

Southwest Island Public Advisory Group (SIPAG) Meeting Minutes

1. Call to order

Jill West, Environmental Programs Advisor, called the 1st meeting of 2007 to order, of the Southwest Island Public Advisory Group, at 4:34 p.m. on **February 28, 2007** in Shaker Mill Restaurant, Lake Cowichan, BC.

2. Members

Present:

- Tom Jones, Pacheedaht First Nation
- Vince Callander, Local Business
- Tim McGonigle, TFL 46 Worker
- Dennis Martel, Wilderness Watch Committee
- Sandy Peters, Valley Fish & Game Club
- Pat Weaver, Lake Cowichan Town Council, Cowichan Lake Community Forest Co-operative

Support (TJG):

- Mark Carter, Operations Planner
- Teresa Burton, Recording Secretary
- Jill West, Environmental Programs Advisor

Regrets:

- Jack Smith, Lake Cowichan First Nation
- George Williams, Ditidaht Band
- Larry George, Cowichan Tribes
- Ted Burns, Salmonid Enhancement
- Jim Humphrey, Chamber of Commerce

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. South Island Meeting #14 Agenda
2. SIPAG Members Contact Information
3. Honeymoon Bay Operation (HBO) Tracking System for Administration Task (Outstanding & Completed)
4. South Island PAG Meeting #13 Minutes
5. SIPAG Terms of Reference
6. Advertisement for SIPAG
7. TFL46 Landslides Presentation, Nov/06 events
8. SFM Plan, Draft Invasive Plants target
9. Oct/06 FSP Additional Information document section 5.1, Measures to Prevent Introduction and Spread of Invasive Plants
10. SFM Plan, Draft Fisheries Sensitive Features

11. SFM Plan, Draft Cultural Cedar Indicator
12. SFM Plan, Draft Employment Indicator
13. SFM Plan, Targets & Indicators - Proposed Revisions

4. Reviewing minutes from Previous Meeting

Time was given to review the November 22, 2006 meeting minutes. Jill asked the members if they had any concerns or comments regarding the meeting or minutes and there were none. There were no changes to the minutes. The minutes were accepted.

5. Review Updated SIPAG Member Contact Information

Jack Smith, of the Lake Cowichan First Nations was added back onto the list (somehow got deleted from the last version).

6. Review Terms of Reference

Time was given to the group to read through the Terms of Reference. Jill asked if there were any comments or questions and there were none. The group agreed to the terms and it was signed by those members present.

7. Current Events / Management Issues

1. External Audit Results for registration program CAN/CSA Z809:2002

- The first surveillance audit and was conducted by QMI (Quality Management Institute). Every 3 years they do a full blown audit.
- Held Jan 22-24, 2007. Pat Weaver attended the field day, Jan 23.
- Several SIPAG members were interviewed. Dennis Martel's interview was by phone. All the First Nations (FN) groups were interviewed.
- Several recommendations were presented and Jill said we will look at the ones relating to indicators tonight and review the rest in detail at the next few meetings.
- Focus of the field day was on verifying performance and tracking of the SFMP Indicators, the weather was heavy rain and fog and hindered the evaluation of Visuals and Deer Winter Range.
- Culvert inspections and wind-firming treatments were also audited.
- Mark said that one of the logging areas had to be shut down because the rainfall level had reached shutdown levels. Tom said Pacheedaht FN in Port Renfrew were concerned about the village flooding at that time.
- Tom asked if QMI is the same group as last year. Jill replied yes and Gregor Macintosh led both audits. Gregor often brings different audit partners with him and this time it was Bodo VonSchilling (trainee auditor).
- Pat said the field trip was very interesting and very wet. And was surprised how inside a gully you would think it would not be windy but there was lots of blowdown there. Pat said she saw lots of nice timber and this was a treat, also a lot of fog. She said it was a good day enjoyed. Tim asked if Pat would recommend others to come out and Pat said yes.

2. Review of Draft Advertisement for SIPAG

- Jill presented a draft advertisement for SIPAG and said it was a recommendation from the Internal Audit for us to advertise the local Public Advisory Group in local papers. In order to meet the CSA Standard we need to solicit for members and continue to improve involvement from the Public.
- Tom asked if we would screen individuals and could the group make a decision on new members? Jill said we would consider all requests as a group.
- Pat said she found the SIPAG meetings a bit dry at first, but if you've stuck to it you'd find it quite interesting now.

3. Mark presented the TFL46 Landslides Presentation (Nov/06 events).

- Mark said Teal is required to report all landslides and we have a standard reporting form in our Corporate Management System (CMS) to do the reporting.
- The first slide is in Nixon Creek on the Caycuse Mainline and the road failure is a major one. The truck down the hill in the slide area we thought maybe someone was inside when we discovered it. The road was built in the early 50's and so the road is fine fill on top of old rotted stumps and with so much water it became saturated. When the truck drove over it the road failed and the truck went with it. The road is still not fixed and we're still waiting for dry weather to fix this. The Geologist said we can't cut into the bank as this would make the upslope unstable, so the plan is to use the wide ditch area to put some road and narrower ditch on then shore up the overhang.
- Tim said they were trapped behind the slide so were coming out Truck Road 2 and that a logging truck and pickup went thru and 20 seconds later another pickup and logging truck were following behind and they couldn't get through because a slide came onto the road in front of them.
- Mark moved onto the 2nd slide on Granite Creek Mainline. Teal lost the road in 2 places. Above the 1st one is an old rock quarry and the bank slumped and filled the ditch causing water to run down the road. The road failure is similar to what happened at Caycuse; this also is an old road where fill was put on stumps. We were trying to get equipment thru the slide so we could get the culvert open while it was still raining.
- Tom asked if we still build roads with bench and fill. Mark said that we end haul and bench, but still, if there's excessive water you can still have problems.
- Pat asked what about the Sandpit in Port Renfrew, there is a slide and water running over the road. Mark said that had happened back in November and that people remove the sand and the bank became unstable and it is too dangerous right now to work on. Mark said that when TimberWest removed their private property from the TFL they gave the road r/w to the government (Hillcrest/Harris) so it is now under our road permit.
- The next picture is the log jam at Sutton Creek bridge behind the golf course in Honeymoon Bay. Mark said this is Private Lands. The log jam destroyed the bridge approaches and we helped with repairs by providing rock and dump trucks to haul the debris away.
- The 3rd slide was at Truck Road 2 and Mark said the storm tracked through this area, meaning the intensity of the storm was greater at this location. Mark said when he drove through this area there was heavy rain and water everywhere and then he drove down to Port Renfrew and it was like nothing happened.
- Mark said an old wood crib in the road slumped.
- The 2nd slide at Truck Road 2 some material came down over the road from old logging above where a gully gave way. 2 or 3 gully's let go.

- Tim said he was stuck behind the road failure at Truck Road 2.
- Tom said he was out with a GeoTech when he was working for the logging company and was told that gullies let go and flush out every 30 years.

8. SFM Plan - review of draft indicators and targets

Jill said we would first work on draft indicators from the last meeting.

Criterion 1.0 – Biological Diversity;

Value (native flora & fauna), Objective (maintain natural diversity of native flora & fauna)

Draft Indicator: % site occupation of invasive plant species

Draft Target: <10% site occupation by invasive plant species at time of Free Growing. Measured on an annual basis averaged over all blocks declared Free Growing in each calendar year.

Variance: 5%

Jill provided all key points and notes below the indicator and reviewed these with the group.

- Tom asked who's responsibility is it? He said what has happened at Wardroper with the Gorse and the reason it was left and is now spreading? I would hate to see it take off in more areas.
- Sandy asked if there is a requirement for land holders to have to control invasive species. Jill replied there is a requirement for Tenures under the Forest & Range Practices Act
- Tom said the Invasive Species Act requires private land owners to manage for this.
- Jill said Teal has not found any invasive plants on any of their landbase.
- Sandy said isn't it too late if your at 10%?
- Jill said 10% is at Free Growing, which is a 10-20 year time span.
- Sandy said 10% of the site, can we define what the site is? Jill responded that site refers to the Cutblock, and any roadsides within the cutblock.
- Tom said if I had a patch of an invasive plans and the site was say even the size of this room, I would consider we have a problem, even though it may measure at 3%.
- Jill said the difference is if we are talking about he %'s for triggering action, like Mark said, that is quite different. Basically, it is Teal's best interest to take prompt action if any invasive plants are discovered in the TFL, particularly within cutblocks. So actions would be implemented at any time for cutblocks, not just at free growing. The way the Target is currently worded, this is way beyond action time, this is free growing.
- Jill said maybe what Tom is saying is that 10% at Free Growing is too late. How about 0% target and then establish a variance of 10%
- Tom said there are different invasive plants, some you're not going to be able to do anything about.
- Pat said it will crowd your plantation and you won't be able to plant.
- Discussion around the room then led to the conclusion that we will split the target into the problem species and non-problem species within the TFL an apply different targets and variances for each (e.g., stricter target/variance for invasive species: Broom, Gorse and Knotweed)

**Criterion 3.0 – Conservation of Soil and Water Resources;
Value (fisheries), Objective (protection of fisheries resources)**

Draft Indicator: % Retention of Riparian Management Zones (RMZ)

Draft Target: 25-100% basal area retention within the RMZ of all streams class S1-S4.

Variance: Zero

Jill provided all key points and notes below the indicator and reviewed these with the group.

- Jill said the percent of retention in RMZ's is a requirement in Teal's Forest Steward Plan (FSP).
- Tom "I think if you have to leave trees next to a S4 creek then you might end up with trees blowing over so you're setting yourself up".
- Jill replied that Teal and the agencies recognize this problem so there is some flexibility within the targets is so that you could vary the distribution of the retention along the stream. E.g., you could retain all of your basal area in a portion of the stream side that is protected from winds. Also important to note that this is basal area retention targets, not stems per hectare. For example, one big tree could meet your retention quota.
- Vince "From what I've seen, if you're leaving the big trees and it blows over, it blows a big root up. Tom mentioned that from his experience, it is the smaller trees that are left that have a tendency to blow over, not the bigger trees.
- Jill said that we have to leave the percentages because they are an FSP requirement.

Draft Indicator: Management of Fisheries Sensitive Features

Draft Target: Min of 20% of the annual FIA budget for TFL46 to be spent on fisheries related projects

Variance: -10% (no restrictions on upper limit)

- Jill reported that since the FIA budget for 2007/2008 is not yet available, she was unable to review the upcoming budget for comparison with the draft target (action item from previous meeting). We will have to wait until the budget is available.

Action Item 14a:

Review 2007/2008 FIA budget in reference to the target for FIA funding for Fisheries Sensitive Features.

– **Criterion 6.0 – Society’s Responsibilities;**
Value (cultural cedar), Objective (work with first nations to supply cedar & cypress)

Draft Indicator: Number of First Nations requests responded to for establishing a protocol for identifying a current and/or future supply of cedar and cypress trees suitable for traditional use within TFL 46, consistent with the extent of historical use

Draft Target: 100%.

Variance: Zero

- Added to indicator, “consistent with the extent of historical use”, reference as requested by Tom.
- Mark said that the Penelekut (spelling?) First Nation is now recognized to have territory in the area and we now have to consult with them.

Criterion 5.0 – Economic & Social Benefits;
Value (employment), Objective (Stable, full time jobs provided from TFL46)

Draft Indicator: Number of full time jobs per cubic meter harvested

Draft Target: 0.0003 jobs/m³ (direct), employees & full phase contractors

Variance: Zero (no restrictions on upper limit)

Jill provided all key points and notes below the indicator and reviewed these with the group.

- Jill; “I know 0.0003 seems like a pretty small number to show the auditors.
- Sandy said maybe we should have m³ per job then the number would be a lot bigger.
- Jill said she is waiting form some more information to get a better number, but we came up with this for now so we can start with a benchmark and we change that number at a later date.
- Mark said that Teal is providing 20-25,000m³ of logs to Karlite and Ditidaht Mills and the volume provides jobs.
- Jill said she used Teal, Island Pacific Logging, Hayes and some local suppliers, which is the number of employees in the training database and came up with 110 full time jobs. Going forward the plan is to get the training database to include Duke Pt and all the employees. The annual cut is 365,000m³.
- Vince said what we were originally looking at is what Teal is spending in this community. You have all the helicopter and heli logging workers too. Also what Teal was spending, what their overhead is.
- Tom said there is also the contribution to the community on top of that.
- Mark said that Teal is reluctant to provide costs as they feel this is confidential, I would have to run it by our head people to see.
- Tom said we want to show our contribution and the 0.0003 doesn’t turn my crank.
- Vince; you’re making money off of Karlite and Ditidaht but still you’re providing jobs.
- Sandy; Government puts figures on how much revenue certain projects pump into communities so what we’re looking for is the order of magnitude as to the value to the community.

Action Item 14b:

Further work needs to be done for the employment indicator. Group original concern was how much money Teal is spending in the local community. Need to determine what information can be reported (i.e., not confidential).

9. SFM Plan - Review of proposed revisions to indicators

Jill said it's almost dinner time so I don't think we'll get to all these, but as I've been working on the reporting information for how we've been doing on the targets for the last year, I have come across suggestions or recommendations for some revisions to some indicators and targets. Hopefully to do with tracking and clarifying what we've been tracking.

Criterion 1.0 – Biological Diversity;

Value (Variety of pattern ecosystems & ecosystem processes at landscape level), Objective (structural diversity at the stand level)

Indicator: Stand level retention for each cutblock as a % of the harvest area (wildlife tree patch)

Revised Target: Single cutblock 3.5%, Group of cutblocks 7%

Variance: Zero

- The target that we had in the SFMP was based on the Renfrew Landscape Unit Plan. That was a draft plan that was in place and it didn't get approved at the time of the Forest Stewardship Plan, but it has since been signed off but it will take a couple of years to be fully implemented, but in the mean time, in order to be in compliance with our legal commitments in the FSP we should change that target to reflect what the FSP and the Legislation says. Which is, for a single cut 3.5% or for any group of cutblocks 7%.
- Tom asked for a single cut 3.5% or for any group of cutblocks 7%, what does that mean? Jill said that at the end of the year you tally up all your blocks and the average should be 7%. They don't want you to have 3.5% on each block. It prevents you to do the minimum on every block, because the average has to be 7. Jill said no, you have to have a minimum of 3.5%, but you can't have 3.5 everywhere because your average has to be 7.
- Mark said that's right, but in a couple of years the Legal requirement is likely going to change and we'll be able to have 0% on one block and 14% on another.
- Vince asked if that includes your leave strips on your creeks. Jill and Mark replied it can.

Value (critical habitat features for special interest species), Objective (maintain Roosevelt Elk and black tailed deer critical habitat)

Indicator: Area within TFL46 managed for Roosevelt Elk and black tailed deer winter range

Revised Target: Minimum of 1219 ha of the Timber Harvest Land Base managed as Ungulate Winter Range.

Variance: Zero

- Jill said this was just a correction to minimum ha of timber harvest land base.

Value (Species at risk), Objective (maintain/enhance habitat needs for threatened or endangered species),

Revised Indicator: Compliance with Wildlife Habitat Area (WHA) orders and objectives

Revised Target: Full compliance with Wildlife Habitat Area (WHA) orders and objectives (zero non-compliances)

Variance: Zero

- Changed conformance to compliance

Value (Species at risk), Objective (manage activities to support survival and success of species at risk),

Revised Indicator: Compliance with Integrated Wildlife Management Strategies

Revised Target: Full compliance with Integrated Wildlife Management Strategies (zero non-compliances)

Variance: Zero

- Changed conformance to compliance.

**Criterion 2.0 – Ecosystem Condition & Productivity;
Value (Healthy Forests), Objective (minimize impacts due to windthrow),**

Revised Indicator: Percentage of required Windthrow treatments that are completed. (areas specified within site level plans as requiring edge treatments to address windthrow risk)

Revised Target: 100%

Variance: Zero

- Mark commented that by leaving wider strips rather than expensive windfiring which seems ineffective and cannot find people to do the work.

2nd Revised Indicator: Number of Catastrophic Windthrow Events within Riparian Reserve Zones as a result of harvesting activities. (calculated over a five year rolling average)

Revised Target: Zero

Revised Variance: Two

- Sandy; Zero target is not realistic.
- Tom; So it's not really measurable until your 5 years are over? Jill if we do go with five years I would go back 5 years.

Action Item 14c:

Will remove the five year rolling average and clarify catastrophic.

**Criterion 2.0 – Ecosystem Condition & Productivity;
Value (Productive Forest Ecosystem), Objective (Conserve Productivity of forests by minimizing disturbance due to harvesting activities),**

Revised Indicator: Compliance with soil conservation limits (permanent access and soil disturbance) as specified within the FSP or Site Plan.

Target: 100%

Variance: Zero

- Jill said rewording the indicator not trying to change the indicator & clarify that the SFP or Site Plan is the operational plan.
- Permanent access is not in your FSP it is in your Site Plan.

**Criterion 3.0 – Conservation of Soil & Water Resources;
Value (Soil), Objective (Protection of Forest Soils),**

Revised Indicator: Number of Landslides originating from roads under permit to Teal

Target: Zero

Variance: Two

Revised Indicator: Number of Landslides originating from cutblocks harvest by Teal (or their sub-contractors)

Target: Zero

Variance: Two

- Jill said we recommended changing because the target should be a number because of our indicators. One of the recommendations from the auditors is to increase our variance, so I changed that to two.

Action Item 14d:

Change the wording in Indicators from Landslides originating from roads or cutblocks to “as a result of road building or harvesting”

**Criterion 3.0 – Conservation of Soil & Water Resources;
Value (Water), Objective (Protection of Water Resources),**

Revised Indicator: Number of Coastal Watershed Assessments adhered to in operational Planning

Target: Three (Gordon River, Harris/Hemmingsen & Hatton Creek)

Variance: Two

- Jill said just cleared up how many coastal watersheds we are following and which ones they are, as required in the FSP.

**Criterion 5.0 – Economical & Social Benefits;
Value (Recreation & Tourism), Objective (Visual Quality),**

Revised Indicator: Compliance with Visual Quality Objectives in visually sensitive areas

Target: Zero non-compliances

Variance: Zero

- Jill said just made a slight wording revision to add compliance and change 100% compliance to a number, Zero non-compliances.
- Mark asked aren't we going to have any variance?
- Vince said that 100 compliance sounds better than zero non-compliances.

Action Item 14e:

Change Variance from zero to one and change the Target back to 100% Compliance

**Criterion 6.0 – Society's Responsibilities;
Value (Aboriginal & treaty rights), Objective (Coordinate & manage activities to maintain a good working relationship with local First Nations),**

Revised Indicator: Number of invitations extended to First Nations for participation in SIPAG

Target: Minimum of one per meeting

Variance: Zero

- Jill thought to better report on the indicator and target it would help with the new wording.
- Tom asked minimum of one what per meeting.

Action Item 14f:

Add the wording minimum of one notice per first nations group for each SIPAG meeting.

**Criterion 6.0 – Society's Responsibilities;
Value (Aboriginal Values), Objective (Adequate, meaningful sharing of information),**

Indicator: Information Sharing Protocols

Revised Development of Information Sharing Protocols with local First Nations

Variance: Zero

- Jill said that our target of December 2006 has passed so thought we should remove that timeline.
- Mark said we won't establish the Protocols if we don't get a commitment. We have to provide an opportunity. We have formal protocols with Pacheedaht & Ditidaht and with our FSP I made a commitment with the other east coast first nations we've just made a commitment to extend an invitation & I've just recently done that. I send them maps of any logging in their traditional territory and invitation to comment. At this point we have just one block within the Cowichan Watershed (a tributary to the Nixon).

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held April 25th. Topics will be to review the results of the indicators and fill out an evaluation form.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.