

Nimpkish Woodlands Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes May 24,2018
Woss Community Hall, Woss, BC
5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Attendance: Kelly McMahon, Area Planner, WFP, Stu Ellis, General Public, Steve Lacasse, Environment, Cam Brady, Karst, Chris Bowden-Green, Community, Pat English, Local Government

Regrets: Mayor Shirley Ackland, Town of Port McNeill and Regional District, Adrian Pendergast, Education, Trevor Egely, Contractors, Paul Barolet, MOFLNRO, Jack Miller, Labour

Presenter: John Deal, Senior Biologist, WFP

Observers: Steve Latreille, Logging Fundamentals Program student

Facilitator: Annemarie Koch

Notes: Kelly McMahon and Annemarie Koch

1. Introduction and Safety Procedures:

Annemarie welcomed everyone, stressed the importance of safety to WFP throughout its operations and reviewed the safety procedures to follow in the event of a fire or medical emergency. She thanked Kelly for making arrangements for a very informative discussion with logging fundamentals program instructor Dave Weymer. She thanked the two program class members for dropping in to meet NWAC members.

She welcomed John Deal and asked everyone to introduce themselves. She noted that, following review and adoption of the minutes and action items, Steve would provide an outline of his proposal related to Indicator 3.2.2 and then John would be making presentations on a variety of topics, including the co-location initiative and issues around the species at risk requirements.

2. Review of Meeting Objectives, Minutes and Action Items

Annemarie reviewed the objectives of the meeting, namely:

- To review the March 22,2018 meeting minutes and selected action items;
- To hear about Steve Lacasse's proposal related to Indicator 3.2.2;
- To hear presentations by John Deal on a variety of topics, including Englewood's Colocation and Stabilization Project and issues around the B.C. Species at Risk requirements;
- To carry out the annual review of the Terms of Reference;
- To discuss the internal audit;
- To confirm the date and content of the next meeting.

Annemarie reviewed the March 22nd minutes and action items and noted that she would not be addressing action items that were ongoing but only items that were completed or needed to be addressed in the shorter term. Given this, Annemarie noted that there were nine action items to address or review from the March 22nd meeting:

Action Item 5: support Youth Forestry Initiative

Responsibility: Kelly

Due date: Ongoing

Action Item 20: Revise Criterion 5 target related to community investments along the following lines: ‘100% of the communities in and with interests in the DFA, namely Woss, Alert Bay, Sointula, Hyde Creek and Port McNeill receive annual community investments of some type from WFP.’

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: May 24,2018

Annemarie asked Kelly to confirm that this action item had been completed. Kelly noted it had and referred to the community investment fund and the report out on funding for community projects in the DFA. Kelly stressed the importance of having requests come from the communities so that WFP could respond. She noted it would be helpful if there were more project proposals from the community. Kelly noted that anyone wishing to make a proposal could do so through her or other WFP representatives. She referenced a number of projects that had been funded through WFP already.

Steve asked if the program could be publicized more locally. It was agreed to make it an action item to do something to promote the Community Initiative Fund locally.

Action Item 32: Keep NWAC members up to date on the forest sector strategy initiative

Responsibility: Pat English

Due Date: Ongoing in 2018

Action Item 33: Keep NWAC members up to date on the initiative to form a coalition of industry, business and community representatives to respond to the UBCM resolution to ban all future logging of old growth on Vancouver Island.

Responsibility: Fred Robertson and Shirley Ackland

Due Date: Ongoing in 2018

Action Item 40: Implement recommendations in 2016 participant satisfaction survey report.

Responsibility: Kelly McMahon, Annemarie Koch, NWAC members

Due Date: Ongoing

Action Item 42: Discuss WFP’s Silviculture Strategy for Englewood Division

Responsibility: Kelly McMahon, Paul Kutz

Due Date: Scheduled for September 27,2018 Meeting

Annemarie reminded members that this presentation was scheduled for the September, 2018 NWAC meeting in Woss.

Action Item 43: Explain why key targets are not set for old growth and immature stand types for target 1 under Indicator 5.1.1

Responsibility: Kelly McMahon

Due Date: November 8,2018

Annemarie advised members that Mike Davis had offered to attend the November NWAC meeting to address this item.

Action Item 54: Talk to the Woss Residents Association about more actively pursuing community funds from WFP through CIF and other corporate sources.

Responsibility: Chris Bowden-Green

Due Date: Ongoing

Action Item 64: Track and follow the potential water quality and quantity impacts of tethered feller buncher harvesting
Responsibility: Kelly
Due Date: Ongoing

Action Item 65: Consider adding an education target around sedimentation management to Indicator 3.2.2, possibly for grader and hoe operators
Responsibility: Kelly
Due Date: Ongoing in 2018

Action Item 66: Consider adding a data collection target to Indicator 3.2.2
Responsibility: Kelly and Steve
Due Date: Ongoing

Action Item 67: Retain and develop target 4 under Indicator 6.1 to communicate information about what NWAC does specifically
Responsibility: Kelly
Due Date: Ongoing in 2018 and for 2019 SFMP

Action Item 69: Send dates of engagement sessions on train to NWAC members
Responsibility: Kelly
Due Date: As soon as information is available

Annemarie asked Kelly if she had an update on this item. Kelly noted she had no information at this time but would look into this and get and email out to members.

Action Item 70: Offer the 2018 annual participant survey through survey monkey as well as in Word.
Responsibility: Kelly and Annemarie
Due Date: September 27,2018 and November 8,2018

Action Item 71: Invite management to provide operational reports from time to time.
Responsibility: Kelly
Due Date: Throughout 2018

Action Item 72: Try to source a recreation/tourism representative for NWAC, possibly someone from a tourism adventure company, fishing guide or Mount Cain Board
Responsibility: Jon, Steve, Kelly
Due Date: May 24,2018

Annemarie asked if there were any recommendations for a recreation/tourism representative for NWAC. She noted that, further to action item 79, Cam had talked to Ben McGibbon and that he was interested in attending a future meeting, perhaps in September, to see about representing the sector.

Action Item 73: Talk to Jon Flintoft about the possibility of including NWAC members in the annual VINWAG tour and including a look at tethered harvesting
Responsibility: Annemarie
Due Date: September, 2018

Annemarie reminded members that Kelly and Jon would be in touch about this.

Action Item 74: Set up a tour or visit with the forestry fundamentals training students in Woss in conjunction with the May 24th NWAC meeting there

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: May 24,2018

Annemarie noted the tour had taken place as planned and thanked Kelly and other organizers for putting the event together. She noted that the grand opening of the training centre in Woss had been well attended and wished the program organizers and participants every success.

Action Item 75: Send a note out to NWAC members with an update on time and location for the day of mourning on April 28

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: As soon as details are available

Annemarie thanked Kelly for sending out a notice and thanked the organizers for having the service.

Action Item 76: Bring concerns communicated by forest users and members of the public generally, e.g. karst issues to members of NWAC to discuss from time to time

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: Ongoing

Action Item 77: Report back to NWAC on the cause and effects of an anticipated reduction in company and contractor harvest

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: May 24,2018

Annemarie asked Kelly to report out on this item. Kelly noted that the company was aware of and working internally on this matter and said she would keep members of NWAC updated on any developments related to the SFMP. Kelly added that she had hoped the operations planner would be able to come to the September meeting to provide an update on this matter.

Action Item 78: Talk to Rob Shambrook about whether the target can be increased to more than 50% of the CIF being invested in communities in the DFA

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: May 24,2018

Annemarie asked Kelly if she had anything to report on this item. Kelly noted she hadn't had a chance to talk to Rob about this yet, but that it would help to make the case if there were more proposals coming from the communities.

Stu noted that WFP had been generous in responding to any proposals to date.

Action Item 79: Approach Ben McGibbon about representing the tourism and recreation sector on NWAC

Responsibility: Cam Brady

Due Date: May 24,2018

Annemarie noted Cam had talked to Ben and that he was interested in representing the tourism and recreation sector but that he was in training and could not attend this meeting. Cam noted that he would send Ben's email contact to Annemarie so that she could include him on the email distribution list for the September meeting.

Action Item 80: Talk to members of VINTAC about providing a representative for the tourism and recreation sector on NWAC

Responsibility: Pat English

Due Date: May 24, 2018

Annemarie asked Pat if he had a chance to talk to VINTAC about a representative for tourism on NWAC.

Pat said he would report back on this at the September meeting.

Action Item 81: prepare a promotional piece on the community investment program for members of NWAC to distribute to their networks

Responsibility: Kelly

Due Date: September 27, 2018 Meeting

Pat asked whether there would be an operational update at the meeting in September and Kelly noted she would talk to the operations planner about providing an update at the September meeting. It was agreed that, if there was going to be an operational update, Annemarie would try to have it on the agenda that goes out two weeks before the meeting.

Steve noted that Dave Rushton had received an award through Black Press for his work on behalf of the community of Woss.

There were no further questions or comments on the minutes or action items and the minutes were accepted.

3. Steve Lacasse's Proposal Regarding Indicator 3.2.2, Englewood Colocation and Stabilization Project and B.C. Species at Risk Initiatives and Various Other Topics: John Deal, Senior Biologist, WFP

Annemarie reminded members that Steve had proposed at a previous meeting to prepare a proposal to fund a monitoring project related to Indicator 3.2.2 and that he had been in communication with John Deal about this. She invited Steve to open a discussion about this before John proceeded with his presentations.

Steve provided a review of his proposal to gather information on water quality and quantity in the Vernon Lake area and down river to Mine Lake. He noted the proposal would involve taking three to four samples a year along the river in order to track values like dissolved oxygen over time and see what is happening within the watershed. Steve pointed to the information that had already been collected by the Gwani Hatchery for over 30 years and noted that this resource could be built on.

He talked about some of the stories that had been passed down by the members of the Namgis working along the river. Steve stressed that the collection of the information was not intended to

point to the effects of logging but to get baseline information about the watershed. Stu noted his concern for the potential misuse of this information.

There was a discussion of how rivers naturally change over time. This discussion included the possibility of looking at effects on karst terrain.

It was noted that other industries might impact the water quality or quantity in the watershed.

It was noted that Steve's proposal has been submitted to WFP and has been shared with the Namgis and is being evaluated at this time.

Annemarie thanked Steve for preparing the proposal and working with Indicator 3.2.2, and she thanked John and Kelly for working with him. She invited John to proceed with his presentation.

John outlined his talk, noting it would include a look at the co-location projects, biodiversity strategies and the retention strategy.

John started his presentation with some background on the co-location projects. He noted the goals for the pilot projects had been set by the B.C. chief forester and included improving stewardship and economic forest activity and optimizing stewardship.

John reviewed the guiding principles of the initiative, including early engagement with First Nations, an integrated approach to support colocation, setting evaluation criteria to evaluate alternate land use configurations, linkage to other initiatives, guidance through VILUP, Species at Risk and the Integrated Silviculture Strategy, and timely evaluation.

John reviewed the San Josef colocation area and some of the results from the initiative. He pointed to the importance of consistency with higher level plans, along with FRPA and the Landscape Unit Planning Guide. He pointed to the importance of collaboration and reviewed the steps involved in implementing the initiative, such as setting proportional targets, analysis of pre-pilot OGMA's, multiple iterations of re-design and analysis, submission of a draft plan for review, addressing and reviewing comments and then final submission.

John reviewed the values that were reviewed and targets set, including productive forest and old growth, cultural cedar, visuals wildlife features, marbled murrelet, goshawk, rare ecosystems, forest interior, karst and impacts such as the THLB and harvestable area.

John pointed to the importance of having good mapping and data sets. He noted that the project's success was measured by looking at pre and post project design results. He pointed to a reduction in harvestable area in OGMA, for example.

John reviewed the Nimpkish colocation project, starting with a look at new LiDAR information on marbled murrelet habitat and karst features. He pointed to a new marbled murrelet inventory that will help to update information and assist with a review and redesign of the original OGMA design. He noted there was additional information on cultural and riparian values as well.

John noted the objective was to redesign OGMA's to optimize environmental and socio-economic values under the Landscape Unit Planning Guide and VILUP. He added that the goal was also to redesign Wildlife Habitat Areas to optimize environmental and socio-economic values.

John pointed out that the Nimpkish ++ initiative has been approved by the Province but has been put on hold by the Namgis in order to accommodate completion of a higher-level land use plan first.

There was a discussion of other values that could be integrated into the redesign, including new information on fisheries values.

John then went on to talk about what is currently referred to as ‘WFP’s Forest Strategy’, which will potentially include timber, silviculture, biodiversity, carbon, climate change and engagement components. He went on to discuss one of these components, namely a biodiversity strategy. John talked about the components that make up a biodiversity strategy, including habitat types and elements. He noted that the retention strategy comes into play at the stand level, managing wildlife trees and big trees, for example.

John then reviewed WFP’s big tree retention policy. John provided a definition of big trees, using the big tree registry. He noted that many of the trees in WFP’s tenure are in the Port McNeill and Holberg areas and some are in the Englewood division. He noted that 158 trees have been retained to date by WFP over all divisions.

John reviewed different retention systems and differentiated them from clearcutting. He defined the retention system, noting it included three components, including distribution of internal retention and trees being left for one rotation.

John described the ecological rationale for retention systems, noting retention systems are designed to help conserve biological diversity by providing ‘life-boating’ and connectivity.

John reviewed some of the benefits of retention approaches for winter wrens, golden-crowned kinglets and Pacific slope flycatchers.

John reviewed some of the targets associated with retention, including how much area harvested on a retention system. He discussed some of the factors that might affect these targets.

John discussed some of the monitoring results, noting the target for harvest area under retention had been met, for example.

It was noted that NWAC doesn’t monitor retention results at the stand level but that this might be a possibility in future.

John reviewed some of the results in the field, based on 2016 field sampling. He noted that criteria reviewed included leaving biological legacies, whether the block can be defended as not being a clearcut and whether the block meets the intent of being an example of good forest stewardship (including safety).

John reviewed some of the issues around the field monitoring, including inconsistent mapping of forest influence. He noted that actions arising from this included training of personnel responsible for mapping and creation of a LiDAR-based tool for consistent forest influence calculations.

John noted that other issues include leave tree selection, spatial guidance (some of the blocks were too open) and edge issues on harvesting adjacent to retention blocks. He pointed to some of the actions taken to address these issues, including training and refining the forest influence calculation.

There was a discussion of how windthrow can result from retention harvesting, and how the shadows produced by retention can influence what species can be planted in the vicinity, e.g. Douglas fir. It was noted that retention systems can produce fire breaks.

There was a discussion of retention versus clearcuts and the perceptions of the public.

John went on to discuss work on rare ecosystems. He noted that, in 2014 WFP had a team of ecologists review the state of ecosystems under tenure and develop an overall management approach. He noted a phased approach was taken. He explained that there are 80 ecological units across WFP's tenures and a process was developed to determine which of the areas could be defined as 'rare ecosystems.' John reviewed the steps involved in this process and noted that LiDAR is then used to check for significant natural disturbance. John pointed to some of the results from such a process, including the ability to make a case to change the status of Species At Risk, e.g. if large amounts of the ecosystem and associated species at risk were identified and measured.

John reviewed some of the results of the process and noted that the total impact for Englewood was to add 41 hectares of area to be protected. He pointed to how this confirms that WFP is already protecting rare ecosystems with its current planning.

John then went on to provide a habitat planning update. He noted that the BC recovery plans for marbled murrelet and northern goshawk were released in February, 2018. He provided a history on the species at risk, recovery strategy and implementation plan and what these plans mean to WFP in terms of its harvesting plans.

John noted that the overall goals of the BC plans are to maximize conservation benefits and the probability of achieving recovery goals, to maximize the likelihood of achieving federal SARA expectations and to minimize socio-economic impacts.

John reviewed the conservation regions for northern goshawk. He pointed to the population goal for northern goshawk, noting that 65 new WHA's would need to be set to meet the goal on WFP's Vancouver Island tenures. He noted that harvesting and road building would be prohibited in these areas set aside for northern goshawk.

John reviewed some of the requirements set around forage habitat for northern goshawks. He pointed to the possibility of restricting the timing of harvesting as a means of managing for this species. He noted that a lot of research still needed to be done in this area.

There was a discussion of how many new WHA's would need to be set in this area and John noted that he did not anticipate very big changes.

John talked about the murrelet conservation regions, noting we sit in the northern and west Vancouver Island region. John noted that the province had a set a target of 70% of the 2002 nesting habitat coastwide, on crown land only, be set aside. He added that this translated to 68% of this area on west and north Vancouver Island. John reviewed the possible effects of an order that is coming out on conservation measures for marbled murrelet. He pointed to some of the challenges around meeting the need to revisit 39 landscape units and complete the consultation requirements within the timeline currently prescribed.

There was a discussion of what the effects of these decisions will be on harvesting, e.g. using modelling. John noted that the impacts will vary, depending on the approach that the provincial government takes. It was noted that the range of effects was between zero and a ten percent reduction in AAC.

John noted that the amount of hard reserve for marbled murrelet would potentially have to be increased by 9,000 hectares on west and north Vancouver Island., with an overall impact on THLB of 7,500 hectares.

John flagged some of the uncertainties around doing marbled murrelet planning, including what scale of planning would be used, whether to use OGMA-sized patches versus WHA-sized patches for marbled murrelet, whether treed buffers will be required on suitable marbled murrelet habitat, the impacts of First Nations engagement, and the socio-economic impacts. John noted that the province has completed a socio-economic impact but it hasn't been released yet. John noted that the effects on employment could be calculated, but it was important to also know the overall impact on community stability.

John noted that he expected draft habitat targets to be set in late May or June for marbled murrelets. He noted that the next steps would be to complete the goshawk genomic project in order to complete the range map, to conduct a marbled murrelet status reassessment and to continue with land use planning.

Annemarie thanked John for his presentation and invited NWAC members to have dinner before reconvening to review the terms of reference at about 7:30, prior to adjourning at 8 p.m.

4. Annual Review of Terms of Reference: Annemarie Koch

Annemarie noted that the Terms of Reference had been circulated with the agenda on May 10th and added that there were no changes proposed by WFP at this time. She asked members if they wished to propose any changes.

There were no proposed changes and it was agreed to keep the document as it is for now.

5. Internal Audit: Kelly McMahon

Kelly noted that Englewood would now be internally audited annually and that there was currently an external auditor conducting an internal audit of the certification process on behalf of WFP. She noted that the auditor would like to interview some members of NWAC on either Monday or Thursday of next week, probably between 10 am and 4:30 p.m.

Pat offered to be available on Thursday afternoon for a 15-minute interview. Cam and Stu also offered to be interviewed.

Pat asked if the 2017 annual report was on the website yet. Kelly noted that it was not available yet but she would try to get this done as soon as possible. Annemarie offered to send out a group email as soon as the report was available.

Action Item 82: send 2017 annual report out to NWAC members

Responsibility: Kelly and Annemarie

Due Date: as soon as the report is published

Kelly noted that the digital recreation map was almost done but work was still needed on the road system. She noted that she would let members know as soon as the map was ready.

6. Next Meeting:

Annemarie noted that, further to the proposed 2018 meeting schedule, the next meeting would be September 27, 2018 in Woss and that the topic would be WFP's silviculture strategy. She added that the annual participant satisfaction survey would also be on the agenda and noted that Kelly had offered to set this up in Survey Monkey, for ease of response.

Annemarie and Kelly thanked members for their ongoing commitment to NWAC and bid them a safe journey home.