

West Island Woodlands Advisory Group – Western Forest Products
Minutes – January 14, 2010

Advisory Group Members

✓ ✓	Harold Carlson Barbra Baker (alt)	Forest Recreation		Lyle Newton Arnie Magnusson	Logging Contractor Island Pacific
✓ ✓	Rick Avis Judy Carlson (alt)	Naturalists	✓	Gilbert Richir	Ministry of Forest
✓	Dave Chitty	Watershed/Fisheries	✓	Jim Creighton Neil Malbon	Small Business/Tourism
✓	Ken McRae	A.C. Regional District		Darlene Clark	Alberni Fish & Game Club
✓	Mike Kuruliak John Young (alt)	Port Alberni & District Labour Council	✓	Jack McLeman	City of Port Alberni
✓	John McIntosh Bob Redhead (alt)	Parks Canada	✓	Jane Morden	Environment
✓	Stefan Ochman	Bamfield			

✓ = attended R=regrets blank=did not attend V=vacant seat Q=Quorum

Total of 13 Advisory Group (AG) members	20 AG including alternates	Q	7 is the quorum	9 AG present 2 Alternates
WFP Resources present	Facilitator and Recorder 2		Guests	present January 14

Resources Present:

Western Forest Products (WFP) Port Alberni Forest Operations (PAFO)

Erin Badesso - PAFO WFP, Forester

Mike Davis – WFP, Forester – Campbell River

Michel De Bellefeuille Certification Forester

Jennifer Dyson – Facilitator

Tracy Godin – Recording Secretary

Guests

Frank Stinni

Mike Stinni

1. Welcome and Introductions

Meeting called to order @ 5:30pm

Introductions were made around the table.

Safety Orientation

Jennifer reviewed safety procedures.

Review of Actions Items from October 8 2009 Minutes

Action Item 1; JK to report back when he returns

Actions and Minutes approved and will be posted to website, approved by show of hands

Erin Badesso provided an update for WFP.

12 months ago WFP delivered bad news about the industry generally, considerable staff lay-offs and shutdowns. There has been some improvement since then. The forecast was to harvest 160,000 cubic meters, but no new falling. Looking to 2010 the plan is to harvest 400,000 cubic meters representing less than ½ of what would be harvested in a banner year. WFP needs to justify every cubic meter.

WFP looking at innovation and options, one consideration is *market logging*, we may not take possession of logs for our own mills rather a contractor takes possession of logs and decides the best option for the logs, which could be WFP mills or elsewhere. WFP will have the first right of refusal - so we may keep or refuse any or all. With *market logging* there may be log exporting which would be required to stay competitive; it would be done by these market loggers. This would allow WFP to go into stands that would not be economical otherwise. By aggressively trying to maximize harvest levels, we are in a position that looks more encouraging than last year.

KM: will be attending a meeting in Victoria the Export Log Advisory Board. The board meets once amount. The Board decides on the value of the logs to determine the price, in Vancouver, interior and the coast. We can identify who is trying to block it; Ken has been on the board for past 3 months. There is much to learn, huge learning curve, even thinking about taking a course in log grading. Ken would like to see the board be opened up to prevent the idea that it's a secretive organization. The Board is represented by FN, Steelworkers (labour), municipalities, log manufacturers; sawmill representative, log exporters and government. We do wood for crown land and federal private land.

Harold: Can you explain the difference between export ability between crown and private land?

KM: not much difference in the process. We are an advisory group to the federal and provincial governments. Last months meeting the Minister of Forests and Range was there. The position of the Minister is to keep more income within the province. We need to find use for our own wood, until then we look at the log export markets. It's only the FN that we have no say over as more timber moves through them; they go where they get the best money for the log. We need to get FN involved.

CSA QMI Audit

Michel: the audit starts on the tenth of May for WFP operations, there are two other operations first. There may also be an opportunity for the advisory group members to participate in the field portion and or interview, three weeks prior to the audit Michel will provide dates
Because of the date for the audit and to complete the data set, we need to re-set the WFP WIWAG meeting to April, the 22nd or 29th to allow enough time for the completion of the data set.

Action Item 1: JD will send a notice to WIWAG to determine the best date for WIWAG in April. Island Timberlands may want to have a meeting April 8th.

Action Item 2: JD will communicate with Michel to identify potential for advisory group members to participate in the field audit and or interview with auditors

Indicators 11, 16 and 19

JD: The indicators are a change from the ones reviewed last February and March (that are currently in the SFM Plan). These indicators have been changed to reflect the legal requirements by Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA).

Indicator 11 target was 10% variance now it is 0

Indicator 16 target was 2 or less cutblocks, now 0 and variance is 0.

Indicator 19 target was 0, and variance was plus, now 0 and 0

Indicators on water Quality Justin will speak to the **Action Item** regarding water quality indicators.

Tasked with potentially coming up with a new indicator after Neil suggested one, it was an indicator that Canfor had adopted. The original information was quite detailed and given that we only have one or two community watersheds I was trying to keep the cost lower and meet our objectives

One thing I talked about was that instead of doing an indicator on water quality we do one on watershed health. If you remember Glynnis Horrel's presentation her assessment could help with the health of the watershed.

(Justin's handout)

1. The number of watershed reducing in either 'watershed sensitivity' or watershed disturbance following watershed assessment evaluation. This table shows where our watersheds are in terms of sensitivity and disturbance. This is our report card. No watershed will be reduced in terms of disturbance. Its high level won't happen every year, rather every 3 years.
2. Water quality – Glynnis mentions possible events that will result in high turbidity. She suggested this because since there is quite close monitoring in the China Creek watershed, if there was any event we would be able to determine the threshold levels.
3. We have a number of inspections that happen regularly demonstrate compliance or non-compliance. What I was getting at was that in any of our community watersheds, the inspections would identify any problems. Michel is there better wording

Michel: there is the issue of having no control over others within the DFA

Justin; this might be too overzealous, there might be an alleged non-compliance; this would maybe just highlight how much concern is out there. It's another form of measuring our activities in the bush and how well we're doing.

The last one may be the best

4. The distinction is that within our own standards we have shutdown policies regarding community watersheds and preventing sedimentation. So this is where we would deem ourselves non-compliant.

Michel; that one is definitely in your own control

Stefan; there are a number of watersheds where watershed disturbance following watershed disturbance assessment is done. The target of 1 is not good; if we have 2 watersheds and your variance is 1, then you can have one out of two!

For the 2nd if you're not there during an event you're not necessarily documenting it.

Justin – you are right; Glynnis meant an identifiable event like a slide

Stefan – so that's a documented landslide, sediment levels are also very high during rain events. Are there only 2 watersheds?

Justin – no there are more, there are 4 watersheds.

Stefan – some of them are in treaty lands, how will these indicators apply? Or are they just taken out?

Erin – yes

Neil – What are other areas doing with regard to this?

Michel – everyone struggles with this, strategies are all available on the web

Justin - I'm thinking number 1 of the watershed and number 2 of the water quality, and if there aren't any suggested new ones, then move forward.

Neil- there used to be an indicator that talked about damaged watersheds or restored?

JD - Move to an action item. Review the indicator once Justin has completed. Then share with Neil and Stefan and get it back to the advisory group for final approval. We still have Indicator 24 in which damaged watersheds are restored. This indicator is the number of red and orange basin which uses the watershed matrix developed by Glynnis Horel

Frank – Are we talking only about drinking water what about fish bearing streams?

JD - we have indicators on fish bearing streams.

Action Item 3; Justin- Take the indicators that JK has begun and re-word with the help of Stefan and Neil, copy to Michel to make sure we are on the right target with the new standard. Then bring back to WIWAG for approval.

Bi-annual Satisfaction Survey based on Indicator 42

Action Item 4: WIWAG due in 2010 for satisfaction survey. The survey has advisory group rate the process on several topics. The survey will be formatted in a similar way to the 2008 survey, and will also consider surveys used by other CSA advisory groups. Survey will be available for WIWAG at the next ITLP meeting (February) so that it is completed in time for the annual audit.

TFL 44 Management Plan # 5 AAC Determination Process and Timber Supply Analysis (TSA), Mike Davis

New Management Plan (MP) regulation took effect November 2009

New MP eliminates duplication of a Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) although it is still evolving, TFL 44 will be one of the first in the province.

TFL AAC determination process seven steps:

1. WFP submits draft MP and TSA Information Package (IP) – June '09
 - a) IP summarizes data and assumptions for timber supply analysis
 - b) Agency / Public review
 - c) FN consultation / information-sharing
2. IP accepted – October '09
3. Timber Supply analysis (TSA)
 - a) "Base Case"
 - b) Sensitivity Analyses
 - c) 20 Year Plan
4. TSA review, consultation, information-sharing
5. TSA Accepted
6. Proposed MP submitted
7. AAC determined and MP approved

Presentation Material handed out – Posted to <http://www.westernforest.com/wiwag/minutes.htm>

A Management Plan is completed every five years this is the 5th one that will have been done.

Timber supply analysis – We met with the Tseshaht in September, 09 and they asked what the purpose of timber supply was. It is not a tool for changing practices. When the Forest Act was amended in November 2009 this allows AAC to be effective for up to 10 years, with some circumstances resulting in smaller terms.

The timber Supply Analysis is not synchronized with cut control. At the end of a time frame We must ensure we do not exceed 110% of our cumulative AAC.

Step 1: Process: WFP submitted a draft MP and TSA Information Package for public review. Sent to WIWAG last June 2009 – based on the information received the information package was accepted in October 2009.

Step 2: The information package was accepted in October 2009

Step 3: TSA.

Base case – model reflecting current practices and knowledge on the ground, areas we won't log and economics are the biggest concerns.

Sensitivity analysis – change assumptions and see the impact on timber supply. For example; what we think the volume in 2nd growth stands at certain ages will be, if we are out by 10% our cut is out by 10%. Testing our assumptions

20 year plan – mapping out cutblocks

Step 4: Now move to review of the TSA the next stage for public comment will be February 2009

Step 5: TSA submit for ministry approval

Step 6: Proposed MP submitted which includes any comments changes that arise from the public etc

Step 7: MP approved and AAC determined

Current AAC Allocation

In MP#4 – 86,000 of the initial was BC Timber Sales the rest was Weyerhaeuser. There were a few major changes resulting in a decreased AAC, private land was taken out in 2004 and turned over to Island Timberlands. A year ago, the community forest was taken out (see table in presentation)

MP #5 includes a contribution from the Ma-nulth Treaty Lands. There was a temporary AAC reduction for those areas, but it has expired, so we have the cut from this land but have no the access to this land.

20 years ago TFL 44 was **460,000 ha**. Between 1990 and 1999, parks were created taking about 40,000 ha away. Private lands came out in 2004, 73,000 ha. BCTS area is about 73,000 ha, not official yet, Maa-nulth 14,000 ha (which includes a culturally sensitive area for the Uchucklesaht First Nation which may become a park), 2,400 ha for the Huu-ay-aht First Nation 9,700 ha for the Huu-ay-aht other areas. Remove non-forested areas, roads, non-productive, inoperable, riparian management, old growth management areas, ungulate winter ranges, draft OGMA's, wildlife areas, legal areas, unstable terrain, uneconomic leaving etc leaves 139, 446 ha land base and further netdowns leaves **79, 591ha**.

Future land base changes There are more considerations that restrict the landbase:

FN Bill 28 – areas will be identified for the 3 FN's

Future treaties – those FN not part of Maa-nulth

Visual Quality Areas (VQAs), community watersheds, fisheries sensitive watersheds, steep terrain – Glynnis Horel assessment and strategies from that assessment, special management zones, cultural areas for FN, wildlife tree patches, recent economics.

It can be hard to find wood.

Out of that 79,000ha, is there any timber, or old growth? About ¼ of the landbase has old growth on it. All the land withdrawals, we lost a lot of older second growth, so our percentage of less than 20 years old has gone up which will impact timber supply.

Discussion around the presentation:

Stefan – what were the numbers for the bottom, means zero, less than 10 years?

Mike – Zero is not planted yet, they are in 20 year increments up to 8 when the age range changes. There wasn't a lot of logging 80 years ago, but we lost a lot in age group 3 and 4 due to reductions in the AAC.

Justin – there aren't a lot of age class 7 and 8 on the coast

Mike – there isn't a lot of disturbance resulting in turn over.

In the last analysis 35 years was the minimum age across the board. This time we did it with the idea that it takes longer to grow a tree on poorer sites, so we broke the forest into 4 areas with varying site quality, and assigned a minimum volume... An area has to meet both age and volume requirements to be harvested, this has changed the minimum age to 50 – 90years based on site quality.

Timber supply objectives

TFL 44 is declining, we need to manage the rate of decline, and typical level would be 5% decline every 5 years. Achieve stability by harvesting every year what is growing every year.

To reflect recent performance, helicopter logging done, we reviewed records, 6% was identified as requiring helicopter. Since there is more than that out there that requires 6%, we put a limit of 50,000 cubic meters per year. The initial run shows the next AAC could be around 800,000 cubic meters, not all of it Western, some would go to FN.

Refer to Presentation: Blue line is conventional; as cut comes down because volume is coming down we reach equilibrium. Red line is total trees in the forest, keeps conventional steady, but does not require heli to stay stable. Total harvestable volume, green line – is lower due to stands that are too young, there is a difference of about 12,000,000 between our total conventional and what is available.

Neil - Age class distribution where it is now, how much old growth will there be in 20 years?

MD – the analysis report will have that. I've shown that age class every 50 years. The results show that most of the old growth (OG) is harvested in the next 40 years.

Frank- how many trees left in the hundred year old range?

MD - not much but in 40 years, some trees will make it to one hundred years.

Frank - Are there any OG areas set aside?

MD– Yes – 60,000 ha that won't be touched.

Justin – There is just about the same in reserve as is in productive for Old Growth Management Areas (OGMA).

MD- we can talk numbers – 60,000 ha included non-forest, non-productive. If we talk good forest there is about 40,000 ha. That doesn't include parks, the 40,000 that was already taken out of the TFL 44. The old growth is dispersed over a large area, south-facing site, riparian, etc, we have requirements dictating that.

Judy – back to timber supply graph – I don't understand how the total harvest can go up while the green line, volume in the forest meeting harvest criteria is going down?

MD – the lower graph is the inventory of trees, not the harvest level. The red line is the total volume on the timber harvesting land base, and it's climbing because the model is constraining how much heli-logging can take place, so the volume available to heli-logging is increasing so the total volume is growing.

Justin – Since we're only talking a 5 year terms, in ten years if there's more heli-logging we can remove the cap on helicopter harvest.

MD – the sensitivity analysis is to remove the cap on the heli and it shows that the AAC could go up 40,000 cubic meters. In this scenario only 50,000 cubic meters would be allowed by heli.

The management plan will be out soon, and available for comment.

Presentation: Michel de Bellefeuille address new CSA Standard Z809-08 for Sustainable Forest Management CSA Z809-08

Michel: New CSA **standard that came out in December 2008**. When the new standard was published there was a summary put together by the CSA that summarizes in broad high-level terms the changes. The standard has been updated, last done in 2002. Remember this date, it was published December 2008, which is significant and I will cover later. The copies are free. It is organized like the 2002 standard, there were portions that were in boxes, now they've flipped it, with all the rules are in the beginning and the guidance etc is in the back in the appendix. All the key definitions, what is a value, indicator etc remain unchanged. As you recall, the standard gives us a **set of 6 criteria** and for each of these there are 1, 2, 4 sub-elements.

- The big things are the **Mandatory Discussion Topics** For each criterion the standard imposes mandatory discussion topics for the advisory group. It makes sure that the topics are covered, and the **Mandatory Core Indicators** which try to bring a more consistent set of indicators throughout the country.
- There are notably stronger First Nation indicators.

New Standard Presentation posted to the website: <http://www.westernforest.com/wiwag/minutes.htm>
Letters at bottom indicate have much effort he believes will be required to meet them.

Sec 4.2

Sec 5.2 – There is a list of interested people, but there are people not interested and we now need to track why they're not interested

Sec 5.3 (a) could devise a standard corporate survey

Sec 5.4 JD – this is something that this group has been doing as well: Michel – yes

Sec 6.1 Brings in the criterion and elements that you are charged with developing values, indicators etc. Have to change the procedure of providing evidence in the minutes only, must summarize in the SFMP.

Erin - Michel's example for justification could be something as simple as a legal requirement
Michel – yes, or it could be a stakeholder knowledge, or that's all we can afford, there are a number of indicators that could be used

JD – we have a list of legal requirement so we would just put in our justification

Michel- I remember discussion in this group about donation levels, which vary on economics, so can use affordability, model forecast. It should align with your objective.

6.3. The minutes will probably suffice for the discussion to indicate which topics were covered, i.e. presentation etc. The new SFMP will need to contain the new **35 core indicators**.

6.3.1. – There are no issues there, we don't use genetically modified organisms, the FSC standard has a clause that is similar.

6.3.2 – Normally for us, 6 years is the max, but regularly 2 years. For the plan.

6.3.5 – No issues on the first 5.1, but 5.2 could be issues because of the core indicator. We need to be sensitive, there a things we can do and can't do in terms of tracking minority.

Neil – indirect employment it seems we're always harping on it, but we've never been able to get it as an indicator and measure it.

Michel – we need to find a means of measuring and determining whether we can do it ethically.

6.3.6 – The 6.4 element – we need to find a way of demonstrating public awareness of the process and its progress. I don't know how we'll do this. There are ways, holding

open houses, presentations – how to show an auditor, maybe track how many people attended these events.

7.2 – Stefan (d) is (e) in the standard.

7.3.2 – I see this as helpful, now we don't have to chase every guy out there when they don't have any influence.

7.3.3 – This one is all about clarification, should be no work for us to do on this

7.4.3 – It brings about a standard kind of content for a certifier/auditors report

Stefan – Does an audit get picked up by the media when it's a good audit or just the bad?

Michel – The auditor does have a little section to mention what they found was good

7.5.1 – It's a validation process that we need to come up with; I think I will be a key part of that. We've already heard "we'll have to pass that by Michel";

Discussion Items and Core Indicators

I won't read every one; I'll talk about the table and what it shows. The standard says, when you talk about biological diversity, you should be covering in your group these discussion items. A lot of this you've done over the years and it should be reflected in your minutes already, but some of them you might have missed. I have told Jennifer and Erin that you can go through your minutes and identify what you have covered off this list. And create a reference document for an auditor indicating what and when you covered these items. The process will also identify what you have missed; you can use this list to create future speaker topics.

Under biological diversity element – ecosystem diversity gives us **4 core indicators**. Some of these probably sound familiar. Where you see **green**, these won't take up much time on your part; they are close to what you already have, low effort. **Yellow**, moderate effort, more compilation, new way to look at things like the degree of suitable habitat it in the long-term, **Red** is totally new, nothing like that in the pipeline.

- **Net carbon uptake** – carbon regime, you can't do that here, you'll probably have to do that in Campbell River. The standard gives you an indicator, but what is an indicator? Start with a value, something dear to you. Move to an objective – where you want to see your value in the future. Pick an indicator to measure our progress towards our objective/target. So I give you the # of lakes – where does it fit in your hierarchy, no objectives to move towards.
- The ones that are new to you, you will have to develop values and objectives.
- If you look at the indicator column you'll see some of them are bolded, the significance is that WFP is one of the major licensees in Canada that are CSA certified, there are a group of companies that have this certification. When the new standards came out there was a discussion about creating short documents to outline some of the new discussion items to use as a resource and/or stimulate discussion. The bolded ones are those that have an issue paper done.

In the core indicator some are **blue**, not black, these are to identify that the core indicators that relate to the FN.

- **Criterion 4** – there are 2 indicators that are repeats, black-bold. This says that an indicator can measure two different things – the standard breaks the rule of one indicator for one measurement.
- Under **biological diversity criterion** – the 3rd element genetic diversity, they provided no help; there is no core indicator for that element.

WFP strategy – one of the things we did through 2009 was a review of our certification at western – what makes sense, do we continue pursuing this, economics. I came up with recommendation – we looked at all alternatives from dropping everything to going FSC everywhere. At the end it was decided that we'll stay the course. Currently WFP has FSC certification as part of a group certification called CFCI – includes Canfor pulp, Interfor, Catalyst, BCTS and WFP. For CSA we'll keep what we have, we may expand this outward to Gold River, but at the moment we have a lot of certified wood already.

Z809/08 – December 2008 – the significance is that in the transition to the new rules any certification will die on December 2011, so for us CSA was registered this spring and those registrations are usually good for 3 years, so that would take us to spring 2012. But it will cut out December 2011. Here, Stillwater, mid-island – all have December 2011 as an expiry date. North Vancouver Island – just went through its 2nd surveillance audit – so next fall it will have to re-register. One of the ways we looked at saving money was the chain of custody. We had 4 registered Chain of Custody (COC). Last year we succeeded in moving to 1 registered. Every year those 4 COC needed to be audited, but now that we have one for all, only 2 out of 4 areas will be picked up for surveillance audit. The goal is to that all 5 CSA certification into one as well. The goal is one certificate. But that will not mean 1 plan that fits everybody and identical indicators. I was told that right now what we have works. Most of the systems are common throughout the timberlands. We can keep most of the processes the same independently. The only thing left is timing; 3 different dates of expiry. North Vancouver Island – end of this year – will be our guinea pig, they will get the new registration to the new standard in the fall of 2010, and everyone else is on their current standard. Early 2011 there will be a big audit to look at all the operations to bring everyone under one certification. 2010 is where all the leg work will need to happen. All the other 4 must be ready, because during the last 5-6 months internal audits will need to be done to the new standard.

If you think of external audit processes, QMI currently does 5 surveillance audits throughout the company every year. The three year cycle will go from 15 external audits to 7 audits throughout the company.

Erin – Michel and Jennifer and I will bring more clarity around timeline, action items and create a schedule and means of getting there to take away any anxiety.

Michel- it's a big coordination effort

Jennifer – it will be helpful to share some of the processes with other advisory groups

Barb - We will be working on this 09-11 plan?

Michel – we will be updating it

Announcements

Dave Chitty: Dave Clough consulting biologist has won a 2010 Canadian Recreational Fisheries Award, a lot of people around the area wrote in support. It's an honour; we really admire him for what he does here and on the west coast. Clough receives national honour for work and will travel to Ottawa in the spring to receive the national award. Dave mentioned that the nomination came through the Pacific Salmon Foundation. They asked for letters of support from all the enhancement organizations around the Island, Dave Clough works with enhancement groups all over the central Island, from the west coast through the Alberni Valley, and on the east coast from Fanny Bay to Ladysmith. Dave Chitty stressed that Dave Clough has been the quarterback, very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. One of Clough's biggest achievements has been in building partnerships.

Next Meeting(s) at ACRD

Island Timberlands – February 11th, 2010 at the Regional District

WFP – April 22, 2010.

Meeting adjourned at – 8:30pm

#	ACTION ITEM AND PROGRESS	Date of request	Recommend Completion	Completion Date	Person Responsible
1.	JD will send a notice to WIWAG to determine the best date for WIWAG in April. Island Timberlands may want to have a meeting April 8 th .	January 14, 2010	February 2010	Feb 11,2010	Justin K.
2.	JD will communicate with Michel to identify potential for advisory group members to participate in the field audit and or interview with auditors	January 14, 2010	May 1, 2010	Communication Feb 11 at ITLP Email March 3 WFP April 22	JD
3.	Take the indicators that Justin has begun and re-word with the help of Stefan and Neil, copy to Michel to make sure we are on the right target with the new standard. Then bring back to WIWAG for approval.	January 14, 2010	March 2010	Completed April 22/10 Justin will present in June 2010	Justin, Neil, Stefan
4.	WIWAG due in 2010 for satisfaction survey. The survey has advisory group rate the process on several topics. The survey will be formatted in a similar way to the 2008 survey, and will also consider surveys used by other CSA advisory groups. Survey will be available for WIWAG at the next ITLP meeting (February) so that it is completed in time for the annual audit.	January 14, 2010	February 2010	Feb 11, 2010	JD

Western Forest Products – WIWAG Action Items

All Completed Action Items see file: [Actions completed\WFP actions completed.doc](#)