
**North Island – Central Coast District
Forest Management Leadership Team
Meeting #16 - Minutes**

Date: April 15, 2015

Location: North Island –Central Coast District Office Boardroom, Port McNeill

Time: 9:30-4:20 pm

Attending: Andrew Ashford, Jon Flintoft, Cyndy Grant, Amy Beetham, Paul Barolet, Kai Sonnenberg, Michelle Todd, Lisa Nordin, David Flegel, Randy Hart, Kelly McMahon, Kathy Walker, Ione Brown, Murray Estlin, Mike Beck, Mike DesRochers

Guests: Laura Darling (by phone), Kathy DesRochers, Craig Wickland, Bob Craven, Lloyd Davies, Andy Waines, Jon Lok

Regrets: Hans Granander, Peter Share, Bill Grutzmacher, Jon Pezel

1. Introductions, Housekeeping

2. OIF Report – Andrew Ashford

March 12th – S6 stream project licensee-led; streamside management. Summer students will be reviewing streams in blocks that were harvested in last year. Large sample size – coastal involvement.

Charles Hunter gave an update on submission standards to address changes in light of William Decision. The level of consultation is proportional to the strength of the First Nations' claim to title. Sharon Hadway indicated that FNs are shifting in their expectations – accommodation toolkit being developed. Uncertainty with BC treaty commission. Les Kiss asked if ministry could share SOC info with licensees. Jessica Coster suggested that detailed SOC is not done for every decision, and this information cannot necessarily be shared with licensees. Crown will be looking at accommodation options and is meeting with FNs to discuss accommodation ideas. Six coastal districts are drafting guidance document to reflect submission standards for permits that reflect information sharing documentation.

Wildlife (IWMS, Elk, Fed SAR), MLA Morris has been asked to review Wildlife Habitat management strategy. Bob shared that CFPA has met with Morris; seems to be more of an interior initiative (MPB). Trappers concern with harvest done.

Larry Petersen spoke about Wildlife measures to protect mamu, goshawk, mountain caribou, grizzly bear, etc. The federal government plan to launch Species at Risk Act – causing concern in BC – if feds designate SAR critical habitat, there is a short timeframe for implementation; Province is trying to demonstrate that IWMS and WHA capture needs of SAR. Feds not necessarily considering socio-economic factors. MOE have been doing a good job making a case that wildlife is being well managed in BC.

THLB Stabilization Project – 2 coastal pilots (Stella Lake-IFP, San Josef-BCTS/WFP) and others in interior. Co-location of reserves to better manage all values. In some cases, we could see 20% uplift in THLB. CF has distributed an info bulletin.

CRIT Hardwood strategy – not meeting targets on the coast – timber supply impacts. More in Craig's presentation later in this meeting.

Stocking Standards paper – Nadina – DM policy in place to set minimum stocking standards to address mid-term timber supply impact to address Mountain Pine Beetle. DM identified gap between what was happening on the ground to base case minimums. Paul indicated that FREP assessed lodgepole pine stands for the FREP timber value (using the Stand Development Monitoring (SDM) Protocol) and found a lot of mortality; stems remaining did not meet AAC assumption. Options are to either reduce the AAC accordingly or increase planting densities to 2000 sph. Concern by clients is increased costs. CRIT has been asked to draft a discussion paper to recommend that licensees put assumptions in practice. Provincial review of stocking standards is ongoing, led by Al Powelson.

Trying to limit OIF to 3 themes.

3. First Nations Update – Kathy DesRochers, Senior Advisor, First Nations Relations, NICC

- 10 months post-Tsilhqot'in SCC decision
 - Majority of operational decisions, still occurring within timelines similar to pre-Tsilhqot'in
 - Due for the most part on the continued commitment and diligence by the licensees in the development of positive working relationships with FN and meaningful information sharing
 - Some hiccups being encountered
 - Reminder to engage early, engage often, consider timing of info sharing (ie. pre-Tsilhqot'in?)
 - Listen, learn and develop an understanding about the FNs use and occupation
 - Seek a letter from the FN at the conclusion of your information sharing, prior to submitting your application to the Province – ideally letter will confirm whether the FN has any outstanding concerns regarding the proposed

application. These letters then aid the Province in establishing whether any additional consultation is required on your application.

- Ensure that your engagement and response is with the appropriate representative within the community – remember that Aboriginal rights are communally held.
- Nanwakolas 'Step 6' letters – seek a letter from the relevant FN – not just NRO – provides us with confidence that FN considers itself to have been appropriately engaged in the process – perhaps thereby negating need for NICC to re-engage under the SEA. I understand that some Nanwakolas FNs are comfortable with NRO providing that confirmation to licensees, others are not.
- If in doubt, seek advice from NICC FN Relations staff.

- Strength of Claim Assessments

- Level of consultation is to be consistent with strength of the FN claims and the potential impact of the proposed decision/action
- Assessment of SOC not new, but Tsilhqot'in SCC decision caused us to adjust certain considerations related to SOC for Aboriginal title
- Province is undertaking SOC assessments on a Regional basis, working closely with JAG
- Must be recognized that the assessment of SOC is evolving skillset and oftentimes reliant on limited available information and will require refinement as new information becomes known, especially that from the FNs.
- Province is developing guidance on how we will be sharing our assessments with FNs – especially over large geographic areas, including the entire TT – ie. FSPs, TSRs, etc.
- Value in sharing some of our site specific assessments with licensees but only after it has been shared with FN and they have been made aware of the intent to share
 - Part of that value to licensee is to assist in the consideration of accommodation measures that may be required
 - At this point we can certainly have general discussions as to whether there appears to be evidence of FN use or occupation of an area – either at time of European contact 1846, or contemporary use
- Province is still considering refinement to our accommodation toolkit, including potential adjustments to our revenue sharing and direct award tenure programs and will be engaging FNs on the matter soon

- Forestry Consultation and Revenue Sharing Agreements (FCRSAs)

- Many of our FNs are entering into their 2nd FCRSA, although some are awaiting MARR minister endorsement
- Some are reluctant and have not yet endorsed a renewal
 - Removal of consultation process – revert to Haida process – may affect timelines
 - No accommodation being provided through revenue sharing contributions
 - Kwikwasut'inuwx/Haxwa'mis, Gwawaenuk Tribe, Wuikinuxv, Tlowitsis, Skin Tyee
 - Ulkatcho - in discussions w MARR currently

- FTOAs
 - o Replaceable forest licences continue to be available/offered using Bill 28 volume
 - o Continue to work towards fulfillment of existing commitments with FN as contained in FRAs, FROs, FTOAs, RPs
 - o HWB discussions related to LUOs may result in additional tenures being provided to some FN
 - o Many FNs indicating an interest in acquiring additional volume that may be available
- TREATY
 - o MARR is continuing to engage with 'Namgis, Gwa'sala'Nakwaxda'xw and Wuikinuxv
- NICC FN Contact Info
 - o Constantly changing – please use NICC public website to ensure up-to-date
 - o https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/ftp/DNI/external/!publish/Aboriginal%20Affairs/FN_NICC_CONTACTS.pdf
 - o Nuxalk email now .ca not .org
 - o Chantelle Saunders no longer in Referrals role – will be replaced – send info to referrals@nuxalknation.ca email
 - o All referrals, information packages, applications, meeting requests, etc. for Wuikinuxv MUST be copied to Susan AB caddisflyer@gmail.com and referrals@wuikinuxv.net
- FN Consultative Area Mapping
 - o Quatsino boundary shifted slightly – reflective of height of land/shared area with Kwakiutl FN
 - o 'Namgis requested significant expansion to Non-Resource Harvesting Area – may affect FCRSA consultative area
- Replacements
 - o NICC Authorizations staff working closely with licensees on consultation requirements
 - o Licensees in best position to speak to the need of the tenure, state of the tenure, etc. – outcome of info sharing will inform consultation level requirements
 - o Avoids conflicts with established MOUs
- Elections forthcoming...Dzawada'enuxw, Kwikwasut'inuwx/Haxwa'mis and Mamalilikulla-Qwe'Qwa'Sot'Em
- Coastal First Nations Reconciliation Protocol Schedule B Engagement Framework Amendment
 - o Being negotiated by MARR
 - o FLNR significant involvement in review of *drafts*
 - o Likely 3 categories of engagement and a separate 'special engagement' process (ranging from 15-75 business days for Cat 1-3)
 - o *Heritage Conservation Act* likely being brought in – may affect Section 12 Site Alteration Permit process.

Randy asked how human well-being is measured. Bob suggested there is some wording in pre-able of LUOs and Andrew recalled that there are 147 indicators. Province is in discussions with

Nanwakolas Clearing House and CFN to define human well-being for the upcoming LUO amendments. Andrew suggested that tenures and revenue sharing might be proxies for this metric. Randy is looking for opportunity to put FN members to work. This human well-being conversation isn't hitting the radar in the FN community – decisions are being made in Victoria and Vancouver that have big impact on small rural and FN communities. Any decision that affects harvest level impacts our communities and subsequently human well-being. Amy – EBM working group had developed a set of indicators – social and economic. Randy attended a presentation from Dr. Adams, “Wealth = Health”, where the threshold for adult income is \$30,000 to meeting social and health standards.

Cyndy indicated that various marine plans have been raised by FNs as reasons to adjust terms or veto the application. Government is asking for specific interest tied to the plan. Conflicts with special management zones are not necessarily reason to reject the application. These plans are not endorsed by government. FN expectations are at odds with existing decision making framework. DM has to consider all information. Land Act decision making is more discretionary – must balance interests and maintain relationships.

4. Deer Winter Range Model – Lisa Nordin, Senior Ecosystems Biologist – see Presentation

Spatial data is available.

Andrew asked about timelines. Would like to complete fieldwork in 2015. If able to complete flights, will start working on package to review later this year. At yesterday's meeting, many licensees indicated willingness to share flight costs to conduct aerial reconnaissance of specific areas.

Bob asked about flexibility on these polygons given Strategic Landscape Reserve Design (SLRD), Biodiversity, Mining, and Tourism Areas (BMTAs) placement. Lisa: ungulate winter range (UWR) will be spatially explicit – hoping for co-location – existing draft 260 polygons should inform SLRD process.

5. Environmental Mitigation Policy – Laura Darling, Unit Head, Environmental Sustainability and Strategic Policy Division, Environment, Ecosystems Branch, Ministry of Environment – see Presentation

Andrew asked about applications on the landbase with respect to forestry decisions. Laura was not part of development, but understands that FRPA is meant to have covered much of the mitigative impacts of forestry decisions. Lisa reiterated that this policy would support decisions. Licensees are following this policy in their applications for amendments and mitigation/accommodation/compensation areas (with like-for-like attributes). These are the best application packages – easy to bring to Decision Maker. Bob reflected that compensation

under the Federal Fisheries Act works under the same premise. Documentation is key in demonstrating willingness to mitigate, residual impact, rationalizing the level of risk to Decision Maker. Would play into upcoming FSP amendments – extensions. Terms and conditions could include mitigative options on approvals.

Mike asked about monitoring of policy implementation. Laura responded that measures and activities will be tracked. New initiatives are identified. Project applications of several years ago were developed with draft policy in mind – trying to capture plans, implementation, outcomes for these projects and will be comparing project outcomes with similar projects. Will develop a resource for practitioners.

6. Public Trust – Mike DesRochers – see Handout

Would like to consider this topic as a standing agenda item for FMLT. All the good work is forgotten when the media highlights one negative situation. Things like the Forestry Capital (2010) go a long way to educating the public and garnering some trust from the public.

Andrew was asked whether he's received any negative comments. He has not.

Mike Beck had a similar issue in the interior where there was a conflict between recreation users and forest companies.

Jon Lok indicated that this issue is high on the ABCFP's radar, with the visuals issue on Haida Gwaii and the fuel spill in English Bay. The perception of the public is ill-informed. We need to do a better job with advocacy, education. The complaint process exists in the association, but very few take concerns through the ABCFP – there has been no complaint process with respect to the Haida Gwaii visuals issue which was originally raised by the Forest Practices Board.

Andrew asked the group about how we can better approach advocacy, education. Kelly brought up Nimpkish Woodlands Advisory Committee (NWAC) as a good example.

The Discovery Island conversation is a good example of the squeaky wheel getting the attention and action of Government. On the positive side, both the Forestry and Recreation sectors are better aware of one another's' challenges and total chance planning, location of recreation activities, etc. The ecotourism folks may even speak positively about/explain forest practices on the landscape as part of their tour.

Craig: CRIT is another avenue to demonstrate and promote solution oriented initiatives. It is non-partisan. But the negative media does take its toll on a forester's attitude.

Randy noted that all professions seem to be facing reduced public support/image. This might be a fact of life in this information age. We have a lot to be proud of.

Bob: The Homalco ecotourism company incorporates forest harvest stops (the Homalco have a forest tenure to showcase), along with bear viewing.

Andrew indicated that the Ministry's Communications Branch has a role in getting stories into the media, and responding to situations like the Nimpkish fire.

During the Port McNeill-Forestry Capital year in 2010, forest professionals wrote feature articles each week, covering a variety of topics. This was well-received and has been missed by the public since it was discontinued.

The Summer Coastal Silviculture Conference is coming up – June 10-11. We should ensure that there is good representation from the media.

Next meeting: report out on CRIT meeting; tangible products to enhance public image.

7. THLB Stabilization – Bob Craven, Interfor – see Presentation

This is not meant to be critical of previous initiatives.

Randy – referring to a slide with 2 goshawk nests – recognizes that goshawks (NOGO) find the old growth attributes more attractive. What happens if there are NOGO nests in areas not previously identified? Bob – trouble is that NOGO will leave nests in favour of new ones - will likely have to keep the previously-used nests as habitat. In central coast SLRD will be anchored reserves, it will allow us to understand exactly what is the working forest. Build in some flexibility; eg anchor to FN interest, High Value Fish Habitat, UWR.

Randy – can we have an SLRD for timber value? Bob – working forest is outside of areas where SLRDs are anchored. More strategic.

Craig – Arrowsmith – looking at optimizing all values, government and industry.

Andrew – constraints are legal, but some flexibility as to where they are to be placed. Several layers of review will be required for this to go forward.

Bob- Paul Bavis in San Josef gave an itemized “report card” to identify each value.

Quatsino First Nation was brought in early on the WFP San Josef pilot – looking to incorporate FN values, cultural areas, monumental cedar.

Randy – public relations – high proportion of landbase is currently protected. Why are we getting such poor “press” when we have so much area protected? Compared to Pacific Northwestern US? Bob – jurisdictionally, our Old Grown management strategy is unprecedented. In Mackenzie there was a high, moderate and low intensity zones for forest management. Agreement was reached at the land use table. Andrew – Vancouver Island Land

Use Plan (VILUP) was set up that way. This doesn't work well when new operators/industries come on the scene. We are managing new concepts through small adjustments; Government Actions Regulation orders – not willing to open VILUP. At some point we will have to re-visit that planning process.

Andrew – in Haida Gwaii, Haida are largest operator; asking why we are managing for values that may already be protected in the protected areas. The concept of a managed forest, similar to Agricultural Land Reserve, has fallen off the radar – Andrew will see what the current status is on this initiative.

Lisa – would like to see methodology how species' habitats are over-lapped. Bob/Andrew – that is what joint review process will focus on.

8. Visual Quality Review – EBM MRVA report – Lloyd Davies, Andy Waines

Andrew opened by stating that district staff re-visited the FREP MRVA VQO as requested by FMLT. In the end, 88% of samples met the FREP criteria, 10% were border-line and 2% did not meet. Job well done, likely the highest conformance on the coast!

The group agreed that viewpoints and viewing conditions affect the results. The Side Bay example, where two operators harvested within weeks of one another and the resulting landscape exceeded the visual quality objective (VQO), is one which feeds the public perception of visual management.

Cyndy asked about surveys and questionnaires on which the VQOs are based. Lloyd responded that there were public perception surveys done in 1995, and updated more recently.

9. Broadleaf discussion paper by CRIT – Craig Wickland

When asked, Craig responded that there are no seed orchards for hardwood seeds yet. Seed comes from Vancouver Island. DNI FMLT should review CRIT target of 200 ha of hardwood management per year and discuss which licencees want to commit to achieving or exceeding this target.

10. Working Group reports

Multi Resource Value Assessment (MRVA) – management of S6 streams – Warren and Paul have drafted paper (Guidance document – non-prescriptive, best management practices) – will distribute for comments prior to September meeting. Field trip will address some components of small stream management. Derek Tripp will attend and talk about his data. No issues with S4s in NICC, consistent with MRVA data. Management of S6 streams has never inferred an AAC impact is necessary. CR FMLT is also having this conversation.

TSR – not active to date. EBM initiative has taken staff/licensee time, effort with respect to second growth, etc.

11. Field trip logistics – all

Derek Tripp to join riparian conversation.

Jon reviewed agenda. 8 am start; marshal at 7:45. Will have hard copies of itinerary available. Lunch not provided. PPE required.

12. Check-in, Meeting evaluation

Bob- good to see from perspective of OIF

Andrew – good, nice to have Bella Coola staff here and Jon Lok

Paul – v. good, members on same page

David – good

Scott – good forum, topics

Murray – first FMLT, good topics, discussion

Randy – nice in person, good range of topics, engagement

Amy – good

Mike – good speakers

Mike B – diverse subjects, good deer WR presentation yesterday

Lloyd – offer support

Kai – excellent presentations, encourage investment of time in modelling – UWR, let's not repeat mistakes (Grizzly Bear), Bob's presentation interesting, co-management

Lisa – good in person, good interaction, VQO presentation,

Michelle – good meeting, speakers

Craig – good participation, working together, eager to learn

Kathy – topics planning focussed, impressed with learning at planning stage to incorporate into operations of BCTS

Cyndy – Public trust conversation played into other topics, nice mix of presenters (industry – government), note-taking detailed to inform the adjunct members.

Jon – good OIF conversation, FN, UWR, environmental mitigation policy, public trust – good discussion, THLB stabilization – CF letter, VQ, Broadleaf discussion, all good learning, nice to have Jon Lok in attendance.

Next meeting: September , 2015

Topics –

Tourism sector – impacts, collaboration