

Sustainable Forest Management Plan

Proposed Changes for 2009+
Presentation to HLFAC
September 1, 2009

Items to be reviewed

- Indicator 6: Retention Targets
- Indicator 11: Final Harvest Plans to protect areas of interest
- Indicator 17: Soil Productivity
- Indicator 18: Water Yield (variance with PFMS)
- Indicator 26 & 3: Area removed
- Indicator 27: Stakeholder participation (non-timber)
- Indicator 31, part 1: Stakeholder participation (other timber uses)
- Indicator 31, part 2: Mechanisms for public input
- Indicator 32: Forestry Awareness
- Conclusions from Management Review
- PAC roles and responsibilities

Indicator 6: Retention Targets

- Current landscape level targets
 - Seasonally minimum of 1% volume of both coniferous and deciduous across operations
 - Seasonally 5% of harvested area to be retained as *residual material*
- Changes
 - Need targets that can be measured by the one doing the job!
 - Area based “block specific” target correlated to historical volume and area retained by cutblock size
 - Continue to be measured by landscape level targets

Indicator 6: Retention Target

- Historical analysis
- Provides basis for the go-forward
- Tolko has met % volume for coniferous and deciduous however area based target of 5% has been difficult to achieve

Indicator 6: Retention Target

Block Size Range (ha)	Total Area (ha)	Total Retention (ha)	Percent Retention	Weighted %	Targets
0.1 - 15.0	4255	74.6	1.75%	N/A	0.0%
15.1 - 25.0	2580	72.3	2.80%	3.22%	4.0%
25.1 - 40.0	3202	157.7	4.93%	5.35%	5.5%
40.1 - 60.0	3024	111.7	3.69%	4.11%	5.0%
60.1 - 100.0	3468	154.3	4.45%	4.87%	5.0%
100.1 - 150.0	2715	125.1	4.61%	5.03%	5.5%
> 150.0	2725	139.2	5.11%	5.53%	6.0%
				Weighted Average:	5.18%

Indicator 6: Retention Target

- Retention Table: Guideline only, **does not replace** the indicators and targets within the DFMP and **SFMP**: 1% coniferous and deciduous volumes, and 5% of harvest area in residual material. It is understood that retention % may not be able to be met on all openings; therefore **contingency plans** should be in place to ensure retention amounts are achieved by compartment per harvest season.
- **Note: Although not required to leave retention in blocks ranging in size from 0.1 to 15.0 ha, **other commitments** for distance to hiding cover, wildlife habitat, etc., still need to be met, and therefore retention might be required. (Discuss with company supervisor)

Indicator 6: Retention Target

- All retained patches that are fully encompassed by logged area will contribute towards the retention % for a block.
- Retention patches can be a variety of sizes, however patches ≥ 0.25 ha's are easier to map, allow protection of interior features, provide more thermal and hiding cover, and larger patches can remain more intact following windthrow events.
- Retention should be focused on areas of the block that are unique and provide quality habitat or meeting biodiversity commitments: (examples)
 - *Standing snags, with no safety concerns.*
 - *Low site areas that could contain vernal pools.*
 - *Large diameter "Wolf" trees (high wildlife value, low timber value)*
 - *Patches containing understorey conifer, larch, black spruce, poor form pine and shrubs*
 - *Previous blowdown areas containing dead and damaged timber*
 - *Bear and other animal dens: leave $\frac{1}{2}$ overstorey tree length radius*
- Merchantable and/or non-merchantable trees can be retained in patches
- Where scattered individual trees are used as retention within openings the following applies:
 - *Conifer trees must meet the 15/11 utilization*
 - *Deciduous trees must meet the 15/10 utilization*

Indicator 11: FHPs to protect AOI

- Auditor found that planning layer data from outside sources was not being updated periodically
- Proposed Change: (page 31)
 - Added statement to Management Strategy: "Annual updates of applicable data layers will be required prior to Final Harvest Plan development."

Indicator 17: Soil Productivity

- Refers to maintaining Growth and Yield program
- G&Y program has been on hold since FFP curtailed
- Auditor recommended that indicator should be adjusted due to changing circumstances
- Proposed change (page 39)
 - Noted that G&Y program suspended
 - Changed wording to current “research” reporting requirement
 - “However, the Growth and Yield program is currently on hold due to curtailment at Footner Forest Products. While FFP is curtailed, Tolko will report on research initiatives relating to soil and timber productivity in the Annual Performance Report.”

Indicator 18: Water Yield

- Changes to sequence is considered a change to water yield ... need to be within variance threshold
- Auditor noticed that variance threshold was “+/- 20%”, however, Tolko would need special permission to be “+” 20%
- Propose change is to alter wording to: (page 39)
 - “Acceptable variance will be up to 20% of the area harvested.”

Indicator 26 and 3: Area removed

- Indicators involve accounting for area removed for ecological and aesthetic significance
- Both involve removal of Peace River Islands and Ponton River Corridor, plus allowance for further removals, if identified
- Proposed Change
 - Indicators are noted as being Complete as of 2003 DFMP approval
 - “Future reporting will only be in the stewardship report, unless further area is removed for ...”

Indicator 27 & 31, part 1: Stakeholder participation

- Providing opportunity to stakeholders for consideration of “non-timber values” and “other timber uses” in plans
- Auditor noted that Target and Monitoring/Reporting were not aligned (opportunities vs. incorporating stakeholder needs)
- Proposed Changes:
 - Indicator: “Forest Management Plans (FMP’s) and operational plans which have incorporated the needs of other stakeholders.”
 - Target: “Stakeholders **are notified** of company’s plans and are provided an opportunity for comment and sharing of ideas or concerns related to the proposed operations.”

Indicator 27 & 31, part 1: Stakeholder participation

- Proposed Changes: (continued)
 - Monitoring and Reporting: “The Companies will track stakeholder involvement in the development of forest management plans and summarize opportunities in the Annual Performance Report. Reporting may involve description from the internal Communication Module, advertisements in local papers or open houses held to display company plans. This Indicator will be reported jointly with Indicator 31, Part 1.” (refers to 27 for Indicator 31, part 1)

Indicator 31, part 2: Mechanisms for public input

- Currently reporting is based on what mechanisms have been used for public involvement
- Auditor suggesting change to include continual improvement in the target
- Current Target: “The Companies will implement a number of mechanisms for public participation according to the CSA Z764-96 Guidelines.” (public involvement how-to)
- Suggestion: focus could be on record of public comments regarding plans, and management actions in response to each (timing, content, level of consideration, etc.)
- Comments??

Indicator 32: Forestry Awareness

- Current target is to have continual improvement in the number of mechanisms used (tours, classroom presentations, etc.)
- Target is measureable, but mechanisms should not be the focus (limit on kinds of events)
- Focus should be on # of persons involved in effective forestry awareness events.

Indicator 32: Forestry Awareness

- Examples: measuring effectiveness
 - *Forestry Tours (# of attendees)*
 - *Classroom presentations (# of students + teacher)*
 - *Trade Fairs (# of surveys completed)*
 - *Public Advisory Committee (# of unique attendees)*
 - *GDP Open House (# of attendees)*
 - *Unique Newspaper Ads (Counts as 1, plus 1 for any response)*
 - *Unique Emails (Counts as 1, plus 1 for any response)*

Conclusions from Divisional Management Review

- Review occurred July 23, 2009 (TL, JB, MS, ML)
- Items discussed and conclusions:
 - The public participation process
 - *General overview of process: PAC, GDP open houses replaced with plans available at Tolko for review, First Nation Consultation, etc.*
 - The VOITs, reviews and forecasts
 - *Reviewed items from the 2007-2008 reporting period*
 - Performance in relation to targets
 - *Regeneration was discussed*
 - Findings of audits (internal and external)
 - *Discussion about prime contractor requirement*
 - Corrective and preventative actions
 - *Focus to be on root cause and determining appropriate CAP*
 - The SFM policy and the need for changes
 - Changing legislation or other relevant requirements

Conclusions from Divisional Management Review

- Items discussed and conclusions: (cont'd)
 - Changing expectations, requirements, or responsibilities of interested parties
 - Changes in types of forest operations or forest activities
 - *FFP curtailment*
 - Changes in the organization or in resource requirements and availability
 - Advances in science and technology
 - *GPS guided bunchers*
 - Lessons learned from experience
 - Changes in the DFA
 - *Reduced O&G activity*
 - *Decked aspen issue unresolved*

Conclusions from Divisional Management Review

- Items discussed and conclusions: (cont'd)
 - Questions to Manager
 - Is the EMS/SFM Suitable?
 - Is the EMS/SFM Adequate?
 - Is the EMS/SFM Effective?
- Manager's Comment:
 - *"Yes. I feel confident that the necessary programs are in place to continue to make the certifications successful. The woodlands group is following the programs, responding to short falls, and striving to make it more effective."*

PAC Roles and Responsibilities

- Even though the HLFAC Terms of Reference is included in the SFM Plan, there is a requirement by the CSA Standard to state the PAC's role under Shared Responsibilities section of the SFM Plan.



Questions?