Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management

Public Advisory Group

PAG Meeting

March 10, 2008 [5:30 PM – 9:00 PM]
Seniors Centre, Fort St. James

Meeting Summary

Attendance:

Public Advisory Group:*	*Steering Committee & Advisors:*
Beulah Broen Larry Erickson Ross Hamilton Brian Muloin Randy Sulyma Joe Vogl Sr.	Bruce Bradley – Canfor PG Dwayne Eastman - BCTS Jeremy Greenfield – BCTS Bryan Jakubec – Canfor Houston Tyson von den Steinen – Canfor PG Alena Terry – Carrier Lumber
Facilitator & Scribe: Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) – Facilitator Loni Spletzer - Scribe	*Observers:* Patience Rakochy - Timberline

Quorum based on past five meetings: 4

1. **Welcome & Introduction**
    1. Members signed in
    2. Welcome by the Chair of the Licensee Steering Committee [Alena Terry]
    3. Introductions
        a. Patience Rakochy from Timberline was introduced as the guest speaker for the evening.
    4. Reviewed evaluation results of February 4th 2008 PAG meeting.
        a. Comments regarding improving meals/refreshments and Minutes of the meeting need more detail
2. Confirmed agenda
3. Minutes of the February 4th 2008 PAG meeting accepted as written.
4. **PRESENTATION #1 - Patience Rakochy (Timberline)**

<u>Course Woody Debris Investigations Conducted Within the PG Timber Supply Area</u>

1. PAG member opened with a comment that the amount of Course Woody Debris (CWD) after logging is not a true indication of what would happen after a fire. The point was that there may often be significantly less CWD after logging than after a fire.

Background:

2. See handout.

3. The purpose of the study conducted in the PG Timber Supply Area was to collect baseline data on undisturbed forests and attempt to capture information on the quality and quantity of CWD in sample regions. The study area and methodology for this project were defined.

4. A definition of CWD was provided. PAG asked for clarification between coarse woody debris vs fine woody debris and discussed the origin of CWD categories "fine vs coarse". There was some discussion around the 7.5 cm diameter measurement and its impact in animal habitat and shelter. PAG member also recommended watching an insightful film made by Vanderhoof trappers about what is necessary to support animal habitat.

5. The importance of CWD with regards to survival of plant/animal species, cycling of nutrients, slope & stream stability, and its role in ecosystem structure & biological diversity was also reviewed.

6. The project started with a scientific literature review on information published re: CWD management, abundance and distribution in other countries and the factors which influence these points (ex. climate, soil, forest type and age classes). From this information, factors influencing current CWD Management Practices were identified and compared against Lloyd 2005 study and recommendations on CWD Best Management Practices.

Summary:

7. CWD is an important indicator of the biodiversity and health of a region hence its inclusion in CSA Standards and CCFM

8. CWD is highly variable across the land base therefore "a single metric isn't useful" (see Table 12)

9. The quantity and quality of CWD is also highly variable as far as height, age, stand type, rotting vs intact, etc.,

10. There is the need to set clear management objectives and then attempt to apply Best Management Practices.

PRESENTATION #2 - Patience Rakochy (Timberline)

Indicators of Stand Level Retention Quality in the Moist Interior Natural Disturbance Units of the PG Timber Supply Area

Background:

11. See handout.

12. The purpose of this study was to develop a set of indicators and thresholds of Stand Level Retention quality in the PG Timber Supply Area that is heavily impacted by increased harvesting due to the mountain pine beetle epidemic.

13. Quality Stand Level Retention was defined.

14. From the literature review, a number of key attributes of quality stand retention were identified including the presence of snags, CWD, live tree/shrub diversity, windfirmness, area retained and

patch size, proximity to existing retention or reserves, and proximity to roads. Each of these attributes were described in more detail.

15. A pilot test was conducted which had a GIS component and Field Sampling. With regards to current management strategies/trends, the GIS analysis results showed amount and size of retention is lacking, but location and composition was adequate. The results of field testing indicated that many indicator targets were not met due to beetle killed trees, young age class and blow down.

16. Canfor licensees directed PAG attention to Jeff Burrows' FREPA presentation at last PG PAG meeting. It showed that in many areas, stand level retention was being over achieved, but it was contingent on landscape data vs cut block samples. Since there was some confusion over the data results, PAG members would like future comparison between today's presentations showing GIS/Field data vs Randy Sulyma's continuing work in the field to verify.

Summary:

17. The results collected from the GIS component and the Field Testing were compiled and compared to Best Management Practices.

18. A number of recommendations were suggested including creating targets that are specific to beetle kill stands, developing local indicators and targets, and continuing to fill in knowledge gaps around pine snag suitability, snag density, live tree size, etc.

5. Indicator #23 – CWD

1. See handout.

2. PAG requested clarification on text in the Indicator details "*CWD volume targets do not necessarily have to be met on every cutblock*". Licensees explained that anomalies have to be accounted for. Licensees are reporting out by stand type rather than cutblocks. This type of data collection will be more detailed and less likely to be skewed (attempting to localize targets a bit more). There was discussion around how the natural range of variability in CWD is assessed and reported on (the difference between using actual plot data and upper/lower confidence limits/standard deviation). The licensees will amend Table 1 to reflect this.

3. PAG discussed the rationale of conducting post-harvest assessments to better reflect pre-harvest CWD. The point was to ensure that the amount of post-harvest CWD remain balanced with what was there before the area was logged. There was some discussion on the feasibility of augmenting this indicator in the SFM Plan to add clarity at a future date.

4. Licensees would like to change the sampling intensity to 1 CWD plot for every 20 ha of harvest area, to a maximum of 5 plots per block. This is due to the fact that the original sampling intensity was too high. Licensees feel that the results of the surveys, at this lower intensity, will meet the target ranges identified in Table #1.

5. Consensus of PAG members on Indicator 23 to change the sampling intensity to 1 CWD plot for every 20 ha of harvest area, to a maximum of 5 plots per block.

6. Indicator #38 - Cut Level Volumes

1. See handout.

2. Steering Committee recommends the following: Add the following text to the indicator statement "*percent of licensee AAC harvested over a 5 year cut control period. Percent of BCTS Volume Offered over fiscal year*". No change to target, but a change in reporting annually instead of every 5 years.

3. Consensus of PAG members on Indicator 38 Indicator Statement

a. **Add** "*percent of licensee AAC harvested over a 5 year cut control period. Percent of BCTS Volume Offered over fiscal year*" to Indicator statement.

7. Continual Improvement Matrix

1. Tabled until next meeting

8. Others:

1. Proposed Revisions to CSA Standard

a. PAG directed to pick up a copy of Proposed Revisions to CSA Standard. PAG members requested to review and invited to give feedback to CSA directly (website given on handout). NOTE: These revisions are not yet approved, it is in the public process.

2. Apollo & BCTS revised DFA's - tabled until next meeting

9. Update Actions:

1. Action List was reviewed and updated:

a. Action Item Nov 5 – 01: Descriptions and background on Coarse Filter Ecosystem Groups to be provided next fiscal.

b. Action Item Feb 4 – 01: Revised Indicator #59 text was distributed to PAG members.

c. Action Item Feb 4 – 02: Revised Indicator #59 text was distributed to PAG members

d. Action Item Feb 4 – 03: Reports distributed to PAG members

10. PAG Meeting Feedback (PAG questionnaire): Fort St. James SFMP PAG meeting evaluation distributed, completed, and collected.

11. Next meeting

1. Agenda:
    a. Review and Update of Continual Improvement Matrix
2. Time: 5:30 PM – 9:00 PM
3. Date: June 16, 2008
4. Place: Seniors Centre (Fort St. James).

12. Actions

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Jan 27 - 04	Provide one page update on licensee FIA funded projects. Licensees to maintain and update.	Licensee Team	Next meeting	Completed & ongoing
Mar 26 - 02	Draft suggestions for CI Matrix Strategies and Completion dates for consideration by the PAG	Licensee Team	Next Meeting	
Nov 5 - 01	Provide descriptions of Coarse Filter Ecosystem Groups and background on how these Ecosystems are formed.	Licensee Team	September 2008	
Nov 5 - 02	Confirm distribution of final version of 2006 Indicator Monitoring Report	Licensee Team	Next meeting	Completed
Nov 5 - 03	Plan a Field Trip for fall 2008 (Dwayne Eastman & Bob Frederick	Licensee Team	September 2008	
Feb 4 – 01	Indicator 59: Licensees to elaborate on the definition of “referred” in the supporting text for the indicator to address concerns about identification of FN values and uses.	Licensee Team	Next Meeting	Completed
Feb 4 - 02	Indicator 59: Licensees to reword “Forecasting & Predicted Trends” and consider only keeping first two sentences. Also, consider removing “however” from second sentence.	Licensee Team	Next Meeting	Completed
Feb 4 - 03	Licensees to provide Year 1 results for the “Wildlife habitat Inventory/modeling Supply Block C” project	Licensee Team	Next Meeting	Completed