Hishuk-ish-tsawalk

(everything is one)

Towards

Sustainable Forest Management

West Island Timberlands
BC Coastal Group
Weyerhaeuser Company

SFM Plan 2002 Data Set

July 2003

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Indicator 1: Percent of **timber species** by DFA compared to historic baseline

Indicator 2: Percent of **0-20 year age class** by landscape level

Indicator 3: Percent area of **old growth** within landscape units and biogeoclimatic subzones

Indicator 4: Percent of **planners oriented**

Indicator 5: Percent of area harvested using **Variable Retention** (VR)

Indicator 6: Forest Ecosystem Network [**FEN**]

Indicator 7: **Stand level retention** in all cutblocks as percent of total cutblock area

Indicator 8: **Species** and Programs mentioned in the Forest Development Plan

Indicator 9: Number of identified **species at-risk** in the DFA

Indicator 10: Existence of a **habitat management program** for identified species of special interest (includes a list)

Indicator 11: Annual percent of opening areas in **permanent access structures**

Indicator 12: Operationally-caused **fire damage** by area

Indicator 13: Annual **area harvested** as percent of total productive forest area

Indicator 14: Area of operationally-related **windthrow**

Indicator 15: Area of **slides** originating in harvested areas or roads

Indicator 16: Area out of compliance with **Free Growing** objectives

Indicator 17: Area out of compliance with **regeneration delay** obligations

Indicator 18: Total **productive forest** area in DFA

Indicator 19: Equivalent years of Not Sufficiently Reforested (**NSR**) as 5-year rolling average

Indicator 20: Inventory of all known **sites requiring preservation or protection** within the DFA

Indicator 21: Openings harvested in which **soil disturbance** exceeds level specified on Silviculture Prescription

Indicator 22: **Water quality** measurements for selected streams in areas of concern

Indicator 23: Percent of stream length of **S4, S5 streams** buffered ≥15 metres in areas harvest annually

Indicator 24: Percent of **S6 streams** with a > 15 metre buffer in areas harvested annually

Table of Contents

Indicator 25: Forest Practices Code **reserve zones for wetlands, lakes and streams**.

Indicator 26: **Coastal Watershed Assessment Procedure** (CWAP) programs completed for watersheds of identified concern and results are incorporated into FDP

Indicator 27: Change in area of **water bodies**

Indicator 28: *Indicator pending on advisory group education and information gathering* [**carbon budget**]

Indicator 29: Number of complaints annually [**Non-timber forest products**]

Indicator 30: Annual harvest (5 year average) as percent of [**Long Term Harvest Level** LTHL]

Indicator 31: Percent of **protected area perimeter** harvested with previous 5 years

Indicator 32: Percent of **harvesting adjacent to protected areas** that is VR

Indicator 33: Area of identified **recreational areas** with the DFA

Indicator 34: Percent of identified **roads that have been maintained**

Indicator 35: Number of **recreation sites maintained**

Indicator 36: Number of polygons in which visual condition fail to meet **Visual Quality Objectives** [VQ0]

Indicator 37: Total WIT [West Island Timberlands] **wages and salaries**

Indicator 38: Total **paid to contractors**

Indicator 39: Contract total **paid to FN** First Nations

Indicator 40: Total paid in **property taxes** by each WY division or operation in DFA area over last five years

Indicator 41: **Annual harvest** level compared to last 5 years

Indicator 42: Distribution of WY **expenditures locally**

Indicator 43: Annual harvest compared to **local log consumption** that is provided by WY

Indicator 44: A **meeting of value-added stakeholders** is held

Indicator 45: **Stumpage** paid

Indicator 46: Number of **FN contracts** signed

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process**

Indicator 48: **Profit/loss** statement

Indicator 49: Number of [**Cultural Heritage**] surveys conducted vs. number requested

Table of Contents

Indicator 50: Number of First Nations who have requested a **Cultural Heritage Resource [CHR] contract** vs. the number who have one

Indicator 51: First Nations **information sharing and referrals programs**

Indicator 52: Archaeological and **Culturally Modified Tree** (CMT) sites inventory

Indicator 53: Percent of **blocks by band where agreement is reached** around the management

Indicator 54: Number of **public comments** to WY and percent of those that result in changes to operational plans

Indicator 55: Incidence of **non-compliance with treaty settlements and Interim Measures Agreements**

Indicator 56: A joint **communications and public consultation plan**

Indicator 57: **[FN] Education and training program**

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The West Island Timberlands unit was certified for both ISO 14001 & CSA Z809 standards in November of 2000. The certified area consists of 311,388 hectares of public and private lands surrounding the communities of Port Alberni and Bamfield on the West Coast of Vancouver Island. There are 10 First Nations with territories touching on the DFA as well. The area approximates TFL #44 with the exception of small parcels of leased licenses and private property.

As part of the certification process for CSA the company facilitated the development of an arms length Advisory Group (West Island Woodlands Advisory Group or WIWAG) whose primary role is to provide input into the Sustainable Forest Management Plan. WIWAG continues to be actively involved in reviewing data and revising the plan with a view to ongoing learning and increased effectiveness in the area of sustainable forest management.

The data set, and in particular the summary, is intended to meet several objectives:

- A tool for thinking about relationships between factors, the need for changes in our goals or objectives and the usefulness of the indicators themselves.
- A short, concise way of highlighting key areas of progress towards the goals, the need for improvement and identification of trends over time.
- A means of communicating these issues to the public that is informative and easily understood.

There is a large body of work across North America in the area of public reporting on indicators in the areas of health, community quality of life and the environment. In all of these efforts however are similar challenges:

- There are problems with access to data for small scale or local information gathering. While Weyerhaeuser has committed resources for data collection related to work in the DFA, there are cases where data also needs to come from other sources such as the Small Business Forest Enterprise Program. Coordinating the timing and criteria for data collection from a range of sources is more complex than single source collection. In other situations, particularly around the social and economic values, the best type of data is simply not available.
- Related to the issues of data access and reliability is the notion of scale. On what basis does one think about sustainability? Across the DFA, by Landscape Unit, or by Watershed, etc.? Of the 29 LUs in the DFA many are shared with other tenure holders over whom this plan has no authority.

- Most efforts have focused on hard data, or quantitative data, when in some cases the best measure of progress is qualitative. This year a satisfaction survey of FN contract negotiation processes has proven informative, however this type of data collection is costly, time consuming, and not always as easily shared as a hard number.
- Finally, the process is an iterative one, and if the Advisory Group are to commit to the development of better goals, and better measures of progress on those goals, this means changing indicators for a time at least. The question: "to what extent does this data tell us about progress, or lack of progress towards the goal" sometimes leads to new or slightly revised goals, objectives and indicators. The movement towards sustainability is often slow and not perfect.

The following data represents a summary of some of the key indicators of sustainable forest management from the SFM Plan and the progress, or lack of, over time. The arrows are used to indicate movement toward the objectives/goals. This means that in some cases an actual number has gone up, but the arrow will show down, meaning that the data reflects movement away from the objective. The implications of the data and the plans to improve are represented in the revisions and improvements to the 2003 SFM Plan.

THE ECONOMIC VALUES

- ↑ Harvest levels were close to both the AAC and the LTHL in 2002 and were higher than they have been since 1997. Harvest within the TFL was 1,688,584 cubic meters, and 96% of the AAC compared to 90% in 2000.
- ↑ Wages ($39.3 million) and contractor payments ($57.2 million) were up. Contracts with 7 First Nations totaled $3.6 million. While contractor payments have increased steadily since 1997, wages in 2002 were lower than they had been in 2000, but slightly higher than 1998 ($31.4 million).
- WY non-wage spending within the Regional District of AC was $33.9 million in 2002 (includes taxes, donations, supplies & all contractor payments – which include contractor wages as well as overhead & supply costs). This is baseline data.
- ↑ WIT profits were up over past years.
- ↑ Local log consumption was up this year to 1,562,992 m^3 logs consumed locally as opposed to 1,523,435 m^3 sold logs from local operations. Local company operations were a net importer of logs this year.
- ↑ Local log sales outside of company operations was also up in 2002. 315,975 m^3 were sold locally as opposed to 292,275 m^3 in 2001. Log sales to local non-company operations have gradually increased each year.

External Events with regards to provincial policy and free trade have had an impact on this trend and 2002 performance is not necessarily an indication of near future trends.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES

- ↔Old Growth (250 years plus) as a portion of the total productive forest remained steady at 35%. Thirteen units show inadequate old growth (particularly in the xm1 and xm2 biogeoclimatic variants) and the LUs where recruitment may be required have been identified.
- ↔ Connectivity is addressed through the maintenance of the Forest Ecosystem Network (FEN).
- ↔ Harvesting as a portion of the productive forest increased to .89% from .74% in 2000, this remains under the stated objective of less than 1%.
- ↔ Area of operationally related windthrow (as a measure of harvest disturbance) was at 3.7% of the area, an increase from previous years, but still below the maximum 5% objective.
- ↓ Slides in operational areas were up this year over the last 2 years.
- ↑ Variable retention use was up this year to 78% of area harvested from 67% last year however it is still not at the objective levels of 80% by area. VR use adjacent to protected areas was at 100%, also up from 80% last year.
- ↓ Harvesting of protected area perimeters within previous five years was higher this year at 11.64%, up from 10.2% in 2001. The protection of perimeters has declined and we are further away from the objective of less than 5% of protected perimeters being harvested in a given five year period.
- ↓ Stand level retention was at 23% in 2002. While exceeding the objective range of no less than 15%, this is a decrease in retention from 2000 and 2001 (38%).
- ↑ Free to grow non-compliance has been reduced to 60 hectares or 2 units, from 288 hectares in 2001. The improvement brings this within the objective of less than 150 hectares.
- Non-compliance with regeneration delay objectives occurred over 2 hectares of 1 unit this year. There were issues related to stock availability and the area will be planted in September 2003. This was baseline data for 2002.
- Progress was also made in 2002 with regard to: baseline data gathering for stream buffers on S4, S5 and S6 streams and initiation of a Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory in the DFA.

THE SOCIAL VALUES

- ↑ Units outside the Visual Quality Objective are down to 22,199 hectares in 2002 from 25,124 hectares in 2000. The objective targets ongoing efforts to reduce this.
- ↑ Support for recreation has increased as a result of the work of this sector of the Advisory in developing and updating a road inventory. Ninety seven percent of road access was maintained last year.
- ↑ Education of both workers and the public improved this year with the Advisory organizing three public seminars and the completion and delivery of both the FN Cultural Awareness Program (517 workers) and the Red/Blue Listed Species orientation for planners (23 planners). A joint Advisory/WY communications plan has been developed.
- FN indicators were all baseline for 2002. Of the 10 affected First Nations, all have protocol agreements with WY and 6 of those are formal. All CH surveys requested were conducted and 83% of First Nations that requested a CHR contract have one in place. A CMT survey and special features survey have been completed. A survey of Band satisfaction with the contract development process indicated overall satisfaction with the process but specific concerns for 4 out of 6 First Nations who negotiated contracts around timing and the knowledge/authority of those sent to negotiate for WY.
- Responsiveness to public input has been benchmarked this year with WY staff making changes in 13 out of 13 comments on either an SP or FDP amendment.

CONCLUSION

Is the DFA more sustainable? Based on the 2002 data and the three years of collective experience with sustainable forest management planning, there is progress. Some WIWAG members would say that it is not enough, or that it is not in the right place.

The information presented here certainly speaks to advances made in a number of areas – both socially and environmentally. The members of WIWAG continue to wrestle with these values and their significance to sustainable forest management. Both WIWAG and Weyerhaeuser welcome your questions and comments.

Indicator 1: Percent of **timber species** by DFA compared to historic baseline

Discussion: Diversity of tree species many be an indicator of broader biodiversity attributes

Objective: Maintain historic baseline for all commercial tree species within ±15% [of the total].

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: 10 %

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 2

Performance:

	2002 Inventory (includes Park Trade and FDP updates)				1955 Base Line		
Species	**Mature (1)** (hectares)	**Second Growth** (hectares)	**Productive forest area** (hectares)	**% of PF**	**MMBF** (2)	**%**	**Variance %**
Fir	10,974	64,843	75,817	28.8	3,292,242	25	**15.2**
Pine	95	710	805	0.3	0.3129,669	1	**(70)**
Cedar	18,214	18,600	36,814	14.0	2,1641,818	20	**(30)**
Cypress	4,815	2,082	6,897	2.6	75,097	1	**160**
Spruce	217	670	887	0.3	155,899	1	**(70)**
Hemlock	39,807	58,757	98,564	37.5	4,938,837	37	**1.4**
Balsam	17,891	12,324	30,215	11.5	2,131,869	16	**(28.1)**
Alder	39	4,529	4,568	1.7			1.7
Maple	0	420	420	0.2			0.2
no major species indicated (nulls)			5,037	1.9			1.9
area where % species breakdown does not account for 100% of stand			3,060	1.2			1.2
	92,052	162,935	263,084	100.0	13,365,431	100%	0.00

(1) Mature age is 250+ for all species, except for pine, alder and maple where a mature age of 140+ years was used.

(2) MMBF, 1955 Inventory reported in board feet

Indicator 1: Percent of **timber species** by DFA compared to historic baseline **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: No stand level re-inventory took place in 2002. Species distribution, at stand level, was not updated in the inventory in 2002. Changes that resulted in differences between 2001 and 2002 dataset/reporting were;

- the DFA boundary changed (smaller), species distribution only
- roaded area (the 13m buffer on roads) is now excluded from the productive forest land base
- areas logged in 2002 were given a stand age of zero (0). In other words, logged areas moved from older age classes to an age class of zero in the data set.

Forest Inventories have been maintained for more than 40 years for the DFA. The inventory is maintained and updated by the Inventory Analyst, Nanaimo Woodlands.

The inventory estimate of mature volumes in 1955 (when TFLs 20 and 21, the predecessors to TFL 44, were combined) is the baseline for the indicator.

Mature (old growth, 250+) stands are 250 years plus for all species, except pine, alder and maple where 140 years plus was used. The Inventory includes a description of primary, secondary, tertiary, and quaternary species and for a portion of these records there is a percent of basal area listed for each species. Species distribution was calculated two ways:

- If a value exists for species percent then the species area equals the total stand area times the species percent from the inventory.
- If no value exists for species percent then the following species distributions were used: where MS, SS, and TS exist 50%, 30%, and 20% were used; where MS and SS exit 60%, and 40% were used.

Calculations for when the species breakdown did not add up to 100% of the stand area, were as follows:

- The missing % for each record was determined and multiplied by the stand area.
- Deciduous stands, and areas with no species listed (nulls), were added to the matrix to allow for reconciliation with total DFA Gross Productive Forest (GPF).

Indicator 2: Percent of **0-20 year age class** by landscape level

Discussion: This indicator provides a measure of habitat diversity by Landscape Unit [LU]. Different species are adapted to different forest habitats as represented by age class.

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

We [WIWAG] have elected to focus on old growth age classes as measures of goal #1 – maintaining a representative ecosystem across the landscape – however we have an interest in looking at all age classes within landscape units and biogeoclimatic sub zones in the future.

Objective: Less than 30% of any given landscape unit [LU].

Acceptable Variance: ±10% [of the total number of units, expressed in area]

Forecast: ±30%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicators # 20 and 27

Performance:

Year	Productive forest (hectares)	0-20 age class, total area (hectares)	LU outside objective total area (hectares)	LU outside objective (number)	LU outside objective as % of productive (%)
2002	263,084	53,114	3,986	4 of 27	1.7
2001	272,059	52,483	4,467	4 of 27	1.6
2000	268,562	51,377	4,474		

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: Small areas (slivers) exist within DFA which have no landscape unit designation, this amounts to 229 ha of the DFA productive forest.

No stand level reinventory took place in 2002. Species distribution, at stand level, was not updated in the inventory in 2002. Changes that resulted in differences between 2001 and 2002 dataset/reporting were;

- the DFA boundary changed (smaller), species distribution only
- roaded area (the 13m buffer on roads) is now excluded from the productive forest land base
- areas logged in 2002 were given a stand age of zero (0). In other words, logged areas moved from older age classes to an age class of zero in the data set.

Indicator 2: Percent of 0-20 year age class by landscape level cont.

Performance cont.:

Distribution of 0-20 Age Class by Landscape Unit

Landscape Unit (LU)	LU gross productive (hectare)	DFA productive area (hectare)	2001 (hectare)	2001 (%)	2002 (hectare)	2002 (%)	Variance from Objective (%)
Ash	18,982	21,846	3,580	16	3,806	17	0
Barkley Sound Is.	3,585	160	0	0	0	0	0
Cameron	7,472	7,167	1,315	18	1,317	18	0
Caycuse	**18,251**	**5,408**	**1,829**	**33**	**1,761**	**33**	**10.0**
China	8,502	8,078	1,138	14	1,172	15	0
Corrigan	24,021	22,609	1,835	8	2,215	10	0
Cous	15,355	13,579	3,440	24	3,332	24	0
Cowichan	7,995	893	143	15	179	20	0
Effingham	15,538	2,025	631	30	595	29	0
Great Central	22,924	20,582	3,637	17	3,620	18	0
Henderson	23,537	15,330	4,348	28	4,309	28	0
Kennedy Flats		87	1	0	1	0	0
Klanawa	24,622	23,333	6,489	27	6,496	28	0
Little Qualicum	**2,259**	**460**	**172**	**36**	**162**	**35**	**16.7**
Maggie	10,903	8,929	1,643	18	1,551	17	0
Nahmint	15,563	14,969	3,155	21	3,061	20	0
Nanaimo	4,542	9	0	0	0	0	0
Nitinat	40,503	26,256	6,185	23	6,089	23	0
Puntledge		502	36	7	33	7	0
Qualicum		764	0	0	0	0	0
Rosewall	9,567	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sarita	35,550	33,425	7,719	22	7,533	23	0
Somass	9,150	7,373	1,062	14	1,232	17	0
Sproat Lake	24,469	23,720	2,209	9	2,508	11	0
Toquart	11,076	395	84	20	79	20	0
Upper Kennedy		**12**	**5**	**34**	**4**	**33**	**10.0**
Walbran	**16,675**	**4,752**	**1,830**	**37**	**2,059**	**43**	**43.3**
total		263,084	52,483	19	53,114	20	0

Small areas (slivers) exist with the DFA which have no biogeoclimatic or landscape unit designation. This amounts to 321 ha. for BEC and 228 ha. for landscape.

Indicator 3: Percent area of **old growth** within landscape units and biogeoclimatic subzones

Discussion:

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

> We [WIWAG] have elected to focus on old growth age classes as measures of goal #1 – maintaining a representative ecosystem across the landscape – however we have an interest in looking at all age classes within landscape units and biogeoclimatic sub zones in the future.

Objective: Do not increase the number of units where inadequate old growth exists

Acceptable Variance: Two units increase [2002 data is baseline, variance will apply to future reports]

Forecast: Zero increase

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicators # 1 and 20

Performance:

Year	Productive Area (hectare)	Old growth (hectare)	Old growth (%)	Inadequate Old growth (units)
2002	262,765	92,584	35%	**13**
2001	272,059	95,804	35	
2000	268,562	93,861	35	
1999	268,562	87,668	33	

BEC Unit	Productive forest area (hectares)	Old Growth (hectares)	Old Growth (%)
CWH mm1	20,030	6,135	31
CWH MM2	25,433	10,420	41
CWH vh1	7,165	3,128	44
CWH vm1	117,112	42,217	36
CWH vm2	26,658	17,690	66
CWH xm1	4,367	278	6
CWH xm2	52,267	5,607	11
MH mm1	9,689	7,068	73
AT p (1)	43	43	n/a
total	262,765	92,584	**35%**

(1) Alpine Tundra, usually non-productive

Indicator 3: Percent area of **old growth** within landscape units and biogeoclimatic subzones, cont.

Landscape Unit, Biogeoclimatic Unit	BEO / % target	Total Area (ha)	Total Old (ha)	Percent of Unit
Ash, AT p		1	1	100
Ash, CWH mm 1	Inter. > 9	3792	817	22
Ash, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	4867	2145	44
Ash, CWH xm 2	**Inter. > 9**	**11430**	**368**	**3**
Ash, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	1756	1292	74
Barkley Sound Islands, CWH vh 1	Low, > 4.3	132	132	100
Cameron, AT p		4	4	100
Cameron, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	3879	876	23
Cameron, CWH xm 2	Inter. > 9	1736	387	22
Cameron, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	1547	780	50
Caycuse, CWH mm 1	**Inter. > 9**	**206**	**0**	**0**
Caycuse, CWH mm 2	**Inter. > 9**	**158**	**0**	**0**
Caycuse, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	4141	1908	46
Caycuse, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	867	545	63
Caycuse, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	36	36	100
China, AT p		12	12	100
China, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	2339	713	30
China, CWH xm 2	Inter. > 9	4634	614	13
China, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	1092	529	48
Corrigan, AT p		20	20	100
Corrigan, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	3682	1105	30
Corrigan, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	9445	1413	15
Corrigan, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	1984	1406	71
Corrigan, CWH xm 2	Inter. > 9	6667	878	13
Corrigan, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	771	564	73
Cous, CWH mm 1	Low >3	5730	923	16
Cous, CWH mm 2	Low >3	1481	410	28
Cous, CWH vm 2	Low >4.3	2539	1256	49
Cous, CWH xm 2	Low >3	3709	432	12
Cous, MH mm 1	Low > 6.3	287	236	82
Cowichan, CWH mm 1	**Low >3**	**16**	**0**	**0**
Cowichan, CWH vm 2	Low >4.3	251	117	47
Cowichan, CWH xm 2	Low >3	611	48	8
Cowichan, MH mm 1	Low > 6.3	14	8	58
Effingham, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	1585	776	49
Effingham, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	438	248	57
Englishman, MH mm 1		0	0	100
Gordon, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	3	3	100
Gordon, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	7	7	100
Gordon, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	2	2	100

Indicator 3: Percent area of **old growth** within landscape units and biogeoclimatic subzones, cont.

Landscape Unit, Biogeoclimatic Unit	BEO / % target	Total Area (ha)	Total Old (ha)	Percent of Unit
Great Central, AT p		2	2	100
Great Central, CWH mm 1	Inter. > 9	3218	1566	49
Great Central, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	5015	3450	69
Great Central, CWH xm 1	Inter. > 9	1219	145	12
Great Central, CWH xm 2	Inter. > 9	10104	1457	14
Great Central, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	1025	991	97
Henderson, CWH vm 1	Low > 4.3	12482	5946	48
Henderson, CWH vm 2	Low > 4.3	2691	1905	71
Henderson, MH mm 1	Low > 6.3	99	99	100
Kennedy Flats CWH vh1		**48**	**0**	**0**
Kennedy Flats CWH vm 1		**30**	**1**	**4**
Kennedy Flats CWH vm 2		**9**	**0**	**0**
Klanawa, CWH vh 1	Inter. > 13	98	92	94
Klanawa, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	21819	10509	48
Klanawa, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	1416	1058	75
Little Qualicum, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	73	67	92
Little Qualicum, CWH xm 2	Inter. > 9	2	2	100
Little Qualicum, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	385	185	48
Maggie, CWH vh 1	Low > 4.3	3109	1634	53
Maggie, CWH vm 1	Low > 4.3	5638	1280	23
Maggie, CWH vm 2	Low > 4.3	154	11	7
Nahmint, AT p		0	0	100
Nahmint, CWH mm 1	High > 13	8	7	81
Nahmint, CWH vm 1	High > 19	9576	5085	53
Nahmint, CWH vm 2	High > 19	4566	3810	83
Nahmint, CWH xm 2	**High > 13**	**46**	**4**	**9**
Nahmint, MH mm 1	High > 28	771	757	98
Nanaimo, MH mm 1	n/a	9	9	100
Nitinat, AT p	n/a	3	3	100%
Nitinat, CWH mm 1	**Inter. > 9**	**215**	**8**	**4%**
Nitinat, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	1524	671	44%
Nitinat, CWH vh 1	Inter. > 13	491	365	74%
Nitinat, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	20259	5310	26%
Nitinat, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	3228	1760	55%
Nitinat, CWH xm 2	**Inter. > 9**	**0**	**0**	**0%**
Nitinat, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	536	442	82%

Indicator 3: Percent area of **old growth** within landscape units and biogeoclimatic subzones, cont.

Landscape Unit, Biogeoclimatic Unit	BEO / % target	Total Area (ha)	Total Old (ha)	Percent of Unit
Puntledge, CWH mm 2		42	17	39%
Puntledge, CWH xm 2		459	71	15%
Qualicum, CWH xm 2		764	162	21%
Rosewall, MH mm 1	Inter. > 9	2	2	100%
Sarita, CWH vh 1	Low > 4.3	3097	804	26%
Sarita, CWH vm 1	Low > 4.3	28035	8134	29%
Sarita, CWH vm 2	Low > 4.3	2267	1251	55%
Somass, CWH mm 2	Low > 3	264	46	17%
Somass, CWH xm 1	**Low > 3**	**625**	**1**	**0%**
Somass, CWH xm 2	Low > 3	6404	486	8%
Somass, MH mm 1	Low > 6.3	74	25	34%
Sproat Lake, AT p	n/a	0	0	100%
Sproat Lake, CWH mm 1	Inter. > 9	6839	2809	41%
Sproat Lake, CWH mm 2	Inter. > 9	2109	922	44%
Sproat Lake, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	446	267	60%
Sproat Lake, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	4911	3420	70%
Sproat Lake, CWH xm 1	**Inter. > 9**	**2523**	**131**	**5%**
Sproat Lake, CWH xm 2	Inter. > 9	5686	696	12%
Sproat Lake, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	1207	1035	86%
Toquart, CWH vh 1	Inter. > 13	130	71	54%
Toquart, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	162	21	13%
Toquart, CWH vm 2	**Inter. > 13**	**102**	**4**	**4%**
Upper Kennedy, CWH mm 1		5	5	100%
Upper Kennedy, CWH vm 1		0	0	100%
Upper Kennedy, CWH vm 2		7	3	38%
Walbran, CWH vm 1	Inter. > 13	3456	1537	44%
Walbran, CWH vm 2	Inter. > 13	1220	890	73%
Walbran, MH mm 1	Inter. > 19	76	75	98%

Indicator 3: Percent area of **old growth** within landscape units and biogeoclimatic subzones, cont.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: No stand level re-inventory took place in 2002. Species distribution, at stand level, was not updated in the inventory in 2002. Changes that resulted in differences between 2001 and 2002 dataset/reporting were;

- the DFA boundary changed (smaller), species distribution only
- roaded area (the 13m buffer on roads) is now excluded from the productive forest land base
- areas logged in 2002 were given a stand age of zero (0). In other words, logged areas moved from older age classes to an age class of zero in the data set.

Old growth (mature, 250+, old seral) is defined by the MoF in the Biodiversity Guidebook as forests 250 years of age and older. Forest ages are determined from the forest inventory. For productive second-growth forest areas, age is determined by considering the difference between the current (or reference) year and the establishment year. For mature stands (established prior to 1873 but younger than 250 years), age is determined by considering the current year, the year of cruise and the age class assigned at the time of cruise.

Old-growth targets (percent) are from the MoF Regional Landscape Unit Database (v2.01). Areas with a Low biodiversity emphasis option (BEO), are subject to an initial drawdown of the old-seral requirements to one-third of the target as allowed in the base case.

Projections of areas of old growth by landscape unit will be provided in future strategic timber supply analyses.

Small areas (slivers) exist with the DFA which have no biogeoclimatic or landscape unit designation. This amounts to 321 ha. for BEC and 228 ha. for landscape.

Caycuse, Walbran and Nitinat LUs are shared with TFL 46. Others (within TFL 44) with TSA land include; Ash, China, Corrigan, Effingham, Gt. Central, Henderson, Little Qualicum, Maggie, Nahmint, Rosewall, Sarita, Somass, Sproat and Toquart.

Indicator 4: Percent of **planners oriented**

Discussion:

Objective: All planners complete red/blue listed species awareness and location orientation

Acceptable Variance: -50%

Forecast: All planners oriented

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Year	Planners (number)	Planners oriented (number)	Planners oriented (percent)
2002	45	23	51%
2001		0	0%

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 5: Percent of area harvested using **Variable Retention** (VR)

Discussion:

Objective: 80% VR by area

Acceptable Variance: -15%

Forecast: 90 %

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 7

Performance:

Year	Operation	Variable Retention (hectares)	Area harvested (hectares)	Variable Retention (percent)
2002	Total	1503	1920	**78%**
	Franklin (1)	1003	1343	75%
	Sproat	500	577	87%
	SBFEP	no data		
2001		993	1483	67%
2000		1157	1780	65%
1999		534	1788	30%

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Action Plan: Increase VR

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting: Administrative Coordinator - Franklin, Administration Assistant - Sproat

CC: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Variable Retention Tracking Spreadsheet

Notes: Small Business or roads not included. VR hectares are calculated by adding up the total hectares logged (within the year) of each block considered to be a Variable Retention block. The retention system is defined under the Forest Practices Code as "a silvicultural system that is designed to (a) retain individual trees or groups of trees to maintain structural diversity over the area of the cutblock for at least one rotation, and (b) leave more than half the total area of the cutblock within one tree height from the base of a tree or group of trees, whether or not the tree or group of trees is inside the cutblock."

Indicator 6: Forest Ecosystem Network **(FEN)**

Discussion:

Objective: Maintain the Forest Ecosystem Network

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: Connectivity is maintained through some form of scientifically defensible strategy

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Year	Connectivity (y/n)
2002	yes

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner
Reporting: EMS / Planning Forester
Source:
Notes: Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings.

Indicator 7: Stand level retention in all cutblocks as percent of total cutblock area

Discussion:

Objective: ≥ 15% in 2002 (focusing on riparian areas, structure, wind firmness, distribution and key ecological values

Acceptable Variance: 10% for a lower limit

Forecast: 30%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 6

Performance:

Year	Operation	(long term) Stand Retention (hectares)	Total Area under Prescription (TAUP) (hectares)	(long term) Stand retention as % of TAUP (percent)
2002	Total	906	3975	**23%**
	Franklin (1)	593	2707	22%
	Sproat	313	1268	25%
	SBFEP	no data		
2001		561	1467	38%
2000		474	1749	27%
1999		438	2507	18%

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting: Administrative Coordinator - Franklin, Administration Assistant - Sproat

CC: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Variable Retention Tracking Spreadsheet

Notes: Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade, other minor private land holdings, Small Business, or roads.

Stand level retention consists of all timber leave components designated to a block, such as timber leave areas, riparian areas and wildlife tree patches. This total retention may consist of more than 10% of the total area under prescription. However, a block may not be considered VR due to its slash areas not being under edge influence (more than 2 tree lengths from a timber edge).

This indicator reflects the amount of retention areas which are linked to the SP. Target VR is 15%.

Indicator 8: Species and programs mentioned in the Forest Development Plan [FDP]

Discussion:

Objective: Increase the number of management programs by six when the FDPs are revised

Acceptable Variance: - 2

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 8

Performance:

Year	Management Programs	Increase
2002	6 (1)	n/a (2)
2001	6	2
2000	4	n/a

(1) Identified Species of Special interest that are currently managed for include;

- Red-legged Frog
- Great Blue Heron
- Northern (Queen Charlotte) Goshawk
- Marbled Murrelet
- Vancouver Island Marmot
- Roosevelt Elk

(2) There were no new FDP's for 2002. Amendments were made, but are not generally designed to introduce new management strategies.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner
Reporting:
Source:
Notes: The Conservation Data Centre identifies species at risk. The Forest Development Planner reviews the list annually and ensures that the Interim Measures to Protect Identified Wildlife are being incorporated into the Forest Development Plans. Where Wildlife Habitat Areas have been defined and measures determined, the FDP Team leader will ensure that the information is included in the MWP and FDP's.

Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings.

Indicator 9: Number of identified **species at-risk** in the DFA

Discussion: At time of this report Weyerhaeuser is not aware of any species added to the list as a result of our management activities.

Objective: Zero increase in at-risk status attributable to management activities

Acceptable Variance: Zero increase

Forecast: Zero increase

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 9

Performance:

Year	Increase
2002	0 (1)
2001	0
2000	0
1999	0

(1) The FDP for Alberni East and Alberni West were revised in 2002, however amendments do not change management strategies.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting:

Source: British Columbia Conservation Data Centre CDC): Vascular and Vertebrates Tracking Lists, South Island Forest District, April 2001. The lists, which are updated in April and available by June, can be accessed at http://srmwww.gov.bc.ca/cdc/.

Indicator 9: Number of identified **species at-risk** in the DFA cont.

Data Protocol:

Notes:

Currently Managed for		
Red-legged Frog		Marbled Murrelet
Great Blue Heron		Vancouver Island Marmot
Northern (Queen Charlotte) Goshawk		Roosevelt Elk
no active management plan		
Leatherback		Tufted Puffin
Painted Turtle		Barn Owl
Sharptail Snake		Western Screech-Owl
Double-Crested Cormorant		Northern Pygmy-Owl
Brandt's Cormorant		Short-Eared Owl
American Bittern		Purple Martin
Green Heron		Vesper Sparrow
Canada Goose		Pine Grosbeak
Surf Scooter		Vancouver Island Water Shrew
Peregrine Falcon (anatum)		Keen's Long-Eared Myotis
Peregrine Falcon (pealei)		Townsend's Big-Eared Bat
Cassin's Auklet		Ermine
Common Murre		Wolverine
Cutthroat Trout		Western Bluebird (Georgia Dep.)
White-Tailed Ptarmigan		Western Meadowlark (Georgia Dep.)
Cassin's Auklet		Killer Whale (Resident)
Band-tailed Pigeon		Killer Whale (Offshore)
Lewis's Woodpecker		Killer Whale (Transient)
Lewis's Woodpecker (Georgia Depression)		Grey Whale
Sea Otter		Humpback Whale
		Northern Sea Lion
not in DFA		
Lake Lamprey		Enos Lake Limnetic Stickleback
Yellow-billed Cuckoo		Enos Lake Benthic Stickleback

Indicator 10: Existence of a **habitat management program** for identified species of special interest (includes a list)

Discussion:

Objective: Support habitat programs in cooperation with regulatory agencies and others

Acceptable Variance: Zero increase

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 10

Performance:

Identified Species of Special interest that are currently managed for in the DFA include:

- Columbia Black-tailed Deer
- Black Bear
- Bald Eagle

Year	Currently Managed (number)
2002	3 (1)
2001	3
2000	4
1999	4

(1) No FDP's were revised.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner
Reporting:
Source: Species of Special Interest are those species identified by the MoF, MWLAP, or the public as requiring special consideration in operational plans. These species of special interest are not considered at risk. The Forest Development Planner annually reviews the correspondence from the agencies, and ensures that measures to protect these species are incorporated into the Forest Development Plans.

Notes:

Indicator 11: Annual percent of opening areas in **permanent access structures**

Discussion:

Objective: ≤7% of opening areas in permanent access structures

Acceptable Variance: ± 1%

Forecast: 5%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 15

Performance:

Year	Operation	TAUP (gross area) (hectares)	Measured access (hectares)	Measured Access as percent of gross area
2002	total	3328.7	195.0	**5.9%**
	WIT (1)	3036.1	181.0	6.0
	SBFEP	292.6	14.0	4.9
2001		1770	106	6.0
2000		2501	155	6.2
1999		1626	109	6.7
1998		1376	91	6.6
1997		1702	90	6.6
1996		1770	101	5.7

(1) Contract operations located at Great Central and Uchucklesit included. Includes two Park Trade blocks.

Indicator 11: Annual percent of opening areas in **permanent access structures cont.**

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co

Compilation:

Source: Measured Access - Genus Stocking Status (NP UNN), TAUP – Genus Silviculture Prescription Table

Notes: If measured access was unavailable then SP Permanent access was used. A harvest of start of 2002 was used, and includes blocks where harvest complete is still planned.

Data includes SBFEP and R/W, does not include salvage operations, Sproat Park Trade, or other minor private land holdings.

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 12: Operationally-caused **fire damage** by area

Objective: Zero hectares

Acceptable Variance: +10 hectares

Forecast: 5 hectares

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 16

Performance:

Year	Operation	Fires	Area (ha.)	Cause	Timber Class
2002	Total	3	5.1		
	Franklin	1	0.1	no data	no data
	Sproat	2	5.0 fringe	escaped slash fire escaped slash fire	regen. old growth
	SBFEP	no data			
2001		0			
2000		0			
1999		3	9.8	escaped slash fire	NSR
1998		0			

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

A post fire analysis with the Fire Warden, Silviculture Forester and General Foreman completed in October, identified a number of actions designed to prevent escaped slash fires. They are as follows; better assessment of conditions before lighting of piles, and more aggressive mop-up.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester
Reporting: Silviculture Forester (Sproat), Environmental Coordinator (Franklin)
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 13: Annual **area harvested** as percent of total productive forest area

Objective: < 1%

Acceptable Variance: ± 0.5%

Forecast: 1%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 17

Performance:

Year	Operation	Area Harvested (hectares)	Productive Forest (hectares)	Area Harvested as % of productive
2002	total	2418.5	271,443	**0.89%**
	Franklin (1)	1426.4		
	Sproat	567.3		
	SBFEP	424.8		
2001		1,530	272,059	0.56
2000		1,981	268,562	0.74
1999		1,831	268,562,	0.68
1998		1,304	268,562	0.49
1997		1,519	268,562	0.57
1996		1,724	268,562	0.64

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Indicator 13: Annual **area harvested** as percent of total productive forest area **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co (area harvested), Pacific GIS Consulting (productive forest)

Source: Genus (area harvested). All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages.

Notes: Data includes SBFEP and R/W, does not include salvage operations, Sproat Park Trade, or other minor private land holdings.

The total productive area is determined from the current (1997) forest inventory. The forest inventory is updated periodically (usually every one or two years) for areas harvested, and stand assessments. The Inventory Analyst, Nanaimo Woodlands, produces reports on the current inventory. No changes were made to the inventory in 2002.

There were two changes which resulted in less productive forest area being reported for 2002;

(1) The DFA boundary changed.

(2) Road area is now excluded from the productive forest land base. The road area is calculated by applying a buffer of 6.5 metres on each side of the road centerline. This buffer was applied to roads with the status of maintained, non-maintained, permanent, semi-permanent and temporary.

Indicator 14: Area of operationally-related **windthrow**

Discussion: This indicator measures the relative area impact of disturbance of harvesting activities on an annual basis.

Objective: < 5% harvest area

Acceptable Variance: + 5%

Forecast: 2 %

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 18

Performance:

Year	Operation	Area Harvested (hectares)	Windfall (hectares)	Harvested Windfall (hectares)	Harvested Windfall as % of Windfall	Windfall as % of Area Harvested
2002	Total	2418.5	79.2	43.6	55%	3.7%
	Franklin (1)	1426.4	74.0	43.5	59%	5.2%
	Sproat	567.3	5.2	0.1	2%	0.9%
	SBFEP	424.8				
2001		1,530	10	61	610	0.6
2000		1,981	46 (1)	75	175	2.3
1999		1,831	no data			

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Indicator 14: Area of operationally-related **windthrow** cont.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting:

Source:

Notes: Data includes SBFEP and R/W, does not include salvage operations, Sproat Park Trade, or other minor private land holdings.

The potential for operational windthrow is assessed at the engineering and Silviculture Prescription phases. Openings are developed with the intent of little to no windthrow in and along the block boundary. In some cases, windthrow specialists are used to assess openings and help design wind firm openings. Information of significant windthrow is passed on to the FDP Team and the Salvage team to develop a recovery plan. Harvested windthrow areas will be incorporated into adjacent SP's where reforestation prescriptions will be developed.

In order to identify windthrow or disease outbreaks, WIT will utilize various sources of information. In 2001, new aerial photos of the DFA were acquired. Areas of windthrow not previously recorded were identified on these photos.

In addition to the photos, areas of windthrow or dying trees are reported to the Forest Management Group from a variety of sources:

- Salvagers reporting dead and down trees in hopes of salvage opportunities,
- helicopter tours and reconnaissance flights

all of which add to the opportunities for identification.

Areas identified as operationally induced windthrow, adjacent to areas harvested pre 1995, are not included in this data set.

The area of windthrow harvested in a year, that is adjacent to existing harvest areas less that 5 years old is divided by the total area harvested in that year.

Reconnaissance in April 2002, identified approximately 10 ha. of additional operationally induced windthrow adjacent to areas harvest in the DFA within the past 5 years. This total area does not include the previously reported area or windthrow known to have occurred in 2002.

There were no windfall areas in the Contract (Estevan) or Sproat Areas.

Indicator 15: Area of **slides** originating in harvested areas or roads

Discussion:

Objective: Zero (post 1995 development)

Acceptable Variance: 5 hectares

Forecast: 2 hectares

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 19

Performance:

Year	Operation	Slides (number / hectares)
2002	Total	
	WIT	23 / 6.1
	SBFEP	
2001		3.8
2000		0.6
1999		5.2
1998		1.0

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Action Plan: Review each slide for preventative actions

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting:

Source:

Notes: See Environmental Occurrence reports are completed for all slides that have occurred and are kept on file in the Planning Department. Copies are sent to Ministry of Forests, Ministry of Environment and the Department of Fisheries & Oceans.

When two or more slides are reported in a drainage area, a recce flight will be carried out as soon as possible. At a minimum, a recce flight of the DFA will be done after the winter months.

Slides of significant size in harvested areas or initiated on roads will have a terrain assessment completed by a professional and any remedial action will be scheduled.

Indicator 16: Area out of compliance with **Free Growing** objectives

Discussion: This indicator measures the success at achieving free to grow targets defined in the Silviculture Prescriptions. These targets are derived from the MoF " Establishment to free Growing Guidebook for the Vancouver Forest Region" The Silviculture Prescription provides indications of regeneration success, utilization of the productive area and maintaining forest ecosystems. The objective reflects requirements of the Forest Practices Code.of BC.

Objective: Identify and reduce the non-compliance area to below 150 hectares [per year]

Acceptable Variance: 150 hectares

Forecast: Zero

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 29

Performance:

Operation	Standards Units due 2002 (hectares / number)	Standards Units met 2002 (hectare / number)	Standard Units not met 2002 (hectare / units)
total	1922 / 75	1862 / 73	**60 / 2** (1)
Franklin	1308 / 43	1279 / 42	29 / 1
Sproat	265 / 10	234 / 9	31 /1
contract (2)	349 / 22	349 / 22	0
SBFEP	no data		

Data based on year (2002) of compliance.

(1) Amendments have been submitted to extend, the FTG date, and are awaiting approval.
(2) Contract operations are located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Previous:

Year	Area in compliance (hectares)	Openings in compliance (number)	Area out of compliance (hectares)	Openings out of compliance (number)
2001 (3)	2,216	47	288	9
2000	832	23	743	21
1999				18

(3) Approximately 90 % of the openings have Free Growing dates that are not reflective of the current standards of the "Establishment to Free Growing Guidebook."

Indicator 16: Area out of compliance with **Free Growing** objectives cont.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Foresters

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Genus

Notes: Compliance for regeneration and free growing status, both for EMS and MoF, are tracked by Standard Units (SU) through the use of Genus an integrated resource management system. Previous years' (2001 and earlier) tracking was done by block. A Standard Unit is an area of a Silviculture Prescription that is managed through the uniform application of Silviculture system, stocking standards and soil conservation standards.

Data does not include SBFEP, R/W, salvage operations, Sproat Park Trade, or other minor private land holdings.

Hectares displayed are Net Area to be Reforested (NAR).

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 17: Area out of compliance with **regeneration delay** obligations

Discussion:

Objective: Zero

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: Zero

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 30

Performance:

Operation	Standards Units due 2002 (hectare / number)	Standards Units met 2002 (hectare / number)	Standard Units not met 2002 (hectare / units)
total	1653 / 242	1651 / 241	**2 / 1**
Franklin	953 / 116	953 / 116	0 / 0
Sproat	428 / 81	426 / 80	2 / 1
contract (1)	272 / 45	272 / 45	0 / 0
SBFEP	no data		

(1) Contract operations are located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Sproat comments

Block: 161305 – 1610, Road: Nahmint Main (Big Creek), NAR: 9.6 ha (one SU)

This block has a commencement date of April 1999. 2.9 hectares (conventional portion along Nahmint Main) were planted September 2001. A stocking survey was completed on 9.6 ha May 2002. The stocking survey noted the two helicopter portions of the block required fill planting (some natural seed-in of Hw and Cw had occurred) to meet stocking requirements of the SP. A further 4.1 ha were planted (one of the two helicopter portions) September 2002. Due to stock availability problems, the remaining 2.2 ha (remaining helicopter portion) were not planted September 2002 as planned. Access to the remaining helicopter portion involves a long walk-in from Nahmint Main. Presently, the remaining helicopter portion is planned for planting September 2003.

Corrective action: Recommend submitting a section 36 (FPC Act) letter stating what happened and a major SP Amendment to extend regeneration delay and early and late free growing periods by two years.

Indicator 17: Area out of compliance with **regeneration delay** obligations cont.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Foresters

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Genus

Notes: Compliance for regeneration and free growing status, both for EMS and MoF, are tracked by Standard Units (SU) through the use of Genus an integrated resource management system. Previous years' (2001 and earlier) tracking was done by block. A Standard Unit is an area of a Silviculture Prescription that is managed through the uniform application of silviculture system, stocking standards and soil conservation standards. Data based on year (2002) of compliance.

Data does not include SBFEP, R/W, salvage operations, Sproat Park Trade, or other minor private land holdings.

Hectares displayed are Net Area to be Reforested (NAR).

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 18: Total **productive forest** area in DFA

Discussion: This indicator provides a measure of sustainability of the forest land base

Objective: Limit conversion to non-forest use to 0.001% per year [n/a for 2002]

Acceptable Variance: <0.0027%

Forecast: Stable

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 34

Performance:

Year	Productive Area excluding roads (hectares)	Conversion (percent)
2002	263,083	**baseline**

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: The total productive area is determined from the current (1997) forest inventory. The forest inventory is updated periodically (usually every one or two years) for areas harvested, and stand assessments. The Inventory Analyst, Nanaimo Woodlands, produces reports on the current inventory. No changes were made to the inventory in 2002.

There were two changes which resulted in less productive forest area being reported for 2002;

- The DFA boundary changed.
- Exclusion of roaded area (13m buffer for roads), due to a change in the definition of Productive Forest

Indicator 19: Equivalent years of Not Sufficiently Reforested (**NSR**) as 5-year rolling average

Discussion:

Objective: Maintain NSR equivalency at <3years harvest area

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: 1.5 years

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 40

Performance:

Year	Operation	NSR area (hectares)	Area Harvested (hectares)	Area harvested 5 year average (hectares)	NSR equivalency (years)
2002	total	3179.4	2252.0	1780	**1.8**
	Franklin (1)	1938.6	1426.4	n/a	n/a
	Sproat	926.4	567.3	n/a	n/a
	SBFEP	314.4	258.3	n/a	n/a
2001		2761	1530	1633	1.7
2000		2066	1981	1672	1.2
1999		2339	1831	1621	1.4
1998		2638	1304	1681	1.6

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Indicator 19: Equivalent years of Not Sufficiently Reforested (NSR) as 5-year rolling average **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Foresters

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Genus

Notes: Data includes SBFEP and R/W. Data includes salvage operations, Sproat Park Trade, or other minor private land holdings. Blocks which were started and not completed (no stocking status) then logged hectares were used for NSR, which includes R/W.

Blocks which are not complete and/or released for Waste and Residue or Post Harvest have no recorded stocking status.

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 20: Inventory of all known **sites requiring preservation or protection** within the DFA

Discussion:

Objective: Maintain inventory of sites that require preservation or protection with the DFA

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Data has been obtained regarding known locations of rare and endangered species from the Conservation Data Center (CDC). A "shapefile" of known cave locations, based on information supplied by the Vancouver Island Cave Exploration Group (VICEG), has also been created.

Funded by FIA, a Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory was begun in 2002, with completion planned for 2003.

Weyerhaeuser is currently developing procedures, so as to incorporate the data sets into their business systems and processes.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 21: Openings harvested in which **soil disturbance** exceeds level specified on Silviculture Prescription (Note: this indicator does not apply to private land outside the DFA)

Discussion:

Objective: Zero

Acceptable Variance: 1 opening

Forecast: Zero

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 35

Performance:

Year	Operation	Openings exceeding allowable soil disturbance (number)	Openings exceeding allowable soil disturbance (percent)
2002	Total	0	0%
	Franklin (1)	0	0
	Sproat	0	0
	SBFEP	no data	no data
2001		0	0%
2000		0	0%
1999		0	0%
1998		0	0%

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Foresters

Reporting:

Source: Genus 2002 completed Post Harvest Assessments (PHA's).

Notes: Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings.

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 22: **Water quality** measurements for selected streams in areas of concern

Discussion: This indicator was revised January 2003

Objective: Collect water quality data (turbidity, conductivity, water temperature, pH and dissolved oxygen (DO), from streams suggested in the June 2002 Water Quality Report by Higman, and identified at the January 9, 2003 WIWAG meeting. Document, last five years, water quality data from streams suggested in the June 2002 Water Quality Report by Higman, and identified at the January 9, 2003 WIWAG meeting.

Acceptable Variance: N/A

Forecast: To be determined

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 37

Performance: [the following is from the *Weyerhaeuser West Island Timberlands Sustainable Forest Management Plan Goal 17 Water Quality Report* prepared by Streamline Environmental Consulting June 5, 2003, some editing has taken place]

4. Discussion

As part of an integrated long-term management planning process, water quality monitoring programs can be useful for assessing ecosystem responses to forestry-related activities. Long-term water quality studies can be used to detect trends in ecosystem conditions related to climate change. Increasing pressure and focus on water resources related to population increases and changing societal values mean that reliable water quality information will be increasingly important to resource managers in the future. The WIT - SFM process is a good framework within which to establish a water quality monitoring program that anticipates future management information needs.

4.1 Re-draft Goal No. 17

Management programs require clear, long-term goals supported by realistic objectives that can be evaluated using measurable indicators. Re-drafting Goal No. 17 to adopt as its objective the attainment of the criteria specified by the British Columbia Approved Water Quality Guidelines (BCWQG) will streamline the planning and Implementation of the SFM Plan and will incorporate a high level of credibility. The approach will eliminate the efforts and costs needed to define unique water quality objectives and criteria, and will place WIT in a clearer position to defend the objective if the numerical criteria for water quality parameters are challenged. Finally, the modified approach offers a simple and widely applicable framework that enables WIT managers to quickly evaluate new water quality data in a cost effective matter.

Indicator 22: Water quality measurements for selected streams in areas of concern cont.

4.2 Evaluation and Discussion of the Available Water Quality Monitoring Datasets

Should the WIT-SFM process continue to move forward on a water quality monitoring objective, the data presented in this report can be incorporated into a future WIT water quality database. However, there are some limitations to each dataset that should be considered. A brief discussion of the limitations specific to each dataset followed by a brief summary of the main conclusions that can be drawn from the work is provided below.

4.2.1 City of Port Alberni Drinking Water Monitoring Program – Somass River and China Creek

Public scrutiny of public drinking water sources has intensified recently. As such, it follows that the quality assurance of the city of Port Alberni Drinking Water Monitoring Program should be high. However, differing program objectives and other aspects limit the utility of the data for WIT-SFM process. Specifically:

- The frequency of sampling for all parameters (except turbidity and fecal coliforms) is low (twice per year). As water quality typically varies seasonally and in response to storm events, the low sampling frequency is unlikely to accurately characterize the range of water quality conditions.
- The data is biased, as high turbidity readings are not recorded due to the fact that the water supply is switched to the Bainbridge Lake intake when turbidity levels are greater than 5NTU.
- Water quality readings do not accurately reflect stream or watershed conditions, as sampling is done within a pope after initial chlorination treatment in China Creek and Somass River water quality readings are taken after filtration treatment.
- Similarly, residual turbidity, pH, conductivity, and temperature are monitored at the main distribution centre in town. The water quality will be affected by transport through the pipes.
- Water quality is not available in monthly format.

Overall the results presented in this report indicate that water quality in both China Creek and the Somass River appear to be within acceptable BCWQC standards for the parameters reviewed. However there is limited utility in comparing annual data based on low sampling frequency to water criteria that specify maximum allowable instantaneous concentrations. Due to the data limitations described above, this source of water quality data is not considered useful for WIT to measure the attainment of water quality objectives.

Indicator 22: **Water quality** measurements for selected streams in areas of concern **cont.**

4.2.2 Sabrina Creek Assessment

The data from Sabrina Creek water quality study should be incorporated into a future water quality database fro TFL 44. There are a few limitations of the data that should be considered.

- The data was collected by several parties, and the level and consistency of quality assurance measures that were included is unknown.
- The sampling frequency is low and the interval is variable. Water quality conditions associated with high flow during storm events is not represented. Such events need to be sampled to accurately characterize the range of water quality conditions.
- Un-summarized water temperature measurements, from the data loggers, were not available.

With the exception of temperature, the recordable levels of water quality variable in the Sabrina Creek study were within the acceptable limits of the BCWQG criteria. Using drinking water criteria, the exceeding of the temperature criterion (15 C) in Reach 37 is of minor importance, as the criterion is based on aesthetics (MELP, 1998). However, the elevated temperatures are of concern to aquatic life. Average weekly temperatures in excess of 18 to 19 C can be detrimental to salmonoids.

4.3 Recommendations

4.3.1 Initiate a Water Quality Monitoring Program for the WIT Area

Considering the paucity of water quality information specific to DFA, the increasing public scrutiny of water resources, and the value of moving the SFM process forward, WIT should consider initiating a water quality monitoring program. The program should be designed to adequately capture information that can be related to a variety of forest management practices, and should provide data suitable for measuring the achievement of the BCWQC criteria. Useful information for consideration in the design and implementation of such a program is provided in, Proposal For A Water Quality Monitoring Program for South Island Timberlands (Higman 2002).

4.3.2 Other Recommendations

- Re-drafting Goal No. 17 based on meeting criteria outlined in the BCWQC will streamline the planning and implementation of both the SFM Plan and a future water quality monitoring program while maintaining a high level of credibility. WIWAG will have to select the appropriate water quality objectives (based on water uses) and variables. The criteria specific to maintaining water quality suitable for human consumption or, alternatively, aquatic life are likely candidates. If drinking water criteria are used, it is recommended that the monitoring program include dissolved oxygen due to its importance to aquatic life.

Indicator 22: Water quality measurements for selected streams in areas of concern **cont.**

- Create a working partnership with the City of Port Alberni to share water quality information. The City of Port Alberni will be initiating a more comprehensive water quality monitoring program in partnership with MWLAP as part of the new drinking water guidelines. Maintain communications with these agencies for the purposes of sharing data and reducing duplicity of monitoring efforts.
- Integrate the Upper Nahmint data into the SFM water quality objectives when the data has been verified and collated.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: P. Eng./P. Geo (Nanaimo)

Source: *Weyerhaeuser West Island Timberlands Sustainable Forest Management Plan Goal 17 Water Quality Report* prepared by Streamline Environmental Consulting June 5, 2003.

Notes:

Indicator 23: Percent of stream length of **S4, S5 streams** buffered ≥15 metres in areas harvest annually

Discussion:

Objective: S4 ≥ 85%, S5 ≥ 60% [72.5% weighted average]

Acceptable Variance: ±15%

Forecast: S4 ≥ 85%, S5 ≥ 60%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 21

Performance:

Weighted average of S4 and S5 streams is **65.3%**

Year	S4 streams	Total (km)	Non-buffered (km)	Buffered (km)	Buffered (%)
2002	Total	18.91	8.73	10.18	**54**
	Franklin (1)	9.27	2.27	7.00	75
	Sproat	9.64	6.46	3.18	33
	SBFEP	no data			

Year	S5 streams	Total (km)	Non-buffered (km)	Buffered (km)	Buffered (%)
2002	Total	9.76	1.22	8.54	**87**
	Franklin (1)	7.32	1.22	6.10	83
	Sproat	2.44	0.00	2.44	100
	SBFEP	no data			

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

A S4 non-fish stream is a stream in a community watershed less than 0 to 1.5 meters wide. (Anything greater than 1.5 meters in a community watershed is buffered). S5 streams are non-fish streams, outside a community watershed and wider than 3 meters.

An objective of 85% buffered, is far in excess of Code requirements and comes with a significant logging cost impact.

Indicator 23: Percent of stream length of **S4, S5 streams** buffered ≥15 metres in areas harvest annually cont.

Data protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Logged hectares register. S4 and S5 streams manually measured.

Notes: Indefinite or intermittent streams were not measured. Only streams within logged areas (not buffered) or within leave areas adjacent to logged areas (buffered) were measured. Buffers such as retention, WTP, and leave areas are indicated on 1:5000 maps. With regards to Total Area Under Prescription (TAUP), block boundaries adjacent to (one side of) creeks were included in the calculations.

Blocks with S4 streams within 50m of a blocky boundary were included.

Approximately 175 blocks were examined, which included blocks where harvesting started prior to 2002.

Salvage areas and the Small Business Forest Enterprise Program (SBFEP) were not examined.

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 24: Percent of **S6 streams** with a > 15 metre buffer in areas harvested annually

Discussion:

Objective: Determine the % of S6 streams with a > 15 metre buffer in areas harvested annually

Acceptable Variance: N/A

Forecast: To be determined

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 21

Performance:

S6 streams are non-fish streams outside community watersheds and equal to or less than 3 meters wide. There is no legal requirement for a buffer.

Year	S6 streams	Total (km)	Non-buffered (km)	Buffered (km)	Buffered (%)
2002	total	120.45	73.49	46.97	**39.0**
	Franklin (1)	102.38	61.58	40.8	39.9
	Sproat	18.07	11.905	6.165	34.1
	SBFEP	no data			

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Data protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting: TM Pearson & Co

Source: Logged hectares register. S6 streams manually measured.

Notes: Indefinite or intermittent streams were not measured. Only streams within logged areas (not buffered) or within leave areas adjacent to logged areas (buffered) were measured. Buffers such as retention, WTP, and leave areas are indicated on 1:5000 maps. With regards to Total Area Under Prescription (TAUP), block boundaries adjacent to (one side of) a creek were included in the calculations.

Salvage areas and the Small Business Forest Enterprise Program (SBFEP) were not examined.

Approximately 175 blocks were examined.

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 25: Forest Practices Code **reserve zones for wetlands, lakes and streams**.

Discussion: This indicator does not apply to private lands outside the TFL

Objective: Full reserve zones as Per FPC; zero non-compliance related to harvesting on TFL

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: Zero

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 32

Performance:

Year	Operation	FS 107 write-up
2002	total	0
	Franklin (1)	0
	Sproat	0
	SBFEP	no data
2001		0
2000		0
1999		0

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting:

Source: Incident Tracking System (ITS)

Notes: Reserve zones are established for wetlands, lakes and streams using the following guidebooks; Riparian Management Area, Gully Assessment Procedures, Fish Stream Identification, Channel Assessment Procedure, and Community Watershed.

Reserve Zone requirements are audited by the prescribing Silviculture Forester for compliance. Silviculture prescriptions are not approved by the District Manager with reserve zones that do not meet the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings.

This objective (indicator) reflects standards/regulations found in the Forest Practices Code of BC.

Indicator 26: Coastal Watershed Assessment Procedure (CWAP) programs completed for watersheds of identified concern and results are incorporated into FDP

Discussion: CWAPs are required for community watersheds, and for watersheds as directed by the MoF.

Objective: Carry out CWAPs on watershed not previously examined and where proposed development or past activities may constitute a risk to key value; incorporate results into FDP

Acceptable Variance: One late CWAP

Forecast: All watersheds assessed and results reflected in FDP

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 38

Performance:

Year	Completed CWAPs (number)	Late CWAPs (number)
2002	1 (1)	0
2001	3	0
2000	3	0
1999	1	0
1998	7	0

(1) Klanawa update

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting:

Source:

Notes: Weyerhaeuser has requested exemptions from completing CWAPs in some community watersheds where only road maintenance and timber salvage was occurring. WY has completed CWAPs for some watersheds to address rate of cut concerns. These are not directed CWAPs.

Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings outside the TFL.

On February 6, 2001, the SIFD District Manager issued a letter with regards to expectations on hydrological impacts of the Vancouver Island Higher Level Plan (HLP). The letter also instructed Licensees to meet with MoF, MWLAP, and DFO representatives to determine if CWAPs are required in certain watersheds potentially affected by the HLP. Licensees were instructed to meet with agencies regarding the need for CWAPs in certain watersheds. A meeting for TFL 44 was held on July 3, 2002, the minutes are as follows;

Indicator 26: Coastal Watershed Assessment Procedure (CWAP) programs completed for watersheds of identified concern and results are incorporated into FDP **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Notes: Alberni FDP/CWAPs Meeting Minutes – July 03, 2002

Listed below are the agreed to actions for each watershed discussed at the July 03, 2002 meeting at the MOF office in PA. Note that the discussion was based on the February 6, 2001 letter from the District Manager, DSI to All Licensees, DSI re: HLP and pertained to the upcoming amendment submission for the Alberni East FDP by WY. Our understanding from the district manager is that with the changes to the FPC we should look at the level of development proposed, sensitivity of the watershed and the use of HLP Sections 7& 8 to determine if a CWAP is needed.

In attendance : Mike Davis (WY); Glynnis Horel (Consultant for WY); Brad Rushton (DFO); Dan Biggs (MOF); Bob Cerenzia (MWLAP) and Madeline Maley (MOF).

Corrigan Watershed

* Significant development anticipated - concentrated in the second growth area of the watershed
* Glynnis will provide a summary (approx. 1 page) noting:
* Key concerns including:
* landslides
* deactivation
* channel sensitivity
* cumulative effects over the area under development
* hydrological review of proposed development
* ECA over the entire watershed should include some sense of the threshold to trigger a CWAP

Sarita River Watershed

* Not much development proposed
* Mike to note if using Sections 7 and 8 of the HLP and provide rationale
* Glynnis to reference the amount of development to the rate of recovery using the 1996 CWAP as a baseline

Pacheena River Watershed

* Not much development proposed - no actions
* Mike to note if using Sections 7 and 8 of the HLP and provide rationale

Indicator 26: Coastal Watershed Assessment Procedure (CWAP) programs completed for watersheds of identified concern and results are incorporated into FDP **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Notes: Alberni FDP/CWAPs Meeting Minutes – July 03, 2002

Klanawa River Watershed

* CWAP has expired and Glynnis will be completing a CWAP focusing on the following
* Summary of work to date - deactivation, instream and any positive indicators (ex: riparian vegetation)
* ECA Update
* Sediment Source Survey
* Report on the new terrain mapping and it's use at the SP stage
* Assess the proposed development
* Review and comment on previous recommendations/results
* Review key channels using orthophotos - no new aerial photography available so the smaller channels cannot be reviewed
* Note that Bob has a windthrow concern that Mike will be addressing in the amendment

Nahmint River Watershed

* DM directed CWAP and will be completed in the fall - no development proposed until the CWAP is completed
* Glynnis will be doing a CWAP similar to the Hatton
* Updating the original results/recommendations
* Mapping channel profiles
* Sediment Source Survey
* Reviewing any proposed development
* Look at any water (weather ?) station data

Ash River Watershed

* No proposed development in the Alberni East FDP Amendment - no actions

Caycuse Creek Watershed

* Madeline to check if a CWAP has been completed for the Caycuse
* Not much development proposed - no actions
* Note a concern from the agencies re: Looper Creek - significant development would trigger a CWAP
* Any development in Hatton must be consistent with the current CWAP

Indicator 26: Coastal Watershed Assessment Procedure (CWAP) programs completed for watersheds of identified concern and results are incorporated into FDP **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Notes: Alberni FDP/CWAPs Meeting Minutes – July 03, 2002

China Creek - below the community watershed

- Not much development proposed - no actions

Walbran Creek Watershed

- Glynnis will report on the percentage development within the TFL 44 area in the watershed and check the rate of recovery
- Note that a CWAP would be useful to monitor the impact of the SMZ and the Park on the development of the watershed
- Significant development will require both tenure holders (TFL 44 and TFL 46) to complete a CWAP
- Note that Bob has a concern in the Roy Creek area

Upper Nitinat River Watershed

- Area defined as north of the falls
- Not much development proposed - no actions

Indicator 27: Change in area of **water bodies**

Discussion: This indicator measures the area of lakes, wetlands and large streams in the DFA. It provides an indication of the impact of forest management on water resources.

Objective: Maintain current area of water bodies

Acceptable Variance: Zero

Forecast: Stable

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 39

Performance:

Year	Area of water bodies (1) (hectares)	Area of water bodies, w/o swamps (2) (hectares)
2002 (3)	15,959	15,200
2001	15,976	15,214
2000	15,983	15,222
1999	15,983	15,222
1998	no data	15,222

(1) includes large rivers, lakes, and swamp
(2) reported previously as area of water bodies
(3) DFA boundary changed in 2002, resulting in the removal of 14 ha. of water bodies

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Compilation:

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Inventory Section reports (1:20 000 scale) on the area of lakes, wetlands and large streams at each inventory update. This includes the inventory summaries in TFL Management Plans. No re-inventory of water bodies took place in 2002.

Care needs to be taken in interpreting historical records of the area of water because of changes in map standards and boundaries.

Base line data is the 1997 Inventory area of 15,222 ha.

Indicator 28: *Indicator pending on advisory group education and information gathering* [**carbon budget**]

Discussion: This indicator has till 2003 to be completed

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

Carbon budget is not specifically addressed in the plan due to a lack of understanding about its impacts on age classes, growth rates, blowdowns, fuel consumption and other factors. To what extent should we be contributing to global cycles? The Advisory will arrange a learning session as a way of preparing to address this in the next plan revision.

Objective: Increase the advisory group's understanding of carbon budget factors

Acceptable Variance: Completed in 2003

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Year	Learning Sessions (number)
2002	0

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 29: Number of complaints annually [**Non-timber forest products**]

Discussion:

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

There is some concern about the need to do more to stimulate NTFP diversification, however the Advisory needs more information about what is currently being done in this field before determining what (if anything) they should focus on in this area.

Objective: No complaints related to NTFP

Acceptable Variance: One complaint

Forecast: Zero

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicators # 52 and 56

Performance:

Year	NTFP complaints	Other Complaints / Comments	FDP Comments (3)	FDP Responses (4)
2002	1 (1)	72 (2)	n/a	n/a
2001	no data	1	93	30
2000	no data	5	31	28
1999	no data	no data	no data	no data

(1) FDP comment
(2) 69 comments were as a result of a “Stop logging the Walbran” email campaign
(3) action items and/or changes to FDP by cutblock/area, no FDP’s in 2002
(4) may include multiple cutblocks, no FDP’s in 2002

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: EMS Clerk

Source: Incident Tracking System (ITS)

Notes: All “significant public concerns” generated through comments, questionnaires or complaints through reviews of Forest Development Plans or Management Plans, Sustainable Forest Management Plans or other higher levels plans are documented. “Significant public concerns” are sent to the EMS Clerk for record keeping by Forest Development Plans – FDP Leader Management Plans Sustainable forest Management Plan–EMS Forester A Management Plan – TFL Forests. Complaints are also received by Office receptionists.

Indicator 30: Annual harvest (5 year average) as percent of [**Long Term Harvest Level** LTHL]

Discussion: This indicator combines recent rates of timber harvest with the projected long-term harvest rate for the forest. Previously referred to as Long Run Sustained Yield (LRSY) in the 2002 SFM Plan.

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

Discussions about sustainable harvest levels are ongoing. There is a general dissatisfaction with that portion of the plan that deals with harvest levels. This is partially linked to our examination of zoning this year, and to the need for more information about species and age classes that currently make up the DFA – by landscape unit and biogeoclimatic variant.

Objective: 2002: ± 10% of LTHL

Acceptable Variance: ±15% of LTHL

Forecast: LTHL

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 36

Performance:

5 year harvest period	Average harvest (m3)	LTHL (m3)	Average Harvest as % of LTHL
1998-2002	1,531,031	1,661,000 (2)	92%
1997-2001	1,474,989	1,604,000 (1)	92
1996-2000	1,570,413	1,583,000	99
1995-1999	1,657,304	1,583,000	105

(1) The addition of park trade area in 2001 increased the harvesting land base and hence increased LTHL.
(2) The TFL 44 MP#4 Timber Supply Analysis completed in 2002 included different assumptions than the MP#3 analysis. The result is a change in LTHL.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester
Reporting: Nanaimo Timberlands Planning Forester
Source: Annual harvest volumes are based on official MoF scale volumes. For more detail refer to Indicator 41.

Notes: LTHL, the long term harvest level is dependent on area, the productivity of the forestland, level of silviculture (e.g. numbers of trees established per ha, control of competing vegetation, fertilization etc.) and harvest constraints (e.g. restrictions on the rate of harvest). All of these factors are defined in the strategic analysis.

Indicator 31: Percent of **protected area perimeter** harvested within previous 5 years

Discussion: Current performance reflects a disproportionate amount of mature forests adjacent to protected areas. This performance level will improve slowly over time

Objective: < 5%

Acceptable Variance: <9.5%

Forecast: < 5%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 41

Performance:

Year	Park perimeter (km)	Harvested perimeter (km)	% of protected area harvested in previous 5 yrs.
2002	72	8.3	**11.64**
2001	74	8	10.2
2000	89	9	10.1
1999 (1)			2.7

The 2003 plan will be reviewed to ensure the performance is within variance.

(1) 1997 inventory

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: The percent of protected area perimeter harvested within the previous 5 years, will be calculated annually, utilizing the productive forest only. The measurement procedure is to use the GIS to buffer the park perimeters by 100 meters, then intersect the buffered coverage with the forest cover. (1997 forest inventory).

Select only those stands that are less than 5 years old and recalculate to compute the percentage of protected area perimeter harvested within the previous 5 years.

No stand level reinventory took place in 2002. Changes that resulted in differences between 2001 and 2002 dataset/reporting include;

- Exclusion of roaded area (13m buffer for roads), due to a change in the definition of Productive Forest
- Areas within 100m of the park perimeter were logged in 2002.

Indicator 32: Percent of **harvesting adjacent to protected areas** that is VR

Discussion:

Objective: 80% in 2002

Acceptable Variance: 10%

Forecast: 95% in 2002

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 46

Performance:

Year	Operation	Openings adjacent to protected areas (number)	VR openings (number)	% adjacent
2002	Total	4	4	**100%**
	Franklin (1)	2	2	
	Sproat	2	2	
	SBFEP	no data	no data	
2001		5	4	80%
2000		9	7	77%

(1) Franklin includes Alberni East and contract operations, located at Great Central and Uchucklesit

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Planning Engineers

Reporting: Administrative Coordinator - Franklin

Source:

Notes: When choosing the type of Variable Retention, Weyerhaeuser takes into consideration such elements as proximity to parkland, fishing resources, and other resource values in the block.

Cutblocks within 100 metres of the park perimeter are considered adjacent.

Indicator 33: Area of identified **recreational areas** with the DFA

Discussion:

Objective: Maintain inventory of recreational areas

Acceptable Variance: 95% of DFA inventoried

Forecast: 100% of DFA inventoried

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 47

Performance:

Year	DFA (hectares)	Recreational inventory area (hectares)	Inventoried (percent)
2002 (1)	315,443	306,869	**97.3%**
2001	316,150	309,589	97
2000	311,388	309,589	99
1999	311,388	309,589	99

(1). DFA boundary changed in 2002

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: A Recreation Inventory was completed for TFL 44 in June 1995, with additional information added in 1997. The Recreation Analysis and Management Strategy Report (Juan De Fuca Consulting,) including the remaining portion of the DFA (Park Trade), was completed in 2002. However, as of December 31, 2002 it had not been entered into GIS format.

Large lakes are not included in the area covered by the Recreation Inventory dataset. This indicator compares the gross DFA area with the gross Recreation Inventory area. Inventory lakes were added to the Recreation Inventory area for the 2002 calculation.

The data is used for the Management Plan as well as the FDP.

Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings.

Indicator 34: Percent of identified **roads that have been maintained**

Discussion:

Objective: Access to X% (percent to be confirmed) of identified major recreation areas (as per sector priority list) is maintained

Acceptable Variance: 50%

Forecast: 100 %

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicators # 31 and 52

Performance:

Year	Identified roads (number)	Identified roads with access (number)	Identified roads with access (%)
2002	73	71 (1)	**97%**
2001	73		

(1) Two roads were identified as not having access, N600 (log pile) and Katlum Creek (slides).

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: WIWAG Recreation Sub-Committee

Source: Recreation Access Inventory (April 2002)

Notes: The Recreation Access Inventory (sector priority) was produced by the West Island Woodlands Advisory Group's Recreation Sub-committee, and is located on the WIWAG's website http://www.wiwag.org.

Access, for purpose of this indicator, is defined as 4-wheel drive, within 500 metres of the identified feature.

'Major' recreation areas will need to be reviewed for 2003.

Indicator 35: Number of **recreation sites maintained**

Discussion: Weyerhaeuser does not maintain recreation sites. Access to the sites is made available through maintained roads. Weyerhaeuser's harvesting activities are designed and conducted so as to result in minimal or no impact on recreation sites. The MoF has a small maintenance budget for formal campsites.

Objective: Maintain existing recreation sites and site access, in cooperation with Ministry of Forests [MoF]

Acceptable Variance: Review with MoF and determine funding needs

Forecast: Develop one new site every 5 years

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 43

Performance:

Year	Formal site (number)	Informal site (number)
2002	9	34
2001	9	34
2000	9	34
1999	9	34

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting:

Source: 2002 Recreation Analysis and Management Strategy Report (Juan De Fuca Consulting

Notes: A Recreation Inventory was completed for TFL 44 in June 1995, with additional information added in 1997. An inventory for the remaining portion of the DFA (Park Trade) was completed in 2002. However, as of December 31, 2002 it had not been entered into GIS format.

Weyerhaeuser maintains a recreation inventory. Formal sites are not specifically identified in the inventory. However, areas are identified as requiring special management for their recreation values.

In March 2002 the MoF announced that it would gradually withdraw from the management of recreation sites and trails. In October, the ministry issued requests for proposals for the non-commercial management and maintenance of recreation sites and trails.

Indicator 36: Number of polygons in which visual condition fail to meet **Visual Quality Objectives** [VQO] (Benchmark for 2002)

Discussion: The purpose of a Visual Landscape Inventory is to provide information about the visual condition, characteristics and sensitivity to alteration of areas and travel corridors. A Visually Sensitive Area (VSA) may includes viewscapes visible from communities, public use areas, travel corridors, including roadways and waterways, and any other viewpoint so identified through a referral or planning process.

Objective: Reduce the number [of polygons] from previous reports

Acceptable Variance: +5% [2002 data is baseline, variance will apply to future reports]

Forecast: Zero

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 53

Performance:

Year	VQO polygons (number)	VQO polygons with failed existing visual condition (EVC) (number)	Area of VQO failure (hectares)
2002	1621 (1)	479 [baseline]	22,199
2001		n/a	not reported (2)
2000		n/a	25,124

(1) 890 polygons are less than five hectares
(2) no updates

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner

Reporting: Pacific GIS Consulting

Source: All data is from GIS in the form of ArcInfo coverages, with the exception of logging updates which came from Genus.

Notes: Data for this indicator does not include the Park Trade or other minor private land holdings. The visual inventory area within the DFA only was used.

Existing Visual Condition (EVC) is a measure of the present level of landscape alteration caused by human activities. EVC values are taken from Form 15 (EVC, Final Values) of the VQO inventory.

The official inventory is updated periodically, not annually. Visual Impact Assessments (VIA's) for cutblocks, may influence a polygon's EVC.

Indicator 41: **Annual harvest** level compared to last 5 years

Discussion: This indicator compares actual timber harvest with harvest targets. It provides an indication of sustainability and of contribution to the local and provincial economies.

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

Discussions about sustainable harvest levels are ongoing. There is a general dissatisfaction with that portion of the plan that deals with harvest levels. This is partially linked to our examination of zoning this year, and to the need for more information about species and age classes that currently make up the DFA – by landscape unit and biogeoclimatic variant.

Objective: Annual cut is within 15% of previous 5 year average

Acceptable Variance: ±25%

Forecast: ±5%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 45

Performance:

Year	TFL 44 (excluding Clayoquot, including Small Business and residue)			Outside TFL 44	DFA
	AAC (million m3	Harvest (million m3)	%	Harvest (m3)	Harvest (million m3 / % of avg.)
2002 (1)	1,760,000	1,688,584	**96%**	85,861 (2)	**1,774,445 / 120%**
2001 (3)	1,760,000	1,292,568	73	128,854	1,421,423
2000 (3	1,760,000	1,575,386	90	23,063	1,589,862
1999	1,760,000	1,578,862	90	19,108	1,597,970
1998	1,760,000	1,247,911	71	43,736	1,291,647
1997	1,823,000	1,408,861	77	85,375	1,494,236
1997 to 2001	8,863,000				7,374,947
5 yr. Average	1,772,600		100		**1,474,989**

(1) includes 95,141 m3 of SBFEP
(2) all of the harvest is from the Park Trade area
(3) AAC incorrectly reported as 1,766,200 m3

Indicator 41: Annual harvest level compared to last 5 years **cont.**

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester

Reporting: Nanaimo Timberlands Planning Forester

Source:

Notes: The Chief Forester determines the Allowable Annual Cut (AAC) every five years for TFL 44 as part of the Management Plan process. The current AAC for TFL 44 is 1,766,200 m3. Of this 1,760,000 m3 is in the DFA and 6,200 m3 is in the Clayoquot Sound. The 1,760,000 m3 includes allocations of 1,635,598 m3 to Weyerhaeuser, 81,698 m3 for Small Business, and 48,994 m3 for Small Business/other.

The Chief Forester is expected to announce a new AAC determination for TFL 44 in mid 2003, at which time an adjustment for the Ucluelet Working Circle is expected.

Scaled harvest volumes are accumulated in the MoF harvest database. The TFL 44 harvest is from the MoF 2002 'cut control" letter. The Nanaimo Woodlands Statistician reports these harvest volumes (by operation and tenure) in the TFL 44 Annual Report.

Indicator 43: Annual harvest compared to **local log consumption** that is provided by WY

Discussion:

Objective: Maintain or increase ratio of logs consumed locally by WY operations vs. WIT harvest

Acceptable Variance: -2%

Forecast: Even flow

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicators # 45 and 64.

Performance:

Year	Sales, Company Operations (m3)	Converted Locally (m3)	Brought in (sent out) (m3)	Harvest, DFA (m3)	Converted locally as % of harvest
2002	1,523,435	1,562,992	39,557	1,774,445	**88.1%**
2001	1,258,858	1,117,046	(141,812)	1,421,423	78.6
2000	1,354,186	1,336,028	(18,158)	1,589,862	84.0
1999	1,372,009	1,533,122	161,113	1,597,970	95.6

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Log Supply Accountant

Reporting: Financial Manager, Timberlands Business

Source:

Notes:

Indicator 43: Annual harvest compared to **local log consumption** that is provided by WY **cont.**

ALBERNI FIBRE FLOWS		*(revised)*		
	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**
Log Sales from Company Operations				
Alberni Company Facilities	527,908	496,020	365,246	512,977
Alberni Custom Cut Facilities	45,867	59,893	38,290	52,667
Other Alberni Customers	246,539	219,975	233,166	285,658
Other Customers	551,695	578,298	622,156	672,133
Total Sales from Company Operations	**1,372,009**	**1,354,186**	**1,258,858**	**1,523,435**
Logs Acquired for Other Alberni Customers	**40,947**	**76,311**	**59,109**	**30,317**
LOGS CONSUMED IN ALBERNI				
Company Facilities				
From Alberni Operations	527,908	496,020	365,246	512,977
Logs brought in	541,753	404,607	269,065	558,437
Total	**1,069,661**	**900,627**	**634,311**	**1,071,414**
Company Custom Cut Facilities				
From Alberni Operations	45,867	59,893	38,290	52,667
Logs brought in	130,108	79,222	152,170	122,936
Total	**175,975**	**139,115**	**190,460**	**175,063**
Logs Sold to Other Alberni Customers				
From Alberni Operations	246,539	219,975	233,166	285,658
Logs brought in	40,947	76,311	59,109	30,317
Total	**287,486**	**296,286**	**292,275**	**315,975**
Total Logs Consumed in Alberni	**1,533,122**	**1,336,028**	**1,117,046**	**1,562,992**

Indicator 44: A **meeting of value-added stakeholders** is held

Discussion:

Objective: To determine the local fiber needs of value-added manufacturers and cottage industries

Acceptable Variance: By 2003

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

This indicator and objective is shared by both WIWAG and Weyerhaeuser.

A presentation by Dan Garland (Vice President) of the **Vancouver Island Association of Wood Processors** was given at the West Island Woodlands Advisory Group's January 9, 2003 regular meeting.

WIWAG has identified a number of questions and issues with regards to value-added:

- There is a need to identify and define local value-added manufactures and cottage industries, are they sawmills and/or secondary wood manufacturers/processors, and are there others that should be included?
- What are the specific fibre issues among regional processors?
- While there is a commitment to create clear direction and focus for determining local fibre needs, the task seems more complex than originally anticipated.

Other priorities for WIWAG, such as the public lectures (Indicator 56), combined with uncertainty on how to proceed contributed in failure to meet the objective.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 46: Number of **FN contracts** signed

Discussion:

Objective: Identify the number of contracts (benchmark)

Acceptable Variance: N/A

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Year	Contracts (number)
2002	7

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process** (FN sector to gather the data)

Discussion:

Objective: To establish the benchmark for future satisfaction ratings (FN to complete)

Acceptable Variance: N/A

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Indicator Background

Under Goal 31 (provide opportunities for revenue sharing, joint ventures and/or First Nations access to harvesting or tenure opportunities) there are indicators to measure both the number of contracts signed as well as the dollar value of the contracts. While these indicators are a progressive statement about First Nations' increasing involvement in the forest industry, alone they do not provide information about negotiations that may have not been completed. Nor, do they provide more fundamental information about the relationship between the company and First Nations. The intent of indicator 47 (satisfaction with contract development process) was to provide this additional information. Note that this indicator only refers to First Nation satisfaction with the contract development process.

Methodology

Indicator 47 is the only indicator in the SFM plan that is not written with objective language. However, the intent in monitoring this indicator was not to subjectively ask First Nations if they were satisfied with the contract development process. This is not quantifiably measurable, and is not an equitable way to judge performance. The intent was to define the components of contract development and evaluate how each component was handled. The following questions were developed as the criteria for measuring performance on this indicator:

1. What types of contracts did you negotiate in 2002? (e.g. cultural heritage, salvage, logging, planting)
2. Were all negotiations concluded with a signed contract?
3. Agenda

   Were all the issues you wanted to negotiate included in the agenda? Was there a willingness to talk about all issues raised? Or, were certain issues closed for discussion?

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process** (FN sector to gather the data) **cont.**

4. Timing

   If a schedule was made and deadlines set, were they met?
   Did those negotiating make themselves available to meet on a timely basis?

5. Negotiators

   Did the negotiators have the right level of authority and mandate to negotiate the issues on the table?

6. Breakdown

   Did the negotiations breakdown at any point resulting in a party leaving the table?
   Was there any attempt at mediation, and if so, was it successful?

7. Rating

   On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being poor and 5 being all expectations met, what number summarizes your experience with contract development in 2002.

There are 10 First Nations whose territory is affected by the SFM plan. The following First Nations and representatives were contacted and asked the same set of questions.

Cowichan Lake – Georgina Livingston	Ditidaht – Bryan Coffsky
Huu-ay-aht – Larry Johnson	Hupacasath – Trevor Jones
Uchucklesaht – Charlie Cootes Jr.	Tseshaht – David Watts
Toquaht – Rick Schaeffer	Pacheedaht – Jeff Jones
Qualicum – Kim Recalma-Clutesi	Ucluelet – Al McCarthy

Representatives were selected based on their involvement in senior level negotiations for their First Nations.

The Toquaht representative reported that there has been no TFL 44 related harvesting by Weyerhaeuser in their territory for the past few years due to an ongoing process where by the Barkley Block is being taken out of the TFL and transferred to the Arrowsmith TSA. Therefore, the list of First Nations surveyed for this indicator was reduced to 9.

Of the 9 First Nations, complete responses were gathered from 8. 1 First Nation's representative was not available to provide a response within the data collection timeframe.

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process** (FN sector to gather the data) **cont.**

Survey Responses

1. Types of Negotiations

Out of the 8 First Nations that data was gathered for, the following summarizes how many First Nations entered into each type of negotiation:

- Salvage 5
- Cultural Heritage / CMT Reconnaissance 5 *
- Logging 4 **
- Silviculture 3
- Private land exchange 1
- Engineering 2
- Old growth / cedar access 1
- Wood supply to mill 1
- Planting 1

Notes:

*	This number does not include one First Nation that had a multi-year contract signed in 2001 and did not require negotiations in 2002
**	This number does not include one First Nation that had informal discussions on accessing a harvest

Two First Nations did not enter into any contract negotiations with Weyerhaeuser. The first reported that there was no communication from either party in this area. This First Nation now appears to be in the early stages of getting involved with forestry and will report salvage negotiations for 2003. The other First Nation reported that they had no existing relationship with the company. They had not approached the company to negotiate because they felt discriminated against as a small First Nation, and believed that it was the company's responsibility to initiate negotiations as a way of respecting the First Nation's aboriginal rights.

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process** (FN sector to gather the data) **cont.**

2. Contracts Resulting From Negotiations

The number of contracts signed compared to sets of negotiations held is as follows:

• Salvage	5 of 5	
• Cultural Heritage / CMT Reconnaissance	5 of 5	*
• Logging	2 of 4	**
• Silviculture	3 of 3	
• Private land exchange	0 of 1	***
• Engineering	2 of 2	
• Old growth / cedar access	1 of 1	
• Wood supply to mill	0 of 1	
• Planting	1 of 1	

Notes:

*	Six First Nations in total have a cultural heritage contract. The above number does not include one First Nation that had a multi-year contract signed in 2001 and did not require contract signing in 2002
**	One contract was not signed was due to the negotiations being rolled into the larger Coulson/First Nations Sproat Unit negotiations. The other contract was not completed because the parties could not agree on a price.
***	The First Nation acknowledged that this was a unique area of negotiation, and that it was not unreasonable that a contract wasn't signed in 2002.

3. Agenda

Of those Six First Nations with direct contract development experience, Five reported unconditionally that the company was willing and flexible in to discuss any issue the First Nation proposed for the agenda. One First Nation noted that the company had improved in this area over the past year. Another stated that issues were not always successfully negotiated into a final contract, but this didn't diminish the First Nations' appreciation that the agenda was open.

The Sixth First Nation in this group reported that the issue of revenue sharing was not accepted for negotiation because the company said that this was a provincial government issue. Aside from this though, the First Nation provided a positive report.

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process** (FN sector to gather the data) **cont.**

One First Nation that was just entering into negotiations for the first time in 2003 made an early observation that the agenda seemed set and closed because contract templates were used. It was their preference that templates not be used, especially in the area of price.

4. Timing

Of the six First Nations that negotiated contracts in 2002, four reported that performance in this area was unsatisfactory and needing improvement. Negotiations were characterized as "slow and dragging" with deadlines "often" being missed. These First Nations stated that they were in competition for the negotiators' time, that the negotiators sometimes didn't share the First Nations' priority for an issue, and that if meetings were postponed they were difficult to reschedule. Despite this, one First Nation expressed that the timing issues seemed to be rooted in there not being enough people and time, not a question of whether the company was acting in good faith or not

The other two First Nations reported a different experience for different reasons. 1 First Nation's contract development process was expedited because they had adopted guidelines from a First Nation that already had a contract. The other First Nation said that they met with the company so frequently that timing wasn't an issue.

5. Negotiators

The same four First Nations reporting dissatisfaction in the Timing section also reported dissatisfaction with the level of authority and mandate that company representatives brought to the negotiation table. These First Nations said that numerous meetings were held before the "right" people were brought in, leading to delays. It was summarized that there was disconnect between First Nations and decision-making authorities, which has increased since a recent reorganization of key positions.

The First Nation that reported meeting frequently with the company in the Timing section reported positively about access to the right level of negotiators. The representative said that access has always been adequate, but has improved in the last year. As higher level negotiations have started, the company responded by bringing more senior people, and that negotiators always had the authority to sign contracts.

The final First Nation in this group could not provide an answer since the negotiations were conducted by a previous chief.

Indicator 47: Degree of satisfaction with **contract development process** (FN sector to gather the data) **cont.**

6. Breakdown

None of the First Nations had experienced a negotiation breakdown where either party left the table. One First Nation summarized the importance of this accomplishment by saying in the past the First Nation would have take the hard line and walked from the table because they didn't think the company was there in good faith. Now the First Nation says there is a "really good relationship that has come a long way."

7. Rating

Of the 6 First Nations that negotiated contracts in 2002, the following summary ratings (on a scale of 1-5) were given:

- Three First Nations provided a score of 3
- One First Nation provided a score of 3.5
- One First Nation provided a score of 4
- One First Nation provided a score of 5

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison

Reporting: Tawney Lem (June 12, 2003)

Source:

Notes:

Indicator 49: Number of surveys [**Cultural Heritage Surveys**] conducted vs. number requested

Discussion:

Objective: Conduct Cultural Heritage Surveys as requested by FN

Acceptable Variance: -5%

Forecast: 100 %

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Year	Surveys requested (number)	Surveys conducted (number)	Surveys conducted (percent)
2002	159	159	100%

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 50: Number of First Nations who have requested a **Cultural Heritage Resource [CHR] contract** vs the number who have one

Discussion:

Objective: 100% of First Nations that want one have a CHR contract with WY

Acceptable Variance: -20%

Forecast: 100%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

Year	Contracts requested (number)	Contracts (number)	Contracts (percent)
2002	6	5	83%

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 51: First Nations information sharing and referrals program

Discussion:

Objective: Respecting governmental obligations develop and implement protocols for mutually acceptable information sharing and referrals programs with all First Nations having traditional territories within the DFA

Acceptable Variance: 100% of First Nations are sent a proposed information sharing protocol and 75% of First Nations have a protocol in place by December 2002.

Forecast: 100%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 60

Performance:

Six First Nations' have formal agreements with Weyerhaeuser, with four having referral letters. Four First Nation's, whose traditional territories are minor in area, have not expressed a desire to participate at a level beyond those previously established. The Ucluelet First Nation, whose traditional territory includes the Nahmint, also has not indicated a desire to participate beyond previously established levels.

Year	First Nations	Total Protocol Agreements	First Nations with Protocol Agreements %
2002	10	10	100
2001	10	10	100
2000	10	10	100
1999	10	10	100

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 52: Archaeological and **Culturally Modified Tree** (CMT) sites inventory

Discussion: An inventory of areas where an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) or a Culturally Modified Tree (CMT) survey is completed is maintained in the GIS. The inventory is updated regularly and shows both where surveys have identified archaeological sites, and where surveys have identified that no archaeological resources are present. This information is used during the FDP review to assist in determining archaeological potential of proposed cutblocks, and the type of cultural heritage resource survey required, if any.

Objective: Maintain up-to-date inventory of CMTs

Acceptable Variance: Annual update

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 58

Performance:

The Inventory was updated for the 2002 Forest Development Plan Amendments.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 53: Percent of **blocks by band where agreement is reached** around the management

Discussion: Weyerhaeuser pursues agreements from all First Nation(s) that have traditional territory covering archaeological sites that may be impacted by proposed forestry related activities. This includes the harvesting and/or the management of non-harvested cultural heritage resources. Consent on the management of significant features (as defined in the Heritage Conservation Act) is sought from First Nation(s) claiming the area where modifications are proposed.

Objective: Achieve FN consent on management and/or protection of identified CHR [Cultural Heritage Resource].

Acceptable Variance: -20%

Forecast: 100%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 58

Performance:

Year	Consent of Implementation Plans (percent)
2002	100%
2001	100%
2000	100%
1999	100%

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 54: Number of **public comments** to WY and percent of those that result in changes to operational plans

Discussion:

Objective: The company demonstrates a commitment to incorporating reasonable concerns in its planning process (Benchmark in 2002)

Acceptable Variance: N/A

Forecast: 100%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, reported previously (in part) as Indicator # 56

Performance:

Year	NTFP complaints	Other complaints / comments	FDP comments (2)	FDP responses (3)
2002	0	72 (1)	n/a	n/a
2001	no data	1	93	30
2000	no data	5	31	28
1999	no data	no data	no data	no data

(1) 69 comments were as a result of a "Stop logging the Walbran" email campaign
(2) action items and/or changes to FDP by cutblock/area, no FDP's in 2002
(3) may include multiple cutblocks, no FDP's in 2002

Year		Comments (block / area)	Changes (block / area)	Changes in Operational plans (percent)
2002	SP	4	4	100% (1)
	FDP Amendment	9	0	n/a (2)

Data does not include discussion or correspondence with First Nations.

(1) Local residents' design ideas and concerns for four cutblocks (2626 – West Bay, 263204 – Stirling Arm, 273207 – Alberni Valley Memorial Park, 362202 – McLean Mill) were incorporated into the harvest area design.

(2) Five individuals/organizations commented on the Alberni East and Alberni West Forest Development Plan (FDP) Amendment Review. Concerns were, and can be, addressed without changes to the FDP.

Indicator 54: Number of **public comments** to WY and percent of those that result in changes to operational plans **cont.**

Performance:

Previous:

Year	FDP comments (1) (number)	FDP responses (2) (number)	Complaints (number)	Average Response Time Complaints
2001	93	30	1	n/a
2000	31	28	5	1 day
1999	no data			

(1) action items and/or changes to FDP by cutblock / area
(2) may include multiple cutblocks

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: Forest Development Planner
Reporting:
Source: 2001-2005 TFL 44 Forest Development Plan Amendment, Alberni East & West, and Opening Files.

Notes: All “significant public concerns” generated through comments, questionnaires or complaints through reviews of Forest Development Plans, Management Plans, and Silviculture Prescriptions.

Indicator 55: Incidence of **non-compliance with treaty settlements and Interim Measures Agreements** [IMA]

Discussion:

Objective: Achieve 100% compliance

Acceptable Variance: 90%

Forecast: 100%

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: Reported previously as Indicator # 57

Performance:

Year	IMA compliance (percent)
2002	100%
2001	100%
2000	100%
1999	100%

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison

Reporting:

Source:

Notes: The Ditidaht / Pacheedaht Interim Measures Agreement (IMA) expired at the end of 2002. There has been no communication from the First Nations or the Government with regards to renewal.

Indicator 56: A joint communications and public consultation plan

Discussion:

Parking Lot Item: From Appendix 2, 2002 SFM Plan

Indicator 56 identifies a communications plan. This is an attempt to address the substantial gap that was created by the closure of the Alberni Forestry Visitor Information Centre due to WY budget cuts in 2002. The 2001 SFM Plan included a goal to maintain the Centre. Members of the WIWAG, and other groups and citizens, have expressed their concern about the negative impacts of this relatively minor and shortsighted cost saving to the company.

Objective: A communications plan is developed and implemented that identifies both WY and advisory group education / awareness activities

Acceptable Variance: 2003

Forecast: N/A

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator

Performance:

The Integrated Communication Plan for WIT and WIWAG was developed, and is now posted onto the WIWAG website; http://www.wiwag.org

As of the February 2003 meeting, Weyerhaeuser committed to the TFL 44 Recreation & Logging Road Guide and community events, but was not sure about representation on community organizations or a school program.

Three public lectures were held during 2002, they are as follows;

- Biodiversity: Beauty and the Beast in Forestry – June5
- Non-timber Forest Products and Sustainable Forest Management – June 19
- Log Exports – November 26

The implementation of the Communications Plan is ongoing.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: EMS / Planning Forester
Reporting:
Source:
Notes:

Indicator 57: [FN] Education and training program

Discussion:

Objective: In conjunction with First Nations, design, implement, and monitor a training program to familiarize employees with cultural and other issues ad company policies and obligations related to First Nations.

Acceptable Variance: 2003

Forecast: All employees

Previous (2001) SFM Plan: This is a **new** indicator, previously reported (in part) as Indicator # 54

Performance:

Year	Newsletter Articles)	Information emails (2)	Training Programs
2002	0 (1)	22	1 (3)
2001	3	8	0
2000	no data		
1999	no data		

(1) newsletter cancelled

(2) hourly, staff and contractors are kept informed of topical information

(3) First Nations training was incorporated into EMS training, 517 Weyerhaeuser employees and contractors participated.

Data Protocol:

Responsibility: First Nations Liaison
Reporting:
Source:
Notes: