

# Southwest Island Public Advisory Group (SIPAG)

## Meeting #26 Minutes

### 1. Call to order

Kirstin Campbell from the Teal Jones Environment Department, welcomed members of the Southwest Island Public Advisory Group at the Shaker Mill Restaurant in Lake Cowichan on the 24<sup>th</sup> of November at 4:30.

### 2. Members

Present:

- Vince Callander, Local Business
- Pat Weaver, CL Community Forest Co-op
- Tom Jones, Pacheedaht First Nations
- Dennis Martel, Wilderness Watch Committee
- Rob Brouwer, DFO

Support:

- Mark Carter, TJG Operations Planner
- Kirstin Campbell, Environment Department

Regrets:

- Jack Smith, Lake Cowichan First Nation
- George Williams, Ditidaht Band
- Tim McGonigle, TFL 46 Worker
- Larry George, Cowichan Tribes
- Shawn Wolansky, TerraTree Forestry
- Jayne Ingram, Lake Cowichan Town Council
- Jim Humphrey, Chamber of Commerce
- Sandy Peters, Valley Fish and Game Club

### 3. Documents

Documents distributed to members:

1. SIPAG Meeting #26 Agenda
2. Draft Meeting Minutes for August 25, 2010
3. Changes to Provincial Funding of Projects within the DFA
4. Summary of Indicators for SFMP Indicators as of November 24, 2010
5. Handouts for the presentation

Documents available:

1. SFM Plan
2. CSA Sustainable Forest Management Standards Z809-02 and Z809-08
3. Terms of Reference

#### **4. Introductions: New Members/Guests**

No new members were present. Kirstin welcomed everyone and told everyone that the meeting was being recorded. She also told everyone that Chris had a healthy baby boy at the end of September and that mom and baby were doing well.

Kirstin pointed out the updated Contact List and asked for everyone to check that it was current.

#### **5. Previous meeting minutes, August 25, 2010**

Kirstin referred to the draft meetings minutes for the August 25, 2010 meeting. It was noted that the meeting minutes were previously distributed via email, therefore the review during meeting time would be kept brief.

Tom said he would like to clarify with Mark a point brought up in the previous meeting regarding Coastal Watershed Assessments. He said that the Pacheedaht would like to review CWAPs as they are being redone. Mark reminded everyone that CWAPs are completed in fisheries sensitive watersheds. In TFL 46 there are three of these watersheds: Hatton, Gordon, and Harris/Hemmingsen. These are reviewed externally and with the PAGs. Mark agreed that the Pacheedaht could review the CWAPs when they are in the external review stage.

Vince asked why Teal did not meet the CWD Indicator in 2009 (Indicator H4-5: Coarse Woody Debris). Kirstin said it was because the CWD Program has been delayed until 2012 and that the status of this program was reported in 2009.

Action Item #26-1: Post meeting minutes on the internet
---

Environment Department, January 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2011
---

#### **6. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #26**

There were no additions to the agenda.

## 7. Current Events – External Audit Results, and Changes to Provincial Funding

Kirstin summarized the results of the external audit, and changes to Provincial Funding of forestry-related projects.

### External Audit Results

The External Audit took place Sept. 14-16, 2010 in the Fraser Valley. The Auditors spent two days in the office and one in the field. The field tour took place in both the Pitt River and Hope operating areas. During the course of the audit the auditors interviewed 2 PAG members, Randall Dayton from the FPAG, and Jayne Ingram from the SIPAG. They also talked with Clive Baudin, Ministry of Forests, Cobble Hill. The Pacheedaht Band in Port Renfrew responded to the auditors' letters asking for input from First Nations Group with a letter to the auditors.

There were no non-conformances and no non-compliances from the audit. There was 1 area of concern, and 5 opportunities for improvement.

Kirstin read results from the External Audit Report:

#### Positive Aspects of the Management System

- Continued strong efforts in the PAG process with good FN participation.
- A diverse PAG in both the South Island and Fraser Valley areas.
- Harvesting contractors (Southview) update of the prework form to include new operators as they enter the harvest area and their documented inspections of their operations.
- Teal Jones received an excellent letter from the Chilliwack District Manager due to favourable comments he received from the Fraser Valley Regional District about Teal Jones certification efforts.

#### Area of Concern

- The audit found that 3 - S6 streams (presently dry) had logs decked in them contrary to the Yarding and Loading SOP which states to protect the stream channels and banks and maintain natural drainage patterns. Ensure the plans address the placement of logs during harvest to protect the riparian resources.
  - Kirstin said this was not an environmental concern, the streams were dry and not fish bearing
  - On the block there were several streams which made it difficult to find alternative decking locations
  - Teal will be amending the SOP to state that logs can be temporarily decked in dry S6 streams when necessary
    - Tom expressed concern over this change in the SOP
    - He said that the concern is that the logs might stay in the streams longer than intended if the area is shut down for any period of time

- He also said that the SOP should provide as much detail as to when this might be acceptable so it is clear it should not happen all the time
- Mark said that what the audit picked up was that the logs were decked over very small dry ephemeral streams and that they had no other options. In the SOP it will state that this can only happen when there is no other option
- Tom suggested that logs be used to create a bridge over the streams for decking in this case
- Vince asked how big the logs were. They were full sized logs not going anywhere.

#### Opportunities for Improvement

- Consider formalizing the use of road inspection forms in the CMS. Some road inspections results are being written on different forms.
  - Kirstin noted that this is already in progress
- Consider keeping all woody debris piles away from standing, reserved trees. A woody debris pile was too close to standing timber in SQ10A.
  - Kirstin mentioned that this would be done in the future
  - Bruce asked was this an issue because of fire hazard
  - John answered yes, and that occasionally the piles are close to timber because of the sized of the block (small blocks) but that they would only burn when conditions permit, such as the day before rain is expected
- Consider backing up information that goes into the SFM annual report. It was difficult to get the information that provided the basis for the annual report, such as Ungulate Winter Range areas.
  - Kirstin said this is in progress
- Consider tracking all road issues that require follow-up. Boston Bar area road issues were not being formally tracked, like the Pitt and Norrish Creek areas are being tracked.
  - In progress
- Consider fully completing the incident reports by ensuring all areas of the report are completed during the investigation. Although 2 wildfires were reported fairly recently the forms were incomplete in the root cause and corrective and preventative action areas.
  - Kirstin and Chris will be following up with all new incident reports to make sure the root cause is identified

## Changes to Provincial Funding

Kirstin discussed recent changes in provincial funding for projects in the DFA. She mentioned that these changes have occurred in 2010, and that further changes may occur since the BC Government restructured the Ministry of Forests within the previous two weeks.

As it stands now, several funding sources are now amalgamated: Forest Investment Account Landbased Investment Program (FIA LBIP), Forests for Tomorrow, base forest health funding, and base invasive plant funding. Most projects within the DFA, such as fertilization, and road deactivation, were funded under the FIA LBIP in the past few years. The new program is called the Land Based Investment Strategy (LBIS) and is administered by the Ministry of Forests rather than PriceWaterhouseCoopers. Unlike previous fiscal years, funding for projects is no longer based on AAC.

Funding continues to be available for projects as long as they meet the objectives of new funding under the LBIS. Priority funding areas are:

1. Treatments to address mid-term timber supply (fertilization, spacing and backlog brushing)
2. Reforestation of areas impacted by catastrophic disturbance (i.e. Forest For Tomorrow)
3. Tree improvement
4. Forest health and mitigation of invasive species
5. Forest inventory activities - prioritized towards the midterm timber supply.
6. Fish passage
7. Ecosystem Restoration
8. Fuel management (along with Union of BC Municipality Funding)

Teal has used funding from these programs in the past for projects such as fertilization, road deactivation, and restoration of fish habitat.

In 2010, this money was available for fertilization in the Fraser Valley, and for an inventory project in the TFL. The inventory project involved sampling trees throughout the TFL and determining tree height and age in order to better understand just how much timber is available for harvesting in the longer term.

### 1) H3-10 Fisheries Sensitive Features

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Fisheries	Protection of fisheries resources	Management of Fisheries Sensitive Features	Minimum of 20% of the annual FIA budget for TFL 46 to be spent on fisheries related projects	-10% (no restrictions on upper limit)

Fisheries related projects refer to any projects related to:

- water quality,
- watershed restoration,
- gully restoration,
- fish inventories,
- hydrometric station measurements,
- stream mapping and classification or
- riparian treatments.

In 2009, Teal spent 32% of the FIA budget on fisheries related projects, including the Cheewat Sediment Basin, Harris Creek maintenance (increase rearing and spawning habitat for Coho and Chinook) and maintenance of the Renfrew Hydrometric/ climatic stations.

Mark said that in the past year Teal felled hemlock trees for LOD across Harris Creek. Still more is needed, and will put some more down there when they go back to clean up the block.

### 2) H3-11 Fish Barriers

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Fisheries	Protection of fisheries resources	Number of fish barriers resulting from old road building methods (e.g., steep culverts) addressed as referrals received from outside sources	Fish barriers are addressed where operationally feasible	Zero

In some cases, old road building methods created barriers to fish passage in fish streams. In 2009, there were no fish barriers noted.

Fish barrier projects will continue to be funded under the new program, but fisheries sensitive area projects will not. We are going to have to seek alternative funding for these projects in the future. Since funding availability is changing Teal wanted to inform the PAG of these changes, and suggest that we re-evaluate these indicators in a year's time. We may want to modify these indicators in the future to better reflect funding availability.

## 8. Presentation: Criterion 4 Global Ecological Cycles

Kirstin pointed out a summary list of indicators in the handout package which showed the indicators yet to be approved by the SIPAG. She reminded everyone of the tight timeline needed to approve all core indicators before September 2011. She re-iterated the purpose of the re-registration audit in 2011 which will be to the new 2008 CSA Z809 Standard. She mentioned that the audit will be taking place in September next year.

She said that most of the indicators being presented at this meeting have been approved by the Fraser Valley PAG. She explained that they had their meeting a few weeks ago and were able to discuss and approve a number of indicators at that meeting. SIPAG has the option to: 1) approve the indicator as is, 2) request minor wording changes which Kirstin and Chris would do their best to accommodate, or 3) have a separate indicator that has a different target and variance than the FPAG.

Kirstin also mentioned that the next meeting will focus on Community and Aboriginal Issues and asked if members would be interested in setting up a webcam meeting venue. This would allow members who might not be able to attend in person to attend from home over the internet. Mark suggested that Helen Reid might come, if invited, from Cowichan Tribes.

Pat, Vince and Tom said they did not believe that First Nations would be inclined to join the meeting over the internet. It might not even be possible for remote groups such as the Ditidaht. Kirstin suggested that a telephone conference call to the meeting might work? Tom said the best way would be to send a clear, brief letter asking for input, and being specific about the input we are looking for. A questionnaire might even be more useful, something that can quickly be answered in a Yes/No format.

Action Item #26-2: Develop a questionnaire and letter for distribution to First Nations asking for input on indicators under Criterion 6.

Environment Department, January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011

Kirstin then gave a presentation on Criterion 4 Global Ecological Cycles which included the following:

- Carbon in Forests
- Carbon Cycle
- Forests, Carbon Source or Sink?
- Wood Products and Carbon
- Implications for Harvesting
- Carbon Emissions from Fossil Fuel Consumption in Forest Operations

The presentation was a summary of the Homework Package distributed to SIPAG members prior to the meeting.

During the presentation Tom commented that Teal’s rotation lengths are very short and that he would like to see longer time periods between harvesting. He asked Mark if these types of issues were communicated to Teal’s owners. Kirstin said that she believes April is aware of issues brought up in the PAG meetings, and Mark agreed. This issue will, however, be brought up at the next MERC meeting.

Action Item #26-3: Discuss increasing rotation lengths or the rationale for shorter rotations at a MERC meeting.

Environment Department, April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011

## 9. Discuss Core Global Ecological Cycle Indicators

Kirstin initiated the discussion of global ecological cycle indicators by reading the VOIT, and discussing how the indicator would be measured.

### C4.1.1 Net Carbon Uptake

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Global ecological cycles	Minimize carbon emissions and maximize carbon storage	Net carbon uptake	Maintain net positive carbon storage over the DFA from forestry operations (excluding carbon emissions from natural, uncontrollable events such as wildfire)	Zero

Tom asked how this would be tracked. Kirstin explained that the Canadian Forest Service has created a carbon budget model which can be linked to timber supply data to track carbon over time. Tom said he is ok with this as status quo for the time being but would prefer to see actual goals set in the future for reducing carbon emissions each year. Kirstin agreed that this would be possible once they start using the model.

## 10. Discuss Other Core Indicators

Kirstin initiated the discussion of other core indicators by reading the VOIT, discussing how the indicator would be measured, comparing the indicator to similar indicators (either similar core indicators, or indicators from the previous SFMP).

### D2-1: Accidental Industrial Caused Fires

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Healthy Forests	Minimize stress associated with harvesting	Number of Accidental Industrial Caused Fires > ½ ha in Size	Zero incidents	Average one incident per year over a five year rolling average

Tom suggested that the indicator should read “Number of Accidental Industrial Caused Fires > ½ ha in Size.” He said the intent of the indicator should be on fires that got out of control, not small fires that were immediately put out with minimal damage done. Mark said that such a fire had occurred in October during pile burning, but that the helicopter came and immediately put the fire out. He said conditions were drier than anticipated but that it started to rain at the same time the helicopter put the fire out.

### D2-2: Reportable Spills

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Healthy Forests	Minimize stress associated with harvesting	Number of Reportable Spills	Zero incidents	2 spills/year over a five year rolling average, with only 1 spill to water over entire 5 year period

Tom asked that spills to water be reported separately from spills to land. He also said that the variance implied that 2 spills to water each year would be within the acceptable level of tolerance. He suggested that a maximum of 1 spill over the 5 year period would be acceptable variance for spills to water.

### D2-3: Landslides

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (consistent with wording presented at the meeting) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Healthy Forests	Minimize stress associated with harvesting	Number of Landslides within Recently Built Roads or Harvested Areas	Less than an average of four incidents per year over a five year rolling average	+1

Tom said that there should be a differentiation between landslides which impact streams and landslides on land only. The target is too lenient if 4 landslides occur in riparian areas. He agreed that this could be addressed in another indicator; either an existing indicator or a new one for HBO.

Action Item #26-4: Review the SFMP indicators regarding this issue. If it is not addressed in an existing indicator, create a new indicator or modify an existing indicator to capture the impacts of landslides in riparian areas.

Environment Department, March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011

**C6.3.1: Evidence that the Organization has Co-operated with other Forest-dependent Businesses, Forest Users, and the Local Community to Strengthen and Diversify the Local Economy**

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Forest community well-being and resilience	To continue to foster good working relationships with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy	Evidence that the Organization has Co-operated with other Forest-dependent Businesses, Forest Users, and the Local Community to Strengthen and Diversify the Local Economy	Prioritize co-operation with forest users, local businesses, and the local community	The intent of this indicator is to provide a general idea of the co-operation with Forest-dependent Businesses, Forest Users, and the Local Community, and results will fluctuate over time

Kirstin presented to members the proposed measures of this indicator. The final list of measurables approved by PAG members present were:

- # of new requests from forest users responded to favourably, excluding those requests not granted where safety, fire risk, vandalism or sensitive ecological sites are of concern.
- # of new local employees hired.
- # of local suppliers and services utilized.

Tom asked whether Teal already tracks supplies and services. Mark answered yes that they track each invoice, including where the business is located. In this case, it is mostly contractors that make up the bulk of the services.

**C5.2.1: Level of Investment in Initiatives that Contribute to Community Sustainability**

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Contributions to society (including local community)	Assess the level of investment in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability	Level of investment in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability	Report on total dollars contributed to initiatives that contribute to the local economy and community sustainability	The intent of this indicator is to provide a general idea of the dollars contributed to the local economy by harvesting activities within the DFA, results will fluctuate over time

Kirstin explained that this indicator was replacing H5-13 Community Benefits originally developed by the SIPAG. She warned the group that FPAG had asked for some changes from the original indicator, but that the intent of the indicator would be reported using the new core indicator as well as a few other indicators.

The group expressed concern over the exclusion of several measures from this indicator: stumpage, wages to employees and contractors, and \$ spent in local business. They disagreed with FPAG that community sustainability initiatives should be above and beyond timber harvesting. Tom pointed out that timber harvesting contributes to the local economy and provides jobs. Vince and Pat agreed.

Kirstin said that they intended to continue to report on these measures. Stumpage will be reported under Indicator 5.1.1 Timber and Non-timber Benefits. Wages paid and \$ spent in local businesses will be reported in 5.2.3 Level of Direct and Indirect Employment. Tom, Pat and Dennis agreed that the changes to the new indicator were fine as long as the numbers were reported elsewhere. Vince did not agree. Kirstin said that the only issue was that if SIPAG did not agree to the changes and had a separate indicator was that the same measures would be reported twice. She asked if they could discuss the matter again at the end of the meeting after some of the other indicators were presented. Everyone agreed.

At the end of the meeting Kirstin asked the group again if they agreed with the changes to Indicator 5.2.1 now they had had a chance to review other related core indicators. Everyone agreed.

### C5.2.2 Level of Investment in Training and Skills Development

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Investment in DFA Workers	Opportunities for workforce training and skill development	Level of investment in training and skills development	100% conformance with internal mandatory training requirements	20%

Kirstin described the requirements of the training for employees and contractors.

### C5.2.3: Level of Direct and Indirect Employment

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Contributions to society (including local community)	Assess the monetary benefits to the local community as a result of harvesting	Level of direct and indirect employment	Report on total dollars contributed to direct and indirect employment	The intent of this indicator is to provide a general idea of the dollars contributed to indirect and direct employment in the DFA, and results will fluctuate over time

Tom asked if wages (direct employment) included employees and contractors. Mark answered that yes it did. Pat asked how local was defined and Kirstin responded that it was Southern Vancouver Island, but more specifically the communities of Lake Cowichan, Honeymoon Bay, Mesachie Lake, Nitinat and Youbou. Pat said she thought it might be difficult to get many supplies locally and Mark agreed, but said they purchase some goods locally, including gas from time to time.

Dennis asked if the SIPAG could have a breakdown of the numbers being reported so they could see where the money was spent. Kirstin said that they could show this after the 2010 Annual Report was completed.

Action Item #26-5: Present a breakdown of \$ spent on wages and in local businesses and suppliers to the SIPAG.

Environment Department, June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011

### C6.3.2: Evidence of Co-operation with DFA-related Workers and their Unions to Improve and Enhance Safety Standards, Procedures, and Outcomes in all DFA-Related Workplaces and Affected Communities

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
A healthy and Safe Work Place for all personnel	Establish and maintain safe work practices and environment through adequate procedures and direction	Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities	Teal Manager/ Supervisor to attend Primary Contractor Safety Meetings a minimum of 3 times a year, and review Safety Meeting Minutes from meetings not attended	Zero

Kirstin asked Mark if it was common practice to attend safety meetings and he responded that yes it was. He said if they can't make it out they get a copy of the minutes to review.

### C6.3.3: Evidence that a Worker Safety Program has been Implemented and is Periodically Reviewed and Improved

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
A healthy and Safe Work Place for all personnel	Establish and maintain safe work practices and environment through adequate procedures and direction	Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved	All primary contractors working in the DFA are eligible for Safe Certification or have equivalent safety system in place by December 2012	Zero

Kirstin said that all primary contractors in the DFA are currently SAFE certified. Tom asked if this meant that all contractors will need to be certified or just primary ones. Kirstin said the intent was to give some flexibility to the smaller companies if they are not SAFE certified but to encourage them to become certified as soon as possible.

**C6.4.1: Level of Participant Satisfaction with the Public Participation Process**

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Public participation	Improve the public participation process	Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process	Each item on the PAG Evaluation Form scores Satisfactory or better	Steps are taken to discuss and remedy, where possible, Poor or Unsatisfactory scores during a PAG meeting

Kirstin said that it is common practice for Teal to try and correct any Poor or Unsatisfactory scores but that this formalizes the process.

**C6.4.2: Evidence of Efforts to Promote Capacity Development and Meaningful Participation in General**

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Ongoing and meaningful public advisory group participation	Provide adequate background information and resources to Public Advisory Groups	Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general	The public participation process shall include discussions of 100% of the 'Discussion Items' for each criterion in the CSA Z809 SFM standard	Zero

Kirstin explained that the intent of all PAG meetings is to promote learning as much as possible. She said the presentations and homework always cover all of the required Discussion Items from the CSA, but that they also cover additional items relevant to the group or any current events or issues. Tom asked if the CSA specifically lists out the required topics and Kirstin said yes they do for each criterion.

**C6.5.1: Number of people reached through educational outreach**

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Information and decision making	To inform and educate the PAG and other public through field trips, school tours and public presentations	Number of people reached through educational outreach	A minimum of one educational outreach activity each year	Zero

Kirstin outlined some of the outreach activities Teal has undertaken in the past. Pat said that Mark’s participation in the Forestry Co-op is another example of outreach from Teal. Mark said he also gives a talk to students from the Environmental Program at Camosun College who have a school camp at Fairy Lake once a year. Tom pointed out that visits and field trips with the Pacheedaht are also good examples of outreach by Teal.

**C6.5.2: Availability of Summary Information on Issues of Concern to the Public**

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance (wording consistent with FPAG) that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Information and decision making	To summarize issues of concern to the public and make these available on an annual basis	Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public	Make summary information of issues of concern available to the public, including updating Teal’s website at least once a year with PAG meeting minutes	Zero

Kirstin told the group that the intent was to discuss issues of concern to the public through the PAG process as much as possible. She gave the example of Avatar Grove, and how this is an issue environmentalists have brought forward to Teal. John Pichugin from Teal has discussed this issue with the groups who have contacted him. Tom said he knew that Bill Dumont from Ministry of Forests had walked through the area recently and said that the timber value was fairly low.

**D3.1: Riparian Management**

Members discussed this indicator. Tom said he was concerned because sometimes logging in the Riparian Management Zone is having a major impact (blowdown) in the Riparian Reserve Zone. This impact can be severe and result in the loss of the reserve zone. This could occur but Teal would still be in compliance with the indicator because their FSP allows harvesting in the RMZ. He would like either the indicator to be modified or a new indicator created to address this issue. Kirstin asked Mark how this could be tracked. He said it would have to be noted by the engineer when they came across the blowdown. Teal already tracks major windthrow events.

Kirstin said that she would look into the issue and present some solutions at the next meeting.

Action Item #26-6: Review the SFMP indicators regarding this issue. If it is not addressed in an existing indicator, create a new indicator or modify an existing indicator to capture the impacts of harvesting in the RMZ (related to Action Item #26-3).

Environment Department, March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011

## **11. Next Scheduled meeting**

The next meeting will be scheduled for February, and members will be contacted to confirm. Discussion topics will be Criterion 5 and 6 Community and Aboriginal Issues. Homework packages will be distributed prior to the meeting.

**The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m. Minutes recorded by Kirstin Campbell.**