

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #23 Minutes: Ecosystems

February 2, 2010

1. Call to order

Keith Chapman called the 23rd meeting of the Fraser Public Advisory Group to order at 5:30 p.m. on February 2, 2010 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. The meeting sign in sheet was circulated. The meeting audio is recorded for the purposes of the Meeting Minutes only.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Al Stobart, Inch Creek Hatchery, Director Area G FVRD	Heather Morlacci, Hatzic Valley Watershed Committee	Randall Dayton, MoFR
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Valley Emergency Coordinator	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident, Director Area A FVRD	Steve Dillen, 4WDABC

Members Absent:

Brian Jones, Seabird Indian Band	Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Point Resident	Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-am
Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Mike Peters, Ministry Tourism Culture and the Arts
Chief Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	John Bowles, Harken Towing	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Keith Warrenner, Fraser Valley Regional District	
Frank Andrew, Stó:lō Tribal Council	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation	

Others Present:

Chris Harvey, Facilitator	John Pichugin, Teal	Keith Chapman, Teal
Kevin Stanczyk, Teal		

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #23 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #22 (Nov 3, 2009) Minutes: *Indicator Maintenance*
3. *CSA Core Indicators – CSA Z809-08*
4. *FPAG Meeting 23 Ecosystem Presentation Slide Notes*
5. *Revised CSA SFM Standard “Core Indicator” Slide Notes*
6. *Public Advisory Group Terms of Reference (Nov 2009)*
7. *FPAG Group Membership – (internal) Contact List (Jan 2009)*

4. Health and Safety

Keith C. reviewed health and safety items and asked members to put forward any health and safety issues.

5. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #23

Keith C. asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #23 and asked for any proposed revisions. No revisions were put forward.

6. Introductions

Introductions were waived as everyone was familiar with other FPAG Members.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes

Keith Chapman asked the group to put forward any revisions to the meeting minutes from meeting #22 (Nov 3, 2009). Heather Morlacci noted an error on page 3. Keith asked for a motion to adopt the Minutes as revised. Lloyd Foreman 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

8. Current Events: External Audit Report

Keith Chapman asked Chris Harvey to provide a brief summary of the recent external audit.

Chris Harvey reported that the audit was a 12 month "Surveillance Audit". Audits rotate from Honeymoon Bay Operation to Fraser each year. The Audit targeted Teal's Honeymoon Bay forest operation this year. Teal passed the audit with 1 non-conformance identified. Also 5 "Areas of Concern" and 7 "Recommendations" were noted.

Teal's certification has four parts: Public Participation, Performance of SFMP, Systems (i.e. Corporate Management System), and Chain of Custody (i.e., tracking certified forest products). Letters were sent out on behalf of the Auditor to each First Nation associated with the Defined Forest Area (DFA), including First Nations participating in the Fraser PAG. A number of First Nations were interviewed. Two members of South Island Public Advisory Group (SIPAG) were interviewed. Three Members of the Fraser PAG wished to be interviewed but were unable. The 3 FPAG Members send their comments to the Auditor in a letter regarding their concerns about the change in interview times.

The Auditors interviewed the Ministry of Forests' Compliance and Enforcement regarding Teal.

Positive aspects identified by the Auditor include: excellent road maintenance, a good relationship with the Pacheedaht FN and a very good Compliance Record, the meeting minutes note documents distributed at each meeting, and SIPAG had a meeting in the Pacheedaht FN community.

The Non-conformance was attributed to the Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) regarding the "Alternative Strategies" for Indicators have not been adequately documented. The Auditor wants to see them in the SFMP. Teal had 30 days to address the Non-Conformance before the Registrar would determine if Teal's Registration would 'continue'. Teal addressed the Non-Conformance within the time-frame and the next edition of the SFMP will have an Appendix 4 that will summarize the Alternatives discussed during Indicator development at the PAG meetings.

There were 5 Areas of Concern, one of which is related to the SFMP. The Auditor was concerned that some of the Targets in the SFMP that said "The Target is the forecast". A summary of the 2009 Surveillance Audit will be put on the web.

Keith Chapman reviewed the documents in Members' meeting packages. Members may want to keep the "Core Indicator" document handy for the next several meetings. This list of CSA's Core Indicators gives a general outline of the subjects we will be discussing over upcoming meetings. We will discuss Criterion 3 Soil and Water at the next meeting this spring and then skip ahead to Criterion 6 Society's Responsibilities in the fall of 2010.

Also among the documents is the Fraser PAG Contact List. Members are requested to review for accuracy and respond to Keith. Heather Morlacci noted an error in her email address.

9. Presentation: Criterion 2 Ecosystems

Keith pointed out the PowerPoint slide notes in the meeting handouts (slide notes) for Ecosystem (Criterion 2: Ecosystem Condition & Productivity) and projected it on the screen. Keith reviewed element 2.1 Forest Ecosystem Resilience and Element 2.2 Forest Ecosystem Productivity.

Chris Harvey and Keith Chapman presented the slide show. The slide presentation contained an overview of Ecosystems including:

- Allowable Annual Cut (AAC)
- Timber Supply Review process
- Climate Change trends (temperatures, potential impacts, species shifts, fire risk, adaptations)
- Forest management & climate change mitigation
- Potential effects of a warmer climate
- Potential ways to influence carbon storage
- Trends in Natural & Human Disturbance
- Emergency Planning
- Biomass utilization/ Forest Salvage Harvesting
- Proportion of naturally disturbed area that is not salvage harvested

Homework (“Ecosystem Discussion Items”) on these topics was sent to Members January 22nd.

It is important to remember that many of the Core Indicators are a ‘high fly-over’ compared to some of our more heavily debated indicators for some local situations.

There was a discussion regarding different Licenses and how the AAC differs between them. Discussed how Cut Control works and how Licensees must use up their 5 year cut or risk losing it. Discussed how the Mountain Pine Beetle led to significant increases to the AAC in beetle affected areas.

There was a brief discussion about potential increases in forest fire occurrence and severity in the next 80 years.

Sharie Conroy asked about the trade-offs between leaving logging debris on the ground for soil and biodiversity versus removing it for fuel or to reduce the fire risk. Does the size of a cutblock play a role in terms of changing the microclimate or hydrology?

Keith Chapman replied that there is a process used throughout the province for determining if the fire risk from post-harvest slash okay or if it needs to be reduced by removing or burning the fuel. If reforestation objectives can be met and the fire risk is acceptable, the slash is left in place for soil and biodiversity. The onset of salvage operators, retrieving this slash from the woods, will lead to more being removed to generate electricity etc.

Heather Morlacci asked if the “maintenance of stands with multiple species and ages” include managing to have Old Growth as well.

Keith Chapman replied that it definitely includes having Old Growth represented. Old Growth supports a number of species that are dependent on those stands. For example, some tree lichens are a species that often need to ‘seed in’ from older stands. A diversity of age classes and species across the landscape is desirable so that one simple factor like a particular bug will not have a devastating impact across the forest.

Lloyd Foreman asked if the Salvage harvesting is part of Teal’s Quota (i.e. AAC)? The government should do more to encourage salvage by not penalizing the Licensee for others salvaging wood that the Licensee does not want.

Keith Chapman replied that Salvage is included as it is part of the harvested productivity within the Licence.

Bruce Edwards asked about Douglas fir bark beetle. He had not heard of this insect. How much of a concern is it?

Keith Chapman replied that all of the large conifer tree species have a beetle similar to the Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) that attacks them. These other beetles can have population explosions like the MPB. These species are endemic within their host tree’s range and periodically their populations ‘explode’.

Chris Harvey moved the discussion on to the Indicator development for Criterion 2. There are only a few Indicators to develop for Criterion 2 and some remaining Indicators from the last meeting. In order to streamline things, Teal will take the existing Indicators and use them for similar Core Indicators where the spirit and intent of the indicator is the same. We will go through them as an example at this meeting but in the future we will simply list out the changes.

Chris reviewed Core Indicator 2.1.1 “Reforestation Success”, 2.2.1 “Additions & Deletions to the Forest Area”, existing Indicators developed by FPAG, and SIPAG and the proposed new Indicator (i.e. ‘draft’ Core Indicator). Chris pointed out the differences between the Alternative Indicators’ Values, Objectives, Indicator and Target.

Steve Dillen asked why proposals for converting forest lands to non-forest would be directed to Teal.

Keith Chapman replied that Teal would be offered an opportunity to comment on the proposal and indicate how it may affect them as a stakeholder. An example would be the Independent Power Project in the Pitt River valley a year ago.

Keith reviewed the draft (proposed) Core Indicator 2.1.1 “Reforestation Success” on the slide presentation and the current Fraser and Honeymoon Bay Indicators that are almost identical (i.e. F2-3, H2-1 Successful Regeneration) and will be replaced with the final Core Indicator.

There was a brief discussion at the table regarding regeneration. The draft Core Indicator was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Regeneration of harvested areas	Successful regeneration of harvested areas	Reforestation Success	Full compliance with regeneration delay requirements in approved stocking standards	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 2.2.1 “Additions & Deletions to the Forest Area”. This draft Indicator will replace F4-7 & H4-3 “Conversion of Forest Lands”.

Steve Dillen asked why or how Teal would be reviewing proposals. Keith replied that Teal would be consulted as a stakeholder for many developments such as independent power projects or power line transmission corridors. Teal

returns comments and concerns to the proponent. The draft Core Indicator 2.2.1 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Minimize loss productive area	Minimize conversion of forests to non-forest uses	Additions and deletions to the forest area	Evaluate and respond to 100% of all formal proposals for conversion of forested lands to non-forest uses	Zero

Chris reviewed the draft Core Indicator 2.2.2 “Proportion of the calculated long-term sustainable harvest level that is actually harvested”. This indicator is based on an existing indicator developed by SIPAG but Fraser does not have a comparable Indicator. Chris discussed the SIPAG Indicator and potential strategies for a Fraser Indicator. An Indicator around ‘harvesting’ provides a measure of how sustainable the economic climate is for communities and the amount of activity in a year. It is a measure of economic activity while our other indicators measure everything else. AAC’s are governed under the Forest Act of BC which specifies cut control rules and limits.

Al Stobbart commented that the draft 2.2.2 language made sense as a simple measure of activity.

Bruce Edwards commented that he would be interested in the Forest Act cut control language.

John Pichugin commented that he can help explain the AAC and Cut Control. Teal’s licenses give them a right to harvest a set amount of cubic meters each year. The Chief Forester of BC determines a level that is sustainable in light of all of the competing factors and social dimensions that impact forest management. Teal can harvest its AAC each year or less in some years balanced with more in other years. It can be zero in one year and all of the AAC at once. If Teal exceeds the AAC there are penalties such as losing ‘cut’ (AAC) or financial penalties. The year to year flexibility gives Teal flexibility to respond to markets. Teal can cut less when markets are depressed and more if markets are good. We are in a world market where customers can buy wood from anywhere in the world. There is a 10% ‘tolerance’ to AAC before penalties kick in. The proposed draft Core Indicator simply says that Teal will comply with the law – it won’t harvest too much and it will not harvest too little and sacrifice jobs.

Randal Dayton added that another the reason for the cut control system is to ensure that there is a harvesting – licensees must harvest their AAC’s and not ‘hoard’ it. There is an incentive to provide economic activity while providing flexibility.

Lloyd Foreman commented that there is a social responsibility implied in the right to harvest timber. Here is an opportunity to harvest – use it, generate economic benefits – or lose it. It isn’t just for the companies; it is for the public’s interest as well.

Al Stobbart motioned to adopt the draft Core Indicator 2.2.2 unchanged. Heather Morlacci 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Timber	Sustainable harvest levels	Proportion of the calculated long-term sustainable harvest level that is actually harvested	100% compliance with Allowable Annual Cut over Cut Control Period	As allowed under the Forest Act cut control rules

Chris Harvey commented that there are currently 11 indicators under Criterion 2 within the SFMP that relate to ‘emergencies’ such as fire, wind, landslides and chemical spills which relate to natural and human caused disturbances. Teal proposes to combine the 11 indicators into one indicator that may cover “Emergencies”. Ten of the 11 existing Indicators have a Target of zero and a variance of 2. For example, the Indicator for accidental fires has a Target of zero and a Variance of 2 per year. All of the same information will be reported under one Indicator.

Lloyd Foreman commented that consolidating the Indicators would be good; streamlining is always a good idea. Heather asked what specific Indicators would be involved. Chris Harvey responded that Fraser Indicators F 2-5, F3-3, F3-5, F3-9. Honeymoon Bay has the other Indicators.

Heather Morlacci commented that some of these Indicators are very important to Hatzic.

Al Stobbart asked about the how the differences in the Variances will be resolved?

Chris Harvey replied that it could go either way we could keep the same variances or make them all 2.

Bruce Edwards commented that consolidating the Indicators would be fine provided that nothing is ‘lost’.

Chris Harvey said that Teal will draft a new Indicator and email it to PAG Members for review.

Keith Chapman called for a 20 minute meal break.

(Note: Meeting recording stopped at 7:25 pm)

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.1.3 “Forest Area by Seral Stage or Age Class”. This draft Indicator will replace

F1-1 “Retention of Old Forests” and F1-18 “Old Growth Management Areas”.

Steve Dillen commented that the word ‘draft’ in the proposed Target for 1.1.3 does not seem right. How does someone follow or adhere to a ‘draft’ plan. Alternative wording was discussed. Reference to draft Landscape Unit plans was replaced with ‘the Non-Spatial Old Growth Order’ for Landscape Units without final plans. The Core Indicator 1.1.3 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Ecosystem Biodiversity	Conserve Ecosystem diversity at the stand and landscape levels by maintaining a variety of communities and ecosystems that naturally occur in the DFA	Forest Area by seral stage or age class	Meet Old Growth Management Area representation by Landscape Unit (LU) as defined in legally established Landscape Unit Plans or the Non-Spatial Old Growth Order	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.1.4 “Degree of Within-stand Structural Retention”. This draft Indicator will replace F1-2 “Stand Level Retention (WTP)”.

There were no changes or comments put forward on the proposed changes. The Core Indicator 1.1.4 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Ecosystem Biodiversity	Conserve Ecosystem diversity at the stand and landscape levels by maintaining a variety of communities and ecosystems that naturally occur in the DFA	Average annual percent of stand level retention in all cutblocks as a percent of total cutblock area	Meet retention targets as specified in Teal’s Forest Stewardship Plans (FSP)	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.2.1 “Degree of Habitat Protection for Selected Focal Species, Including Species at Risk”. This draft Indicator will replace F1-16 “Spotted Owl”.

There were no changes or comments put forward on the proposed changes. The Core Indicator 1.2.1 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Spotted Owl habitat (Species at Risk)	Maintain habitat in Special Resource Management Zones established by government	Degree of Habitat Protection for Selected Focal Species, Including Species at Risk	100% Compliance with the Spotted Owl result and strategy in the approved Fraser Valley Operation Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) section 7.2.2.2	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.2.2 “Degree of Suitable Habitat in the Long Term for Selected Focal Species, including Species at Risk”. This draft Indicator will replace F1-17 “Wildlife Habitat Areas” and F1-19 “Ungulate Winter Ranges”.

There were no changes or comments put forward on the proposed changes. The Core Indicator 1.2.2 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Species at Risk	Maintain habitat within Wildlife Habitat Areas established by government	Degree of suitable habitat in the long term for selected focal species, including species at risk	Zero net area reduction of WHA and UWR	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.2.3 “Proportion of Regeneration Comprised of Native Species”. This draft Indicator will replace F1-14 “Registered Seed”.

There were no changes or comments put forward on the proposed changes. The Core Indicator 1.2.3 was approved as follows:

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.2.3 “Proportion of Regeneration Comprised of Native Species”. This draft Indicator will replace F1-14 “Registered Seed”.

There were no changes or comments put forward on the proposed changes. The Core Indicator 1.2.3 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Healthy forests with genetic diversity; forest productivity and wood quality	Maintain genetic diversity of native tree species, forest productivity and wood quality	Proportion of Regeneration Comprised of Native Species	100% of seed used for reforestation registered according to the Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.4.1 “Proportion of Identified Sites with Implemented Management Strategies”. This draft Indicator is entirely new (i.e. no similar existing Indicators). This Indicator was reviewed and discussed at the last FPAG meeting. The term “Identified” is defined within the CSA Standard as meaning items that are known to government from prior inventories and processes. There was a discussion at the last meeting about how there may be many sites that have not been “Identified”. This Indicator is targeting how the known sites are protected. Criterion 6 Indicators will frame the discussion and management of how the “un-identified” sites are identified through relationships with First Nations.

There were no changes or comments put forward on the proposed changes. The Core Indicator 1.4.1 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Identified Sites	Manage rare or unique sites of ecological, geological, historical or cultural importance in a manner that recognizes their special qualities	Proportion of Identified Sites with Implemented Management Strategies	100% of identified sites within the DFA have implemented management strategies as per the approved Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP)	Zero

Keith reviewed draft Core Indicator 1.4.2 “Protection of Identified Sacred and Culturally Important Sites”. This draft Indicator will replace F1-20 “Special Biological Sites”.

There was a discussion at the FPAG Table regarding the Target wording relative to the Indicator wording regarding “protection”. Keith proposed including wording from the CSA Standard regarding “long term maintenance”. The Core Indicator 1.4.2 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Special sites	Manage rare or unique sites of ecological, geological, historical or cultural importance in a manner that recognizes and maintains their special qualities	Protection of Identified Sacred and Culturally Important Sites	Spatially track all special sites identified (outside of OGMA, WHA, etc.) and implement management strategies appropriate to their long term maintenance	Zero

Keith C. noted the time and concluded the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m. Meeting Minutes recorded by Keith Chapman.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting TBA.