

Nimpkish Woodlands Advisory Committee Meeting  
Minutes November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
Black Bear Resort Port McNeill, BC

**Attendance:** Ray Lutz, Buzz Walker, Jack Miller, Gaby Wickstrom, Jon Lok, Stu Ellis, Neil Smith, Trevor Egley, Kelly McMahon

**Advisor:** Paul Barolet, MOFLNRO

**Presenters:** Bev Webber and Jeanne Matthews

**Regrets:** Linda Philipp, Mac Willing, Bill Nelson, Dave Rushton, Peter Curtis

**Facilitator:** Annemarie Koch

**Notes:** Kelly McMahon

Annemarie reviewed the safety procedures to follow in the event of a fire or medical emergency. She then invited those present to introduce themselves for the benefit of the new members and the presenters. She welcomed Jon Lok as the new representative for forestry contractors and consultants and Stu Ellis, the new community forest representative, and thanked speakers Bev and Jeanne for coming.

Annemarie reviewed the objectives of the meeting, including:

- To review the previous meeting minutes and action items;
- To hear a presentation on Englewood's trail projects, including reference to Criterion Five mandatory discussion item 'benefits to local communities and Aboriginal peoples;'
- To review the SFMP indicators that were revised as a result of recommendations for the recent internal audit;
- To have a general discussion, and;
- To set a date for the next meeting.

Bev and Jeanne reviewed the work that has been done to date on a system of trails in the Englewood DFA, including the Woos Lookout Trail and the Hoomak and Klaklakama Lakes interpretive trails.

There was a discussion of how this trail initiative might be integrated with the Vancouver Island Spine Trail initiative.

There was a discussion of the heritage value of the Woss Lookout building.

*Notes from Kelly's presentation on indicators revised as a result of recommendations from a recent internal audit, and from the general discussion that followed:*

Annemarie introduced Kelly's presentation. Kelly referred to a handout in the agenda package that summarized the relevant recommendations from the internal audit.

She reviewed the six indicators that had been highlighted by the internal audit for revision, starting with 2.1.2, Percent consistency with time to control a forest fire- She

noted that the WFP-EFO variance sizes are made small with emphasis on the proactive side where they are stopped immediately and effectively.

Kelly reviewed Indicator 2.2.2-Proportion of the LTHL that is actually harvested- It was noted by the internal auditor that the explanation in the Annual Report was not descriptive enough. Rationale on why we have been maximizing our harvest is to be elaborated on. Kelly noted that she would clarify her descriptions in the SFMP.

Kelly moved to Indicator 3.2.1-Proportion of watershed with recent stand-replacing disturbance. She noted that she was looking at providing more detail in relation to what is done specifically in each watershed. It was agreed that a more descriptive statement in relation to management strategies, watershed, will be provided with the next Annual Report.

Trevor added that the annual report needed to quantify which watersheds had been managed and how and why. Kelly referred to the risk rating established by Glynnis Horel.

Jack asked about the change from always using mats to no requirement for mats. Trevor noted that mats were still be used where required, eg, honouring riparian management and soil management requirements. Jack asked if maybe they were doing too much previously. Trevor noted that this may have been the case, but it was critical that there be management for issues such as soil compaction. Stu asked about effects of changes in machine type and use. Ray noted that operators work on steeper terrain now. There was a discussion of ways not to 'hurt the dirt.' Ray noted his concern for operating on steep grades and stressed the importance of conserving soil and operating safely.

There was a discussion of how effective site rehabilitation can be. There was a discussion of safety issues on steep grades. Jack noted his concern for running machines on steep grades. Trevor noted that, if there was a concern, WFP should address it.

There was a discussion of the responsibility of the operator. Trevor noted that the company shouldn't expect the operator to make these types of decisions and noted that he felt it was the responsibility of the foreman in combination with the operator to make the right decision for the worksite.

Kelly referenced Indicator 5.2.2-Level of investment in training and skills development- She noted that she would take better note of trends related to this target in the next annual report. Neil asked whether there was any further depth to the review of economic indicators, such as the recruitment question in Woss. He asked whether this might be too deep for what was intended through the certification process.

Kelly noted it was worth considering. Neil noted the concern for communities such as Woss and Holberg, where there are serious demographic problems, ie. loss of population and impact on school closures etc., emerging.

It was agreed that this was a topic worth pursuing next year. It was noted that there has been previous discussion of these issues at the NWAC table.

Jon asked why the training target does not include contractors. He noted that this could help achieve targets. Kelly noted that she would look at this. She explained that it can be difficult to track contractors and their training initiatives.

Gaby asked how long the annual report data compilation takes and Kelly noted it takes a considerable amount of time, from December to the end of March.

Kelly referred to Indicator 5.2.3- Level of direct and indirect employment- She noted that this should probably be a reporting out target. She noted it would be very difficult to quantify. Gaby noted she would like to see the company buy locally and contribute to the economy rather than focus on identifying non-forestry businesses. Kelly noted she would like to keep this indicator for tracking purposes, but also look at sourcing local services and supplies.

Paul suggested that target one might be expressed as a percentage of cubic metres harvested. Neil noted that it was useful to attach a number, for political purposes. He added that an overall picture with estimated numbers of jobs supported was very helpful, but he agreed that gauging this number against the harvest might be more accurate.

Jack noted that the number of jobs per cubic metre has dropped generally due to such things as changes in technology.

Kelly reviewed Indicator 6.3.1- Cooperation with forest-dependant groups to strengthen and diversify the local economy- target to maintain access to three categories of raw material types made available locally. She noted that the target could be changed to three or greater, so as not to limit the target.

There was a discussion of how and whether this target should have any numbers associated with it or whether the group would like the numbers tracked over the years.

Kelly noted that there were some action items that required integrating revisions and additional information into next year's SFMP and annual report.

Kelly asked if Jack would like to see a target related to tracking oil consumption, use and recycling.

### **General Discussion:**

Gaby asked what the criteria are for coarse woody debris left on harvested blocks. She noted that some areas were full of slash and some are cleaned up. Trevor noted there is a minimum requirement for coarse woody debris but that, for various reasons, the amount of woody debris left on a site can vary.

There was a discussion of the various factors related to how much woody debris is left over, eg. collection of waste for operations like Northland Power. Kelly added that the type of harvesting system used was also a factor, and added that some blocks are harder to plant because of the waste left on site. Jack referred to the effects of market prices and species mix on how much is left behind.

Kelly referred to the use of grinders and the use of wood waste for energy production or other waste wood products. Trevor referred to a potential waste wood study currently underway and he pointed to the potential that exists for utilization of wood waste.

Kelly asked about a schedule of meeting dates for next year. She proposed the following tentative meeting dates:

**February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

**April 9th, 2013**

**May 14th, 2013**

**September 10th, 2013,**

**November 12th, 2013**

Jack asked about collaboration between the various parts of the company to attract young people into the workforce. Trevor noted that the company was looking at coordinating training sessions throughout the divisions. The logging training course coming out of Holberg was referenced. It was agreed that there is a great need for training to bring new recruits into and build a future for the industry.

Gaby asked about getting a speaker to address this topic at the April meeting.

Jack pointed to the need for a strategy, in view of the future reductions to funding for this sort of initiative.

Jon noted that many of the people needed in future for the harvesting sector might be recruited from his sector, so it was important to see the whole picture and look out for the industry as a whole.

Jack asked about the issue of safety along the highway, where non-windfirm trees are standing right next to the highway. Jack noted there should be some sort of responsibility, to those who drive the highway, for the blocks that are now wind-prone. Paul noted it was not WFP's tenure to harvest the trees along the highway. It was noted that highways does not have the resources, desire, or expertise to manage these blocks along the highway.

Jack noted it was a matter of time before falling trees caused injury along the highway. It was suggested that, if there is fibre there to be harvested, why isn't that done on order to enhance safety of road users.

Neil noted that the Regional District could bring up this issue with the highways representative during their annual round table with the ministry. Stu asked if WFP would be welcome to sit in on the meeting and Neil said this was totally possible as the meetings are public.

Neil referred to the community work done by highways contractors down Island.

Meeting adjourned – it was noted that the next meeting was scheduled for February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013 and that the agenda topics would likely be speaker Vince Devlin to address WFP's training initiatives, and a review of the annual report. It was noted that the external audit was scheduled for April 22-30, 2013 and Annemarie invited NWAC members to participate in the audit, if they wished to.