

Nimpkish Woodlands Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes February 11, 2016
Black Bear Resort, Port McNeill, BC
7:00 p.m. – 9 p.m.

Attendance: Kelly McMahon, WFP, Graham MacDonald, Town of Port McNeill, Pat English, Local Government, Jeff Jones, Mount Cain Alpine Park Society, Steve Lacasse, Environment

Regrets: Bill Nelson, Small Contractors, Jon Lok, Small Contractors, Stu Ellis, General Public Paul Barolet, MOFLNRO Advisor. Trevor Egley, WFP, Deidre Haight, BCTS

Observers: Jon Flintoft, WFP, John Tidbury, VINWAG, Fred Robertson, VINWAG, Christina Mardell, BCTS, Paul Kutz, Senior Operations Planner, CIFO, WFP

Advisor: Cyndy Grant, MoFLNRO, for Paul Barolet

Presenter: John Deal, Senior Biologist, WFP

Facilitator: Annemarie Koch

Notes: Kelly McMahon and Annemarie Koch

1. Introduction and Safety Procedures:

Annemarie reviewed the safety procedures to follow in the event of a fire or medical emergency.

Annemarie reviewed the objectives of the meeting, namely:

- To review the November 26th meeting minutes and selected action items;
- To hear a presentation from John Deal on the northern goshawk and marbled murrelet strategies;
- To review a summary and recommendations from the 2015 participant satisfaction survey;
- To confirm the 2016 meeting schedule;
- To confirm the date and content of the next meeting.

She asked NWAC members if, in the interests of visiting VINWAG members who were attending to hear John's presentation only, she could ask John Deal to make his presentation prior to a review of the minutes and action items of the November 26th meeting. She then encouraged members to introduce themselves, for the benefit of the presenter, new NWAC member and visiting VINWAG members.

2. Presentation by John Deal, WFP Corporate Strategic Planning Biologist on the Marbled Murrelet and Northern Goshawk Planning Recovery Strategy

John provided some background on his work as a biologist and with Canadian Forest Products on the north coast and in the Interior, and then with WFP on the coast.

John noted he had a long history studying both Marbled Murrelet and Northern Goshawk on the coast, adding he was on the first recovery team organized for these species. He referred to the supporting documents he had distributed, regarding the species themselves and the implementation plans for these species.

John provided an introduction to and background on the recovery strategy process. He stressed that WFP supports species at Risk Habitat Management. He encouraged PAG members to attend

the workshops and try to understand the local impacts of and submit comments on the recovery strategies proposed by the Province.

He noted that there were opportunities to explore alternative, lower impact solutions with respect to managing these species at risk. He noted that WFP was encouraging government to complete a full socioeconomic impact analysis, in association with the implementation strategies for these two species.

John provided background on Marbled Murrelets, noting they were threatened, old growth dependent, and that the estimated population in the Province was about 100,000 individuals.

John noted the Northern Goshawk required mature old growth forest for breeding and foraging, and that their estimated population in B.C. was 1,400 individuals. He stressed that the goal was to keep these endangered populations from becoming extinct.

John pointed out that the species assessment takes place at the federal level and that the legal listing is under the Species At Risk Act (SARA). John noted that recovery strategies were required for Endangered or Threatened species. The Recovery Strategy has population and distribution objectives, and strategies for critical habitat. He added that SARA applies only to federal land, but there is a requirement for effective protection which may trigger a safety net order, at the behest of the federal government.

John reviewed the provincial process around the implementation plans. He noted that First Nations and stakeholders have the opportunity to provide input on the Province's proposed management option for Marbled Murrelet and Northern Goshawk. The BC Implementation Plan is BC's response to the Federal Recovery Strategy (advice).

John noted that a final recovery strategy was posted for the Marbled Murrelet in June, 2014, but that revisions are in progress and an amendment is expected in 2016, to address issues that weren't addressed in the initial recovery strategy.

John noted that two draft recovery strategies have gone out for the Northern Goshawk, one in 2012 and another in 2014, and that the posting for public comment is imminent. He added that the final strategy is expected by late 2016.

There was a discussion of how agreements can be made on private land through the federal government, but not through the provincial process.

John provided an update on the provincial process, noting that First Nations and other stakeholder groups would be asked for input on the strategies for the next month or so. He reviewed B.C.'s proposed solution, to: engage First Nations and other stakeholders; complete land use planning, e.g. legalize OGMA's; complete and legalize priority Wildlife Habitat Areas; by 2017, protect specified amounts of habitat by Conservation Region and; employ spatial WHA's and aspatial (amount of habitat) approaches.

John noted that he wasn't sure yet how the federal government was going to establish protection areas for the species. He pointed to the use of spatial and aspatial methods of preserving habitat for these endangered species.

John noted that the spatial solutions have a larger impact on forestry operations. He noted that aspatial methods allow for tracking targeted amounts of protected habitat for the species. John noted this latter approach provides for more flexibility in forest management.

John noted that there is a long term population goal for Northern Goshawk of 411 home ranges. He added that the short term goal is for 95 new approximately 200 ha WHA's across the coast, 30 on the South Coast, 30 on Vancouver Island, 30 on the North Coast and 5 in Haida Gwaii. The foraging areas require additional research and will be revisited in 5 years.

Specifically for the Marbled Murrelet it will preserve 70% of the suitable habitat and will use a 2002 baseline, it will apply to crown land only.

John reviewed the nesting and breeding patterns of Northern Goshawks.

There was a discussion of how the 411 home ranges had been set and John noted this was a science-based number that was required to maintain a viable population of the birds across the north coast.

John noted that the impact of the federal recovery strategy for managing goshawk on Vancouver Island could result in removal of as much as 4,000 hectares from the THLB, and that this could result in as high as a 20 percent harvesting cut in the Nimpkish DFA annually, although this was more likely to be in the range of 5-8%.

There was a discussion of how the Great Bear Land Use agreement might affect these decisions.

John then reviewed B.C.'s proposed solution around protection of the Marbled Murrelet, which is to preserve 70 percent of suitable habitat across B.C., based on a 2002 baseline on Crown land only, which will result in disproportional Regional targets (e.g. higher percentages on eastern Vancouver Island than in the Interior), thus having a higher impact for Vancouver Island and the southern mainland coast.

There was a further discussion of John's reference to surplus habitat for the Marbled Murrelet.

John reviewed the possible impacts of B.C.'s proposed solutions. He noted there was some confusion around these impacts, but noted that the proposed impact for goshawk management was to be 0.6% of the total coastal THLB, so approximately 16,000 ha, and 15,500 ha for the Marbled Murrelet management strategy. John noted that the total coastal impact on the THLB was estimated at 32,100 ha. He noted, again, that the effects on Vancouver Island and the south coast would be disproportionate (higher than) to the rest of the province. John suggested that members ask about the socioeconomic impacts of implementing this strategy.

It was noted that it was the incremental constraints, including the Northern Goshawk and Marbled Murrelet strategies, that were making it very difficult for license holders to sustain profitable operations.

It was noted that the federal strategies do not apply to private land.

Steve asked if there was any way of ensuring that the food of the Marbled Murrelet was protected, as much of this foraging activity takes place in the marine habitat.

There was a discussion of how much federal research would be taking place around these strategies.

John reviewed some alternative solutions to the provincial proposal. For goshawks, he noted that the coastwide target of 411 home ranges was solid and that it was difficult to propose an alternate solution, except by managing B.C. populations across the coast (and not on a regional basis) in the long term, to lessen the impact on Vancouver Island. He added that there didn't seem to be an alternative to the short term solution. For Marbled Murrelets, John suggested managing for the 70% habitat target across the Province and not on a regional basis, to acknowledge the surplus areas of habitat on the north coast. Within the proposed strategy habitat for the Marbled Murrelet exceeds the BC target by 60,000 ha due to the surplus habitat in EBM areas. The alternate option would be to manage to the BC habitat target (not the regional) and use the surplus habitat to offset impacts.

John reviewed some of the key messages, including the need for communities to understand how the plan will affect harvest levels and local jobs; an understanding that the BC option is not the only option and that lower impact, science-based options should be considered; that a full socio economic analysis should be done and considered in the decision-making process, and that local companies be given the option to plan reserves for their own tenure to maximize co-location for other values.

John noted that Northern Goshawk monitoring in Englewood dates back to 1994 and notes that the licensees in the Nimpkish Valley have done a good job of inventorying Northern Goshawks and Marbled Murrelets over the years. It was noted that WFP is managing for more than what is acknowledged officially as Northern Goshawk and Marbled Mu habitat in WHA's.

John encouraged members to attend the engagement session on February 24 from 1-3 p.m. and suggested that members ask questions and understand how the issue will affect stakeholder groups in your community, from a socioeconomic perspective. John provided contact information to provide input to MOFLNRO.

There was a discussion of how the strategies for these species might impact harvesting plans for VINWAG. Jon noted that it was too soon to determine the impacts on harvesting as the decisions around the management strategies had not been confirmed yet.

John moved on to talk about a THLB stabilization pilot in the San Josef Landscape Unit. He reviewed data around Marbled Murrelet habitat and First Nations information. He noted that it came down to co-locating a number of values, including karst, old growth, species at risk, visuals and so on, and determining how to meet objectives while minimizing impacts on harvesting plans. John noted a pilot area had been identified, primary and secondary values identified, GIS layers developed, assessment of true harvestability of legal OGMA's carried out and an analysis resulting in a review and decision around harvesting options would follow.

John noted there was an opportunity for projects and pilots to be developed to evaluate the impacts of cumulative management decisions. He noted that Englewood was a candidate area.

Kelly reminded NWAC members of the February 24th workshop at the MOFLNRO office in Port McNeill from 1-3 p.m. and to RSVP with Laura Body by February 17th if they planned to attend.

3. Review of Minutes and Action Items:

Annemarie reviewed the minutes and action items from the November 26th meeting. She reminded NWAC members that she would be assuming they had read the minutes prior to the meeting. There were no additions or changes to the minutes. She added that she would not be addressing action items that were ongoing but only items that were to be addressed in the shorter term. Given this, Annemarie noted that there were nine action items to address from the November 26th meeting.

Annemarie reviewed the action items from previous meetings (including items that had been completed or revised) for which action was required in the short term, or for which reports were available.

Action Item 1: to follow up and see the feasibility of combining a number of targets for Indicator 5.1.1 that better reflect the economic and community benefits generated specifically in this DFA. It was agreed that Kelly should work with Jack and Bill to develop an additional target for Indicator 5.1.1 that shows Englewood's productivity in relation to other divisions in WFP

Responsibility: Kelly/Jack/Bill

Due Date: After divisional amalgamations are complete

Annemarie noted that, with the creation of CIFO, members might like to revise this action item. She offered to do some work on revising the targets for this indicator and asked members for their input, for example, did they wish to remove the reference to Englewood's productivity in relation to the rest of the divisions and focus more specifically on how to measure the economic and community benefits generated specifically within the Englewood DFA? She noted that, at the November 26th meeting with senior WFP representatives, some members had expressed concern about the effects of the move to continuous shifting on worker safety and community stability. She asked members if they would like to try to track the effects of the change on these matters and how they might propose to do this?

Members agreed that Annemarie should prepare a draft of an amalgamation of indicators associated with Criterion 5 and bring it back to them for review at the next NWAC meeting.

Action Item 2: Determine the feasibility of a cross division PAG meeting- in Port McNeill

Responsibility- Kelly and Trevor

Due Date- ongoing in 2015

Kelly announced that WFP has approved a request for an all-PAG meeting on the North Island this fall. She noted that she had met with Jon and Annemarie prior to the meeting and that a date of September 22-23, 2016 had been suggested for the all-PAG gathering. Annemarie asked members to provide input on what they would like to see addressed at the meeting, including bringing in senior WFP staff.

Action Item 3: Look at ways and means of generating greater awareness of the economic and environmental benefits of preventing loss of petroleum products such as oil.

Responsibility: Trevor/Kelly/Jack

Due Date: Ongoing.

Action Item 4: Refine Indicator 5.2.2 to include a greater scope of training opportunities available in the DFA, including training provided through contractors. Inclusion of the training completed by Bill 13 contractors. Information can come from the safety council audit at Randy's suggestion.

Responsibility: Kelly McMahon

Due Date: 2015 annual report

Annemarie reminded members that Kelly would be addressing this action item in the 2015 annual report. It was noted that requirements for Bill 13 contractors are tracked differently than for WFP employees, but that this can be measured and will be reported on.

Action Item 5: support Youth Forestry Initiative

Responsibility: Kelly

Due date: Ongoing

Action Item 6: Continue to discuss membership and representation on NWAC to ensure that vacant sectors are filled and to see if any new sectors should be added.

Responsibility: Kelly and Annemarie

Due Date: ongoing

Annemarie welcomed Jeff Jones to NWAC as the new NWAC representative, and noted that she had not been able to contact Ray Lutz regarding an alternate to represent fish and wildlife interests until he is able to return to NWAC and she asked representatives from Woss to talk to Ray about this.

Action Item 7: Set up a presentation on the TSOL Joint Venture Between WFP and Atli Forest Products for a Future Meeting

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: Early in 2016

Annemarie noted that this presentation was scheduled for May 19, 2016 in the draft 2016 meeting schedule. She asked NWAC members whether there was anyone in particular who they thought should make this presentation.

It was suggested that Rachel Dalton of the Namgis and Paul Nuttall of WFP be approached to make this presentation.

Action Item 11: Arrange for a presentation on the relative rate of carbon uptake at different seral stages.

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: Some time in 2016

Annemarie noted that this presentation was scheduled for the November 17th meeting in the draft 2016 meeting schedule. She asked NWAC members whether there was anyone in particular who they thought should make this presentation. It was suggested that Will Sloan be approached to make this presentation.

Action Item 12 : Bring new draft targets including additional variance for Indicator 5.1.1. to NWAC for review and consideration

Responsibility: Kelly and Trevor

Due Date: For next annual report, to be reported under “Strategies and Implementation.’

Annemarie offered to work on this action item and bring recommendations to the next NWAC meeting. She asked if members would like to make changes to the existing targets for this indicator, or if they would like to set additional targets, such as a set number of volunteers in the fire department. She asked if members would like to see, in addition to the reporting out, a target set for the annual total of goods and services spent in communities within the Mount Waddington region? She asked if members wanted a new target or reporting out for wood made available for local processing? She encouraged members to review the Criterion 5 indicators closely and to let her know if there were any areas where they felt new or revised targets should be recommended, in the interests of better tracking community sustainability.

Graham suggested tracking beer sales. Pat noted that it was important to determine how engaged people are in their communities, e.g tracking fire department volunteers, but also how many employees permanently reside within the community. He noted that shifting and amalgamation had impacts on people’s residency in the community. It was noted that some people are renting or have temporary residences and so don’t contribute as much as they would if they lived permanently in the community.

Graham pointed to the spinoffs associated with jobs and people working in a community.

Action Item 15: Revisit biomass development opportunities with a future presentation at NWAC

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: Sometime in 2016

Annemarie suggested that this item be included in conjunction with the presentation on carbon uptake on November 17th.

Action Item 16 : Revisit the feasibility of combining a number of targets for Indicator 5.1.1 that better reflect the economic and community benefits generated specifically in this DFA after the CIFO amalgamation is complete.

Responsibility: Annemarie

Due Date: Sometime in 2016

Annemarie offered to work on this action item, integrating it with action item 1, 4 and 12 and bring recommendations to the next NWAC meeting.

Action Item 17: Talk to Ray Lutz about recommending an alternate to represent fish and wildlife interests until Ray can return to participate in the meetings.

Responsibility: Annemarie Koch

Due Date: early 2016

Annemarie noted that she had not been able to contact Ray and asked if any other members worked with Ray and could ask him if he would recommend an alternate to cover fish and wildlife interests until he is able to return to NWAC.

Action Item 18: Graham and Kelly and Steve to form a committee to see if WFP will prepare and provide a list of required supplies and services in the DFA that local suppliers and contractors can access to see if they can compete to offer these supplies and services.

Responsibility: Kelly, Steve, Graham

Due Date: June NWAC meeting

Steve noted he would like to see a list of services required on the DFA that local contractors could access in order to know what supplies and services they might be able to supply to WFP. He noted that this had been discussed at VINWAG.

Action Item 19: Revise draft 2016 meeting schedule and review and confirm final draft at the March 17,2016 NWAC meeting.

Responsibility: Annemarie

Due Date: March 7,2016 meeting

Pat asked when the 2015 annual report was due and Kelly responded that it was due March 31,2016.

4. Confirmation of Draft 2016 Meeting Schedule

Annemarie noted that she had revised the previous draft schedule to reflect John Deal's presentation this evening, and a rescheduling of Jonathan Armstrong's presentation to the June NWAC meeting. She noted that the mandatory discussion topic of soil sensitivity and mitigation measures was to be addressed by David Melville at the September 8th VINWAG meeting, and that NWAC members would be invited and welcome to attend that meeting.

Kelly asked if the proposed April meeting could be moved to March in order to give her an opportunity to review the annual report draft with NWAC members prior to March 31st. Revisions were made to the draft schedule, following discussion with members, and the results are contained in a second draft, which will be circulated to members for review and confirmation at the March 17th NWAC meeting.

5. Review of Results and Recommendations from 2015 Participant Satisfaction Survey

Annemarie reviewed the summary of results from the NWAC participation satisfaction survey and asked members if they agreed with the recommendations made as a result of the input and whether they would like additional or different actions taken in response to the survey.

She asked NWAC members, to provide input on the responses that she had proposed to the survey, either by email or through the meetings.

Pat noted that 'local permanent residents' is an important indicator, and asked if there was a way to ensure that this priority is translated to the company's recruitment policies for example.

It was noted that it was important to define the community within the DFA.

Graham noted that the traditional forestry methods were not going to support communities and that consideration must be given to agroforestry, to create more jobs and ensure community sustainability.

6. Next Meeting:

Annemarie noted that, with revisions to the 2016 meeting schedule, the next meeting was scheduled for March 17, 2016 and that the topic would be a review of the 2015 annual report by Kelly, and discussion of proposed revisions to Indicator 5.1.1. She thanked members for their ongoing commitment and bid them a safe journey home.