSPs, licensee must address comments received by stakeholders. Government then reviews if comments have been adequately addressed by the licensee.
- Government doesn't get involved as much in the FRPA world.

- Referee will be DM for cutting permits/road permits. Timber sales manager for BCTS issues.
- C&E will monitor results and strategies.

FSPs being developed, what guidelines are being used? What's built into regulations for managing for water values?

Answer:

- Government has set objectives in FRPA, must be met in FSPs.
- 26 objectives in LRMPs as well.
- Many objectives from Forest Practices (FPC) are still in FRPA.

Licensee Presentations

Wes Bieber, Cory Yurkowski – Weyerhaeuser

The following was inserted from Cory's notes.

- Current Operations:
 - o harvesting CP 235 Machete Lake
 - o ~20 truck loads per day
 - o will be there until break-up and into Summer 2007
- Other beetle CPs:
 - o CP 233 & 234 Thuya Lakes - ~40Mm³
 - o possible start-up ground May/June
- Current Planning & Future Harvest Operations:
 - o Primarily focused on area west of Akehurst, South of Machete lake and North of Bonaparte
 - o Overall area is ~8200ha of which ~1/3rd of that area is comprised of >60% PI stands that are infested with MPB./
 - o Currently, Weyerhaeuser has a FDP amendment out for public review which is proposing ~200,000m³ of timber to be harvested between Fall 2007 to Winter 2008/09
 - o Along w/ the proposed development, plans to upgrade the Darlington FSR and tributary road systems are also planned to commence in the Summer 2007
 - o Completing watershed risk analysis, Bonaparte through Eakin lake.
 - o High priority sites are being identified for sediment issues.
 - o Encourage discussions with stakeholders regarding access concerns.

Some concern about not requiring grass seeding under FRPA. Concern that there is a requirement for rehabilitation for ranchers, but wondering where the onus is for licensees.

Answer:

- If there is risk of sedimentation, more commitment to grass seed, and seeding on exposed soil.
- Move towards more grass seeding to stop spread of invasive plants, to be able to meet FRPA objective.
- Note that grass seeding roads may be effective in luring cattle away from plantations (*noted that cattle don't do as much damage to plantations as previously thought*). Also noted that *seeding should be done soon after harvest.*

Kurt Freudenberger – Weyerhaeuser

- Road deactivation plans for 2007 – provided maps for reference.

- Noted signification plans for deactivation in 2007. Wants to maintain communication regarding deactivation because licensee doesn't want to deactivate roads that may be re-activated in future by other user groups.

Norm Fennell – Tolko

The following was inserted from Norm's presentation

- AAC: in 2002, AAC was 641,000m³; 2003 275,000m³ traded to Weyco; 2005 115,000m³ to Bill 28 take-back; 2007 250,000 m³.
- NRFL's: Tolko's operating area overlapped with NRFL's for beetle salvage.
 - o 300,000 m³ transferred from Simpcw to LNTCF
 - o 200,000 m³ + 160,000 m³(?) Simpcw
 - o 272,000 m³ KIB
 - o 187,000 m³ ALIB
- Mountain Pine Beetle: All pine stands attacked to some level. Majority of pine in Tolko's operating area harvested, or being harvested.
 - o Darlington – Canfor
 - o Thuya – Canfor, Simpcw, LNTCF
 - o Nehalliston – Tolko, Simpcw, Canfor
 - o Leonie, Dixon, Haggard – Tolko
 - o Newhhykulston – LNTCF
- Fir beetle – seeing attack ratios up to 10:1 (green /red trees)
- Spruce beetle – Taweel Lake
- Trap tree program this spring in Dixon, Bottrel, East Lake
- Discussed 2007 harvest plans
- FSP – submit for approval by March 31, 2007. Same CP referral process as FDP.

Zoran Boskovic – BCTS

- Discussed transition from small business program to BCTS. Program brought in by Liberal government.
- 20% of provincial AAC is sold on the open market to establish market price.
- BCTS doesn't have control over when harvesting occurs, knows when/where sales occurred.
- Encouraged stakeholders to call BCTS office for more information on current sales.
- Noted that 70-80% of cut is beetle-infested pine.
- BCTS is first licensee in Kamloops TSA with FSP approved; start date is January 1, 2007.

Toby Jeffries – Gilbert Smith

- FSP approved in January. No blocks developed under FSP yet.
- Maps won't change much in the FSP world, will be similar to FPC.
- Referral process won't change either.
- Signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Chuchua.
- 2006, change of operating areas with Weyco (acquired Blue River area).
- Heli-logging will begin once breakup starts.
- Fdi-beetle trap tree program under way this spring.
- Likes to see LRUP meetings continue into the future.

Agency Presentation

Phil Youwe – Range Officer, Kamloops Forest District

- Range Use Permits (RUPs) issued by March 31st.
- Funding available for managing natural barriers – looking at options (ie: putting some money towards more riding in light of fencing issues in MPB world).
- Also discussed Range Impact Assessments – for stakeholders to fill out and work with licensees.

Question regarding grazing enhancement program, what happened to it?

Answer:

- Funding was originally available to deal with issues in grazing, when funding ended, the program ended.

Percy Folkard – Invasive Weeds

- Program managed by Ministry of Forests and Range - Branch.
- Districts have input.
- Jo-Ann Fox – weed coordinator. She deals with weeds on a macro level.
- Online viewing of plant sites on
- Requirement in FRPA (Section 47) for licensees to put measures in place for managing invasive plants.

Question regarding inter-agency communication? Concern expressed that there is a lot of focus on educating rather than acting. Note of funding available up North.

Answer:

- Still in planning stage.
- Completing a working document for everyone to adhere to. Identify gaps on what is happening on private lands, looking at building a database of plant sites.
- NWIPC has on-the-ground program. SouthWest not there yet.
- Goal by the spring to have maps available for public review.
- Work going into containing marsh plume thistle.
- Notes that oxeyed daisy is everywhere. Does not reduce forage as significantly as knapweed.

Doug Lewis, MoE – Mountain Pine Beetle

The following were taken from Doug's presentation notes:

- The three-legged approach:
 - Used to describe the components that must be balanced for sustainable use of resources to provide community stability.
 - Must be 'balanced' - one leg too short or too long will cause it fall over.
 - Economic
 - Consequence: Loss of consistent timber supply – short term benefit- possible mid to long term
 - Response – Accelerated salvage harvest to capture economic value from stands
 - Social
 - Consequence - Falling trees or increase fuel loads threaten human safety and infrastructure in communities, along roads, near buildings or fences or in Parks.
 - Response: Removal of trees that endanger human safety and infrastructure.
 - Environmental
 - Consequence - minimal ecological impact from MPB infestation alone.
 - Response – Let forests recover and regenerate naturally.
 - Hydrologic Impacts

- Trees die and lose needles slowly – dead pine trees contribute to intercept snow and provide shade during snowmelt to mitigate effects.
- Non pine overstory trees, understory trees, intact ground cover (shrubs, plants and moss) continue to intercept snow.
- Plant Diversity
 - Loss of overstory trees allows more sunlight to the ground – within several years will have greater plant diversity (Dykstra and Braumandl 2006, Forest Practices Board 2007).
 - Pine dominated forests are replaced with a mixed stand of other conifer or deciduous species.
 - Increased structural diversity – standing dead and downed trees.
- Wildlife Impacts
 - Few wildlife species dependent on pine-dominated forests (Bunell et al. 2004)
 - Some species “win” and others “lose”, most indifferent.
 - Often old-forest structural components (snags- downed dead wood, shrubs) continue to provide habitat for mature forest species.
- Fire Hazard
 - Many dead pine stands will never burn – must have weather and ignition source.
 - Greatest risk is in first few years after death of trees while “fine fuels” (dead needles) are present in on the trees.
 - Over time, loss of needles, growth of non-pine trees and shrubs, fallen trees absorb water requires drought periods to produce fire hazard
 - Under severe fire weather conditions –likely no additional risk

Risks to Environmental Values:

- Initial observations often incorrect 1) lack of experience 2) scale of the disturbance, and 3) Lack of information – result in a tendency to exaggerate negative impacts of the infestation.
- Greatest risks to environmental values are due to the cumulative impacts of human response to the MPB infestation - salvage harvest and tree removals.
- If our responses are not well thought out and carefully planned these actions can adversely impact economic and social values now and into the future.
- Loss of ecosystem resiliency – ability to absorb future natural disturbances – fires, other insect outbreaks without excessive habitat degradation other economic and social impacts.
- Simplification of the landscape – conversion to plantations - loss of habitat – increased risk of loss of forest investments to natural disturbances.
- Unforeseen impacts of habitat alteration on wildlife populations - local extirpations and loss of some hunted and trapped species.
- Elevated hydrologic impacts – potential increased risk to fish habitat, infrastructure and water quality due to flooding, sedimentation, elevated spring run-offs.

What is Ministry of Environment doing? - Parks

- Tree removal in Provincial Parks to reduce hazard of falling trees near campsites and near infrastructure (buildings, trails, fencelines).
- Modifying trees to remove safety hazards but maintain wildlife values where possible.
- Let Natural Processes occur and monitor these changes over time
- Assessing risks to environmental values due to habitat loss and alteration.
- Providing decision-making agencies (MoFR), licensees and the general public with information on risks of salvage harvesting on environmental values.

- Monitoring changes on the landbase to ensure salvage is meeting biodiversity objectives.
- Working with other agencies (MoFR, MoTH, ILMB), licensees, First Nations and other groups to identify, assess and conduct treatments that restore ecological processes and minimize risks ecological values.
- Assessing the impacts of increased road access to small lakes fisheries due to MPB salvage harvest.
- Restoring historic access.
- Preventing increased access.

Question about using federal funding for initiatives on private land?

Answer:

- Federal funding is not available on private land. Could contact Environment Canada for more information.

Discussion around trying to maintain some the “remoteness” to some small untouched lakes. Managing access in these areas to maintain lake integrity.

Leith Mckenzie – Forest Health

- In a salvage state for mountain pine beetle (MPB).
- Focus on fir and spruce beetle – mapping, trap tree programs, small scale salvage program is focusing on these areas too.
- 2007 will be the big MPB year in the South – dependent on weather.
- Projected that 80% of pine will be attacked/killed.
- Fir and spruce beetle are increasing due to climate.
- Spruce budworm affecting fir, shouldn't be too much of an issue north.
- Spruce budworm is defoliator, so will not likely kill mature trees. Affects current year's growth.

Question regarding the “leading edge” of the MPB spread?

Answer:

- Not sure of the actual edge, has walked through some plantations in Clearwater where young pine were all attacked. Around Kamloops/Clearwater, some attack into plantations. This has serious timber supply implications.

Question regarding whether Sx has more chance of pitching out the beetle?

Answer:

- Through observations, some spruce has been hit just as hard as the pine, but will likely not produce a viable brood.

Question regarding whether root rot is killing young cedar trees?

Answer:

- Drought may be the cause.

What is affecting ponderosa pine?

Answer:

- Both mountain pine beetle and western pine beetle.

John McQueen – Timber Supply Review

The following were taken from John's presentation notes.

Process

- Kamloops TSA, which includes both the Kamloops and Headwaters Forest Districts, is in the midst of Timber Supply Review (TSR4);
- TSR3 effective Jan 01, 2004 and planned for an approx. 3 year duration;
- TSR4 is actively being planned;
 - A) The preparation and release of the Data package and PDP is expected for March
- This is the first TSR provincially that is looking at the impacts of an area that has had an AAC uplift due to the pine beetle infestation;

TSR4 Main objectives

- Identify the amount of IBM affected that is able to be harvested to help determine the initial harvest level
- Have a sustainable long run harvest level that reflects managed stand yields

TSR4 Highlights

- The base run model will run out to 400 years to look at all the factors
- The 670,000 m³/year uplift will disappear as most/all of the 2003 firestorm harvesting is completed,
- We appear to be at the peak of the pine beetle population as per the Marvin Eng model version #3,
- ~1.4million m³ non-pine harvest as per 2006 harvest billing;
- Pli modelling
 - o 1) Target those stands severely hit first
 - o 2) Pine NRL's = once the 2 year shelf life over, only the non-pine volume will be contributing from a non-pine leading stand. In pine leading stands the volume will be all removed and the stand will be on the unmanaged yield curve.
- IBS and IBD – discussions with district and regional staff have provided this TSR with the direction to assume that the losses will be minor based on current trends of the beetle populations and harvesting priorities by the major licensees and SSS program;
- More information on public discussion paper can be found at: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hts/>

Steve Schell/Hugh Murdoch – Protection

- Average year for fires.
- Handout with fire statistics given to group.
- Continue reporting to Kamloops fire center for quick response.
- Great support from community for crews when in town.

Darren Bennett – Front Counter BC

The following was taken from Darren's presentation:

A Single Point of Contact

- Negates clients need to personally engage numerous agencies on one project
- Cost savings (gov't and client) through a coordinated, effective, and **seamless** client service, especially when multiple permits are required

A Centre of Excellence

- Performs as a consistent and integrated information provider to the public
- **Citizen-Centric services** are a key deliverable of government
- provide a single point of contact store-front
- guide the client through application process
- provide in-person technical/professional assistance to interpret information

- liaise between ministries, agencies and other levels of government, coordinate referral process
- follow-up and monitor the application; inform client
- exploration of alternatives if the answer is not in the client's favour
- Some full adjudication such as MOFR and MOT authorizations
- Work to identify, and market, local economic opportunities

Front Counter BC

A corporate, integrated vehicle fully capable of providing the client services necessary to make the permitting and authorisation process more **simple**

- Examples of authorizations provided by Front Counter presented.

Contact Front Counter BC for more Information: Kamloops office 372-2127.

Dana Manhard – Forests For Tomorrow

- Under-planting sites impacted by MPB.
- Surveying sites to determine extent of damage.
- Kamloops head start with respect to FFT funding (due to 2003 fires).
- 3 million trees are going to be planted in 2003 fire areas.

Question regarding prescriptions on these unharvested sites that will be planted?

Answer:

- Will vary by site. Some sites will be planted underneath (left unharvested). There are issues with WCB on these sites. Some sites will have the trees knocked down and crushed with a cat and then planted.

General concerns from range community regarding grass seeding and wanting to see more provisions made to accommodate seeding.