

Appendix 4

Alternate Strategies for Indicators Discussed
at Public Advisory Group Meetings

Defined Forest Area

August 2010



The **Teal-Jones Group**



Alternative Strategies

During the development of the Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets with the Public Advisory Groups there were many discussions between Teal, guest speakers, professionals/experts, and the advisory groups on potential management strategies to protect the identified values.

Where there were multiple potential management strategies for a particular value/ indicator, ultimately one was selected as the preferred option, leaving the remainders as potential alternate strategies.

In the following text, listed by indicator, are highlights of PAG meetings where alternative strategies to indicators were discussed. Additional details regarding discussions on each indicator are available in the relevant PAG meeting minutes (see Teal Jones website at <http://tealjones.com/Certification.htm>). A brief summary is also included below to summarize the discussions. To view the final indicators refer to the SFMP Appendices 1 and 2.

H6-9 Pacheedaht Cultural Cedar

Summary: the PAG discussed alternatives for focusing the indicator on different tree species, the definition of 'historical use', and various strategies to achieve the target.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes September 16, 2009 for more details)

- Discussed focusing the indicator on only 'cedar and cypress' versus 'cedar and other tree species (i.e., cypress, yew, Douglas-fir). Confirmed that the Pacheedaht Cedar Strategy was concerned with more tree species than only cedar and cypress
- Discussed the definition of 'historical use' in the context of this indicator. Could be interpreted to mean last 5 years or a much longer timeframe. The PAG agreed the intent of 'historical use' is to acknowledge pre-contact level of use and consider current and future potential use.
- Impact on timber supply and operability were discussed, the strategy to achieve the target was reviewed as well as alternatives: where resources can be obtained, a Pacheedaht field crew will locate trees and small areas where large cedar timber types are indicated in constrained areas, such as Old Growth Management Areas or Parks.
- The question was raised concerning trees located in parks. The Ministry of Environment has confirmed that trees are available to First Nations within Parks for cultural purposes, but it should be noted that it is only one tree here and there that is being removed. Accessibility is usually a large factor within parks. In addition the Ministry has requested a windfirm buffer on the park edges so this is another alternative area where cultural cedar may be located.
- The point was brought up about road deactivation, and how this may impact choice of trees. Since it is a 400 year planning horizon it is expected that roads will be built and deactivated and built again. Pacheedaht will need to manage it similar to a 400 year timeline.



C 1.1.1 Ecosystem Area by Type

Summary: the PAG discussed alternative ecosystem 'types' to be included and measured in this indicator (for example roads and areas with invasive plants).

(See SIPAG meeting minutes November 18, 2009 for more details)

- Discussed making 'forest roads' a separate type and calculating the area annually. Problem noted: the information is not readily available for the Fraser portion of the DFA as the DFA is shared with other licensees and this information is no longer tracked by the MoFR (used to be annually reported by all licensees 'as built roads').
- Discussed whether building a road actually changes the ecosystem type or not, as roads may be rehabilitated and become growing sites with similar characteristics as the adjacent cutblocks.
- Also talked about whether invasive plants could potentially change ecosystem types. It was noted that invasive plants are being tracked under another indicator.

C1.1.2 Forest Area by Type or Species Composition

Summary: the PAGs discussed alternative indicators (i.e., under the core indicator requirements of the CSA Z809-08 SFM standard, the PAGs can choose to measure either Forest Area by Type or Forest Area by Species Composition) and how the different indicators would be measured. After discussions SIPAG and FPAG ended up choosing different indicators.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes November 18, 2009 for more details)

- A preference was indicated for measuring forest area by type, as it may be difficult to develop a meaningful target for species composition (often the tree species planted on a site is different from those harvested. However, the tree species would be ecologically appropriate, just a different stage in the disturbance regime (i.e., shade tolerant versus shade intolerant)).
- Not very meaningful to track forest area by type as it is not expected to change (forecast and target would be to remain consistent from year to year). Harvesting and other large human initiated disturbances within the DFA have occurred across the DFA for a considerable amount of time. Within the timber harvesting landbase, the present forest area by type is anticipated to remain relatively stable for the foreseeable future.
- The question was asked if there if there are any goals with species composition, for example in the Timber Supply Review? Or any other analysis that could be used to determine historic patterns or targets? The answer was no, there are no detailed goals regarding harvesting or regeneration of timber type. Teal has Free Growing information but no detailed information on mature forests.

(See FPAG meeting minutes November 3, 2009 for more details)

- It was brought up that reporting on species composition would be difficult since the species planted after harvesting older forests are different species but are more ecologically suited to the disturbance and ecosystem (i.e. pioneer species). While areas are planted to one or more species, all of the species that would come back naturally also come up and augment the planted trees.



- The question was asked how planting different species than the original stand can affect other species such as birds, insects and amphibians? Also, it was suggested that there is a risk to cropping the same species repeatedly and depleting the reserves of nutrients that individual species seek out. For example, with agricultural crops like corn you don't grow them in the same spot year after year. Soils need a 'rest' some times.
- In September 2009 the Chief Forester released a letter that urges foresters to consider the future of the stands that they are regenerating and what the climate may be like (e.g. warmer, drier etc.) and consider the anticipated risks due to disease, insects and fire. The letter promotes the idea that the more species planted will often decrease the overall risk to a regenerating stand.
- The Species Composition indicator is difficult to place a meaningful target on as there is species alteration due to nature or harvesting. The Forest Area by type may be more applicable to the DFA.
- The Environment Dept. reviewed the CSA definition of Plantation. This definition does not describe any of Teal's regeneration activities. Teal does not use exotic species, engineered species or establish hybrid popular plantations. Teal regenerates areas with natural species with a minimum of intervention and brushing so that a very natural stand develops after harvesting. The term "Plantation" is often used in forestry in BC when speaking about planted cutblocks but the CSA term is more about replacing natural stands with exotic species etc. with very limited species diversity and forest critters. Tracking "Forest Area by Type" would track the amount of area in exotic Plantations, lost wetlands, etc.
- Measuring Forest Area by Type would indicate that we are not converting natural forest area to plantations.
- Al Stobbert commented that the "Species Composition" indicator is almost impossible to track and manage. Al had worked with the forest ecologist Karl Klinka from UBC earlier in his career at the Forest Service. Karl would say that a given 3 meter radius plot would take 30 minutes to inventory the plants that were there, 3 days to tell what insects that were there. Moving the sample plot over one chain would come up with a very different inventory of plants and insects and that hasn't addressed the animals that may occur. I don't think species composition would be feasible to do in a meaningful way.
- It was asked if the Indicator wording could be changed. The wording is set by CSA and is the one thing they don't have control over. We can pick "Forest Area by Type" OR "Species Composition".



C1.1.3 Forest Area by Seral Stage or Age Class

Summary: the PAGs discussed alternative indicators (i.e., under the core indicator requirements of the CSA Z809-08 SFM standard, the PAGs can choose to measure either Forest Area by Seral Stage or Forest Area by Age Class) and alternative targets that would be meaningful.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes November 18, 2009 for more details)

- Noted that we could track and create targets for all age classes but it may be difficult to create meaningful or realistic targets without a lot more analysis. It was determined from past meetings that old growth is one of the most important targets to the PAGs and general public.
- The question was asked if there were any other management goals with regards to seral stages or age classes? It was noted that the Walbran Landscape Unit requires 25% mature or old growth. Also within Goshawk WHA a certain percentage of older stands must be present. There are no other goals that apply across the DFA.

(See FPAG meeting minutes February 2, 2010 for more details)

- It was asked if it was wise to commit to meeting “draft” objectives; as soon as a draft changes we would be out of compliance? It was noted that the drafts are fairly well established and that there is a lot of dialogue between the ministries, licensees, First Nations, and other stake holders before drafts are established. Since these drafts are not legally established Teal would potentially be within their legal rights to put a cutblock within the draft OGMA, however, as a management strategy that would disregard several other forest values (i.e., other than timber) and would potentially create poor working relationships with other stakeholders. Alternative wording was discussed. Reference to draft Landscape Unit plans was replaced with ‘the Non-Spatial Old Growth Order’ for Landscape Units without final plans.

C1.1.4 Degree of Within Stand Structural Retention

Summary: the PAG discussed alternative methods of expressing the target for this indicator; either choosing a specific number or making reference to an operational plan.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes November 18, 2009 for more details)

- One member commented that numbers are more meaningful to general public than a reference to the Forest Stewardship Plan.
- The problem with listing specific targets is they are approximately a page or more (different with each LU) and wouldn't fit with the currently formatted VOIT table. Targets also change according to changes in legislation, however FSP is required to be amended to be consistent with changes in legislation.



C1.2.1 Degree of Habitat Protection for Selected Focal Species, Including Species at Risk

Summary: the PAG discussed creating an indicator that is applicable to the entire DFA, rather than choosing an indicator that is only applicable to the Fraser portion of the DFA.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes November 18, 2009 for more details)

- The group acknowledged there are different wildlife species in different portions of the DFA. Spotted owl is only found in Fraser portion of the DFA.
- Alternatively the PAG could work on an additional HBO specific example, however members were satisfied that WHA and UWR have been designated for HBO portion of the DFA (species at risk) and these features are captured under another indicator.

C1.4.2 Protection of Identified Sacred and Culturally Important Sites

Summary: the PAG discussed various alternatives for the identification of special sites.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes November 18, 2009 for more details)

- An email from one member who could not attend was read. He expressed his desire to see stand level identification and conservation of special sites as a process of what the engineers do every day. He provided some examples.

C2.1.1 Reforestation Success

Summary: the PAGs discussed alternatives to measure reforestation success.

(See SIPAG meeting minutes February 24, 2010 for more details)

- One member asked at what age regeneration was assessed and noted her concerns that the forest was not established at that point. The facilitator noted this was a very good point – regeneration is established generally within 3 years of harvesting commencement, potentially it could be assessed the day after planting. She pointed out that indicator H2-2 Stand Establishment addressed those concerns (Free Growing assessment is generally at 12-15years). Another member confirmed that once that stand is established at that age, nothing is going to stop them.
- It was noted that this indicator only addresses disturbance from harvesting, not natural disturbances. One member pointed out that within the TFL (the Honeymoon Bay portion of the DFA) it was to Teal's best advantage to retain as much growing sites as possible as they are the ones whose annual cut would be reduced if there was no reforestation of natural disturbances. He noted that in the Fraser Forest Licence the motivation is not the same as the annual cut is distributed amongst licencees. The group also discussed road disturbances and rehabilitation. The question was raised whether the same disturbance in the TFL would be treated differently in the FL for those reasons mentioned. The Teal representative said that Teal must be careful what they commit to with respect to natural disturbances as they generally are considered on an individual basis. This topic was flagged for further discussion because there is another proposed indicator with respect to Natural versus human caused disturbances.



C2.2.1 Additions and Deletions to the Forest Area

Summary: the PAGs discussed whether or not to include afforestation in the indicator.

(See FPAG meeting minutes February 2, 2010, and SIPAG meeting minutes February 24, 2010 for more details; discussions were similar)

- One member asked why or how Teal would be reviewing proposals that would cause afforestation. Teal would be consulted as a stakeholder for many developments such as independent power projects or power line transmission corridors. Teal returns comments and concerns to the proponent.
- The CSA definition of 'afforestation' was reviewed and it was noted that it is not a common practice in BC as there are generally no areas which require afforestation. An example was provided (Ireland commonly practices afforestation)

2.2.2 Proportion of the calculated long-term sustainable harvest level that is actually harvested

Summary: the PAGs discussed alternatives to following the AAC (i.e., undercutting).

(See FPAG meeting minutes February 2, 2010 for more details)

- An Indicator around 'harvesting' provides a measure of how sustainable the economic climate is for communities and the amount of activity in a year. It is a measure of economic activity while our other indicators measure everything else. AAC's are governed under the Forest Act of BC which specifies cut control rules and limits.
- One member commented that the draft 2.2.2 language made sense as a simple measure of activity.
- The cut control and AAC were explained and discussed amongst the group. Teal's licenses give them a right to harvest a set amount of cubic meters each year. The Chief Forester of BC determines a level that is sustainable in light of all of the competing factors and social dimensions that impact forest management. Teal can harvest its AAC each year or less in some years balanced with more in other years. It can be zero in one year and all of the AAC at once. If Teal exceeds the AAC there are penalties such as losing 'cut' (AAC) or financial penalties. The year to year flexibility gives Teal flexibility to respond to markets. Teal can cut less when markets are depressed and more if markets are good. We are in a world market where customers can buy wood from anywhere in the world. There is a 10% 'tolerance' to AAC before penalties kick in. The proposed draft Core Indicator simply says that Teal will comply with the law – it won't harvest too much and it will not harvest too little and sacrifice jobs. Another the reason for the cut control system is to ensure that there is a harvesting – licensees must harvest their AAC's and not 'hoard' it. There is an incentive to provide economic activity while providing flexibility. In addition, there is a social responsibility implied in the right to harvest timber. Here is an opportunity to harvest – use it, generate economic benefits – or lose it. It isn't just for the companies; it is for the public's interest as well.



(See SIPAG meeting minutes February 24, 2010 for more details)

- The group was reminded of their discussion earlier with regards to the Forest Act Cut Control Regulations. One member was asked if Teal would ever deliberately undercut? The answer was yes, if they are loosing their shirt logging. In fact if the current economic conditions continue it would be possible to have an undercut. Teal is currently in their 3rd year of the cut therefore they have plenty of time to make up in the next few years.
- One member suggested that we add 'subject to finances' in the wording of the VOIT. The facilitator noted that the forecast would be an appropriate place to add that comment. The member said he thought the government doesn't allow for financial reasons in rationales to carry cuts forward, only things like strikes, but the Teal representative noted that was true but that is only if you are requesting to carry the cut forward, it is still up to the company to undercut.