

Nimpkish Woodlands Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes March 14,2019
Black Bear Resort, Port McNeill, BC
6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Attendance: Kelly McMahon, Area Planner, WFP, Jack Miller, Labour, Cameron Brady, Karst, Stu Ellis, General Public, Rod Sherrell, Local Government, Derek Koel, Town of Port McNeill, Steve Lacasse, Environment, Adrian Pendergast, Education, Jon Lok, Contractors,

Regrets: Mike Green, Mount Cain, Trevor Egely, Large Contractors

Presenters: Sebastien Lecours, WFP Operations Planner, Clint Cadwallader, Regional Manager, Western Timberlands, WFP, Rob Shambrook, Englewood Operations Manager, WFP, Will Sloan, WFP Certification Coordinator, Kelly McMahon, WFP Area Planner

Advisor: Paul Barolet, MOFLNRO

Observers: Bill Nelson, Holbrook Dyson

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 invited members to introduce themselves for the benefit of presenters and guests.

2. Review of Meeting Objectives

Annemarie reminded members of the changes to order and content of the agenda that had been noted in the meeting reminder, and reviewed the objectives of the meeting, namely:

- To hear an update on the operational plan from Sebastien Lecours;
- To hear from and ask questions of Clint Cadwallader and Rob Shambrook
- To hear a presentation from Will Sloan comparing CSA and SFI certification
- To hear a final presentation from Kelly on the 2018 annual report;
- To review and confirm the 2019 schedule of meetings and review membership;
- To review the February 7,2019 meeting minutes and selected action items;
- To confirm the date and content of the next meeting.

3. Update on the Englewood Operational Plan: Sebastien Lecours

Annemarie reminded members that it had been agreed to ask Sebastien to provide an update on the Englewood operational plan early in 2019 and she thanked Sebastien for attending and invited him to proceed with his update.

Sebastien noted he would be talking about the 2019 plan update following a brief look at the 2018 operations. He opened his presentation with an overall look at the TFL and then reviewed volume harvested and roads constructed in 2018, including 74,700 cubic metres of second growth, 246,600 cubic metres of old growth harvested, and a total of 24.53 kilometres of road construction. He noted that operations were curtailed due to fire during the summer and the lack of approved cutting and road permits between the fall of 2018 and spring of 2019.

Sebastien reviewed the 2019 plan, noting a planned harvest of 64,000 cubic metres of second growth, 265,500 cubic metres of old growth, a total of 21.88 kilometres of road construction and 145 planned loading days. He added that harvest volumes continue to be limited due to an inability to obtain cutting permits.

Sebastien noted that operations were scheduled to start up again next week. He stressed that safety was the number one priority this year and that a second priority was to rebuild inventory. He noted that, toward this end, efforts were being made to partner with First Nations.

Sebastien noted that the company was doing a good job of meeting the target of harvesting 20% second growth.

Sebastien reviewed the 2019 falling mix, noting hand-falling was at 54% and 46% mechanical falling. He reviewed the yarding mix, including 8% right-of-way, hoe chuck at 46% and grapple yarding at 35%.

Sebastien reviewed key highlights in the 2019 plan, noting the approach would be similar to 2018, with reduced road construction and harvesting. He noted that WFP would continue to try to build inventory and work with the 'Namgis. He added that the 2020 plan was currently in jeopardy and that there was no specific plan for beyond 2019 at this stage.

Sebastien acknowledged that this was a difficult time for employees and that the company was working with employees to temporarily redeploy people and equipment to mitigate the impacts of reduced harvest volume. He noted that the division has a retiring workforce and that this might help in the short term but not in the long term when the company ultimately needs workers.

He noted that high stumpage rates continue to be a challenge.

He stressed that the company continues to believe in the long-term viability of the operation and will work toward maintaining operations, employment and profitability.

There was a discussion of efforts to work with First Nations to move ahead with sustainable forest operations.

There was a discussion of the Danyas Partnership and how it is a joint venture with the 'Namgis First Nation, operating on a portion of WFP's TFL. It was noted that this venture was also subject to the effects of treaty negotiations.

There was a discussion of the Coast Revitalization Strategy and how this might affect Englewood's operations.

It was noted that there were rumors of tripling stumpage rates and that this would present serious challenges to industry profitability.

It was noted that there are significant volumes awaiting approval but the company isn't going to proceed without better indications that permitting will proceed in a timely fashion. It was noted that WFP had made a commitment to keeping employees up to date on what is happening with the operational plan.

Annemarie thanked Sebastien, Clint and Rob for attending the meeting and answering questions about the operational plan.

4. Comparing CSA to SFI Certification Schemes: Will Sloan, WFP

Annemarie reminded NWAC members that they had asked to hear this presentation prior to the joint meeting with VINWAG in May, where the future of CSA certification on North Island DFA's was to be discussed.

She thanked Will for attending the meeting and invited him to proceed with his presentation.

Will noted that a pdf of this updated presentation would be posted on the PAG website following the meeting.

Will reviewed the topics he would cover during his presentation, including what is certification, why we certify forest products, what are the different certification schemes and the current status of certification schemes in Canada.

Will defined certification, noting it included a formal review process and independent third-party audit.

Will talked about why forest companies engage in certification, noting it was a response to demands from the environmental movement and a means to maintain market access. He noted that certification positions a company for social license and environmental responsibility.

Will noted that, from an operational perspective, certification helps to manage risk and provides an independent endorsement of environmental and forest management. Will added that certification improves operational efficiencies.

Will noted that certification requires a structured approach to managing potential impacts from forestry.

Will went on to talk about the different forest certification schemes, starting with Environmental Management System, which is used as a foundation for sustainable forest management systems. He referenced the more recently developed Health and Safety System as well.

Will described the 'certification house' noting it was built on the foundation of EMS, with 3rd party audits, indicators, SFM targets, mandatory standards and chain of custody on the main floor, overlain by a roof of plans and procedures carried out in the field.

Will reviewed three certification schemes in Canada, namely Canadian Standards Association (CSA, used only in Canada), Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). He noted there was a certification system in Europe, the Program for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC). Will noted there were at least 40 other certification systems worldwide.

Will then went on to compare the three main standards, noting all three have a chain of custody, have a 3rd party audit, allow a product label and have indicators, objectives and targets. Will noted that only the CSA certification system requires a public advisory process on an ongoing basis. He explained that the other certification schemes only require public input when there are major

changes made to the management system. Will explained that only SFI has fibre sourcing verification.

There was a discussion and it was noted that the SFI system arose from and is used mostly on private lands and that CSA is better suited to management of public lands.

Will noted that CSA and SFI are endorsed by PEFC but FSC is not.

Will reviewed the CSA certification system, noting it was based on criteria set by the Canadian Council of Forests Ministers, administered by a non-profit corporation and coordinated by the Standards Council of Canada. Will noted there were seven Criteria, 16 Elements and 33 core indicators in the standard, along with a set of values, objectives, targets and additional indicators. Will reviewed some of the Englewood VOIT's and variances associated with the Soil and Water Criterion. Will reviewed the reporting that goes along with implementing the sustainable management plan.

Will then went on to review the SFI certification scheme, noting it was based on criteria set by the American Forest and Paper Association and seen to be more acceptable to U.S customers. He reviewed the organizational structure of SFI, noting board members come from a variety of sources, including Irving in Canada.

Will noted that SFI has 101 indicators, 13 principles, 15 objectives and 37 performance measures. Will noted that there is a monitoring and reporting aspect to the certification process.

Will reviewed some of the SFI SFM components, including forest productivity and health and the protection of soil productivity, for example. Will reviewed some of the indicators under SFI, including use of soil erosion control methods, processes to identify vulnerable soils, and retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting to protect soil productivity.

Will reviewed some of the differences and similarities between the two systems, including continuous improvement and measurement and evaluation, but that differences are in the public participation and setting of targets under CSA.

Will reviewed activities specific to SFI, including promotion of training for certified and qualified loggers, hosting of annual conferences, provision of funding for community and conservation projects, provision of significant support for Ducks Unlimited and Habitat For Humanity, provision of training materials for Project Learning Tree and requirement of participants to support research, science and technology.

Will reviewed SFI fibre sourcing, noting SFI also has standards for facilities that consume fibre. He added that the standard governs how SFI program participants procure fibre from non-certified lands.

Will reviewed the current status of operations certified under one or more schemes in Canada and in B.C.

Will demonstrated that total lands under certification has dropped slightly since 2017 (possibly due to a drop in FSC certified lands) and that the volume of lands certified under CSA have dropped since 2008, while land certified under SFI has picked up since 2008. Will noted that in 2008, a set of core indicators was introduced under the CSA standard and this was not well received by public advisory groups. He noted that this likely led to a drop in CSA certified

operations, as many public advisory groups dissolved and the key driver to the process was removed.

There was a discussion of why core indicators might have been introduced by CSA.

Will reviewed the companies in B.C. that are currently using CSA certification. He noted BCTS and Canfor would be leaving CSA this year and that WFP was still using CSA.

He noted that Canadian Kraft Paper and Algonquin Forestry Authority are using CSA and that these are operating primarily on crown land. Will noted that 75% of the area currently harvested by WFP is under CSA. He pointed to some of WFP's areas under SFI and indicated that the only reason these areas were under SFI was because the company could not establish a viable public advisory group for them.

Will reviewed companies using SFI certification, including the Revelstoke Community Forest Corporation and TimberWest.

Will noted there were a number of First Nations under SFI certification and, currently, not a single First Nations under CSA in Canada. He noted the TFL 44 partnership with a First Nation would come under CSA certification in the near future.

Will pointed out that, currently in Canada, 21% of the lands are under CSA certification and 51% are under SFI. He added that, once Canfor leaves CSA, 69% of lands will be under SFI certification and 55 companies will be using this standard in Canada.

Will noted that, in spite of this growing trend toward SFI certification, the approximately 16 million hectares under CSA is still a significant amount of land and PEFC has been very supportive of WFP's continued use of CSA certification.

Will noted that most customers are looking for the PEFC chain of custody stamp.

He added that there were a number of links that NWAC members might like to follow up to find further information on the standards and that these would be in the pdf presentation that would be made available on the PAG website.

Will reviewed some of the benefits and costs of each of the certification schemes. There was a discussion of whether the company could move to SFI but still maintain a public advisory group. Will noted that some companies that have gone to SFI have retained their public advisory groups in order to keep a public engagement aspect to the process.

Will added that WFP's chief forester was committed to maintaining a public involvement process.

Annemarie thanked Will for his presentation.

5. Final Review of 2018 Annual Report: Kelly McMahon

Annemarie reminded NWAC members that Kelly had started her review of the annual report at the February meeting and was now going to finish the review, prior to submission of the report later this spring.

Kelly noted she was still waiting on some data in order to complete the report but that she would review parts of the report where she was specifically looking for input from members to change indicator targets. Kelly reviewed some of the data that had not been compiled yet, including Target 1 for Indicator 5.1.1 and Target 1 of Indicator 5.1.2 and the collection of information on contractor numbers, for example.

Kelly noted that she would like some input from members on possibly revising some of the targets, including reducing the current target of 100% for Indicator 1.2.3, to 95%, to allow more flexibility to plant species like noble fir and adapt to changes that are expected through climate change.

There was a discussion of the potential ecological impacts of introducing new species such as noble fir and how this might be managed. It was agreed that these potential impacts should be monitored over time and that Kelly should report back on the elevation range for noble fir.

It was noted that noble fir is allowed under current stocking standards.

It was noted that, currently, noble fir would amount to less than 1% of the tree species in the DFA.

Members agreed to changing the current target for Indicator 1.2.3 to 95% of the proportion of trees planted as native.

Kelly reviewed Indicator 3.2.2, noting the current wording for the target does not allow enough operational flexibility and she proposed that the target be revised to “all cutblocks harvested within the year with completed post-harvest activities (ex. piling, deact, rehab) are consistent with management prescriptions to address water features,” with a variance that there is an action plan in place or documented rationale for variance from prescription.

She noted that the proposed change was more about ensuring good results than the following process. There was a discussion of the need for flexibility for the company to meet the target and get good results to maintain good water quality.

It was noted that seasonal constraints may affect the outcome of the prescription. There was a discussion of how the inspection process takes seasonality into account. It was suggested this be noted in the description of the Indicator.

There was a discussion of how to attend to the stream cleaning while the equipment is still in the area.

It was agreed that any action plans and reports on variances should be shared with the public advisory group on an annual basis. It was noted that, generally speaking, when a target isn't met, the public advisory group must be notified of why.

Members agreed to make the proposed revision to the target and associated variance for Indicator 3.2.2. in the spirit of continuous improvement.

Kelly reviewed Indicator 6.1.3 and noted some challenges associated with target 2, in that the FSP is a five-year document and comments are received every five years and not annually.

There was a discussion of avenues for public input on the FSP. It was suggested that WFP advertise annually that the FSP is available on the WFP website and provide the links. It was noted that the public is most interested in the harvesting plans and that there may be legislative requirements in future that these harvesting plans be advertised.

Kelly agreed to work on this target and come back to the group with a suggested revision.

Kelly reviewed Action Item 6.1.3 and noted target 4 be changed to: “the NWAC group performs one outreach once every three years (e.g. newspaper article, community event, extension to draw in one more members),” with no variance.

Members agreed to the proposed revision to target 4 of Indicator 6.1.3.

6. Review and Confirmation of 2019 Meeting Schedule and Membership Review: Annemarie Koch

Annemarie reviewed the final draft of the 2019 meeting schedule with members, noting that revisions requested at the last meeting had been made. Members confirmed the schedule for circulation and posting.

Annemarie noted that Mike Green had agreed to represent Mount Cain but was unable to attend this meeting. She noted she had asked Pat whether he had been able to source a tourism representative and would follow up with him on this, and asked members if they would like to see any other sector positions filled.

Derek agreed to talk to the Chamber of Commerce in Port McNeill.

Steve agreed to talk to the people at Kutera to see if they wished to send a representative to NWAC.

7. Minutes and Action Items

Annemarie reviewed the February 7th minutes and reminded members that she would be assuming they had read the minutes prior to the meeting. She added that she would be summarizing the action items in tabular format from hereon in, so that the items could be more easily tracked and monitored.

She 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.

ACTION ITEMS					
#	Item	Responsibility	Initiation Date	Target Date	Status
5	Support Youth Forestry Initiative	Kelly	2015		Ongoing
32	Keep NWAC members up to date on the forest sector strategy initiative	Pat English			Ongoing in 2019
33	Keep NWAC members up to date on UBCM resolution to ban all future logging of old growth on Vancouver Island	Pat English			Ongoing in 2019
40	Implement recommendations in 2016 participant satisfaction survey report	Kelly/Annemarie /NWAC members			Ongoing in 2019
54	Talk to the WRA about more actively pursuing community funds from WFP through CEF	Chris Bowden-Green ,			Ongoing
64	Track and follow the potential water quality and quantity impacts of tethered feller buncher harvesting	Kelly			Ongoing in 2019
65	Consider adding an education target around sedimentation management to Indicator 3.2.2, possibly for grader and hoe operators	Kelly			Ongoing in 2019
66	Consider adding a data collection target to Indicator 3.2.2	Kelly/Steve			Ongoing in 2019
67	Retain and develop target 4 under Indicator 6.1 to communicate information about what NWAC does specifically	Kelly			For 2019 SFMP
71	Invite management to provide operational reports from time to time	Kelly			Throughout 2019
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	Kelly			Throughout 2019
77	Report back to NWAC on the cause and effects of an anticipated reduction	Kelly/Sebastien			March 14,2019 Meeting

	in company and contractor harvest				
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	Kelly			Mid 2019
80	Talk to members of VINTAC about providing a representative for the tourism and recreation sector on NWAC	Pat English			Ongoing in 2019
83	Report out on current Indicator 5.1.1 for 2017 reporting year and develop new Indicator and associated targets for 2018 reporting year	Kelly			Mid 2019
87	Get Englewood digital recreation map out by summer of 2019	Kelly	February 7,2019		Summer of 2019
88	Provide more detail of the nature of spending on goods and services associated with Indicator 5.2.1, target 2	Kelly	February 7,2019	March 14,2019	
89	Talk to Harry Alfred about joint presentation to NWAC and VINWAG on knotweed projects in DFA's on the North Island on October 24 th	Sebastien	February 7,2019	March 14,2019	Completed
90	Continue to work with Jon Flintoft on a joint field trip on September 13 th with VINWAG	Kelly/Annemarie	February 7,2019	March14, 2019	Completed
91	Distribute and post 2019 meeting schedule	Annemarie	February 7,2019		Following March 14 th meeting
92	Monitor ecological impacts of planting noble fir in DFA	Kelly	March 14,2019	Ongoing	

93	Report back on elevation range of noble fir in this region	Kelly	March 14,2019	In 2019	
94	Produce a revised target 2 for Indicator 6.1.3 for NWAC members to review	Kelly	March 14,2019	October 3,2019	
95	Post and circulate 2019 meeting schedule	Annemarie	March 14,2019	Circulate with meeting minutes	
96	Talk to Port McNeill Chamber about sending an NWAC representative	Derek	March 14,2019	October3, 2019	
97	Talk to Kutera about sending an NWAC representative	Steve	March 14,2019	October3, 2019	

Annemarie noted that action items 72,73,81, 84,85,86,89 and 90 had been completed and 91 could be completed now that the 2019 meeting schedule had been reviewed.

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

Next Meeting:

Annemarie noted that, further to the proposed 2019 meeting schedule, the next meeting would be a joint one with VINWAG on May 23,2019 at Black Bear Resort and consist primarily of a discussion with WFP Chief Forester Shannon Janzen on the future of CSA certification on North Island DFA's.

She noted that members of NWAC had been invited to join participants in the 2019 Festival of Forestry Tour for dinner on July 9th and added that further detail would be available at the joint meeting on May 23rd.

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