

**West Island Woodlands Community Advisory Group
July 05, 2000
Regional District Office**

Present:*Advisory Group Members:*

✓	Carlson, Harold	Forest recreation	✓	McKay, Pat	Independent sawmills
	Carter, Mike	Tourism	✓	McKay, Jack	Logging contractors
	Cootes Jr., Charlie	Uchucklesaht	✓	Powell, Dan	Provincial government
✓	Edgell, Phil	Watershed Committee	✓	Parker, Eileen	Small business
	Flynn, Shawn	Small woodlots		Randles, Bill	Labour
✓	Johnsen, Gary	Toquaht	✓	Swann, Gary	Regional government
	Johnson, Larry	Huu-ah-aht	✓	Sager, Maureen	Environment
	Laviolette, Brian	Education/Youth	✓	Touchie, Maureen	Ucluelet
✓	Lem, Tawney	Hupacasath	✓	Trumper, Gillian	City government
	Levis, Jim	Bamfield	✓	Watts, David	Tseshaht
✓	McIntosh, John	Parks Canada			

Resource/Other:

Steve Chambers - Weyerhaeuser

Neil Malbon - Weyerhaeuser

Michelle Colussi - Facilitator

Dennis Fitzgerald - Weyerhaeuser

Wayne French, Weyerhaeuser, First Nations
liaison for Franklin

Diane Morrison - recorder

1. Review Agenda

Those on the distribution list for minutes will get a copy of the draft SFM Plan with a memo asking for feedback. This point will be discussed further in the meeting.

2. Concerns

Hupacasath - process issue. Pleased with the way Values & Goals were generated. Truly reflective of things group wanted to see. It was not clear earlier that Weyerhaeuser would bring forward the Indicators & Objectives. Do people at table have enough expertise to look at these? Independent experts could have been brought in to assist. There was a certain flow of thought from Goals & Values. If group had been able to develop Indicators & Objectives, it would have come up with different things. These Indicators and Objectives are not quite where the group was going. Recognize that the Indicators and Objectives have to be realistic and workable but there may have been some other things the group would have liked to have seen. We made decision not to look at the document Weyerhaeuser North Island developed. Group has its own thoughts and interests and that was a good decision. That independent process stopped after Goals & Values and the rest of the process seems fragmented. Some Indicators don't feel relevant to the Goals. Indicators & Objectives are the heart of the document. If they don't meet our expectations, where we want to see this go, I have some concerns.

Indicators & Objectives quite general and in some cases vague. Some meat has to be there. Need to know specifically that certain things are going to be delivered. Those not referred to in Indicators and Objectives.

Watershed Committee - similar comments. Comfortable with the way developed Values & Goals but disappointed with some Indicators & Objectives. Some missed the mark. Lack of expertise on some topics. Don't have proper understanding to comment on them. Thought Indicators and Objectives going to hit a higher level. What in draft is similar to Forest Practices Code or less than Code. Want expertise to comment on some objectives. Feel did not move us towards the goals.

Environment - agree. Lack of public consultation and input. Information was to be posted on web site. People had opportunity to come and follow developments but only through word of mouth. No other advertising about meetings other than news release. Very short time left for consultation with sector groups and experts on whether Indicators are suitable for Goals.

Also wanted to comment on use of term Variable Retention. (This comment was discussed with the Facilitator after the meeting & suggestions passed on to Weyerhaeuser staff.)

Hupacasath - once the draft becomes part of SFM Plan it will be very difficult to make the needed changes. Need opportunity for input and expertise while in draft form.

Tseshah - agree good to bring in experts. WIWAG not knowledgeable enough to understand what everything means. With increase to weekly meetings, process got overwhelming and it left no time to consult with sector.

Parks Canada - Group has accomplished a great deal. Always room for improvement. I don't think Weyerhaeuser has in mind that this document is the be all and end all.

Outdoor Recreation - Don't think the Indicators & Objectives have identified how to achieve the Goals. The basis of the AAC question, LRSY - no indication as to what it is. Want to know progress or pathway so we can be assured we have sustainable forestry. There needs to be some measure so we know we are moving in the direction of SFM.

Weyerhaeuser 1 - concerns all very good. The group has a lot of ground and has collectively learned a lot. The process not perfect. We have identified opportunity for improvement. Please identify where Indicators have missed goal so they can be corrected. Process ongoing although building up to audit process. Agree need to bring in outside speakers. Sense of good and weak indicators will grow as document is used and data is collected. Not static or permanent or fixed. North Island re-assessed indicators and expect this group will also. Don't forget this group is advisory and Weyerhaeuser has responsibility for management. Caution that Values & Goals are public domain. Indicators & Objectives get down to technical management which is the role of Weyerhaeuser although everyone is interested in a good alignment. Speakers good idea. There is more time for process. Can go forward with certification process and continue to deal with concerns.

Notion of Code - Weyerhaeuser is obligated to live up to the letter of the law. Code is not weak compared to other provinces or countries. Costs of implementing Code pushed forward to future generations. Currently we are not bearing the full cost in terms of jobs, cut, community stability, competitiveness, etc. Could be discussed by this group in the future. Hope this group can support the SFM Plan and continue to make improvements in the future.

Round Table comments from all advisory group members:

Weyerhaeuser 2 - writing the document and the audit are not very significant in terms of the way this group functions. This is very much a living, continually changing document. Audit will look at a work in progress. North Island Timberlands had 21 indicators in the first version of the SFM document and increased that to 43 indicators in the first annual review, much based on what had been learned. We want a good platform but the document is a snapshot. Don't make too big a deal or feel too much on the line. It will be continually evolving.

Regional Government - have to be closer together than where we are today if we want a credible certification. The process was fragmented, not holistic. SFM really revolves around level of harvest. We have to reduce the level of harvest and do more with what is cut. I don't think it is right to harvest 15 % above LRSY. There has been no time to discuss managing forest resources sustainably. Plaudits for the number of people at the table and the views that got out on the table. I support getting material out in a public way.

Small Business 1 - It was a different process developing the Values & Goals and developing the Objectives & Indicators. We would never have got it done if it was done in the same way. We have expertise at the table if the questions had been asked. Forest Practices Code is one of highest levels of forest management in the world. No apologies needed. What we have done so far is no waste of time.

Weyerhaeuser 3 - web site never got done. I will make a point of committing the time and getting that done.

Toquaht - comfortable with process. I have 35 years experience with forest development on coast. I don't expect public advisory group to be educated in all aspects. There are experts that can be consulted. It is important that each individual communicate their concerns and then let experts meet the requirements. Ongoing WIWAG to see in six months what effect we have had.

Ucluelet First Nations - Have learned a lot. Know more now when looking at forest development plans.

Community - unfortunate concerns not raised before. Never going to get all concerns raised or get a document everyone can agree with. Expertise available if we do go off the rails. Hate to see a lengthy process drag on to the point that we all get too frustrated – we need to get on with implementation and go from there. Recognize diversity of views around table. Big step to develop this plan. Agree should have been more public involvement. Many relying on WIWAG to put plan together for them. Let's get on with it.

Small Business 2 - excellent process with such diversity around the table. We are just an advisory group. We cannot re-write rules and regulations. Have to see how things change, how indicators work and meet goals.

Weyerhaeuser 4 - take small steps. Dynamic document.

Business - learned a lot and enjoyed every minute. The group decided at a previous meeting that meetings were open to public, visitors were welcome and advisors could invite people. Public has not been left out.

Ministry of Forests - some indicators and objectives very general. Example Indicator 19 (area of operationally-induced windthrow). Objective states it will be less than 5% of harvest area. We need background material to know what less than 5% means, something to compare the 5% figure too. Indicator 31 (area of regeneration failures at first year survival survey). Objective is less than 5%. How does 5% compare to past 10 years re-generation performance? What if past performance is less than 2%? More background needed on Indicators and Objectives to help people rank performance, evaluate certain issues and put it into context.

Facilitator feedback - a little more than half the room seems to be comfortable with the process and are willing to continue with changes to plan. There are suggestions that clearly defined words are needed so there can be agreement about certain terms and need for explanation for certain indicators. Weyerhaeuser indicated that kind of information is part of the larger SFM plan. Concerns around some of the Indicators and Objectives being too general, language needing more definition can be addressed. The document needs to be posted on the web site and feedback is needed. You all have a role to play in getting the draft out to others for that feedback and asking for specific input on areas that are of concern to you still.

Hupacasath - did not want comments to be taken to indicate that we don't appreciate what has been accomplished in this plan. Recognize it is a living document and the group will make improvements. Still feel uncomfortable that this document would go forward into SFM Plan at this point. Don't want to read too much into it. Did talk about expertise to assist with review, some comment as to whether I&O are appropriate for the V&G. Uncomfortable going forward without that review. Difficult in one meeting to review. Want chance to discuss this document with experts and want to see explanatory background mentioned by Weyerhaeuser.

Dennis clarified that the Values and Goals document would go into the plan verbatim with supplementary and background information added to it.

Question from small business 1- Can't we add hard numbers to the indicators? We have to have science in place before decide AAC. The worst thing that could happen would be to have numbers based on hysteria. It needs to be based on science that can be substantiated.

Small business 2 – This is an open enough process that we can go back and re-write the document.

Weyerhaeuser - core of document is basically what the group has worked on expanded with supplementary text explaining programs, activities, appendix, data sets, etc. Each Indicator will be on a separate page with explanation of what Indicator means, how data was collected/updated, tables showing historical trends, etc.

It was established that the Advisory Group will be able to have the entire draft SFM Plan two weeks prior to the final review meeting in order to get feedback from Sector groups and any experts they may wish. In addition, the revised table from this meeting will go out to everyone and that can be shared as well if you wish.

Steve went over a few changes to the document.

1. Third Objective on first page should read "Meet draft Biodiversity Emphasis Options..." not Objectives.

2. Third Indicator on first page (no number on July 1 draft) reworded to "Percentage of forests (>250 years) by Landscape Unit."
3. Indicator 20 - remove "and avalanches". Avalanches are not significant issue because don't get a lot of them. To have both in same Indicator confuses issue. Slides is the Indicator we want to focus on. Agree to remove words. Weyerhaeuser agreed to make avalanche numbers available.
4. Suggestion to eliminate Indicator 31 because it is part of Indicator 41. Group wanted to have regeneration included here because it impacts annual harvest. Indicator 31 to be kept.

3. Review of specific parts of SFM Draft Plan:

(Michelle asked that comments focus on what needs to be added/changed/taken away or what people would like to see reflected that is not there.)

Value 1, first goal and objective - variety & patterns of ecosystem types at landscape level:

Discussion - maintaining representative ecosystem is one of most important roles of the document. Age class does not reflect goal. No specific recommendations because thought that experts would be helpful.

What data collection are we referring to?

Weyerhaeuser - don't know what the data set will look like or what meaningful Objective will look like. Age classes will be in 10 year increments. Data will look at each age class within each bio-geo-climatic zones on Vancouver Island (8 or 9 zones). Age class good indicator for variable ecosystems because functionality already indicated by age.

Dennis - variable retention (VR) means harvest patterns more complicated and diversity harder to measure.

Comment that science has to be in place before group can make hard and fast decisions that really reflect goals on these things.

ADD - Collect more specific information from Silviculture Prescriptions (SP).

Value 2, goal and objectives - connectivity and fragmentation

Discussion - Unsure of how logging between creeks, leaving buffer in riparian zone, aids connectivity across landscape. Variable retention is improvement in maintaining biodiversity but concerned about how animals get across harvested area. Not sure Indicators 6 & 5 achieve connectivity.

Does Indicator 6 give connectivity? Objective seems to understate what happening.

Weyerhaeuser - company does not have good inventory of smaller streams (S-3, S-4, etc.). Salmon probably most at risk of species. Indicator 6 speaks to interior habitat.

New indicator needed that focuses on species mobility between harvested patches to make sure connectivity is being maintained.

ADD - request for research to Indicator 6.

ADD - "S-3 and S-4 where information exists." To Objective for Indicator 5.

Comment that buffer zones around S-1 and S-2 streams will not increase 1% yearly but percentage will jump as forest ages. Objective should include that the ultimate target will be 100 per cent of S-1 and S-2 stream length.

Weyerhaeuser - likely revisit Objective as collect data.

Value 8 (Human induced disturbance and stress), Indicator 18 and Objective:

Discussion - when talking about sustainability, the heart of that is the harvest rate and the AAC. That is not reflected in the Objective. Suggested a base line be established before further cutting takes place.

Weyerhaeuser - Critical Element 2.1 refers to loss of productivity due to stress. Indicator 18 is meant to reflect impact in terms of loss of productive forest land.

What percentage of the defined forest area (DFA) is productive forest and what percentage of the DFA is harvested annually.

Weyerhaeuser - in this TFL the percentage is very high.

ADD - to Indicator 18 "...productive forest area and DFA."

Value 10 - Ecosystem recovery from disturbance and stress

ADD Indicator 1 to the list.

Values 18 - Stream water quality

19 - Riparian areas (fresh and marine)

*20 - Forest hydrologic regimes (including water quality)
and Objectives*

Discussion - Referring to riparian setbacks on S-4 streams, where are the benchmarks referred to in Objectives?

Weyerhaeuser 1 - There are no benchmarks. The company has never measured water quality.

Weyerhaeuser 2 - recent workshop of technical and scientific people to critique Weyerhaeuser stream management practices, primary concerns on S-5 and S-6 streams. Critique good around larger streams. Primary concern is temperature and secondary concern was litter (debris).

Weyerhaeuser 1 - bulk of streams on the west side of Vancouver Island where temperature does not get warm enough for concern.

Comment - can't fool around with raising temperature. Even a few degrees can be critical.

Weyerhaeuser - reminder that Indicator 5 has added "S-3 and S-4 where information exists."

Comment - Don't know if CWAPS (Objective for Indicator 39) are effective. Waterways are very dynamic and major changes can occur in any given year.

Weyerhaeuser - ADD indicator regarding annual increase of buffer zones for S-5 and S-6 streams.

Note - related to earlier added indicator regarding research.

FLAG - Is there a better indicator for this Goal? Flag for WIWAG to re-visit later.

Critical Elements 6.2 (Aboriginal and Treaty Rights) and 6.3 (Social and unique needs of Aboriginal peoples) -

Interested people stayed after regular meeting to discuss changes/additions pertaining to First Nations issues in 6.2 and 6.3.

NEXT MEETING

To be scheduled two weeks after the entire draft SFM Plan has been distributed.

Location: Paradise Restaurant. Facilitator Mark Hanley.

