

Minutes
CSA Community Advisory Group
To Western Forest Products
March 23, 2015
WFP Boardroom

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:00 pm: Meeting called to order
Quorum met.

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 for Community Advisory Group was reviewed.

Welcome and Introductions

Chair welcomed members and guest speaker Nancy Pezel.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Agenda was accepted.

Review and Acceptance of Minutes

Minutes were accepted.

Correspondence

Copies of recent correspondence was provided and reviewed.

Letter to PRPAWS.

Emails to First Nations.

Email re: Russ Parsons thank you.

Email re: 2014 water monitoring report.

Operational Information Map Review

Current Activities

Harvesting – CH-018, CH-042, FH-033, GI-122, GI-129, GI-131, LL-012 (inactive), LL-038, ST-103, ST-276, TM-260, TM-265

Road Construction – FH-041, GI-130, LL-037, ST-040, ST-063, ST-075, ST-080, ST-152, TM-265, ST-298, UL-821, UL-846, PD-Rehab

Engineering – BT-630, GL-661, ST-065, ST-112, UL-844, WL-014

What's New on the Map

New Blocks – BT-643, GI-070, GL-025, ST-284, UL-832, WL-948

New Roads – GI-070, ST-284, UL-832, WL-948

Minutes

Cutting Permit Approved Areas – LL-039, ST-075, ST-111, ST-276, ST-820, TM-263

There are no new blocks or roads along the Sunshine Coast Trail.

Logging Complete – None

Road Construction Complete – FH-033, ST-111

Engineered Blocks – None

Engineered Roads – None

Company Updates

Andrea has left WFP and is now working with BCTS.

There have been organizational changes at Port Alberni and at the North Island involving the timberlands and mills. The company is on a path of continuous change looking for opportunities to be as efficient and optimized as possible.

There are two summer students coming in May. One is here for 4 months and one for 8 months.

Guest Speaker – Nancy Pezel – 2015 Silviculture Review and Canoe Route Updates

Planting				
	2014		2015	
	Ha	Seedlings	Ha	Seedling
Initial Planting	659.2	392871	596.2	625224
Fill Planting	132.2	65724	36.0	13550
Total	791.4	758595	632.2	638774

The number of trees planted this year is lower because Rudi wanted to have everything up to date before his retirement and the volume harvested has decreased as well. There may be more fill planting in the fall after Nancy does some more surveys.

Minutes

Brushing		
	2014	2015
Manual	82.8	107.7
Girdle/Cut	257.8	145.8
Herbicide	73.1	65.7
Total	413.7	319.2

More brushing may be added to 2015 after additional surveys are complete.

Surveys		
	2014	2015
Survival	324.9	982.1
Regeneration Performance	794.5	1479.7
Free Growing	437.5	692.8
Total	1556.9	3154.6

There are lots of surveys to be completed this year. The summer students will be able to help with this program.

Seedlings that are planted in the spring are surveyed in the fall to see how they made out during the dry period. Fall seedlings also get surveyed the following fall as they don't do much over the winter. Generally all of the survival surveys take place in September.

In the spring of 2014 WFP received Douglas-fir seedlings from a nursery that had a root rot problem in their stock. They don't know how many of the seedlings have root rot as it is hard to detect at the nursery stage. Other operations have also had problems with this particular seed lot. Nancy looked at a few of the blocks and found some dead seedlings. She showed a photo of an example of a dead seedling that they had spent extra money on brushing before it died.

Question: Is there any compensation from the nursery available?

Unfortunately not because a lot could happen between when the seedlings leave the nurseries and when they are planted. In this case the root rot has showed up at other operations, so it looks like it did come from the nursery.

Minutes

Question: Would the seedling infect the soil where they are planted?

No. It is just the seedling itself. They could infect each other in the box, but once it is in the ground it would not cause any harm.

Often the seedlings don't die they are just set back a couple of years, but it does kill some. This year it was so dry the combination made it worse. It appears that the trees in the areas that were fertilized did better.

Question: Is there pressure to plant fir because it becomes free growing the fastest?

In a lot of places Douglas-fir is the most ecologically suitable species. Hemlock and cedar does come in naturally and we do plant cedar in many places where we can. The elk is a bit of an issue with cedar because they eat them.

A few years after the survival survey is done, a regeneration performance assessment is done. This is to monitor the growth of the seedlings and to decide if additional treatments such as brushing is required.

The final surveys are the free growing surveys.

Question: What is the definition of free growing?

The technical definition is that a prescribed amount of trees have to be 150% the height of the surrounding brush. There is also a minimum height requirement. The minimum height for Douglas-fir for a medium site is 3 metres tall as well as being 150% the height of the brush. On a richer site you would expect the Douglas-fir to be 4 metres tall before you could call them free growing and the cedar only has to be 1.5 metres tall (but it still needs to be 150% the height of the surrounding brush). There is also a density requirement of a minimum of 600 trees per hectare. This means that not every single tree needs to be free growing, but 600 per hectare do.

Nancy showed a slide showing a cedar seedling with elk damage. WFP plants cedar for ecological, First Nations, and financial reasons. They have been quite successful with obstacle planting. They hide them strategically in the slash and after a few years the seedlings develop a good root system and grow very well.

Question: Is there not incentive to plant cedar? There is double the value of other products.

Yes and we have beautiful cedar sites. That's why it is a shame that the elk like to eat it. We do have a strategy in place to grow cedar on the land base including optimizing areas where elk are not as damaging.

Question: Don't the cones work?

They are very expensive and the elk knock them over.

We plant heavier to cedar in areas that don't have the elk damage. We plant more Douglas-fir in areas where we are experiencing elk damage.

Minutes

On one particular site the elk have been pulling the whole fertilized Douglas-fir seedling plug out. We had to plant some hemlock there now.

Question: Does WFP have data about how much cedar was planted prior to the elk versus how much cedar is planted since the introduction of the elk?

There might be. All of the new data is digital now. The old information would all be in archived paper files. It would be hard to compare because the types of areas harvested would also affect what is planted. For instance cedar is more suited to moister areas.

Comment: I just thought that kind of data could help any argument you might have with forestry over the amount of cedar planted.

Earlier in 2014 Rudi was involved in the Horseshoe Lake driftwood project. \$25,000 was secured through the Recreation Sites and Trails branch of the Ministry of Forest Lands and Natural Resource Operations with major sponsorship from Brookfield Renewable Power and WFP. Brookfield supplied money and WFP provided supplies. Approximately 5 hectares of driftwood was boomed up at the south east end of Horseshoe Lake. This was 80% of the driftwood on the lake. It is now much easier to navigate the lake.

Comment: The lake was low so now that it is higher there is more driftwood out there again. It is still much better than it was before the booming was done.

There was, in addition to the regular maintenance and scheduled improvements to the canoe route this year, the Goat Lake to Windsor Lake portage upgrade. Nancy showed photos of a number of structures that were fixed or replaced completely. Over 20 structures or elements were either rebuilt or replaced on this 2.5 km portage.

Nancy showed photos of the successful method of leaving high stumps near more sensitive creeks like ones in the community watershed for protection. The reason for doing this is once trees are felled it is really hard to see these streams that don't have a deep channel. The fallers and yarding crews can then easily see the streams and they can fall and yard away from them.

Rudi and Stuart have been working on a burn plan for a few years and this year it has been approved as a pilot project. On the Island a number of them were approved and we are following their lead. In the high sensitivity areas we are still required to meet the open burning smoke control regulation which requires good venting on the first day of burning and fair or better on the second day. We divided the TFL into high sensitivity smoke areas and low sensitivity for smoke areas. High sensitivity areas are within 10 km of town and the highway. Everything else beyond that is low. We burned a block within the high sensitivity areas and had two good venting days. In the low sensitivity areas there needs to be 3 consecutive days of not poor venting. One of these low sensitivity blocks was burned with two fair days of venting and it looked good.

Question: What is the definition of poor versus not poor venting?

On a good venting day the smoke goes straight up. It has to do with vertical movement of air.

We were able to burn the 19 blocks that we planned to burn.

Minutes

Question: Why are we burning at all?

Hazard abatement and reforestation are the two main reasons. In some areas it is because of high recreational use and some roadsides there is a lot of slash due to mechanical harvesting.

Stuart said that is a good question that we ask ourselves.

The government requires us to, in some cases, abate the hazard and burning these piles is part of that.

Comment: I think it is unfinished business and a very important conversation to have whether burning around our environment in Powell River or anywhere is getting us the benefits.

Stuart said there is professional flexibility built in and they are burning in their travel corridors but when they move back into lower risk areas they are not burning everything because the risk is not as high.

Comment: People that know nothing about the industry see those piles and have a negative reaction to forestry. They think the waste is useful and wonder why it is left behind.

Grinding the waste is a viable alternative which reduces smoke and creates employment, but only when it is economically viable. In this area only two of our blocks seemed suitable to the grinding company. These were close to town. They can only go out so far and make the economics work for them. Six of the cut blocks have been given out for firewood permits. We have given out 410 firewood permits for the six blocks.

George Illes – Field Visit to TM-265

At the last meeting Russ Parsons talked about logging near stream areas and George expressed a wish to come out and see this. He didn't realize how complicated it was. The first thing that surprised him was how nice the wood in the area was and the so called stream was not what he would have called a stream. It was a much smaller channel of water than he had pictured. Prior to harvesting they walk it, identify and communicate what needs to be done. The trees are felled so that it falls away from the stream channel. I was impressed with how the safety standards and environmental standards were met.

I didn't actually go down to the stream and look for fish...

Stuart said that a lot of smaller S4 streams don't always have fish. There are called S4 because theoretically a fish could swim up there one day.

SFMP – 2014 Indicator Results

Indicator 1.1.1 Ecosystem area by type

Target: The old seral stage of each ecosystem type (BEC) in each landscape unit of the DFA is within 95% the levels recommended in the Biodiversity Guidebook [September 1995] or approved Landscape Unit Plans for the DFA by the year 2218.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Comment: This is so complex. Perhaps it would be easier for people to see on a map.

Minutes

Action: Stuart to bring map for spatial constraints.

Indicator 1.1.2 Forest area by species composition

Target: The forest area (ha) by leading species composition remains within 5% of the baseline on a 5 year rolling average by species.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 1.1.3 Forest area by seral stage

Target: The % of productive forest area in the older age classes (81+/120+) is at least the level recommended in the biodiversity guidebook [September 1995].

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 1.1.4 Degree of within-stand structural retention

Target: The retention silviculture system is represented across the DFA according to the targets listed in the Western Forest Strategy (see below) on a five year rolling average.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 1.2.1 Degree of habitat protection for focal species, including species at risk

Target: The amount of area (ha) of habitat protected for selected focal species remains the same or increase year after year. (Selected focal species are mountain goat, grizzly bear, coastal tailed frog, marbled murrelet, and Queen Charlotte goshawk).

SFO met the target for 2014.

Question: Didn't the speaker that came to talk to us about Goshawks say that they don't necessarily like old growth? And didn't she say she went to some old nests and they had moved?

They do seem to enjoy our second growth. We found a nest last summer and some area was removed for that. It isn't necessarily in the 82 hectares put aside for goshawks. The 82 hectares is the set amount legislation currently requires for the goshawk. As years go by and more and better information becomes available we may want to redistribute our OGMAs into some of these nesting areas and remove them from other areas.

Question: The area that the nests in will eventually no longer be second growth and the birds may move on. You might need to change the criteria to base it on age class and species mix.

Maybe through time the area put aside won't be suitable anymore. That is why things should always be flexible. Current government processes are very much geared toward the spatial delineation.

Question: I know, but isn't that just because it is easier to mandate that versus going out and finding nests?

Comment: When they start tying up areas it is the beginning of the conservation efforts. As soon as people started worrying about goshawks instantly there were efforts to try and protect every site that they knew of and then money starts flowing for better research and surveys. When more surveys are done and more information is available they can start to be more strategic with lining the nests up with

Minutes

parks and other reserves. It is almost like the evolution of identifying species at risk. It is not a bad way to start, it gets everybody paying attention.

Question: Could we change our action list item from 1.4.2 to 1.4.1 because the changes would be suitable for 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 will most likely to be moved to a new section addressing only First Nations issues?

It is OK to do that – we do need though to look at this closer and see how best to appropriately look at this and with what indicator.

Indicator 1.2.2 Degree of suitable habitat in the long term for focal species, including species at risk

Target: The amount (in ha) of potentially suitable habitat available within WHA, UWR, and OGMA remains the same or increases over each 5 year period. (Selected focal species are mountain goats, grizzly bears, and marbled murrelets).

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 2.2.2 Proportion of the calculated long-term sustainable harvest level that is actually harvested

Target: The 10 year average harvest level does not exceed 10% of the total AAC authorized for two five year cut control periods.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 3.1.2 Level of downed woody debris

Target: The annual level of dispersed downed woody debris is on average > 10m³/ha.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 4.1.1 Net carbon uptake

Target: The net annual carbon uptake on the DFA is positive on a five year rolling average.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 5.1.1 Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services produced in the DFA

Target 1: Achieve a positive company EBITDA while providing for a range of other timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services from the DFA. Target 2: Report the annual total value of goods and services spent in the Community.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Indicator 6.4.3 Capacity development and participation for Aboriginal communities

Target: Participation in the forest management process is demonstrated annually with First Nations.

SFO met the target for 2014.

Stuart went through items that the auditor mentioned to make sure that the group addressed all of the issues. All of the items have been taken care of.

Minutes

Action List Items

Action Items

<i>Ongoing</i>	Who	Meeting	When
Indicator 1.4.1 – consider adding non-FN cultural heritage.	Stuart	Feb 11/15	
Bring copies of approved Management Principles next time.	Stuart	Feb 11/15	
Topics for future meeting – the 12 research projects.	Stuart	Mar 23/15	
Bring map for spatial constraints.	Stuart	Mar 23/15	

Minutes

Adjourned 9:00 pm

Stillwater CSA Community Advisory Group
Western Forest Products
March 23rd Attendance

Name	Position	Member Seat
PRESENT		
Jane Cameron – Chair	Primary	Member at large
Rory Maitland	Primary	Contractor
Wayne Brewer	Alternate	Tourism
Colin Palmer	Primary	Local Governments
Nancy Hollmann	Primary	Tourism
Laura van Diemen	Alternate	Employment & Education
George Illes	Alternate	Environment
Read English	Alternate	Recreation
Dave Hodgins	Primary	Recreation
Joseph McLean	Alternate	Local Business
Mark Anderson	Alternate	Member at large
9 Seats represented		
ABSENT MEMBERS		
Barry Miller	Primary	Environment
Andy Payne	Primary	Employment & Education
Bill Maitland	Primary	Local Business
Doug Fuller	Primary	DFA Worker
Rob Stewart	Primary	Forest Dependent
Russ Parsons	Alternate	DFA Worker
Cathy Bartfai	Alternate	Member at large

Minutes

Paul Goodwin	Alternate	Forest Dependent
Mark Hassett	Alternate	Contractor
Karen Skadsheim	Alternate	Local Governments
PRESENT		
Resource – others		
Stuart Glen	WFP	
Valerie Thompson	Facilitator/Secretary	
Nancy Pezel	WFP	