

**VANCOUVER ISLAND NORTH WOODLANDS ADVISORY GROUP  
(VINWAG)**

**Western Forest Products Inc.  
Community Advisory Group  
Minutes of Meeting June 9, 2016**

**Attendance:**

Jon Flintoft, WFP	Ray Harper, Labour
Fred Roberston, Education	Joli White, Tourism and Recreation Alternate
Jeff Houle, Suppliers	Patrick Donaghy, Local Government
John Tidbury, District of Port Hardy	Dale Dorward, Small Business
Steve Lacasse, Environment	Graham MacDonald, Town of Pt. McNeill
Ben Trerise, Fish and Wildlife	

**Presenters:** Jane Cameron, Stillwater Community Advisory Group

**Regrets:** Paul Barolet, Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources Operations, Dave Trebett, Tourism and Recreation, Gunnar Wigard, Small Contractors, Janet Dorward, Business, Ione Brown, NICFLP, Gaby Wickstrom, Port McNeill and District Chamber of Commerce

**Observers:** Jim McDowell, Planning Manager, NIFO, David Stewart, R&B Falling and prospective representative for large contractors sector, Kevin Laird, WFP, Stumpage Appraisals Supervisor, NIFO

**Chairperson and Facilitator:** Annemarie Koch

**Minutes taken by:** Jon Flintoft and Annemarie Koch

## 1.0 SAFETY AND INTRODUCTIONS

Annemarie welcomed everyone to the meeting, stressed the importance of safety in WFP's operations and reviewed the procedures to follow in the event of an emergency. Annemarie reviewed the objectives of the meeting, namely to review the minutes and action items from the April 28th meeting, hear a presentation from Jane Cameron on the new CSA Z809-16 standard and have a discussion about the upcoming all-PAG event on September 22-23, conduct the annual review of the terms of reference, hear updates on WFP's harvesting plans for the DFA, the recreational map initiative and the external audit, further discuss the 2015 annual report, and set the date of the next meeting. Annemarie reminded VINWAG members that a map showing harvesting plans for the next five years was available for viewing at any time before or following the meeting. She welcomed David Stewart of R&B Falling and noted that he had been invited as an observer, to consider representing the large contractors sector. She invited members to introduce themselves to Jane and to David.

## 2.0 REVIEW OF LAST MEETING MINUTES AND ACTION ITEMS

Annemarie asked if there were any comments on the minutes of the April 28th meeting and reviewed action items requiring updates or immediate attention with members, and the results of the discussion are summarized in the table below, along with the addition or modification of three action items developed during the course of this meeting. For the benefit of new or recent members, Annemarie noted that she would be assuming all members had read their minutes and would not be taking additional time to go through them at the meeting, other than to deal with questions, changes and action items. Action items that were completed were dropped from the list and revised action items were retained as modified.

It was noted that action items 140-175 and 191 and 196 were ongoing in 2016, and that action items 177 and 195 would be dealt with in updates to the 2015 annual report. Annemarie noted that, since the 2016 meeting schedule had been set, she suggested deferring the presentation on stumpage, related to action item 175, to 2017. Annemarie noted that she would be providing an update on action items 190 and 197 during the review of the Terms of Reference later in the meeting, and that Jon would be providing an update on action item 178 later in the meeting. She added that action items 192 and 198 had been completed. She thanked those who participated in the external audit May 25-26<sup>th</sup>.

ACTION ITEMS					
#	Item	Responsibility	Initiation Date	Target Date	Completion Date
140	Follow up on engaging youth in SFMP	Fred Robertson/Jon Flintoft/Kindry Mercer/A. Koch	June 27,2013	Ongoing, in 2015-16	
163	Provide an update on the Pacific TSA Timber Supply Review	Jon Flintoft	September11,2014	Later in 2016	
175	Dedicate a future meeting to a presentation on stumpage by a government and a WFP representative	Annemarie Koch	April 23,2015	Sometime in 2017	
177	Review the wording for the target related to Target 2 of Indicator 3.1.1,number of slides treated so that it is clearer and more easily measured and tracked	Annemarie Koch/Jon Flintoft	April 23,2015	For 2015 annual report	
178	Coordinate production of a local map of roads and recreational sites in the DFA	Kindry Mercer	June 4,2015	Sometime in 2016	
190	Integrate recommendations 1-3 from the 2015 participant satisfaction survey into a draft revised Terms of Reference	Annemarie	February 25,2016	For April 28 <sup>th</sup> meeting	Completed June 9, 2016
191	Follow up on recommendations 4-5 of the 2015 participant satisfaction survey in mutual consultation	Members of VINWAG and WFP	February 25,2016	Ongoing in 2016	
195	Include how many animals were actually taken as a result of hunting in the DFA	Jon Flintoft	April 28,2016	For the 2015 annual report	
196	Consider ways to enhance communication of what VINWAG does to the public, integrate with WFP's communications strategy	Annemarie Koch	April 28,2016	Ongoing	
197	Defer ToR review to June 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting, ensure corporate changes are ready and highlighted for review at the meeting	Annemarie, Jon and Will	April 28,2016	June 9,2016	Completed June 9, 2016
199	Revise ToR to address Fred's concerns regarding independence of PAG membership	Annemarie, Jon, Will Sloan	June 9,2016	September 8,2016	
200	Arrange for a future presentation on WFP's safety initiatives	Jon Flintoft	June 9,2016	Sometime in 2017	

201	Carry forward reports on the recreational map initiative and harvesting plans in the DFA to the September 8 <sup>th</sup> meeting	Annemarie and Jon	June 9,2016	September 8,2016	
-----	---	-------------------	-------------	------------------	--

Annemarie added that, unless members of VINWAG wished to discuss any of these ongoing items, and unless there were any comments or changes, she would ask members to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting. The minutes were accepted as circulated.

### **3.0 REVIEW OF THE NEW CSA Z809-16 STANDARD: JANE CAMERON, STILLWATER PAG CHAIR AND MEMBER, CSA TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Jane thanked VINWAG for inviting her. She acknowledged input from VINWAG members through her to the new standards and thanked members for their participation in the review.

Jane noted that all the aboriginal indicators had been placed in a separate Criterion 7. She pointed to the desire through the revision of the standard to create more flexibility for including aboriginals in the process, and to look at ways to resolve disagreements that would inevitably arise throughout the process.

Jane noted that the technical committee reviewed the use of 'aboriginal' versus 'First Nations' as a reference, and she noted that the name 'aboriginal' had been chosen, as this is the reference used in the Constitution. Jane noted that the word 'willing' in reference to participation by First Nations had been removed, as it was seen to put too much onus on First Nations to participate.

Jane noted that the new standard calls for expanded content in audit reports. She pointed out that this is not a problem for WFP, as it currently publishes audit results in full. Jane noted there were discrete changes to the standard allowing established groups like VINWAG to operate in a slightly different way than new groups. She noted, for example, that groups that have been in place for some time are not going to require as much documentation.

Jane added that all of the various external communication requirements had been put in one place under Section 5.

Jane noted that forest ecosystem resilience had been redefined and moved elsewhere in the standard, because 'resilience' means different things to different people and cannot be measured accurately. She noted that other changes include a core requirement to recognize water features. She noted that water features are not defined, and that the definition is currently up to the group. Jane pointed out that there is now a discussion item on wetlands and that this will be a new area for consideration under the standard.

Jane noted that the old discussion item of carbon emissions had been replaced by a focus on the importance of forest ecosystems in the global carbon cycle.

Jane reviewed changes to the reference to forest plantations in the standard. She noted that 'plantation' has historically carried a negative connotation to it (afforestation), and the new definition was intended to differentiate forest plantations from regeneration initiatives (reforestation). She noted that the new definition wouldn't likely affect NIFO's operations.

Jane noted that heritage values have been added to areas of special significance, and that there would need to be management strategies developed for heritage sites that were identified. She noted that heritage values in B.C. were distinct from First Nations' cultural values. She noted that heritage values here could include an old logging camp site that was of some significance in the area, or an old mining site.

Jane noted safety had been placed in a separate element to better reflect its importance.

Jane reviewed changes to economic and social benefits, noting that the types of benefits had been clarified and that reporting requirements had been simplified and made more flexible, e.g. to include a range of benefits to the community, beyond measuring just financial contributions.

Jane noted there was a discussion of forecasts and whether to keep them. She noted that it had been decided to keep forecasts, as a place to discuss whether meeting targets was reasonable, for example. Jane added that expert or local input could be provided to support forecasts.

She referenced some changes to volume based and group certification to allow more flexibility. She added that there were attempts to simplify plans, for the benefit of the foresters preparing the SFMP's.

Jane noted that much of the input from public advisory groups had been around definitions. She noted that some of the input had been incorporated and some not. Jane reviewed some of the definitions, starting with afforestation. She went on to discuss the definition of deforestation, noting it does not include temporary tree loss, as from harvesting, or wildfires or blowdown. She noted that this definition was important, in terms of criticisms that have been levelled by NGO's for example, about levels of 'deforestation' in Canada, that have included primarily temporary loss of trees due to causes such as fires and harvesting.

Jane reviewed the definition of 'forest plantations' under the new standard. She noted that, by the revised definition, a forest plantation is planted for one product – wood. She noted that foresters have traditionally referred to reforested areas as plantations, such as 'alder plantations,' but that the regenerated areas actually have the characteristics of a natural forest, and are managed for other values, such as riparian values, and so are not technically 'plantations,' as now defined under the standard.

Jane reviewed discussions around wood waste and removal of debris from forested areas for economic purposes, balanced against the ecological values of woody debris.

Jane reviewed the definition of wetlands provided in the new standard, noting these can include bogs and fens and marshes. She noted that there is a new discussion item referencing wetlands in Criteria 1 and 3. She noted that much of this came from input from Ducks Unlimited, but that it was felt that advisory groups should be talking about these values.

Jane noted that there were some important strengths that remain in the standard, as it relates to Canada. She noted that the high level of public ownership of the forests in Canada demands involvement and input from public advisory groups, and that this is recognized in the standard, which has enshrined the role of public advisory groups.

Jane reviewed the requirement for transparency, including the requirement for ongoing independent audits. She added that the people who write the standard have nothing to do with whether it is approved or how it is implemented. She added that the PEFC label can be used currently, to demonstrate that the wood comes from a legal source and a certified forest.

She reviewed new elements, including the new safety element and the element related to forest ecosystems. She noted that the indicators had remained largely the same, although many had been renumbered to accommodate changes, such as placing the First Nations indicators under a separate Criterion.

It was noted that it was helpful to public advisory groups to have First Nations' indicators distinct from other values in the standard, particularly where First Nations are not participating in the PAG process.

Fred asked about how First Nations' engagement is expected to take place in treaty versus non-treaty environments. Jane noted that the standard still requires the company to work with First Nations, treaty or not, and to find ways to work together.

It was noted that the company could provide documentation of efforts to seek agreement and efforts to resolve differences with First Nations. Jane noted that the company could deal with aboriginal communities directly, or through parallel groups such as the First Nations Information Exchange Group, or through presentations made by First Nations representatives to PAG members.

Graham noted that aboriginal people practiced forestry for 10,000 years and did a good job of it, and we have only a 200 year history of managing forestry and have not necessarily done a very good job of it. He noted that one of the reasons First Nations did not wish to participate in the process is because they don't support our forestry practices.

Steve noted that PAG members did not mean to be disrespectful but that, as a group, members were trying to seek understanding and common ground in the area of sustainable forest management, and not speak for aboriginal people. Graham noted that he would like to see WFP get on with logging and creating more jobs.

Jane thanked VINWAG members and all PAG representatives who provided input on the revisions to the standard. She noted that every comment that was submitted to the technical committee, which was operating at a national level, was considered and a significant number of comments came from WFP and WFP advisory groups on the coast.

Jane noted that the guidance was now much easier to understand, as a result of recommendations made by PAG members.

Ben didn't feel the definition of wetland was out of step with current management practices, and that it was consistent with current practices. Ben asked if the definition of water features would be left to local groups, and Jane noted that it had been left undefined, and was open to local interpretation and identification. Ben noted that there were some very unique water features on the North Island, e.g. associated with the karst landscapes.

Jane noted that the new CSA standard was posted on the CSA website. Annemarie thanked Jane for her presentation and for representing PAG members on the CSA Technical Advisory Committee.

#### **4.0 ANNUAL REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE: ANNEMARIE KOCH**

Annemarie noted that the draft Terms of Reference that had been circulated with the agenda two weeks prior to the meeting included both proposed changes from the corporate level and as a result of recommendations coming out of the participant satisfaction survey. She pointed out that all proposed changes had been highlighted in yellow and that, where explanations were needed, these had been provided as footnotes. She reviewed some of the proposed changes and invited members for their input.

Fred asked about the reasons for the corporate changes to Section VI. Roles, Responsibilities and Obligations of Participants, related to WFP retaining the final authority in the approval or removal of any member under the Terms of Reference.

Jon noted that the company wanted to standardize the Terms of Reference across the board with the PAG's on the coast. He relayed some challenges that had taken place with the mid-Island PAG and how the company wanted to address these concerns by suggesting the revision that Fred referenced under Section VI of the Terms of Reference.

Fred noted that he still had some concerns about the proposed change. He noted that he didn't see the need to standardize the Terms of Reference for all PAG's, as each group has a different history and has operated differently. He reiterated his concern that WFP retains the final authority for approval or removal of a member and added that this has an impact on the group's independence.

There was a discussion of the balance between WFP's authority over membership decisions, which is enshrined in the standard, and the independence of the group. Annemarie pointed to a suggested mediation process under Section VII. (B), being a 'policy for dealing with actions that are not collaborative or in the spirit of continuous improvement,' as a compromise that might balance the company's authority under the standard with the group's desire for independence.

Dale noted that he could see the need to allow for a process to acknowledge and resolve disagreements, but to give the company the authority to deal with a member or members who went beyond disagreeing to entirely disrupting the process.

Annemarie noted that it was not in the company's interest to expel a member or disallow membership without providing a good rationale for the decision.

Jane added that there is guidance in the standard that suggests that reasons be given for decisions made that are based on the company's authority in the standard.

Fred suggested that he would like to see the proposed revision under Section VI be replaced with a process that deals with such issues as they arise, along the lines of the proposed Section VII (B) policy for dealing with actions that are not collaborative or in the spirit of continuous improvement.'

It was agreed to make this an action item and to carry forward continued review and adoption of the Terms of Reference at the September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting.

John asked about a more generic reference to the standard under the content section, rather than having to reference the specific year of the standard each time. Jane noted that referencing the specific year of the standard was more appropriate. There was a general discussion on this and it was agreed to stay with the reference to the specific year and standard as this was a requirement of the audit process.

## **5.0 UPDATE ON WFP'S HARVESTING PLANS ON THE DFA, 2015 ANNUAL REPORT, RECREATIONAL MAP INITIATIVE AND EXTERNAL AUDIT: KEVIN LAIRD AND JON FLINTOFT**

Kevin started the review of the remaining indicators for the 2015 annual report. He reviewed the indicator around ecosystem types in the DFA, starting with a description of what is meant by ecosystem types. He noted there are four ecosystem types in the DFA, including CWHvh1, southern very wet hypermaritime zone. He reviewed a map showing the various ecosystem types in the DFA. He noted that the target for this indicator had been met.

Kevin reviewed Indicator 1.1.2, related to species composition and that this target had been met across all species.

Kevin reviewed the age class distribution indicator, requiring 25% in the older age class across the DFA. There was a discussion of how this age class distribution would be maintained in future, given the low numbers in the 81-120 year age class.

Kevin reviewed the proportion of regeneration that consists of native species and noted that this target had been met. There was a discussion of whether to plant species that will be adapted for climate change on the coast. It was noted that more Douglas fir and alder was being planted in response to anticipated climate change.

Kevin reviewed Indicator 1.3.1, and noted that the target had been met in that no genetically modified trees had been planted.

Kevin noted that the target for Indicator 2.2.1 had been met. Kevin reviewed Indicator 2.2.2 and reviewed some administrative changes that had resulted in different harvesting targets, and noted that the resulting harvest was in line with the AAC targets.

Jon noted that during next year's Annual Report review there would be a discussion of Year 3 of the cut control period and that projections could be made then for the cut control period.

Kevin reviewed Indicator 2.2.4 and that the target of meeting 100% of formal requests and referrals had been met.

Fred asked about the new regulations around marbled murrelet and northern goshawk fell under this indicator. Jon noted that Species at Risk were covered under another process, which was ongoing with the Province.

Kevin reviewed target 2 of Indicator 3.1.1. He noted that this target had historically been difficult to meet but that it looked more like the target would be met this year.

Kevin reviewed Indicator 3.1.2, noting the target around coarse woody debris was met.

Kevin reviewed Indicator 3.2.1, noting target 1 was within variance and 2 had been met.

Kevin reviewed Indicator 4.1.1 around net carbon and noted that this target had been met in that the result of the accepted calculation was positive.

Jon reviewed Indicator 5.1.2, noting the target had been met.

Jon noted that the target for Indicator 5.2.2 had been met, and outlined the training programs that are provided, including first aid, high angle rescue and apprenticeships.

Jon reviewed Indicator 5.2.6, noting the target had been met.

Jon reviewed Indicator 6.1.1 regarding evidence of recognizing aboriginal title and rights had been met, and he described the ways in which WFP representatives had engaged with First Nations to meet the target.

Jon reviewed the ways in which plans are reviewed with First Nations with interests in the DFA, including the Quatsino, 'Namgis and Kwakiutl First Nations.

Jon reviewed Indicator 6.1.3, noting that target 1 for this indicator had been met, and what practices were put in place to meet it. He noted that target 2 was still under review and development and gave some reasons why this was the case.

Jon reviewed Indicator 6.2.1, noting that target 1 had been met, and that there was only one protocol in place within the DFA, namely the Quatsino Protocol. He added that target 2 had been met through provision of responses to requests for monumental cedar. He noted WFP had supplied a significant amount of cedar to the Quatsino First Nation this year for a project.

Jon reviewed Indicator 6.3.2 around safety, and noted that the targets had been met. He added that, in 2016, the company was looking at levels of acceptable risk. He offered to provide a presentation on safety initiatives and it was agreed to make arrangements for this in future.

Given the shortness of time, members agreed to hear the rest of the presentation on the annual report and then the external audit results, and to carry forward the report on the recreational map initiative and harvesting plans to the September meeting.

Jon reviewed the remaining Criterion 6 indicators with the group, including 6.4.3, noting that the variance on target 1 for this indicator had been met. He noted that there had been limited interest in and time available for participation in the FNIEG meetings that had been organized in previous years. Jon noted that the variance for target two of this indicator had been met.

Jon noted that target 1 was met for Indicator 6.5.1 and that target 2 was in process of being met, in the form of a new recreational map that was being generated. He noted the map would be electronic and geo-referenced, and that a paper copy would follow once the kinks were worked out.

Jon noted that the external audit had taken place on May 25-26<sup>th</sup> and that Graham had participated as a member of VINWAG. He noted that the auditors had also looked at the Englewood Forest Operation, the Corporate Forestry office and the Saanich Forestry Centre. He added that WFP was being recommended for re-registration and thanked everyone who participated in and assisted with this.

## **6.0 NEXT MEETING: JON FLINTOFT AND ANNEMARIE KOCH**

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place on September 8, 2016 and that the presenter would be Dave Melville of Island Geoscience, who would be talking about soil site sensitivity and mitigation measures.

Annemarie reminded members that Jon was proposing that the September 9<sup>th</sup> field tour include a look at aboriginal cultural values, and asked members if there was anything else they would like on the itinerary for the September 9<sup>th</sup> field trip.

Annemarie and Jon thanked everyone for coming and wished them a good summer and a safe journey home.

<b>When:</b>	<b>September 8, 2016</b>
<b>Dinner:</b>	<b>6:30 p.m.</b>
<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>7:00 p.m.</b>