

## FMLT Workplan Priorities to Explore and Develop

Compilation of the September 16, 2010 discussion and notes, in no particular order:

---

### Salvage

Working Group: Tom, Jon, Rob Short (MFR)

- Field scale of small volumes
- Special forest products – recovery prior to residue surveys; recovery under primary CP? SFP includes logged/hogged(?) tree material, woodchips; shake & shingle material. Salvage, Bio-energy, small contractors

---

### Authorizations – log dump/heli drop, etc.

Working Group: Dave, Ione, Scott, Vadim, Jennifer

- Eliminate requirement for a License of Occupation for short term helicopter log drop zones
- Lands vs MFR tenure application / approval streamlining : Application/Approval – Issuance of land tenure (through lands – if applicant does not have forest tenure) seems to be a much more onerous process. I would like to see the Lands system streamlined (like MFR model).
- Log dump authorizations: streamline LAND ACT process by advancing local MFR initiative; heli drops – blanket authorization?; integration of SUP + foreshore tenuring?
- Expand Exhibit “A” allow for “rapid” amendment – “log it and amend later” vs tech trespass.

---

### Waste & Residue (including Standing Waste)

Working Group: Andrew, Dave, Vadim

- Assessment of retention % post-harvest.
  - Postharvest retention methodology.
  - Recognition of poorer quality areas (i.e. blue-stained Yc) during surveys.
  - Post harvest AAC depletion: assessment of disp. Ret.; AAC waste - come clean
  - Tools for measuring waste & residue.
-

---

## **RESULTS / ECAS Databases**

Working Group: Ryan (developing a summary note)

- Difficulty of using the databases.
  - Simplification of submissions??
  - Follow-up with OIF?
- 

---

## **Ocular Assessments Guidance (free growing and regeneration delay)**

Working Group: Mike, Jon

- Ocular FG + RG guidance paper
  - Ocular FG & Regen Delay surveys – guidance paper from FMLT for district; FG heights
  - Stocking Standards – Allow Professional to decide which species should be preferred / acceptable at the site level. One ID # per FSP.
- 

---

## **Cruising (including dead potential)**

Working Group: Scott, Ryszard (Mill & Timber Products), IFP (Dave to identify representative)

- Dead potential – overestimation
  - Inconsistencies between Districts (DWB factors)
  - Factoring the total volume CP cruise data
  - Can the RFP sign their own factored data
- 

---

## **Fire Hazard Assessments**

Working Group: Mike, BCTS (Scott to identify representative)

- Eliminate the need for individual FMA variance
  - Apply a blanket variance at the District level that addresses the issue at a BEC level
-

---

## **Informing LBIP (formerly FIA)**

Working Group: N/A

- FIA-FMLT input into prioritizing and funding decisions
- 

---

## **First Nations**

Working Group: N/A

- First Nations collaboration – Nanwakolas, employment opps, info-sharing
  - Information-sharing process through Nanwakolas
- 

---

## **Landscape Level Planning**

Working Group: N/A

- Landscape level objectives (e.g. wildlife, watershed, EBM...) – need to ensure collaborating + tracking in order for LUs w/ multiple licensees to ensure objectives are met collectively across the landscape
  - Cooperation between govt licensees – i.e. EBM landscape level planning & who is making decisions on what priority work is being done (not communicated with licensees or FN not involved with CFCI)
  - Total chance planning in TSA? Heli harvesting vs. long term development
- 

---

## **Communication**

Working Group: N/A

- Government agencies (ILMB, MFR), licensees, CFCI + other groups re: EBM planning
- 

---

## **District FSP**

Working Group: N/A

- District-wide FSP? + related FSP review/approval process issues - streamlining
-

## APPENDIX A

**June 18 – September 2, 2010**

### **Additional Ideas Generated for Topics to Explore**

The ideas below are compiled in response to Meeting #1 Action Item 4.c.

From FMLT Members:

- One thing that I would like to add to the 'inter-agency' issues, is helicopter drop zones and how to get approved for one. DFO, CFPA and BCTS put out a BMP for heli drop sites guidance document but it would be good to get clarity on what really needs to get done in order to secure a heli drop site. In the case of our operations, we often only need a site for 2-3 months and then we have no future plans in the area.
- opportunities for salvaging in cutblocks before harvest
- Acceptable and consistent methodology to assess post-harvest standing trees identified for retention in the CP
- Recovery of hogged tree material and woodchips prior to residue survey

From CRIT:

- Providing review and comment on the draft product developed by CRIT SWG related to the new Provincial Land Based Investment Program; (Context - For 2011/12 LBIS, the FPIB is looking for each region to have initial draft strategy that defines the category outcomes and objectives for discussion purposes by mid-July. Final category indicators, targets, and activities recommendations are to be completed by the end of September with the determination of outputs, implementation priorities, and finalization of the strategy for executive decision by the beginning of November. Once a draft product is developed by CRIT SWG, the district FMLT's will be asked to provide review and comment.)
- FSP Streamlining Proposal; (Context – Key concept is to use a single baseline FSP owned by the District that each licensee could use and propose variances as needed. Potential cost savings in review and comment and FN consultation process. Other processes could be added to the FSP for additional cost savings, e.g. PUP and FS Lease applications. CRIT should look at using FMLT groups to flush out this concept.)

## APPENDIX B

### **June 17, 2010 North Island – Central Coast Forest District Forest Management Leadership Team Meeting**

Reviewed 'Challenge Wall' post-it note exercise from the March 4 2010 All Licensee Meeting and then brainstormed the following:

#### **Topics to Explore:**

- Addressing perceptions on both sides (industry/government) with a focus on roles and appreciation of individual responsibilities
  - Opportunities for applying professional reliance to a greater degree
  - Bouncing processes off this group (such as stocking standards and FSP extension process)
  - Operational challenges – inform CRIT/OIF
  - Landscape-level planning efficiencies (such as update from MOE on WHAs, and EBM-related items)
  - Professional accountability: continuity of applying prescription; who is responsible; how far our professional obligations go
  - Streamlining processes to find efficiencies and promote innovation (including : review, submission, approval, tenuring, operational amendments on-the-fly)
  - Interagency frustrations (log dumps (DFO) – RMC model currently only provincial in scope)
  - Barriers to innovation: strict adherence to policy; legislative restrictions; too long to get approval is a fear
  - Guidance for professionals regarding: scope of practice (field scale of small volume); declaring areas considerations; clear prescriptions/rationales
  - Blanket salvage permitting
  - Opportunity for flexibility
  - Forum to discuss innovative successes: themes versus cost information (trade secrets); what's new, what's working; new tools; Deputy Minister's challenge
-

## APPENDIX C

### **Compilation of the March 4, 2010 meeting notes related to: Enabling Professional Reliance and Innovation**

#### **Challenge Wall**

##### SCOPE/APPLICATION

- Can we build increased professional reliance into First Nation info sharing? – need to communicate that this is outside of FRPA – but not insurmountable
- Keep talking about the elephants in the room, not just FRPA
- Linking all ministries responsible for land base decisions, into the professional reliance model
- Other agencies need to be on-board as well: ILMB, MOE, DFO, etc. Need to recognize forest professionals as QRPs as they relate to forestry activities/planning.
- Getting non-RPF professionals and laymen (i.e. DFO and First Nations) relying on our professional judgement. Problems – First Nation walks of cutblock that have chance of having FN's values
- Moving log dump and waste permit applications through the process quickly
- Need to find a way to explore conflicting objectives
- FIA Programs have no allowance for professional reliance. Very prescriptive requirements.
- Certified forest licenses already meet and exceed FRPA and other legislation, this should place these licence holders as 'low risk'. FSC+SFI+FPB+C&E+FREP=redundancy in compliance auditing.
- Recognizing when you are outside your area of expertise
- If we are to succeed – cultural change needs to incorporate beyond FRPA – Forest Act, CPS, tenures, openness to new ideas
- Need to address the position that there is 'no professional reliance – appraisals and timber pricing'
- Repetition of review
- ECAS does not provide the output to manage 'change of circumstance'
- Stronger link with consultants/contractors; have to be aware of what they are doing and what work you are relying upon when signing documents; accountability issue
- Ask yourself if your proposal/approach makes good common and strategic sense, not just whether it meets legal requirements
- Depletion for AAC (TSA) – How does a forest professional account for that timber left isolated (standing) or that permanently retained beyond the levels mandated in FRPA or specified in an FSP! My solution: (1) deduct all from AAC, (2) deduct total cruise volume by CP from AAC
- Roadblock: We have made forest legislation & policy too complex. Higher complexity = increased opportunity for errors/omissions which lead to lack of trust from regulators. We need to simplify some legislation/policy
- Provincial programs like FREP need to open up to professional input through appropriate process. Especially where there is emerging science available.
- 1 District Forest Stewardship Plan
- Inconsistency between districts

- Some professionals want less upfront discussion and review, but to ensure high quality submissions, need to ensure a strong internal peer review system is in place before submitting (too often with the Code, submitters relied on reviewers to check, provide corrections when under prescriptive regime)

## INNOVATION

- Local management barriers to innovative practices
- Local challenge: How can we track landscape level objectives? – need team approach, requires innovation
- Licensees share draft A.D.M. proposals and creative strategies with each other
- Professional reluctance to go outside of the regulatory box (FRPA) – fear to try something new
- The view that innovation cannot / should not negatively impact stumpage revenue
- Corporate barriers, e.g. insufficient resources
- A barrier to innovations is complex systems and reporting that will take time to navigate – time which we may not have
- Sliding back through Back Door Effect: Provincial expert standards developed without due consideration of expert and professional work at local level, may be inappropriate, but become viewed as defacto professional standards.

## TIMING

- Pace – lack of timeliness in the review process
- Lack of sense of urgency at times in MFR. Sometimes by the time MFR catches up to a ‘new method or idea’, the market has changed so much the licensee is going down a different path

## RELATIONSHIPS

- Trust
- The importance of demonstrating respect/trust versus saying it exists
- Professional reliance needs to be a 2-way street – if expect reviewers to have less questions, less review, then also need to respect reviewers or monitors roles on informing the DM and provide reasonable information or engage in prof. discussion rather than go straight to DM, RED, etc.
- Many professionals prefer less review (or no review) + rely on checking results after the fact – but then need to have cooperation w/ monitoring/auditing professionals to provide due diligence documents + conservation (right now often get resistance when following up on results)
- Sister gov’t agencies breeding scepticism into forest practices
- Industry needs to have greater transparency
- Too many unforeseen roadblocks in review and approval processes. Practitioners need to be checked on Results only. Joint field inspections to build trust.
- Make open, informed discussion and professional dialogue a source of energy – let it be energizing, not de-motivating
- Industry needs to do some work on the public test
- Industry have not delivered a professional product
- Some agencies not even at beginning stages of prof. reliance (MOE!)
- Advocacy in districts sometimes undermined by region or branch
- Historical baggage over: controlling, lack of accountability, lack of understanding of economics

- Little to no accountability on the part of the reviewing forester. Reviewer oversteps their role in the process.
- C&E lurking in the background on the issue being discussed
- Industry have to be accountable for their professional conduct
- Reluctance to challenge thinking as it gets 'spun' into negativity to serve some other intent

### **Parking Lot**

- Clarity of proposal (lack of understanding)
- "What are you up to?" attitude – lack of trust
- Direction from Victoria/Nanaimo – need local answers; lack of reasonable response to high risk scenarios; courage to identify options to resolve hard issues (think outside the box)
- FSP amendments for declared areas
- FPB high retention harvesting recommendations – How do we respond locally?
- Ocular waste assessments