

**CSA Community Advisory Group  
to Island Timberlands  
September 12, 2007  
Minutes  
Westview Pizza**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:00pm: Meeting called to order  
Quorum noted

**Welcome and introductions**

Chair welcomed everyone and introduced new participants; Valerie Thompson, Facilitator; Makenzie Leine, Manager Sustainability and Community Affairs (Island Timberlands) and Jill West, Zimmermann Forest Products (on behalf of Island Timberlands).

**Safety Review**

Facilitator noted fire exits and first aid attendants in case of emergency. Meeting place in case of emergency was noted.

**Code of Conduct**

Code of Conduct from Community Advisory Group was reviewed.

**Review and Acceptance of Agenda**

Agenda was accepted.

**Review and Acceptance of Minutes**

Minutes from the Island Timberland's February 14th meeting had previously been accepted but were provided for reference.

**Communication from the Public**

Copies of recent correspondence were provided and reviewed.

- Member stepped down from seat on advisory committee due to business and personal commitments
- Thank you letter sent to resigning member

**Action List**

**Action #1** – Copy of list and more info on species at risk – not complete yet

**Action #2** – Appendix “A” (Powell River Trails) needs to be revised for Island Timberlands – Trails are in draft – new map - ongoing

**Action #3** – Fiddlehead area - 2008 plans to log the area. Residents would like the area near the swamp protected. Will leave on the Action List and Kraig will bring more information when it's available. Update in Feb 07 – plans are to log in March 07 - complete

**Action #4** – Bring back to the table plans for logging near Lois dam access road that will affect the SCT. - complete

**Action #5** – SFM Plan – page 2 of the SFM plan needs numbers regarding DFA size. – complete

**Action #6** – Herbicide/pesticide discussion needs to occur. Need to the Advisory group's consensus on use. Keep on agenda

**Action#7** – One hour presentation on water management during a meeting provided by IT – ongoing

**Action #8** – Complete - Member to forward Thulin Lake IWMP to Kraig.

**Action #9** – Complete - Kraig supplied a good map showing trails

**Action#10** – Complete - Info on unused gravel pit provided

**Operational Information - review and updates**

Kraig Urbanoski provided map updated to show watersheds and trails. Logging only in Theodosia due to strike.

**Engineering Active**

Stillwater Properties

**Road Construction Complete**

894117 – ST189 by Freda Crk Bridge on ST Main

793411 – Dixon Rd

973407 – Okeover (Not DFA)

984450 - Fiddlehead

**Road Construction Active – but not during strike**

291450 – Powell Daniels

**Road Construction Planned Next in 2008**

894157 – GL127

894158 – ST911

884103 – Duck Lake

892350 – ST654

894355 – GL1134

891252 – ST450

**Logging Complete**

882352 – Duck Lake

181350 – Theodosia

894150 – Freda Crk

893450 – Tony Lake

Blowdown Recovery Areas

894350W – 2006 Logging (Horseshoe Creek)

894310W – 2006 Logging (TM-191P) – GL1100

892306W – 2006 Logging (TM-230) – ST 800

891251W – 4.5 mile Stillwater Main

894157W – Tin Hat Junction and 9.5 mile Stillwater Main

**Logging Active**

181451 – Theodosia

181453 - Theodosia

**Logging Planned Next**

793250 – Stillwater Sort below Highway

882350 – Myrtle Creek

794150 – Scotch Fir Point Rd

793452 – Lois Dam

*Question* – Did all the wood go through the sort down at Stillwater?

*Answer* – Everything we have logged this year except Theodosia has gone to Stillwater which is why we are not really operating right now.

### **Company Updates**

Wayne noted that company is largely not operation at the moment due to United Steelworkers' strike. Quite active in Buckley Bay. Next week starting up activities near Alberni.

### **Draft SFMP**

Chair gave an overview of the purpose of CAG and posed a number of questions. CAG sees its mandate as being able to provide input to Island Timberlands. CAG appreciates the valuable opportunity to be involved in decision making in the local forest. CAG contributes through providing IT with local objectives, indicators, strategies, and alternate strategies. This is one of CAG's goals in the Terms of Reference.

Chairs asked new IT participants Makenzie Leine and Jillene West to tell the room a bit about their background. Chair also posed the following questions:

*How do you see sustainable forest management?*

Chair notes that if one was to go to the Z809 CSA standard he would see – maintain and enhance the long term health of forest ecosystems while providing economic, social, and cultural opportunities to the benefit of present and future generations. The Chair offers that all of the CAG members around the table sanction this.

*Specifically why does IT want certification and what is the timeline for certification?*

*Define clearly the DFA to which Z809 standards will apply. What is the specific geographic area? There is confusion – Is the area only the part that was previously certified that was in the TFL, or is it only privately managed land, or is it private/private land? CAG needs a clear definition of DFA to which IT will be applying CSA standards.*

Makenzie's response: She has only been with IT for two months. She came from the Ministry of Forests (tenures – community forest and woodlot tenure administration and FN consultation). Prior to that Makenzie worked for Hayes as operational planner and engineer and for Timberline as ecologist and marketing coordinator.

Makenzie says that Sustainable Forest Management is well covered by the CSA definition that the Chair quoted. She strongly believes that SFM is not only about sustaining ecosystems. It is also about sustaining economy, and sustaining cultural values which includes recreation and First Nations. She also has some strong feelings about communication. Meeting such as this between IT and CAG are a testament to communication. It is good that everyone is talking. The group now just need to figure out how to focus. We all have our values regarding

Sustainable Forest Management and we just have to make an honest effort towards doing that.

IT is working towards CSA certification with SFMP and has an audit planned for this spring. One component of CSA certification is an audit of IT's EMS system and due to the strike this cannot yet be accomplished.

Island Timberlands wants CSA certification for two major reasons. First of all their clients want them to be certified. This is the economic and political reason why IT wishes to be certified. The second reason is public input. Although IT is already SFI certified and SFI and CSA are comparable from an environmental point of view, SFI lacks the rigorous public opinion component that CSA provides. IT values the public opinion component. IT was committed to being CSA certified when the TFL removed the land for two years, but this time commitment has now passed. The certification processes will be regularly reviewed to determine if the best business decision for the company.

Jillene said she is a professional forester. When she first came out of university she worked for WFP as a forester for a couple of years. She joined the internal audit team for certification with WFP and started getting introduced to certification and auditing. She left to join Zimmerman Forest Products which is a small consulting company that specializes in developing and implementing environmental management systems and helping companies achieve and then maintain their certification. Jillene mainly helps forest companies with developing and maintaining Sustainable Forest Management Plans.

Jillene presented a map showing pink areas representing the DFA.

*Question: Does the pink area correspond exactly to the multi-coloured part of Kraig's map?*

Yes, it does. To the best of my knowledge this is what's in the DFA.

*Question: Is Myrtle Creek area in the DFA?*

Yes.

*Question: Scotch Fir Point?*

Yes.

*Question: Even the Private/Private land?*

It would only be privately managed land. Ex TFL lands managed under designation as Managed Forest 21 (MFU)

*Question: Eagle River?*

Yes.

*Question: Let's take Eagle River as a specific. Up until February when we last met this table was not dealing with Eagle River. It was being dealt with by Diane*

*on the side. She met with Eagle River people. She held public meetings. If it was part of the DFA why was it not dealt with at this table?*

Some uncertainty about what was happening at this time was expressed by IT representatives.

*Question: At that time CAG was specifically told that Eagle River was not a topic for discussion for CAG and that it would be dealt with outside of the Community Advisory Group. Another recent example of this was a walk that IT did with a group of people down at Stillwater. CAG was not invited to any of these public discussions.*

Was this last winter?

Yes.

We were approached by a neighbour group. We shared this information with CAG. The group of neighbours came to us and did not choose to approach CAG. We mentioned the CAG process to them as an alternative to our discussions.

*Question: Could you give a little history on Eagle River?*

This was a while ago and Diane was still in conversation with CAG and IT was still deciding whether or not it wanted to go through with the CSA certification.

Thank you for clarifying. Certainly we didn't feel clear at this table about Eagle River.

*Question: How would you like to tell us what the problems are at Thunder Bay?*

We are currently preparing the logging plans for our property near Thunder Bay. We have a few neighbours there that noticed the field crews working in the property. The field crews passed IT contact info on to the neighbour. They contacted IT and IT had various conversations with the neighbour and informed them that once the plans are in final stages – they would be recontacted for final notification. The main concerns were around the actual logging and the visual impact of the logging from private property.

*Question: Do you have any other hot spots you'd like to share?*

We contact neighbors all the time and have unsolicited calls from locals and neighbors quite often. We deal with them on a case by case basis outside of the CAG. We do not mention these to CAG – they are just a part of our business process. We do not see this changing.

*Question: The DFA is all of the land that was removed from the TFL39 block 1?*  
Yes, all of them.

*Question: Was there a penalty to IT for not complying with keeping all of the lands certified as this was one of the conditions of withdrawal?*

IT maintained ISO and SFI. This met the conditions.

*Question: May we assume everything west of Powell Lake is out?*

We think so....

Thank you very much for clearing that up.

**Draft SFM Plan**

General comment: The goal of Island Timberlands is to maintain one SFMP document that includes all three operating areas in Powell River, Campbell River and Port Alberni. As many of CAG's values are very similar to other PAG values IT has developed some core indicators. These are indicators that are shared by all three areas. IT changed some of CAG's indicator's so that one indicator may be used for all PAGs. The indicators are numbered. Indicators that are specifically for Powell River are numbered PR-##. Words with a line stroked through them represent original working and yellow highlighted text represents suggested new wording.

#1

Values – The diversity of habitat across the DFA and the variety of structure at the stand level

Indicator – Wording “The % of total area harvested that has retention” was changed to “The % of total area harvested each year that meets Island Timberlands’ Retention Policy (dated Sept. 19, 2006)

*Question: Could retention on overall business create a situation where retention is only on Vancouver Island?*

It is per cut block.

*Could criterion be changed to say “per cut block or operating area”?*

Sure, but it would be redundant.

*No, it's not redundant. There's enough confusion here that it is most certainly not redundant. From the time that we began talking to IT we have had concerns that all of the retention will be in the other operating areas and none in Powell River.*

Every cut block will have 3 ½% (for 2<sup>nd</sup> growth) or 7% (for old growth) held on each cut block. This is stated in IT's Retention Policy.

*If that is the case where can the public find the Retention Policy?*

It is not a publicly available document.

*Why is it secret?*

It isn't secret. As part of CSA and SFI Certification, Island Timberlands maintains an Environmental Management System which contains various policies and procedures. The standard also requires “document control” and what this means is that any time one the EMS documents is updated, all outdated copies must be located and destroyed and replaced with the new versions. In addition, the company has invested a lot of money to develop their policies and documents and they don't want it available for public viewing.

*We'd like to see it.*

Oh, you can see it. I believe the Terms of Reference has procedures outlining the handling of confidential documents.

**ACTION** - IT will provide a copy of the Retention Policy to CAG.

CAG would like to move on and reserve the right to revisit.

**ACTION** – CAG/IT to return to discussion regarding core indicator #1 following review of the Retention Policy

#2

Value – The risk status of forest-associated species in the DFA.  
No changes

#3

Value - Genetic diversity within tree species is maintained through reforestation.  
No changes

It is noted that the old numbering system has been replaced and CAG may find some items in different places.

#4

Value – Maintain areas of special biological significance in the DFA.

*What does this indicator mean for the Sunshine Coast Trail?*

The discussion was about preserving integrity – community values (buffers). Not biological significance.

*Does it belong here?*

I don't know.

*Are the kilometers for Duck Lake correct?*

**ACTION**– IT to confirm Duck Lake kilometers. The number seems too small.

**ACTION** - Group to decide if the Sunshine Coast Trail belongs with this indicator.

#5

Value – Timely regeneration in the DFA  
No changes.

#6

Value – Successful regeneration in the DFA  
No changes.

#7

Value – Wording changed from “The incidence of operationally caused fires that are not for management purposes” was changed to “The loss of forest resources due to fire”.

Indicator – Word “annually” taken out of all indicators because it is redundant. CSA standards require that IT report annually. If the time frame is anything other than annually it will be noted.

*Question: Does the definition of resources include wildlife habitat, fish habitat, and anything in the forest?*

Yes.

Value #7 accepted.

#8

Value – Wording changed from “The incidence of operationally related landslides on the DFA” to “Loss of productive soil area and forest resources due to landslides”

Indicator – Word “annually” removed.

*Comment: Appendix 2 is not consistent with Appendix 1.*

Yes. That is because there were so many changes in Appendix 1 and we expect to have more, so once Appendix 1 is complete Appendix 2 will be updated.

Value #8 accepted.

#9

Value – Sustainable harvest rate on the DFA.

Objective – Wording changed from “The harvest rate is sustainable in promoting carbon intake and storage” to “Long term productive capacity of the forests, sustainable harvest rates”.

Indicator – Wording changed from “The % of the timber supply area harvested” to “The % of the productive forest area that is harvested”.

IT thinks there is still some work to do with regard to the target and variance.

*Question: Could you pull up Appendix 2 for this value? Could you go down to current status - % of the DFA harvested? What we see there in 2006 is that 7 and almost a half percent of our DFA was harvested. We talked a little about sustainability at the last meeting and Bill Waugh said that our harvest rate will never be sustainable. 7 ½ % being cut a year - how does that fit in with your target? What does that say about the land base in Powell River? How can it be sustainable? How can we sustain ecosystems? How can we sustain the economic benefit to the community if in 15 years there are no trees?*

A lot of factors will come into play. We can get into some of the discussion tonight, but by no means is timber supply analysis my area of expertise. I can tell you that these are annual numbers and when you talk about sustainability you can't just talk about 6 months or 1 year. You have to look at the long term plan.

*Comment: In Powell River we are very concerned about the long term plan.*

All I can tell you at this point is that there are a few obvious commitments that IT has made regarding a long term forest plan. First of all they have private managed lands which they have an agreement with the government including a commitment to long term forest plans. Second, they are SFI certified across their entire properties. Not just TFL or DFA. Part of that commitment is sustainable harvesting and they need to demonstrate that by meeting some predetermined yardsticks. Thirdly, IT does complete timber supply analysis which I don't know a lot of detail about.

*Comment: When we met in February we asked about TSA and we were told it*

*had not yet been done. I now understand from correspondence with you that it has been done and it's not available to us.*

It's not available in its entirety, however we have explored the option of bringing an IT manager over for some discussion. He would be able to answer your questions a lot better than I can. We do have to keep in mind that some specific details are confidential.

*Comment: Can I just say that the problem here is arithmetic. Look at Port Alberni – at 2% per year you are estimating a 50 year rotation. By our standards that is awfully low.*

We are logging 50 year old trees now.

*Comment: In the case of Powell River the only explanation for that would be there are going to be periods of years where there will be no harvesting otherwise at this rate in 15 years you will have wiped out the forest.*

That is assuming that we would be harvesting at the current rate.

*Comment: That is what people will assume.*

It is difficult on a small land base. In Port Alberni there is a much greater land base.

Let's look ahead to another indicator where a 5 year term is used. When you are talking about sustainability it's better to look at a longer term goal.

*Comment: How does it address PR-37? This indicator has to do with a stable employment. One of the means of achieving the objective and target is TSA.*

There is a lot of other work that occurs other than the actual harvesting. Road building and engineering.

*Comment: Can I pose a question of process? Please return to #9. If part of what we are here for is to see if IT meets a target and work with you in meeting a target – how will we ever know if we met the target if we don't know what the TSA is?*

Part of the CSA process is internal and external audits. The purpose of those is to verify that the company is meeting all of the requirements and standards. One of the requirements is performance against targets. For those sets of information that are considered confidential and can't be made public the internal and external auditors will have access to the information and they will be able to verify if the company has met its requirements. The full audit report will not be available to you, but we are required to share the results and there will be discussions. So, you will know.

*Comment: I don't find that satisfactory.*

Unfortunately, we don't have flexibility on this one. This is a private company. We aren't even privy to some of the stuff you're asking to see. We saw a presentation on TSA last week and it was pretty general.

*Comment: My problem is not whether or not we see the TSA, but what are we doing with an indicator that relies on information that is not available.*

The auditors would be able to put their finding in a presentation and we could bring that to you.  
Perhaps there is another indicator that we could develop that addresses this value.

*Question: How do the representative go back to the community and say we've worked on this core set of indicators, the company is just going to tell us whether they've met the target or not. How does this translate into transparency?*

I have talked to some auditors from QMI and one of the big deficiencies of CSA is that it doesn't address these issues with private land. Maybe in the update that is coming out this issue will be addressed. It is a challenge that we will have to work out but unfortunately that information will not become available.

*Comment: We understand that there will be information that is not shared and it is our problem what we will do about that.*

IT actually uses all of their land for timber supply. When you think about the company trying to manage their land base sustainably it makes much more sense to include everything that they are logging rather than trying to do it in small pieces.

*Question: In Appendix 2 will your way of reporting change?*

We have no intention of changing that at this point. We are still going to report on how much of each operating area.

*Comment: Let's go around the table and then go on. We reserve the right to come back to #9.*

*Comment: Maybe we could add something with regard to the auditors.*

It does specify at the beginning of the document it talks about proprietary information and that TSA will be made available to CSA auditors.

*Comment: I'd like to come back to it.*

*Comment: You were saying that Theodosia is not in the TSA.*

I don't think it is.

*2700ha is available up there for harvesting in Powell River area. Is that included?*

No.

*So that would be completely separate?*

This is strictly land defined as DFA.

*Comment: I can see 3% of Powell River being left in the next 15 years. It is prime for harvesting. That's the way it is. As long as everyone can accept that...*

*Comment: I'd like to come back to it next time.*

*Comment: Move on, but who does the TSA?*  
It is directed and overseen by IT.

Makenzie suggests for next time that maybe there are some things we can look at when working on this indicator like the process itself, how are we doing our TSA, what are our standards.

Wayne says not to forget that there is other land outside the DFA that may not be harvested.

*Comment: but in the process we are not supposed to be looking at that.*  
I know.

*Comment: We are agreed that we would like to come back to this.*

**ACTION** – CAG/IT to return to discussion regarding core indicator #9 and exploring alternative indicators related to the process of completing the Timber Supply Analysis, or other alternatives that would report on information that is not considered proprietary.

#10

Value – The quality and productivity of soils in the DFA

Indicator – Wording was changed from “The % soil disturbance within cutblocks (averaged over the year)” to “% of cutblocks harvested where soil remediation is required; and remediation is completed”.

*Comment: This group could carry on a discussion about soils for hours.*

Basically just the wording has been changed. The intent is the same.

*Question: Could we change the target from 5% to less than or equal to 5%?*  
Done.

#10 is accepted.

#11

Value – The quantity of forest soils in the DFA

No change.

*Comment: You told me in an email that Plutonic Power didn't cross any of your property. When we met with Plutonic they showed us a visual that was up by Jim*

*Brown creek and I think they mentioned that from the viewpoint we were looking to IT land. I wasn't sure if the line crossed your land. I found that quite confusing.*

I didn't say that it didn't cross our land. I just said that nobody from Plutonic had contacted us.

*Comment: You should find out.*

We're not going to ask them if they want to cross our property.

A point of interest is the way that we have defined permanent access. The power line would not be included in that definition, so if that is something you would like to discuss we should add it. Our definition of permanent access is roads that we build.

*Comment: Section 3.2 Water Quality doesn't have any core indicators.*

This is just core indicators. You have your own set of indicators in the Powell River section. Yours were just not similar enough to turn into a core indicator.

*Question: How are they different?*

We could look at that in the future.

**ACTION** – CAG/IT to investigate the indicators from other PAGs for section 3.2 Water Quality.

#12

Value – Sustainable harvest rate on the DFA

#13

Value – Sustainable harvest rate on the DFA

Comment: Both of these values are dependent on our previous discussion of the TSA. Group agreed to come back to it.

**ACTION** – CAG/IT to return to core indicators 12 and 13.

**Next CAG meeting – October 10<sup>th</sup> with WFP**

**Next IT meeting – November 14th**

**Meeting Adjourned 8:30 pm**

**CSA Community Advisory Group to Stillwater Timberlands  
Island Timberlands  
September 12, 2007  
Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Member Seat</b>
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Jane Cameron – Chair</b>	Primary	Member at large
<b>Bill Maitland</b>	Alternate	Local Business
<b>Ken Jackson</b>	Primary	Recreation
<b>Patrick Brabazon</b>	Primary	Local Governments
<b>Ted Byng</b>	Alternate	Local Governments
<b>Rory Maitland</b>	Primary	Contractor
<b>Doug Fuller</b>	Primary	DFA Worker
<b>Wayne Borgfjord</b>	Primary	Forest Dependent
<b>Nancy Hollmann</b>	Alternate	Tourism
<b>Mark Hassett</b>	Primary	Local Business
<b>Dave Hodgins</b>	Alternate	Recreation
<b>8 Seats represented</b>		
<b>ABSENT MEMBERS</b>		
<b>Kathy Kirk</b>	Alternate	Member at Large
<b>Brent Rothwell</b>	Alternate	Contractor
<b>Paul Goodwin</b>	Alternate	Forest Dependent
<b>Dave Rees</b>	Primary	Tourism
<b>Ron Fuller</b>	Alternate	DFA Worker
<b>George Illes</b>	Alternate	Environment
<b>GUEST</b>		
<b>Cathy Bartfai</b>		
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Resource – others</b>		
<b>Makenzie Leine</b>	Island Timberlands	
<b>Wayne French.</b>	Island Timberlands	
<b>Kraig Urbanoski</b>	Island Timberlands	
<b>Valerie Thompson</b>	Secretary/Facilitator	