

Nimpkish Woodlands Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes February 9, 2011
Black Bear Resort, Port McNeill, B.C.

Committee Attendees

Bill Nelson	Ray Lutz	Buzz Walker	Gaby Wickstrom
Peter Curtis	Jack Miller	Ed Jackson	

Advisors:

John Foster Michel de Bellefeuille

Facilitator: Annemarie Koch

Recorders: Michelle Beaulieu and Annemarie Koch

Safety Procedures and Introductions:

Annemarie Koch reviewed the safety procedures and highlighted who had their level 3 first aid. She then outlined the meeting objectives, namely to review the work done to date on the SFM Plan 11 Criterion 1 to 4, Criterion 6 (Society's Responsibility), Criterion 6 discussion item and to have a general discussion amongst members.

Business Arising from the Minutes:

Annemarie addressed the members highlighting that Scott Muir had moved on to a position at the Beaver Cove Dry Land Sort (Supervisor), she then reviewed the minutes of the October 27th, 2010 meeting.

Annemarie reviewed the six action items identified in the October 27th, 2010 meeting minutes.

Action Item 1: Follow up regarding the 11,000ha of black bear den habitat with regards to indicator 1.2.2, specifically how was the 11,000ha determined.

Michel indicated that he had talked to WFP's biologists (John Deal and Sue McDonald) and clarified that the black bear den habitat was based on old growth Cw leading stands in the non-contributing landbase.

Peter asked if the bears chose Cw the majority of the time for their dens.

Michel indicated that this is usually the case (Cw/Yc) but there are always exceptions.

Michelle B clarified that this indicator was brought up in previous meetings regarding focal species and that the intent of the action item was to attain more information as to how the denning habitat was estimated before a decision was made to either drop or include the black bear as a focal species.

Annemarie asked the members if they would like to leave the recommendation of not including black bear as a focal species with the biologist's justification.

Michel clarified that the biologists recommended that the black bear denning habitat not be included as part of the focal species indicator because WFP does have a strategy to

protect dens and is much more effective than the procedure used to estimate the amount of potential denning habitat.

The members did not object to this suggestion.

Action Item 2: Clarify indicator 1.4.1 “100% of identified sites have implemented management strategies”.

Michel indicated that this indicator has been updated and included in the SFM Plan 11 and has been included in the package (SFM Plan 11 Criterion 1-4) that the members had received prior to the meeting. He also indicated that he could go over the indicator in detail when he reviews the work done to date with the SFM.

Action Item 3: Distribute Scott’s presentation regarding Criterion 1 core indicators and mandatory discussion items.

A copy of the presentation was distributed to the members by Scott Muir through email on November 19, 2010.

Action Item 4: NWAC members to consider any potential guest speakers and/or topics of interest.

Annemarie asked the members if they had any suggestions.

Peter suggested that he would like to do a presentation on karst and indicated that he would like some help to organize a few pictures digitally for the presentation.

Michelle B indicated that Peter could send her the pictures he wanted to use and she would include them in a power point so they can be displayed easily for the members.

Annemarie addressed the members, indicating that if they had any suggestions they should be forwarded to Michelle B.

Ed indicated that it would be interesting to have an Archaeologist as one of the presenters. He also mentioned that Jim Stafford would be a good presenter as he was part of an AOA study that was recently completed.

Annemarie asked Ed if he could keep the members posted to help coordinate the times when Jim Stafford might be available or already in the area.

Action Item 5: Distribute Sue’s Species Diversity presentation.

The presentation was put on the computer used for the meeting’s presentation in case any of the members would like to have a copy. Annemarie took a copy via a memory stick.

Action Item 6: Distribute pre and post code summary referenced in Action Item #3 from the September 16, 2010 meeting.

The summary had not been sent to the members but had been distributed to WFP crew members.

Michelle B indicated that she would look into finding the summary, ensuring it would be distributed with this meeting’s minutes.

Annemarie asked the members if they would like to adopt the minutes as presented?
Peter moved to adopt the minutes.
The members adopted the minutes as presented.

Work Done to Date: SFM 11 Criteria 1 to 4:

Michel introduced himself as being WFP's Certification Forester located out of the Campbell River office. Michel specified that Criteria 1 to 4 had been mostly completed by Scott Muir and that he had reviewed the indicators and included the material in the format that is now being presented.

Michel highlighted that he will not be going through all the indicators in detail as this had already been completed in previous meetings but he felt that five of the indicators would be worth discussing in more detail as there are suggested changes and/or wording differences. He also emphasized that if any of the members would like to go over any more of the indicators in more detail he would gladly be able to bring up the particular sections on the computer for everyone to see and discuss as a group.

Michel handed out the sections of the SFM 11 that included the five indicators that he felt should be discussed in more detail.

Indicator 1.2.2. Degree of suitable habitat in the long term for focal species.

Michel explained that the format of the indicators is the same as in the current plan (including the written description of the indicator's history, justification, current status and interpretation, strategies and implementation, forecasts, details/data set and monitoring).

Michel indicated that he had included some clarification in the target for the indicator highlighting that the target will be evaluated on a 5-year basis.

Michelle B clarified that this type of 5-year evaluation was consistent with the previous plan (e.g. SFMP 10 indicators #3, #8, #9, #11, #12 and #13).

None of the members had any concerns and/or comments.

Indicator 1.4.1. Proportion of identified sites with implemented management strategies.

Michel reviewed the current status of the indicator highlighting that the strategy/status for Old Growth Management Areas (OGMA) is different (100% managed) as opposed 100% protected as indicated for (Ungulate Winter Ranges, Designated Wildlife Habitat Areas and Protected Area Strategy).

Michel also highlighted that the difference between managed and protected is that the OGMAs are part of an ongoing Land Use Planning process between WFP and the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and is anticipated that all OGMAS will become legally established by March 2012.

Peter asked if we knew the average age of the OGMAs and if the OGMAs could be moved around.

Michelle B indicated that the forest cover has been classified through photo-interpretation which is included in the GIS coverage and though, not currently available an estimate of the average age of the OGMA's is likely.

Peter asked if the 2012 date is when the OGMA's will be formally established.

Michel indicated yes, and that the OGMA's are established through an Order.

John addressed Peter's question in regards to being able to move the OGMA's. He indicated that the order has built in some flexibility with regards to the necessity of road building (for example), but that OGMA's as a whole are 'carved in concrete'. Minor adjustments up to 10% are allowed provided that equivalent alternatives are available.

Indicator 2.1.2. Percent consistency with time to control a forest fire.

Michel indicated that he moved the fire indicator to be included as a stand alone indicator.

Annemarie brought the members attention to a previous concern/request of Steve Lacasse, to include all fires in the reporting of this indicator not just operationally caused fires. She indicated that this has been highlighted in the "Strategies & Implementation" and the "Details/Data Set" sections of the indicator.

Indicator 2.2.1. Additions and deletions to the forest area.

Michel indicated that there had been two targets associated with this particular indicator a) Of the cutblocks that have had post-harvest road measurement surveys conducted in any given calendar year, no more than seven (7%) of the cutblocks' aggregate total area is represented as unproductive permanent road. And b) Report annually on the hectares of damaged timber where falling has commenced.

Michel suggested dropping the second target referring to the damaged timber as it does not seem to fit with the intent of the indicator, windfall, insect damage are natural occurrences in the forest not necessarily due to the forest operations.

Annemarie asked if there were any other major deletions to the forest area caused by the forest operations other than roads.

Jack indicated that he could not think of any unless WFP decided to create, for example, another mill site.

No other members had and concerns and/or comments with the deletion of the second target referring to damaged timber.

Indicator 3.2.1. Proportion of watershed with recent stand-replacing disturbance.

Michel referred to the second target for this indicator (All cutblocks harvested over any 5 year period are consistent with management practices to address karst resources). He confirmed through past meeting minutes, that karst is of high value to the members but he did not feel this was the area the karst target would be best suited to. Michel suggested moving the target to be included in indicator 1.4.2 (Protection of identified sacred and culturally important sites).

Peter asked if any of the target's wordings would have to change.

Michel clarified that none of the wording would change it just would be included in Indicator 1.4.2 as the second target rather than under indicator 3.2.1.

Annemarie read element 1.4 to help identify and clarify the intent of indicator 1.4.2.

Peter indicated that as long as the karst target was included in the plan it would be alright to include the karst target in indicator 1.4.2.

Annemarie clarified that the target will be kept but moved to be included in indicator 1.4.2.

Annemarie asked Michel if there will be another opportunity for the members to review and comment on the SFM Plan 11.

Michel clarified that yes, the members will have another opportunity to review and comment on the SFM Plan 11 as the next meeting will include handing out the complete draft SFM 11 plan (Criteria 1-6).

Annemarie asked the members if they had any other comments and/or concerns.

No comments/concerns were brought up by the members.

Review of Criterion 6 – Society's Responsibility:

Objective 6.1. Aboriginal & Treaty Rights

Indicator 6.1.1 Evidence of a good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal Title and Rights.

6.1.1 Target

- Information sharing meetings held with each FN at least one a year with discussion topics ranging beyond operational plans
(new)

Michel explained that this new target mainly deals with the information sharing meetings that more than often includes broad discussions and topics that go beyond day to day operational discussion.

John Foster indicated that WFP Englewood deals with three different First Nations and that WFP Englewood may deal with one First Nations more than the other due to the differences in overlap with operational plans and traditional territory.

Bill indicated that by keeping the target broad, in this case, could be a good opportunity to show that efforts are being made on both sides to include broader discussions.

Indicator 6.1.2. Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plan based on Aboriginal communities having a clear understanding of the plans.

6.1.2 Target

- All operational plans are accessible for review by local First Nations (*previous indicator #45 – plan to keep*).

Michel indicated there was no changes made to this target and is being kept the same as the SFM Plan 10.

Indicator 6.1.3 Level of management and/or protection of areas where culturally important practices and activities (hunting, fishing, and gathering) occur.

6.1.3. Target

- Identified areas where culturally important practices and activities occur are managed 100% of the time. (*new*)

Gaby asked how the areas are identified.

Michel indicated that the majority of these areas are identified during the information sharing meetings.

Annemarie clarified that the particular sites/areas would need to be clearly identified first and brought to the attention to WFP personnel and not just WFP assuming and identifying potential areas.

John Foster indicated there are many different processes that enable WFP to become informed of these particular sites, such as, through Archaeological Overview Assessments (AOA) and discussions through information sharing meetings. He also explained that management does not always preclude harvesting.

Michel agreed and commented that the management is associated with an approach that may include harvesting.

Objective 6.2. Respect for Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses.

Indicator 6.2.1 Evidence of understanding and use of Aboriginal knowledge through the engagement of willing Aboriginal communities, using a process that identifies and manages culturally important resources and values.

6.2.1 Target

- The three local First Nations' are afforded every opportunity to participate in the NWAC. (*previous indicator #46 – plan to keep*).

Michel indicated there are no changes being made to this indicator and that indicator 46 from the previous plan SFM Plan 10 will be included in the new SFM Plan 11.

Objective 6.3. Forest community well-being and resilience.

Indicator 6.3.1. Evidence that the organization has co-operated with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users, and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy.

6.3.1 Target

- Maintain local access to 3 categories of raw material types, when Englewood Operation is operating (*previous indicator #40.5 – plan to keep*).

Michel explained that this target had already been presented to the members under Criterion 5 – Indicator 5.2.1. but he would suggest it be moved as a target for Indicator 6.3.1. He also pointed out that this target fit very well with the intent of objective 6.3.1 and its element.

Michel also clarified that this would leave indicator 5.2.1 with two effective targets.

Annemarie asked if this indicator would also include recreational use etc. in reference to the “forest users” as indicated in indicator’s 6.3.1. definition.

Michel indicated that recreation in particular was already included in the other criteria, specifically with reference to maintained recreational sites.

Indicator 6.3.2. Evidence of cooperation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities.

6.3.2. Target

- Implement and maintain Occupational Health and Safety Committee. (*new*)

Michel indicated this is part of the requirements associated with WorkSafeBC (WCB) and is evidence that we work with safety.

Annemarie asked Jack if he had any comments in particular with this target.

Jack explained that although it already exists in the WCB requirements, it is a good recognition of what we do.

Michel agreed and stated that the CSA standard is a Canadian standard and is intended to be broad because it doesn’t necessarily focus/know what is unique to BC.

Indicator 6.3.3. Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved.

6.3.3. Target

- Maintain SAFE Company certification and WFP Safety System. (*new*)

Michel highlighted that unlike the previous target this target is not regulated but aligns well with WFP values. He also explained that the WFP Safety System is audited annually and as a result is improved regularly.

No comments/concerns were brought up by the members.

Objective 6.4. Fair and effective decision-making

Indicator 6.4.1. Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process.

6.4.1. Target

- Overall results from an annual NWAC member survey.
(slightly revised previous indicator #53 – to keep)

Michel explained that the indicator #53 that is in the SFM Plan 10 has been slightly revised and included in the new target. The target for indicator #53 did read “Conduct an annual review of the NWAC Terms of Reference(TOR).” Michel clarified that the survey portion of the target was pulled from the “strategy and implementation schedule” section of the SFM Plan 10 for indicator #53.

Michel also indicated that this would be a good opportunity for formal input relating to concerns, likes and dislikes of NWAC.

Annemarie noted that she has a good template for a survey from the VINWAG committee that she could make available. Annemarie also suggested that the survey be sent out in word so it is easier for the members to complete and send back in an email. She also indicated that if anyone wanted this survey to be confidential they could always send the survey to the Facilitator or mail directly to WFP Englewood.

Michelle B suggested completing the survey with the annual review of the TOR as it would tie nicely in with the review process.

Michel agreed but stressed that he needed some baseline data to report on in the new SFM Plan 11 and that perhaps this year we could sent it out with the February 9th meeting minutes.

The members agreed and a two week completion due date, starting from when the minutes are distributed was determined.

Indicator 6.4.2. Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general.

6.4.2 Target

- The list of educational opportunities provided annually to the public. *(new)*

Michel explained that while this indicator is fairly broad there are lots of small and large educational initiatives that the operation carries out.

Bill asked if the target would include safety initiatives, such as the display at a recent Truck Loggers Association (TLA) Conference that was well attended.

Michel indicated that this target was not intended to include regular safety activities but something such as the TLA could be included as it was an extra presentation and effort made by WFP.

Indicator 6.4.3. Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal communities.

6.4.3. Target

- The list of efforts to engage the Aboriginal communities in the SFM process annually and the number of training positions made available is greater than 1.(*new*)

Michel indicated that this target was a two-tiered target and that it is intended to show continuous efforts and also by keeping efforts engaged. He also indicated that this is a starting process to build capacity locally with specific focus on Aboriginal communities.

Ed indicated that this particular subject came up in the corporate meeting between WFP and the 'Namgis First Nations that was held yesterday.

Michel highlighted that he included a stipulation greater than 1 as a starting point.

Buzz asked what type of training positions would be included.

Ed clarified that the band has a good capacity to attain funding but they don't necessarily have a large pool of resources for training. The intent would be to introduce people to different aspects of Forestry to see if they have the interest and/or ability that is specifically important to encourage younger individuals.

John asked if the indicator's targets for 6.1.1; 6.1.2 and 6.2.1 were the same as there seemed to be large areas of overlap.

Michel indicated there are overlaps with the targets but they are applied in a different context.

It was brought to the attention by the members that they felt the target for indicator 6.2.1. did not fit with intent of the indicator due to the large degree of overlap with the above mentioned indicators (6.1.1 and 6.1.2.) .

Michel agreed to re-visit the target for indicator 6.2.1. in order to find a more suitable target.

Annemarie turned the focus to the members and asked if they had any ideas to the process of determining a new target started.

Ed indicated that opportunities such as the AOA study that was completed recently would align nicely with the indicator's intent. He also highlighted that studies such as this are dependant on funding and unfortunately there was no funding last year and he did not see too many funding opportunities for the current year.

Annemarie suggested that with regards to the target, it could be that NWAC would hold regular (1-2/year) presentation on culturally significant issues.

Michel indicated that he would take these suggestions into consideration when he looks into a potential target.

Objective 6.5. Information for decision-making

Indicator 6.5.1. Number of people reached through educational outreach.

6.5.1. Target

- The number of people reached through educational outreach is at least 25 annually. (*new*)

Annemarie requested clarification regarding the intent “reach”.

Michel clarified that it is meant to include people who were in attendance at the educational opportunity.

Gaby asked for clarification regarding the Objective’s title “information for decision-making” because she was not clear of the linkage between the objective and the target, particularly due to the wording “decision-making” as she viewed that not all people are making decisions regarding Forestry etc.

Michelle B clarified that through education, people may be able to make more informed decisions and opinions; even if they are on a smaller scale.

Jack asked if this target is intended to include other opportunities outside as well as within the operation.

Michel clarified that yes, it would include both inside and outside the operation.

Indicator 6.5.2. Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public.

6.5.2. Target

- SFM Annual Report is advertised annually and maintained on the website. (*new*)
- The FSP is advertised annually and maintained on the website, and a summary of any non-confidential public comments received from FSP advertising or open houses is prepared. (*new*)
- Summary of corporate monitoring & research projects and alliances is maintained annually. (*new*)

No comments/concerns were brought up by the members.

Review of CSA's Z809-08 Criterion 6 Discussion Items: Development of working relationships with willing aboriginal communities and/or people

Michel highlighted that corporately, WFP leans towards a preference for business relationships and partnerships with First Nations because this opens the lines of communication and opportunities for both parties.

He also indicated that because some of the First Nations Bands are smaller with potentially less capacity to initiate discussions, WFP has had to be the initiator in some cases. The goal for this type of communication and discussions is to be fair, not to take advantage of people and not to be taken advantage of. And being willing to be involved in the process significantly reduces conflicts. Michel mentioned that WFP is open to suggestions and offers as what may work for one band may not work for another.

The success of this process has been recently demonstrated as WFP Englewood had bid on and won a logging contract with the 'Namgis First Nation.

Jack stressed that due to an extended period of waiting for the treaty process to progress or come to a completion and the lack of information available; people are unfortunately forming opinions that tend to be leaning to the opposite direction rather than in a positive direction. Instead of doors being opened there is potential for the doors to close with less communication. Jack asked anyone new why the process was taking so long as it is the general public who he sees forming these opinions.

Michel suggested that this may be a good topic for an NWAC presentation and that Shannon Janzen (WFP Manager, Strategic Planning) and Ray Robazza (WFP Sr. Timberlands Engineer) would be good resources.

John Foster highlighted that processes take a long time because in this case three governments are involved; Federal, Provincial and First Nations.

Ed indicated that processes are lengthy because every Federal decision is required to go through Harper's office and that the 'Namgis First Nations is working with WFP to eventually become partners.

Annemarie suggested that it would be good to approach Shannon and Ray for a future NWAC presentation.

John Foster also indicated that someone from Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAR) may also be beneficial.

General Discussion:

Ed asked whether WFP would use the railway to haul wood for the current 'Namgis logging contract and John responded that, yes, the wood would be trucked to Camp A and rail hauled to Beaver Cove.

Michel suggested the next meeting be held March 10th, 2011 which is a Thursday.

The members agreed to this scheduled meeting.

Michel handed out a spreadsheet for better reference that clearly showed which indicators under Criterion 6 that were new, proposed to be dropped or carried over from the SFM Plan 10.

Annemarie asked the members to review the spreadsheet and indicated that there is a possibility that if one of the indicators that are being proposed to be dropped is of high concern to the members, it can be reviewed in more detail and can potentially be included as a locally developed indicator.

Annemarie asked if a spreadsheet similar to the one handed out for Criterion could be circulated to the members for all the Criteria (1-6).

Michel indicated that he already had the spreadsheets updated and that he will send them to Michelle B to distribute with the meeting minutes.

Michel brought the member's attention to indicator 4.1.1. Net carbon uptake as it had been a topic of discussion in previous meetings.

Annemarie asked if they had decided to include or exclude the carbon associated things such as roots etc.

Michel indicated that this indicator was very complicated and it was decided to keep the data focused on the larger processes and not try to estimate smaller processes such as carbon stored/loss in roots etc. This is because the majority of the time it takes larger processes and large numbers to induce significant differences.

Jack asked if it would be possible to see a summary of variables and current numbers used in the determination of the current status for Indicator 4.1.1. Net carbon uptake.

Michel said yes, it would be possible but cautioned the members to remember that in 2009 WFP Englewood did not cut its full ACC but to evaluate the range and trends related to the effects harvesting has on the net carbon uptake, the net carbon uptake was also evaluated as if 110% of the AAC was harvested. Results alluded to a positive net carbon uptake when 110% of the AAC was harvested.

Michel also indicated that it is hard to get the exact number of carbon burned (usually identified as fuel consumed among other variables) for contractors, therefore an extrapolation of the WFP consumption/m³ was used to estimate the carbon burned from contractors.

Action Item #1: Move the target *“All cutblocks harvested over any 5 year period are consistent with management practices to address karst resources”* to be included under indicator 1.4.2.

Responsibility: Michel de Bellefeuille

Due Date: Include in the SFM Plan 11 to be presented at the next scheduled meeting, March 10th, 2011.

Action Item #2: Complete SFM Plan 11 by the end of the month.

Responsibility: Michel de Bellefeuille

Due Date: Present SFM Plan 11 at the next scheduled meeting.

Action Item #3: Distribute formal survey regarding level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process.

Responsibility: Michelle Beaulieu

Due Date: To be distributed with the February 9, 2011 meeting minutes.

Action Item #4: Find a more suitable target for indicator 6.2.1.

Responsibility: Michel de Bellefeuille

Due Date: Present SFM Plan 11 at the next scheduled meeting.

Action Item #5: Separate the target for indicator 6.4.3. into a two tiered target rather than one.

Responsibility: Michel de Bellefeuille

Due Date: Present SFM Plan 11 at the next scheduled meeting.

Action item #6: Approach Shannon Janzen, Ray Robazza and possibly a representative from MAR to see if they would be available to address current progress regarding the treaty negotiations.

Responsibility: Michelle Beaulieu

Due Date: After the March 10th, 2011 meeting.

Action item #7: Circulate the summary of indicators that are new, proposed to be dropped or carried over from the SFM Plan 10 to NWAC members for clear and easy reference of the changes.

Responsibility: Michelle Beaulieu

Due Date: To be distributed with the February 9, 2011 meeting minutes.

Action item #8: Complete a summary of variables and current numbers used in the determination of the current status for Indicator 4.1.1. Net carbon uptake.

Responsibility: Michel de Bellefeuille

Due Date: After the March 10th, 2011 meeting.

Action item #9: Distribute pre and post code summary to NWAC members as referenced in Action Item #3 from the September 16, 2010 meeting.

Responsibility: Michelle Beaulieu

Due Date: To be distributed with the February 9, 2011 meeting minutes.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm with the proposal of the next meeting to be March 10th, 2011.