

# FFT Workshop Synopsis

October 2014



# Workshop Synopsis

## Land Based Investment Strategy (LBIS): Forests for Tomorrow (FFT) Planning and Delivery Workshop

*Sponsored by*

*Resource Practices Branch  
BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations*

Ministry of **Forests, Lands and  
Natural Resource Operations**



*Workshop Organizers:*

Nigel Fletcher, Dave Cornwell, Matt LeRoy, Monty Locke, John McClarnon and Al Powelson, Resource Practices Branch

*Assembled by:*

Terje Vold, Contractor, LBIS Project Support

**October 2014**

# Table of Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	4
REMINDER OF WORKSHOP AGENDA.....	6
PURPOSE OF THIS SYNOPSIS .....	8
DAY ONE – STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES.....	8
CONVERSATION WITH EXECUTIVE.....	8
SESSION 1: FFT STRATEGIC PLAN – FOCUS AND PRIORITIES.....	14
SESSION 2: LEAN: KEEPING UP PROGRESS–MOVING INTO THE CONTROL PHASE .....	17
SESSION 3: AOP–PRIORITY FILTERING & BUDGET NUMBERS COMPILED TO DATE.....	20
SESSION 4: RAMPING UP CURRENT REFORESTATION .....	22
DAY TWO – PROGRAM DELIVERY .....	24
HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS FROM DAY ONE .....	24
SESSION 5: EVOLUTION OF TYPE 4 SILVICULTURE STRATEGY.....	26
SESSION 6: MAPPING NEEDS .....	27
SESSION 7: INCORPORATING FOREST HEALTH RISKS INTO FFT PRESCRIPTIONS .....	28
SESSION 8: FIRST NATIONS CONSULTATION–IMPLICATIONS OF WILLIAMS DECISION .....	31
SESSION 9: SEEDLING REQUESTS AND SEED PLANNING.....	31
SESSION 10: SAFETY AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM .....	34
WORKSHOP WRAP-UP AND EVALUATION.....	36
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS.....	37
APPENDIX 2: WORKSHOP EVALUATION .....	39
APPENDIX 3: WORKSHOP ACTION ITEMS.....	43

## List of Acronyms

ADM	Assistant Deputy Minister
AGOL	Arcgis Online
AOP	Annual Operating Plan
AOS	Aerial Overview Survey of forest health
BAC	Black Army Cutworm
BCTS	BC Timber Sales
CCLUP	Cariboo Chilcotin Land Use Plan
COP	Community of Practice
CF	Community Forest
CR	Current Reforestation program under FFT
DM	District Manager
ELUC	Environment and Land Use Committee of Cabinet
FAIB	Forest Analysis and Inventory Branch
FFT	Gross Domestic Product
FPC	Forest Practices Code
FREP	Forest and Range Evaluation Program
FRPA	Forest and Range Practices Act
FLNR	Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations
FSMF	Forest Stand Management Fund
FTE	Full time equivalent (staff)
FY	Fiscal Year
GAR	Government Actions Regulation under FRPA
ha	hectares
IRM	Integrated Resource Management
ITSL	Innovative Timber Sales Licence
LBIS	Land Based Investment Strategy
MM	Million
MPB	Mountain Pine Beetle
MRVA	Multiple Resource Value Assessments under FREP
NSA	Nursery Shipping and Administration system
NSR	Not Satisfactorily Restocked
OGMA	Old Growth Management Area
POYS	Pests of Young Stands surveys
PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers
QA	Quality Assurance
REDs	Regional Executive Directors
RISS	RESULTS Information Submission Specifications
RMT	Regional Management Team
ROI	Return on Investment
RPB	Resource Practices Branch
SDM	Stand Development Monitoring under FREP
SEDAs	Stand Establishment Decision Aids
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SPAR	Seed Planning and Registry system

sph	stems per hectare
SPI	Surveys for pest incidence
SPZ	Seed Planning Zone
SS	Silviculture Strategy
TFL	Tree Farm Licence
THLB	Timber Harvesting Land Base
TIB	Tree Improvement Branch
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSA	Timber Supply Area
TSM	Timber Supply Mitigation program under FFT
TSM	Timber Sales Manager
TSO	Timber Sales Office
TSR	Timber Supply Review
UWR	Ungulate Winter Range
VP	Vice President
WHA	Wildlife Habitat Areas
WL	Woodlot Licence
WSCA	Western Silvicultural Contactors' Association
YSM	Young Stand Monitoring by FAIB

## Reminder of Workshop Agenda

### Land Based Investment Strategy (LBIS): Forests for Tomorrow (FFT) Planning and Delivery Workshop

Location: Conference Room at The Hotel at River Rock  
8811 River Road, Richmond, BC V6X 3P8

**DAY ONE: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2014**

#### **Strategic objectives**

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| 8:30 am  | <i>Coffee/tea available – meet and greet – location to be announced</i>                                     |
| 9:00 am  | <b>Welcome and Introductions</b> – Nigel Fletcher   |
| 9:15 am  | <b>Conversation with Executive</b> – Tom Ethier and other ADMs  |
| 10:00 am | <i>Coffee break</i>   |
| 10:15 am | <b>Session 1: FFT Strategic Plan – focus and priorities</b> – Matt LeRoy                                    |
| 10:45 am | <b>Session 2: LEAN – keeping up progress – moving into the control phase</b> – Dave Cornwell and LEAN Team  |
| 12:00 pm | <i>Lunch – to be provided offsite</i>   |
| 1:00 pm  | <b>Session 3: AOP – priority filtering &amp; budget numbers compiled to date</b> – Matt LeRoy & Monty Locke |
| 3:00 pm  | <i>Coffee break</i>   |
| 3:15 pm  | <b>Session 4: Ramping up Current Reforestation</b> – Matt LeRoy   |
| 4:00 pm  | <b>Day One wrap-up</b> – Matt LeRoy   |
| 5:00 pm  | <b>Adjourn</b>  |

**DAY TWO: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2014**

**Program delivery**

- 7:30 am *Coffee/tea available – meet and greet – location to be announced*
- 8:00 am **Housekeeping items from Day One** – Monty Locke
- 8:15 am **Session 5: Evolution of Type 4 Silviculture Strategy –how they relate to TSR and your AOP**  
– Paul Rehsler
- 9:15 am **Session 6: Mapping needs & RESULTS FAQ** – Matt LeRoy
- 10:00 am *Coffee break*
- 10:15 am **Session 7: Forest Health factors to consider when developing a stand mgt plan** – Tim Ebata
- 11:00 am **Session 8: First Nations consultation – implications of Williams decision** – Neil Edwards
- 12:00 pm *Lunch – to be provided*
- 1:00 pm **Session 9: Sowing requests – sowing levels, stock types, seedling selection and seed planning coordination** – Matt LeRoy, Susan Zedel and John McClarnon
- 1:45 pm **Session 10: Safety and safety management system** – Dave Cornell
- 2:45 pm **Workshop wrap-up and evaluation** – Matt LeRoy  
Recap meeting action items  
Please complete the Workshop Evaluation Form before leaving
- 3:00 pm **Adjourn**

Thanks to All Who Participated!

## **Purpose of this Synopsis**

At least 48 individuals, including staff from districts, regions, BCTS and branches, that are involved or interested in the Forests for Tomorrow (FFT) program attended a workshop held September 17-18, 2014 in Richmond, British Columbia (BC). Workshop participants are listed in Appendix 1.

The purpose of this Synopsis is to provide a summary of discussion highlights and action items from the workshop for participants and others that may be interested who were unable to attend.

The Workshop Workbook and workshop presentations are posted on the following LBIS FFT website: [www.for.gov.bc.ca/hcp/fia/landbase/fft/updates.htm](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hcp/fia/landbase/fft/updates.htm). This Workshop Synopsis will be also be posted there.

So as not to repeat material already compiled, this Synopsis should be used in conjunction with the Workbook that was prepared to guide the Workshop.

## **Day One – Strategic Objectives**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Nigel Fletcher thanked attendees for their participation, provided safety information should there be a need to evacuate the meeting room, and provided a quick review of the agenda. Nigel asked participants to introduce themselves (see Appendix 1).

### **Conversation with Executive**

The Executive that attended the workshop were:

- Tom Ethier, ADM, Resource Stewardship Division – in-person
- Dave Peterson, Chief Forester and ADM, Tenures, Competitiveness and Innovation Division – via conference call

#### **Tom Ethier**

Tom acknowledged FFT Workshop organizers for their efforts, and noted how worthwhile it is to have participant experts together at the workshop. He encouraged that name tags be worn at future meetings so that it is easier to identify attendees.

FFT was launched 10 years ago in 2005 to address the impacts of the mountain pine beetle (MPB) epidemic and wildfires. FFT is the longest running government stewardship investment program in the Ministry's history. There is political interest in reforestation – which helps provide program support. Tom is impressed with staff working on the FFT file, as the Minister and the opposition always get the information they need. Not only do staff get things done, but they do so in a good and fun way. Tom thanked Al Powelson for the major contributions he has provided to the FFT program. Although Al has moved onto to the Stand Management Officer position, we will continue to draw on his skills as we work through the significant impacts of this year's fires.



Regarding First Nations, the ministry will be working through the recent Williams court decision to try and make the consultation process practicable. The key is the development of good relationships between the district and First Nations.

The Premier's mandate letter to the Minister addressed mid-term timber supply prominently with a continued silviculture investment commitment being a key part of improving timber supply in the mid-term.

This year's wildfires will result in a significant number of claims under s. 108. Lorne Bedford is working with a team, including Wildfire Management Branch, to look at the implications of this year's fires.

The accomplishments of the FFT program, thanks to the FFT Team, including participants at this workshop, are significant. This year the FFT program planted the highest number of seedlings in a single year – 24.4 million trees.

Since 2005, FFT has:

- Surveyed over 12 million hectares
- Planted about 128 million seedlings on over 91 500 hectares which will be increasing future volume by about 17.2 million cubic metres and will result in a future GDP of about \$2 billion
- Reduced backlog NSR by about 162 000 hectares thereby meeting the 2008 throne speech commitment to eliminate the backlog by 2015.

Since 2010, FFT has:

- Spaced over 7000 hectares of dense stands thereby bringing these areas into production earlier
- Fertilized over 73 000 hectares thereby increasing mid-term timber supply by about 1.4 million cubic metres which will result in a future GDP of about \$125 million.

Although there is only funding for a small fertilization program in 2015/16, we are planning for an increase in funding for fertilization in 2016/17.

The FFT program was selected as a corporate Lean project in 2013. Lean has been a real driver within government and FFT once again is leading the charge. The FFT Lean project was one of the most successful corporate Lean projects to date thanks to the FFT Lean Team and the solid leadership provided by Dave Cornwell.

As Executive Sponsor of the FFT Lean project, Tom is aware there is still a level of dissatisfaction about the priority setting process – not only within FFT but across the LBIS categories. That being said, the FFT Lean Team has done a great job of improving the planning and delivery of the FFT program.

A key outcome of the Lean project was building effective communication processes that engage not only staff but District Managers, REDs, ADMs, our BCTS partners and the Deputy. It is now important that we fully engage those communication processes so that we can collaborate effectively to achieve the goals of the FFT program. We intend to explore using key principles developed from FFT Lean project to other LBI investment categories.

District Managers are becoming more directly involved in FFT because they are now part of the endorsement process for the annual operating plan (AOP) – a well-informed District Manager can be a powerful proponent for the work that we want to accomplish.

The drivers (MPB and wildfires) for the FFT program in 2005 are still here today; that said, should we modify this to make the program stronger? It will be important to revisit and confirm the priorities to ensure we maintain a clear focus for the program.

### **Dave Peterson**

Dave expressed appreciation for being able to speak to a room of dedicated silviculturists. The Premier's mandate letter to the Ministry underscores the importance of the delivering the Mid-Term Timber Supply Action Plan. Item #4 in the letter states that the ministry is to work with the forest industry to prepare for the upcoming fibre reduction as the pine beetle killed timber is exhausted. Dave Cornwell monitors our progress on the Action Plan with FFT being a big part of the Plan.

Type 4 Silviculture Strategies identify the best suite of activities to improve timber supply in a management unit. Dave encouraged workshop attendees to continue to use Type 4 Silviculture Strategies where they have been completed, and to undertake them in units where they have not been completed.

FFT and BCTS have been working together to increase the use of FFT eligible lump sum timber sales. This enables BCTS to market fibre that is currently uneconomical to harvest if there were a legal reforestation obligation. FFT benefits by receiving ground for planting at minimal costs and this significantly extends the areas that can be planted. This is a huge win-win as more fibre is available for the market and more land can be reforested. Dave recognizes there is a gradient between what is economic to harvest with a legal reforestation obligation and what is not; it is not always easy to find the divide.

Harvesting dead pine stands that are currently uneconomical to harvest will provide a supply of fibre for the bioenergy and pulp sectors who are currently experiencing challenges in securing economic sources of fibre.

Since future forest stands face climate change pressure, when making silviculture prescriptions it is important to create resilient forests considering future climate risk.

### **Qs & As and Discussion**

#### FFT treatments needed outside BCTS operating areas

Q: We are doing a good job tackling MPB-killed stands in BCTS's operating area, but we are generally not doing FFT treatments on impacted stands outside BCTS operating areas. Who will lead the charge (e.g. which ADM) to discuss this issue with major licensees?

A: We need operational-level discussions about this. The assumption is that there is nothing to stop FFT from looking everywhere on Crown forest lands for treatment opportunities. We need to discuss this issue with ADM Tom Jensen.

Discussion: District Managers are a key communication link with major licensees. FFT communication with District Managers was not as good as it should have been in past; now with the Lean process we need District Manager endorsement of the AOP - this should help increase District Manager awareness of need for treatments outside BCTS operating areas.

Innovative Timber Sales Licences (ITSLs) are used by BCTS for FFT stand rehabilitation projects. What tool can major licensees use if they are also interested in FFT stand

rehabilitation treatments? If good FFT candidates in major licensee area, this should not be a Softwood Lumber Agreement issue.

We need to move on using ITSLs outside BCTS operating areas so we can most effectively deliver FFT; this will require discussions with Timber Sales Manager, District Manager and major licensees; we need to get going on this. For operations staff, there is lots of energy and work to make those discussions happen, so Executive is needed to help get everyone on-side.

**Action #1: Discussions need to be held with District Managers and major licensees about the need for FFT reforestation activities outside BCTS operating areas in a variety of forums including:**

- **District Manager Community of Practice discussions**
- **Joint industry/ministry Resource Stewardship and Tenures Committee**
- **Provincial Forestry Forum**
- **Regional Operational Issues Forums**

#### Type 4 Silviculture Strategies and Funding

We have spent over \$100 K per TSA for Type 4 Silviculture Strategies (SS) based on the premise of funding support, but we are not getting needed funding. This can irritate the many participants who help prepare the Type 4 SS in their TSA. Lines are blurred between FFT Current Reforestation (CR) and Timber Supply Mitigation (TSM); what is more important is which suite of treatments creates the most benefit to the TSA based on the outcome of the Type 4 SS. There seems to be a disconnect between the budget allocation process (e.g. funding to CR vs TSM) and the need to support the outcomes of the Type 4 SS.

Not getting the needed funding is a real issue. The blurring of FFT sub-programs seems correct; it should be about the best suite of silviculture investments for the TSA. Type 4 SS are evolving to be a 'one land manager' landscape-level plan.

Tom: How do we operationalize the recommendations in the Type 4 SS? What could the ideal situation be? Having the plans helps us keep on track. The additional \$10 MM for CR for next FY is a positive sign.

Dave: Understand frustration. Having the Type 4 SS won't guarantee additional funding, but our chances to secure funding is much better with the Type 4 SS in place than without them. With the Type 4 SS we can demonstrate that we don't have enough silviculture investment funding, and can show the kinds of return on investment (ROI) that can be made.

#### Reforestation practices

Given impacts on future timber supply, how do we encourage major licensees to use a higher density of planting stock than the minimums required for reforestation? It was suggested that changes to the appraisal system is the solution. Currently, appraisal allowances are based on average reforestation costs - not actual costs even if prescription is for natural reforestation.

It was noted that in early October, industry Chief Foresters and ministry staff will be in the field together to discuss issues like use of minimum stocking standards.

Tom attended a field trip recently and said it was useful with several action items identified. We need to be clear about desired outcomes, and be concerned about overall cost impacts to industry.

A workshop participant noted that the intent of FRPA was to provide government objectives to help guide the professional reliance delivery approach. After two years of discussions about stocking standards, there is need to set reforestation objectives for TSAs. FRPA is set up for failure without clear objectives.

Dave responded that we (government) as owner of Crown resources need to clearer about desired outcomes with objectives, that Type 4 SS can help us in that regard, and also that we need to be mindful of and recognize that cost implications as can be an impediment to moving forward. We need to move on all those fronts to be successful.

It was noted via workshop discussions that it is important to consider the kinds of risks and costs that government bears, and the costs to communities if revenues fall due to declining timber supply.

#### Williams court case decision impact on FFT

Dave: Although the implications of the decision are under review, probably safe to say the only way FFT will be able to operate in pure title areas is with the consent of the Tshilqot'in First Nation. That said, FFT reforestation activities in their pure title area likely would be supported by the First Nation. Similarly, also suspect FFT reforestation activities on strength of claim areas (outside pure title) would also be supported by First Nations. So Dave does not see the decision as being an impediment to FFT; however there will likely be more of a workload to get First Nations consent.

#### Expected FFT funding in future

Tom: Based on government's 'blue book', government funding levels appear to be relatively stable over next 3 years. Tom suspects that LBIS funding levels will more or less by at the \$64 MM level.

#### Fertilization delivery

There was a question about delivering FFT fertilization on the Coast since BCTS has had to focus on its core mandate and is no longer able to support delivery.

It was mentioned that we can use third party delivery through our agreement with PwC. Sometimes districts or regions may be interested in delivery, or local licensees.

#### BCTS's FFT role

It was noted that BCTS does see lump sum timber sales in support of FFT CR as part of their core mandate, and that BCTS takes seriously its partnership with FFT. A new FFT focused BCTS position has been posted.

An opinion was expressed that BCTS should be the primary FFT delivery agent (vs divided among many agents) as this is more efficient, and that we need a high level decision of 'what is BCTS's business?'

It was noted that BCTS has staffing issues too, and does not always have the capacity to deliver all aspects of the FFT program. Therefore other delivery agents may need to be used. Increasing BCTS resources to better deliver FFT has cost implications to government; we need to be practical about this considering costs.

#### Is there value in third party delivery?

Dave Cornwell noted that it is the option of last resort – where we don't have the staff to deliver aspects of the program – and third party delivery is only way to get licensees involved. If we have capacity to delivery, then great, do so. But if not we can use PwC to administer third party delivery. About 10% of CR is delivered via third party e.g. caribou GAR. PwC also helps deliver FFT projects in community forests, woodlots, and for fertilization. We have done a cost comparison of in-house and third party delivery, and they are comparable.

We can't use FFT funding to fund an FTE so we do have capacity issues to deliver in-house in some cases. Sometimes we need to quickly ramp-up delivery for a short time; even if we could hire staff, it may not be appropriate to hire staff during ramp-up only to have to let them go when short-term program ramp-up is completed.

It should be noted that most of the FFT program is internally delivered and that a limited amount that varies by internal capacity is delivered by third parties. Having a diversity of options gives us flexibility in how to deliver most effectively.

### **Pre-Workshop Input**

Several of the pre-workshop inputs related to 'Conversations with Executive' were already addressed from the above discussions. There was a review of input that had not yet been covered.

Input: FFT is currently the only discretionary funding source for silviculture investments. Does Executive believe it reasonable to reinvest some funds to all parts of the province that are actively engaged in timber harvesting and producing revenue to the crown or does the FFT strategy of targeting funds on only the highest of impacted sites (regardless of ROI principles) to the exclusion secondary or tertiary priority management units seen as acceptable?

Tom: As noted earlier, there is opportunity for FFT to re-think the 'big drivers' for investment decisions.

Input: Viewpoint on short to medium term FFT investment priorities in consideration of broad-scale regional and provincial issues. Viewpoint on stability of LBIS funding generally, and in particular the medium-term share of FFT funding in light of increasing needs of other LBIS investment categories.

Tom: Think LBIS is stable with FFT CR receiving an increase in \$10 MM next fiscal year.

Discussion: FFT TSM was zero last fiscal year (FY), up this FY, and expected to be down next FY; this makes fertilization application program awkward to manage given dramatically different funding levels from year to year.

It might be better to look at FFT as the complete package (and not CR vs TSM) where a regime of silviculture investments are made; it is a silviculture response – not just a CR response. This may improve the stability of the fertilization program.

Input: Staffing.

Tom: Don't see a change or increase, but we can fill vacancies more quickly, and don't envision a decline.

Dave: Also don't see a decline. There may be increases in staffing, but in the longer-term.

Input: Long-term commitment to funding the fish passage portion of the LBIS budget.

Tom: We will continue to fund Fish Passage; that said the current funding levels are not a high as they were a few years ago.

Input: How does Executive add value to the operational activities conducted at the district, on-the-ground?

Dave: Good communication to hear what the operational issues are; the Executive needs to be aware of the issues. ADMs raising awareness about staffing and funding needs. We need to move the dial in establishing government objectives. We also need to move the dial in legislation and with the forest industry. Staff need to fully inform us of what is happening on-the-ground through venues like this workshop.

Tom: Need to invite District Managers to a meeting like this. There is a commitment by the Executive to the FFT program.

Input: Administrative dollars continuously taken from district by region?

It was noted that FFT overhead was being used to fund regional staff salaries. The assumption is made in budget forecasting that so many people will retire, but they may not retire and if not this results in salary pressures.

Tom: If this is a systemic issue, need to raise with ADMs.

Dave: The reality is that LBIS is only place with discretionary funding; it is the only cushion we have when risk managing the budget. As Tom says, if this issue happens regularly, please raise it with us.

Discussion: If administrative funds move way from district, this can impact their capacity to be involved in FFT delivery.

### **Closing**

Tom thanked everyone for the opportunity to address the group and respond to questions.

Dave noted that it was not surprise to him to hear the depth of questions from the group, and their level of commitment to the FFT program.

## **Session 1: FFT Strategic Plan – focus and priorities**

Matt LeRoy led the session; Matt is currently the A/Resource Investment Officer for Resource Practices Branch. He noted he is dealing with NPDD – new position deficit disorder.

The 2013-2017 FFT Strategic Plan is the program's second Strategic Plan – the plan is the underpinning of what we do, and is intended to help us as we make operational decisions. Most people in the program are aware of the Strategic Plan (which is posted on the LBIS [FFT Guidance website](#)).

Vision and Mission: Matt went over the vision and mission statements in the Plan, and asked for workshop feedback; does it still ring true? There was feedback that catastrophic impacts of the MPB and wildfire are the focus of FFT; although this vision is not necessarily wrong, the reality is that FFT is the only investment funding we have, and thus everyone's trying to get some funding from it. Funding important projects in areas that are not catastrophically impacted is tough when this is the only pot of funding available to make silviculture investments.

Goal 1: When addressing Goal 1 in the Plan, Matt asked: is it time for a program review? Monitoring and continuous improvement? Monitoring performance needs to be a normal part of every project.

During discussions it was noted that there are a lot of small impacts (not singularly catastrophic) that have significant cumulative effects on timber supply e.g. smaller bark beetle impacts. Another comment was made that bad past practices can have significant impacts on mid-term timber supply.

There was a suggestion that the current model used to examine how treatments can mitigate timber supply impacts on the TSA (a key decision support tool) needs to be tested, ground truthed and reviewed.

Another point was made that FFT funds to TFLs (vs TSAs) should be a low priority unless licensees bring funds to the table or unless the district wants to make those FFT investments in the TFL.

A comment was made about importance of goals and objectives for programs like FFT. How does investments on TFLs meet those goals and objectives; it might sometimes be better made there given the area-based management regime. Need to evaluate TFL vs TSA investment impacts on achieving goals and objectives.

A question was asked on how decisions get made on FFT funding allocations to TFLs and TSAs? For community forests and woodlot licenses, there was direction to provide a certain level of funding for these smaller area-based tenures.

There was comment on importance of a five-year investment plan; too often we are overly focused on the issues of the day.

There was a question about FFT program evaluation. Nigel oversaw the LBIS (including FFT) program evaluation work. The evaluation work was paid for from Branch funding. Given funding pressures, the program evaluation work has been dropped.

The coast has a plan to visit sites 10 years after treatment to see if objectives were met e.g. did we have the right density and species? In Chilliwack district, we have done some of these surveys, and are getting some feedback.

FFT is intended to be a 'flagship' program that uses higher densities and increases species diversity – is it working? Need to be able to respond to these questions if we are trying to convince others, like licensees, to go in that direction too.

Regarding species diversity, there was comment that in some cases planting for mixed species does not work. For example, when managing for a short rotation on the coast, there is no point planting cedar and Douglas-fir, as only the Douglas-fir will be merchantable at time of harvest. You would need a long-rotation before cedar becomes merchantable. A strategy is to not intermix the species, but instead plant for cedar stands in some areas, and separately for Douglas-fir stands in other areas to provide species diversity.

A comment was made that we not only need to monitor if we did the right thing in terms of outcomes on-the-ground, but also how tight was our planning and implementation? We also need a budgetary report on how well we are delivering; we have this provincially now, but not by region/district.

Goal 2: Matt went over Goal 2 and related Performance Measures noting that we are doing a good job reporting these Performance Measures in the FFT Annual Report and in the Ministry Service Plan, and also in using this information to support estimates debate briefing note material.

A question was asked about how FFT is different than normal reforestation programs e.g. we are removing the overstory but for most part planting pine. Matt responded FFT is planting at higher densities, and is also planting other species like larch.

A comment from the central interior noted we are trying to maximize use of other species, but ecological conditions – such as dry pine sites – often indicate that only pine is suitable to plant. It was noted in response that even planting pine at higher densities is progressive.

A question was asked about the use of hardwood species in planting. A response from the coast noted that there is the opportunity to increase use of hardwoods for short rotations.

A comment from the southern interior noted that FFT program has pushed hard for mixed species planting, but this may not make sense from a crop planning perspective. For example if you plant pine and spruce together, they mature at 60 years and 80-90 years, respectively. Delaying harvest to 80-90 years to capture the spruce volume could set the pine component of the stand up to MPB impacts. Given that, it may be better to not have mixed species planting.

A response was that from a climate change perspectives, there has been a push for mixed stands. However if from a crop planning perspective, it is not appropriate to have mix species planted, then don't do it. We don't want FFT Performance Measures to influence on-the-ground actions in the wrong manner.

Matt showed a graph of yearly timber volume gains in 65 years after treatment from FFT planting, use of select seed, spacing and brushing – this ties into Performance Measure 7 in the Service Plan.

Goal 3: There was comment that our goal should not be just meeting the 2% return on investment (ROI), but instead should be getting the best ROI from our silviculture investments. Another comment suggested the Goal statement should be qualified by adding 'within the mandate of the program'.

There was question about how non-timber values get factored into FFT decisions? The Multiple Accounts Decision Analysis posted on the LBIS [FFT Guidance website](#) is the tool intended to assist us in that regard.

Goal 4 addresses safety. It was noted that FFT is not safe certified so the issue comes up from time to time. That said most people hired by FFT are safe certified, and BCTS is safe certified.

FFT treatments can be safe without hiring safe certified contractors, but this creates more work on staff – as we need to spend more time to determine this. A comment was made that they did feel that FFT puts a lens to safety like other programs.

It was also noted that a safety perspective can sometimes go too far. In one area, staff can not use a chain saw. Sometimes a manager's aversion to risk can lead to the work not getting done or getting done in an inefficient manner. Safety is important, but learn from what makes sense. There are 'empires' around safe certification that can sometimes go too far.



Goal 5 relates to taking a people centric approach. On one hand, at workshops like this, there is sense of a FFT community of practice with BCTS and FLNR staff. On the other hand, back at the regional or district office, you are often the only one dealing with FFT and can feel isolated.

It was suggested that we may need a community of practice (COP) interaction between regions and districts that goes beyond the FFT workshops.

There was a comment that the FFT Roles and Responsibilities document posted at the [LBIS FFT Guidance website](#) needs to be revisited.

It was also noted that we are not actually measuring Goal 5 Performance Measures such as communication effectiveness feedback, and trends from surveys. The Performance Measures in the FFT Strategic Plan for timber are for the most part being measured and reported, but not so for the other Performance Measures. There was comment that a Lean update can aid communication.

It was suggested that we need one or two FFT staff in the organization charts; currently every region delivers FFT in an ad hoc and different manner – this makes communication difficult. There is also issue of staff turn-over with senior staff leaving the FFT program and a new person coming in to do the job.

There was a district comment that their FFT work is done without administrative support (i.e. that support is addressing other priorities instead); this means FFT staff have to fill the gap and provide that administrative support (e.g. preparing documents for BC Bid). If district staff could tap into BCTS for administrative support, that would be a great help.

The pre-workshop input for this Session was reviewed and most of the feedback has been covered during the presentation and through the ensuing discussions. Regarding s. 108, we anticipate significant budget pressures given the many wildfires that occurred this year.

## **Session 2: LEAN: keeping up progress—moving into the control phase**

Dave Cornwell extended his appreciation to the 10 staff members on the Lean Team. It was a long but good road to travel. Through the Lean process, we tried to do the right thing - is it perfect? No, but we need to follow the process, and learn from it – which can lead to improvements with experience. We are now at the ‘control’ part of Lean process.

Dave asked attendees how many people are following the Lean process; based on a show of hands, not that many are following the process as yet. Following the FFT Lean process is a requirement – it is not an option. The FFT Lean process is not a huge shift from the previous process – it is more of an enhancement. Nigel is working on communication-aspects of the Lean process.

The ‘control points’ in the Lean process are what we are going to monitor, measure and continuously improve on. For example, the process now requires that we get District Manager endorsement of the AOP – this is a key improvement in the process. This requires a conversation with the District Manager (DM) about FFT delivery where issues like the importance of getting BCTS to deliver FFT outside their operating area can be raised.

Who’s delivering the work? The DM needs to be aware of the resourcing implications of the AOP. The DM should not be ‘told’ of the AOP decision that affects district resources; DM endorsement of the AOP helps generate buy-in. If the AOP creates resourcing pressures, the

DM can take the need for additional resources to deliver FFT to the Regional Management Team (RMT).

Monty Locke is on a sub-team of the FFT Lean project that developed a briefing note to Tom Ethier and the ADM, Corporate Services about how do we get more resources for the program.

Another enhancement in the Lean process is being able to start work as soon as the allocation decision is made without having to wait for ADM Area approval; the allocation decision will now provide the blanket approval to proceed with FFT delivery.

Regarding communications, the Director of Resource Practices Branch intends to meet with DMs to raise awareness of FFT and the Lean process. We are hoping to get the Director to address this as an agenda item at a DM community of practice (COP) meeting.

There was a comment that there is a need to re-visit the project approval process for FFT projects on woodlots and community forests; districts need to be aware of the projects in those areas. There was need for s. 52 approval for these projects, but the DM needs to be aware of the projects so they need to be involved in the approval process.

**Action #2: Dave Cornwell to send draft Lean Control Points to FFT contacts for review and comment. When Resource Practices Branch talks with the District Manager COP, they will raise the draft control points with them.**

There was a comment that DM endorsement is perhaps more needed for the 5-year plan than the AOP; the 5-year plan provides links to the Type 4 Silviculture Strategy. Endorsement for the AOP alone may be too late; either have the 5-year plan endorsed by the DM, or have the DM endorse both the 5-year plan and the AOP. There was feedback agreeing with that comment; that we need to build involvement by DM prior to AOP in the Lean process. It was noted that if the DM has issues with the AOP, it is too late; the DM needs to be aware of the 5-year plan.

A question was raised about what is the strategy for engagement of the Timber Sales Manager (TSM)? It is very important that the DM and TSM are provided that same information at the same time. There was comment that the TSM is very aware of the AOP.

There was a reminder that the draft AOP is not the approved plan; the draft AOP is the 'wish list' that needs to be revised to be consistent with the FFT budget and government direction. That is why the DM 'endorses' the draft AOP (vs 'approving' it) – as the draft AOP will need to change depending on the budget.

Dave Cornwell reminded everyone that the FFT Lean process needs to be fully implemented next FY. For example, if there is no DM endorsement of the AOP, there will be no funding for that district.

A proposed control measure is RESULTS entry for district and BCTS delivered projects. Currently quality assurance 'report cards' are prepared monthly; this is coordinated by the RESULTS Working Group.

Although not expected to be a control point, need to check the percent of project spent on overhead, and % planned in AOP vs achieved.

There have been some AOP improvements, for example, better definitions to assist staff address whether there was overstory removal vs site preparation; on the hectares planted/planned; and changes in how to roll-up the AOP in an easier manner.

Regarding FFT Lean communications, there will be a:

- Final report out on FFT Lean
- Report to FFT Business Meeting
- Report to DM COP
- Report to the Executive
- Follow-up with a survey.

Follow the FFT Lean process, make it work; only way to find bumps in the process is to use it and then we can improve the process. Do you understand the process? The ‘challenge wall’ approach where we find out from you ‘what is working well’ and ‘what is not working well’ is probably not appropriate now since few people indicated earlier that they are currently following the process. But later we will address those questions based on your experience.

It was noted that the FFT Lean process will mean we need to update the FFT Roles and Responsibilities document; this comment was also made in Session 1.

**Action #3: Resource Practices Branch will update the FFT Roles and Responsibilities document so that it is consistent with the FFT Lean process.**

A comment from a Lean Team member said the FFT Lean process is complicated as it is a 3-year process from planning to delivery. We need to simplify it to make it more user friendly perhaps by describing different ‘blocks’ in the process.

There was feedback that the person does not think the Lean process has changed the process except for the requirement for DM endorsement of the AOP. In response, a FFT Lean Team member noted that there are several little changes – not earthshaking changes.

There was a comment that the Lean changes to FFT delivery are good, but changes to FFT planning not so much.

The coast has developed AOP changes where we can now print the document, and we can link trees for planting to hectares planned for planting.

The FFT Lean process has resulted in a more standardized approach; before each region or district went about it in usually a similar but also somewhat different manner.

Dave Cornwell reported that all the FFT Lean Action Items posted on the [FFT Guidance website](#) are completed except updating the BCTS/FFT partnership agreement – we are actively working on getting this completed.

Monty noted that updates are intended to the FFT website to make it easier to find documents that you need.

### **Session 3: AOP–priority filtering & budget numbers compiled to date**

To help provide context for discussions about the Annual Operating Plan (AOP), Matt LeRoy:

- Provided reminder of vision and mission of FFT in the FFT Strategic Plan
- Outlined the activities under:
  - Current reforestation (CR): surveys/planning for backlog NSR, MPB/wildfire, and defaulted obligation NSR; site preparation; brushing; repression density spacing; planting; sowing; and overstory removal
  - Timber supply mitigation (TSM): surveys; conifer release; spacing; fertilization; and pruning
- Reviewed current LBIS focus and implementation priorities for CR and TSM
- Noted Lean process requirement for District Manager endorsement of AOP
- Addressed the FFT investment principles
- Described how priority units guide investment decisions.

During discussions it was noted that although Type 4 Silviculture Strategies (SS) help make the case for FFT funding, Type 4 SS are also broader than a ‘FFT plan’ that shows how to effectively make silviculture investments. Type 4’s also show, for example, priority areas for harvesting (e.g. to reduce impacts on mid-term timber supply) that can assist the ministry in negotiations with licensees, identify ways to address climate change, and address other values. An intended coastal Type 4 SS will try to marry its approach with TSR. It was noted that the newer Type 4 SS costs are less than the first ones undertaken – they now cost considerably less than \$100 K.

Matt provided a graph showing species sown by year. In 2012, 65% of FFT species sown were lodgepole pine, this has declined to 55% in 2014 – which shows that we are planting a greater mix of species in the landscape. Larch is also up from 1% in 2012 to 2% in 2014.

The number of seedlings in the AOP over the last 4 years are nearly the same as those reported in RESULTS – showing we actually do what we plan to do. FFT activities, along with tree improvement, tie directly into the Service Plan Performance Measure 7: Timber volume gain from silviculture investments.

FFT activities have also supported the achievement of government commitments such as:

- Planting at least 20 million seedlings per year
- Eliminate the backlog NSR by 2015
- Increase funding for CR by \$10 MM starting in 2015/16
- Continuing to develop Type 4 Silviculture Strategies
- Providing on-going focus on fertilization
- Supporting projects for community forests and woodlots with a \$1 million government commitment for these small area-based tenures in priority units.

The 2014 wildfires will likely significantly impact FFT in 2014/15 via s. 108 given that an estimated 119 000 hectares of THLB were affected by fires with about 13 000 ha with free growing obligations that may be s. 108 eligible.

During discussions it was noted that the summary of fire impacts by fire zone does not include the large Chelaslie River fire – so the overall impacts will be higher.

During previous high fire years the s. 108 budget was about \$10 MM in 2003, and about \$21 MM for the 2009 and 2010 fires.

Matt noted that FFT potential opportunity maps for wildfire impacted areas exists that can assist in finding treatable areas. There is also digital camera and other high resolution imagery available for some areas from FAIB and GeoBC.

Monty Locke went over the draft 2015/16 FFT AOP:

- \$21.5 MM for CR
- \$10.8 MM for TSM
- \$10.0 MM in provincial investments for CR and TSM (e.g. sowing requests, purchase of fertilizer)
- \$3.9 MM (9%) to cover overhead

The draft AOP totals \$46.2 MM while the expected budget is \$44 MM. Monty showed how the draft AOP funding is distributed by area and by activity.

With the \$10 MM increase in CR funding starting in 2015/16 there is expectation that the number of trees planted would increase, but this is not showing up in the draft AOP.

The expected TSM budget for 2015/16 is \$3.0 MM – which is considerably less than the requests in the draft AOP. The budget expectations are for a 6000 ha fertilization program including 4000 ha in interior priority 1 units, and 2000 ha for the coast given the direction to spend \$1.0 MM TSM for the coast. The woodlot and community forest FFT projects will be funded through CR (not TSM as was done in past). TSM planning for years 2016/17 onwards should be based on an annual provincial TSM budget of \$9 MM.

The coast fertilization AOP request is on target with their budget allocation, but the interior TSM request is too high. There was discussion that it may be most cost effective if the 4000 ha fertilization program for the interior for 15/16 be undertaken in one priority 1 unit – ideally for a unit where the Type 4 SS targets at least a 4000 ha fertilization effort as an effective timber supply mitigation strategy.

All of the spacing activities in the AOP should be associated with projects in woodlots (WL) and community forests (CF); and these are covered with CR funding. This is now the second year we have built WL/CF projects directly into the AOP. The total amount in the AOP for WL/CF is \$1.6 MM; this may need to go down to the \$1 MM budget allocation. It may be possible to do this by only funding WL/CF projects in priority 1 units.

The draft AOP identifies the intended delivery agent with most regions relying on district or BCTS delivery; other delivery agents are recipients, WL/CF and TFLs.

The next steps are:

- September 30th – budget submitted as part of LBIS
- November 1st – LBIS budget submitted to Deputy
- December 31st – 2015/16 AOP 2nd draft based on projected budget and endorsed by district manager
- January-March – 2015/16 AOP finalized based on received budget
- April 1st – 2015/16 AOP actioned

During discussions, Monty noted that needed reductions to TSM and WL/CF in the draft AOP will free up more funding for CR activities. Monty asked is the WL/CF integration into the

AOP working? One response was there are some issues. Another from district noted that their role is unclear now that there is no regional FFT contact in the Kootenays.

## **Session 4: Ramping up Current Reforestation**

### RESULTS

Matt LeRoy started the session by going over some RESULTS information. With the latest RESULTS release, it is now mandatory to enter the completed costs; RESULTS will auto calculate planned costs but you can override that and enter what you believe the costs will be.

The monthly FFT Quality Assurance report by district is still showing lots of missing forest cover submissions. That said the 2014 QA reports are much better than 2 years ago. We will be offering a data service provider doing the spatial submissions for you as a pilot this year. Through discussions it was noted that we are getting good quality RESULTS submissions from licensees, but quality has not been so good from regions and districts – thus the offer for districts/regions who do not have in-house resources to use the data service provider. Matt will set up an inbox to receive data packages from regions and districts that the data service provider can then process.

Please let us know your RESULTS training needs. Also ensure you are using the most up to date version of the RISS guide [http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/HFP/publications/00220/RISS\\_gf\\_Edition\\_4a\\_2014\\_May.pdf](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/HFP/publications/00220/RISS_gf_Edition_4a_2014_May.pdf) for government funded activities.

During discussions it was noted that Easylink is a good tool to use when making RESULTS submissions. There was a suggestion that one staff per region should be given responsibility for making RESULTS submissions for that region and districts in that region (not 30 or so people) – that a business case can be made this would be a more cost effective way to operate. Meantime, we are piloting the use of the data service provider to help improve the quality of RESULTS submissions from FFT projects, and we will evaluate how well this approach is working. If it goes well, there is an opportunity to enter into a multi-year contract with a data service provider so that this support can continue to be provided.

### Caribou GAR

All of the openings should now be in RESULTS except the new proposed ones under review such as those from Canfor. There are currently 723 openings in the GAR area itself (where there is no harvesting) where we will not do FFT treatments. There are 1947 mitigation openings where government is now responsible for reforestation – where there will be FFT activities. Matt showed the distribution of the openings by district.

Bernie Peschke provided an update on the review of the Canfor mitigation proposal. The decision by government is that Canfor will be get the \$1.2 MM in mitigation relief by no longer having reforestation obligations. We are now reviewing the proposal to determine if the projected costs for reforestation provided by Canfor are reasonable. We need to ask: would we be able to do the reforestation work for this projected costs including consideration of access? We are trying to estimate actual costs based on previous history of costs for similar work. If the projected costs are too low, then government may take on obligations that exceed the \$1.2 MM mitigation target. Another licensee is challenging government's proposed GAR mitigation.

**Action #4: Matt LeRoy will send out the latest version of ‘Caribou GAR Areas Processing in RESULTS’ to appropriate FFT delivery staff.**

**Action #5: Matt LeRoy will provide link to certified tools in RESULTS website to FFT contacts.**

#### Backlog NSR

We have moved from 174 000 ha of backlog NSR in 2008/09 to only 14 000 ha in 2014/15. We can now end the push to eliminate the backlog NSR, as we are essentially there. We were down to 10 000 ha at one point, but there have been some erroneous reporting in OP87 which incorrectly created new backlog NSR in RESULTS. There was a suggestion we retire OP87. Now that we are done with this Throne Speech commitment, there should be no more backlog NSR activities in the 2015/16 AOP.

The efforts made to eliminate the backlog NSR represent a significant impact on timber supply – when the label was backlog NSR, the sites were not growing in the inventory. Now that we have the correct forest cover for the sites, they are growing in the inventory. We have been challenged by some District Managers why we were doing this work, it is because of the TSR impact due to having the wrong forest cover label.

It was noted that TSR program created a special analysis unit for the backlog NSR as they knew they were incorrectly labeled; now that we have fixed the problem by providing the correct forest cover label, TSR does not have to do that anymore – as the inventory now reflects what the stands actually area. Matt said it is too difficult to find remaining 10 000 ha of backlog NSR spatially; not worth effort.

A question was raised with older (e.g. 30 year old) harvested openings and how the inventory handles them.

**Action #6: Al Powelson will determine how FAIB handles older cutblocks with respect to openings, growth, etc. – and what districts should do**

**Done:** Al reported on this action item at the Workshop. FAIB uses the latest label in RESULTS; so if the information is inaccurate, then this should be updated by district staff.

#### How to ramp up Current Reforestation

The Premier’s mandate letter to the Minister stated: *Develop and implement a plan for the \$10 million in additional silviculture provided to reforestation in the province beginning in 2015/16.* The Premier’s direction on this is also mentioned in the Service Plan.

The LBIS funding for FFT CR for 2015/16 will be \$41 MM. The initial draft AOP indicates we have \$6 MM worth of room for other activities in the CR budget for next FY.

How to ramp up? Some ideas include:

- Possible provincial level free growing survey for the Caribou GAR openings
- Sowing for 2014/15 wildfire areas.

One district said they have already put Caribou GAR free growing survey work in their AOP. One challenge is finding qualified survey contractors to undertake the surveys. For example, some have left silviculture contracting to work with oil and gas.

There was comment that based on 2009 and 2010 wildfires, don't move too quickly on the 2014 wildfires: (i) surveys of the 2009 and 2010 wildfires noted lots of natural regeneration; and (ii) impacts from the black army cutworm may indicate that we should delay planting burnt areas.

There was question of budget impacts of the wildfires given s. 108. Nigel noted that some companies are right on it with respect to replanting the area and applying for s. 108 funding, while others take awhile to address it. There is still a licensee obligation to get the openings to a free growing condition following the wildfire regardless of whether they are s. 108 eligible or not. The s. 108 budget could be around \$8 MM for 15/16 when considering s. 108 budget for years with high wildfire impacts.

The current direction is that the contingency funds for the 2010 wildfires can't be used for the 2014 wildfires – but that direction could change.

During discussions, it was noted that government has an obligation to pay s. 108 eligible work within one year after completion, so it is possible to use 2016/17 FFT funding to cover work completed in 2015/16.

Matt noted that we need post-workshop discussion on how to most effectively ramp-up CR. He asked Lorne Bedford if there was any flexibility in moving some of the CR budget to TSM, and Lorne said there was none. The mandate letter says reforestation of the \$10 MM so there is an expectation that there will be increased planting.

**Action #7: All FFT delivery staff involved in FFT Current Reforestation should think about effective ways to ramp up CR in their AOP given the extra \$10 MM starting in 2015/16.**

## Day Two – Program Delivery

### Housekeeping Items from Day One

Monty Locke reviewed the Action Items from Day One to help ensure they were captured correctly. He then went over the 2014 Spring FFT Workshop Actions; this is the summary that Monty provided:

#### Actions from Spring 2014 FFT Workshop

Action	Status	Comments
<p><u>Action #1:</u> Dave Cornwell will follow-up on three of the action items from the Fall 2013 FFT meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #3: Did Kevin Astridge send subzone variant predictor over time</li> <li>• #6: Did Jennifer Burleigh send a one- or two-pager on the black army cutworm with weblink that provides advice</li> </ul>	See comments	<p>#3 Contact Kevin Astridge</p> <p>#6 FH health factors will be covered in 2014 FFT fall meeting and will be posted after the meeting</p> <p>#7 Will distribute</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #7: Dave will forward the Service Agreement with BC Conservation Foundation</li> </ul>		
<p><u>Action #2:</u> FFT LEAN process maps to be updated considering feedback at Workshop and posted on FFT website.</p>	Completed	
<p><u>Action #3:</u> FFT LEAN products in the Action Plan will be posted when completed on FFT website</p>	Posted Sept. 26, 2014	Updates and final products will be posted on completion of FFT Lean control phase meeting September 16, 2014
<p><u>Action #4:</u> RESULTS reporting: (i) reminder re: importance; and (ii) need to extend FFT requirements to the Forest Stand Management Fund (FSMF) in a manner that garners ‘buy in’ from staff involved with the FSMF. This will involve identifying staff looking after FSMF activities, and conducting conference call(s) on developing policy/requirements around planning in RESULTS for this funding source.</p>	Ongoing	Discussions on Provincial silviculture calls as well as FFT conference calls
<p><u>Action #5:</u> Completion of the Forest Management Partnership Agreement with BCTS following the program review of BCTS, and review of the draft Agreement by FFT staff.</p>	Ongoing	We are in the final stages of completing the document.
<p><u>Action #6:</u> FFT Workshop participants, and others in FFT Team, to review draft Forest Carbon Partnership Program document and provide comments to Al Powelson by April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2014.</p>	Ongoing	A new version is out for review and should be available for distribution in the coming weeks
<p><u>Action #7:</u> Al Powelson will check that the mitigation relief amounts identified in the Canfor document are consistent with the agreed-to levels by government.</p>	Ongoing	Bernie P. is working with CANFOR in an attempt to get them to finalize the block lists in conjunction with the impacted Districts
<p><u>Action #8:</u> Matt LeRoy will distribute process for tracking GAR caribou mitigation costs/ treatments in RESULTS.</p>	Completed	Caribou GAR procedures circulated after the meeting last year. Also created a certify report to track these openings more easily and have an updated Caribou GAR map on line in AGOL in the RPB gallery.

## Session 5: Evolution of Type 4 Silviculture Strategy

Paul Rehsler provided a summary description of Type 4 Silviculture Strategies (SS). The objective of Type 4 SS is the increase mid-term timber supply. They are similar to TSR in that:

- They involve situational analysis based on issues with current conditions
- A data package is prepared that describe assumptions
- There is a modeling and analysis report
- There is a rationale for the preferred strategy.

Type 4 SS involve about 40-50 people per TSA, provide spatial deliverables (making them different than Type 1 to 3 SS), and all have a tactical plan. Type 4 SS could easily evolve to Integrated Resource Management (IRM) plans.

How to go from your Type 4 SS to an AOP? The Type 4 SS provides the optimal combination of treatments for a given budget level. Eligible stands are identified based on FFT treatment criteria with treatment blocks identified considering access, minimum size, and preferred species for fertilization.

Type 4 SS identify preferred treatments for both a constrained budget and enhanced budget. The constrained budget were based on FFT funding levels, but since then the budgets have dropped so the constrained budget in a completed Type 4 SS may be more than the current FFT budget.

When moving from Type 4 SS to an AOP, diverse factors need to be considered such as treatment risk (e.g. high wildfire or pest risk) and First Nations title claims. Other plans and strategies (e.g. ecosystem restoration plans, fire management plans) need to be considered. Some Type 4 SS address other values such as range in the Okanagan TSA.

The data originally used to support the development of the Type 4 SS needs to be verified or updated when developing your AOP e.g. in some TSAs, there have been more woodlots and community forests established since the Type 4 SS was prepared.

Type 4 SS uses the forest level inventory to identify candidate stands for treatment; these stands need to be assessed in the field to verify if they are suitable for treatment. The tactical plan that is prepared is also based on the forest level inventory – this plan provides a guide to where more detailed field work is needed to verify stand level forest cover conditions.

During discussions, one district with a Type 4 SS noted that they have been initially focused in their AOP at addressing GAR mitigation, but then intend to use the tactical plan to guide their AOP.

### Evolving to an IRM planning process

There have been many past drivers for sustainable forest management (SFM) planning – a management unit level operational plan. Current drivers for SFM or IRM Planning process include:

- Provides a mid-term timber supply implementation plan
- Builds on and integrates strategies, plans and frameworks
- Addresses issues and provides direction for the implementation and coordination for a range of values and initiatives e.g.
  - Cumulative effects framework
  - Common objectives project
  - Species at Risk 5-year plan

- Addresses the need for objectives and targets (e.g. the Provincial Timber Goals and Objectives document that speaks to need for targets at the management unit level)
- Guides operations and investments across the landscape
- Provides for continuous improvement
- Provides an effective framework for Professional Reliance.

The Integrated Planning Approach cycle consists of:

- Getting organized – the plan for the process
- Understanding the management expectations
- Understanding forest conditions – identify issues and opportunities
- Creating a vision for the future forest with scenario analysis
- Translating vision to operations through a tactical plan
- Monitor, evaluate, and analyze to adapt management (e.g. cumulative effects, FREP).

Next steps towards developing a IRM planning process include:

- Integrate with TSR (e.g. one common base case)
- Undertake 2 or 3 pilots:
  - In Arrowsmith TSA, there are Species at Risk issues
  - In Merritt TSA, address the guidance emanating from the cumulative effects pilot and the IFPA
  - In Williams Lake TSA, address Williams decision, link to CCLUP and MRVA 2, address trapping, fire and watershed issues.

One of the values of IRM planning to the Merritt District Manager is the opportunity to provide needed information to First Nations. There is recognition that something is needed between the FSP and the cutting permit.

The ADM is going to ELUC to see if there is support in a process that looks at all values; if so we may not be doing more Type 4 SS, but instead will move to IRM planning. The Williams Lake TSA silviculture sub-committee is actively promoting forest estate modeling. It would be relatively easy to evolve the Type 4 SS to IRM planning.

A challenge is to work towards more consistent assumptions and approaches. For example, minimum harvest criteria is often different in various TSAs when there is no reason to be different. FAIB uses 8 different models when doing TSR yet models can impact results; can we settle on one model.

## **Session 6: Mapping Needs**

Matt LeRoy provided an overview of the various tools available:

- Mapview – difficult to use
- iMap – new and improved – fantastic tool
- Arc Map – hard to use
- Google Earth – one region uses it a lot
- Arcgis Online (AGOL) – if you use, need to refresh with the latest version.

RESULTS data already in iMap with RSLT the code to use to get the data regarding activity treatments, reserves, standards unit, but not yet forest cover.

Wildfire mapping on AGOL from 2003 to 2013 for burnt areas 5 hectares or larger; this will be updated to show the 2014 fires. Is this mapping sufficient for district staff to use for their AOP? Or do you need other tools?

Resource Practices Branch has a map gallery that includes:

- Wildfire Mapping
- Caribou GAR Mitigation Openings
- Quesnel Type 4 SS spatial products
- Lakes Type 4 SS – in progress
- Williams Lake Type 4 SS – in progress

Currently working on the spatial products for the Prince George Type 4 SS.

**Action #8: FFT delivery staff should let Matt LeRoy know what their mapping needs are so those needs can be addressed on the RPB Gallery, and let Matt know if they have any issues using the Gallery. Also:**

- Matt will send link to RPB Gallery to all FFT delivery contacts
- Matt will set up a mapping tutorial for interested staff regarding use of the Gallery
- FFT staff using the Gallery should ensure that they download the geodatabase as it is a much more effective way of using the mapping
- Matt will organize Avenza tutorial for handheld devices
- Matt will ask Duncan Richard to develop app for iPads given the number of people using iPads in the field
- For GAR mitigation openings, will provide link to whether some harvesting is possible or not in UWR and WHAs.

## Session 7: Incorporating Forest Health Risks into FFT Prescriptions

In his presentation, Tim Ebata addressed:

- What are the risks? Why should I be concerned with them?
- Risks with planting
- Risks with spacing
- Risks with fertilization.

Tim noted that risk is not hazard. Risk is the probability or likelihood of ‘something bad’ happening in the future, whereas hazard is the susceptibility based on conditions. Forest health risk is a function of hazard, historical data, and proximity of the pest. There are hazard and risk ratings for most high priority pests in BC.

Three caveats about forest health risk:

1. In some cases we don’t have enough information and there is a lot of uncertainty
2. While ‘something bad’ means timber volume impacts, determining what is significant isn’t easy
3. Easiest to record forest health incidence but incidence does not equal impact.

The LBIS Silviculture Funding Criteria provides guidance that restricts activities to areas with ‘minimal forest health hazard’ with a note that a “A forest health specialist should be consulted

in situations where insect, disease, or animal factors may affect the priority rating of candidate stands.” The guidance means that staff involved in FFT investments must consider what the known hazards and risks are at both the landscape and stand level prior to proposing treatments.

Landscape level risks can be considered from incidence and severity maps and data such as the aerial overview survey (AOS) report, RESULTS, stand development monitoring (SDM), young stand monitoring (YSM), pests of young stands (POYS) surveys, surveys for pest incidence (SPI), special surveys, and monitoring of vole and hare populations. Interpretative guides include Stand Establishment Decision Aids (SEDAs), FPC Guidebooks, other publications and information, and forest health specialists. SEDAs include hazard and risk maps.

There are several forest health risk factors for lodgepole pine including black army cutworm & Rhizina, stem rusts, secondary bark beetles, dwarf mistletoe, root diseases, foliar diseases, stem cankers, root collar weevil, terminal weevil, animal damage, pine needle miner and pitch midge. Some of the pests can attack at the time of planting, some during stand tending, and others both during planting and stand tending. The mountain pine beetle risk is currently extremely low.

In contrast to lodgepole pine there are far fewer forest health risks for spruce; they include black army cutworm & Rhizina, root diseases, root collar weevil, spruce weevil, and animal damage. Tim also provided slide that listed pests to consider for Douglas-fir.

Stand level considerations include a special survey or field check well before planting, and pre-stand tending surveys to evaluate suitability for spacing or fertilization treatments.

The biggest risk at the time of planting is from Rhizina root disease, black army cutworm (BAC), rodents (voles and hares), and frost. Refer to the SEDAs to assess hazard areas, and Jennifer Burliegh’s 2013 FFT Workshop presentation on Rhizina and BAC. Pine is the most risky species to plant from a forest health perspective, followed by spruce and Douglas-fir.

For Rhizina, if fire was 10-16 months earlier, conduct survey for fruiting bodies around stumps and large woody debris. If found, management options to consider:

- Delay planting 1.5 to 2 years post fire
- Avoid planting adjacent to food bases such as stumps and large woody debris to decrease the spread of the fungus
- Plant seedlings greater than 1 metre apart to decrease spread of infection.

For BAC, look for caterpillars in May and June, and consider pheromone monitoring in July to September when the moths are laying eggs in the soil.

Regarding risk at time of spacing, please refer to the Field Guidelines for the Selection of Stands for Spacing for the [Interior](#) and for the [Coast](#). A forest health decision matrices was presented by Tim that is designed to quickly determine if forest health is an issue when spacing and guides management recommendations. In the IDF, spacing may improve the resistance to western spruce budworm.

Regarding fertilization, the objective is to avoid treating stands that are heavily impacted by pests thus reducing the return on investments, and also avoid exacerbating pest impacts caused by fertilization. Refer to the 2014 [Stand Selection Guidelines – Forest Fertilization in BC](#).

Some pest specific guidance:

- root disease – not an issue; fertilization may enable stand to reach a merchantable size before root disease causes damage

- western spruce budworm – fertilizing dry belt Douglas-fir stands is not a high priority so not really an issue
- spruce weevil – fertilizing increases attacks but also increases leader growth (growth increases weevil losses)
- rodents – squirrel damage in lodgepole pine may be increased post-fertilization.

In summary:

- FFT prescriptions need to consider forest health at both the landscape and stand level
- Forest health risks are not always predictable with much uncertainty for some pests
- Significance of these risks are not fully understood – damage thresholds are ‘best estimates’
- Try to do your best to avoid known hazards and risks using existing guidance
- Contact local specialists for site specific advice.

During discussions there was a question about what is ‘catastrophic’? Tim said that this is not a forest health term; for beetle management we use terms like endemic, outbreak, and post-outbreak (where population has crashed). Al Powelson noted that ‘catastrophic’ is used in FFT to mean events that cause impacts on timber supply in the mid- and long-term.

There was question regarding how do we add a climate change lens to our forest health assessments? Tim noted the need to monitor pests; you know what’s normal for your areas, and raise the alarms if something abnormal shows up that may be due to a changing climate.

It was mentioned that stocking standards in the [tree species selection tool](#) have been updated by ecologists in consideration of climate change.

**Action #9: Nigel to provide further links on the LBIS [FFT Guidance website](#) to related guidance documents like the [Tree Species Selection Tool](#)**

It was suggested that one way to offset the unknown regarding climate change is to not do the same thing across the landscape; build resiliency by diversifying.

Tim mentioned that the annual provincial AOS have occurred since the 1970’s. Young stand damage is not normally picked up in the AOS. The MPB and Dothistroma needle blight are the only catastrophic pests that have killed young stands; most pests are not plantation killers. Although not common, there can be bear damage to young spruce plantations.

During discussions it was noted that spacing on Haida Gwaii led to looper damage; this should have been known as this damage has occurred before.

There was a question about pest impacts by spacing pine stands. No need to worry about MPB as that threat is over for now. Tim not aware if spacing will increase rust in spaced pine; he will check into that. Western gall rust susceptibility is for first 12 years; after that this pest should not be an issue.

Fir beetle is a big issue in the Cariboo and Kamloops area – currently the main provincial pest issue. There are beetle impacts in mule deer winter range and in OGMA’s where licensees hands are tied with respect to being able to harvest the stands.

The budworm outbreak we recently experienced was one of the worst in the province, but we over that now.

## **Session 8: First Nations consultation–implications of Williams decision**

Neil Edwards with First Nations Relations Branch was not able to attend the FFT Workshop and make the presentation for this session as intended. Nigel mentioned that the guidance regarding First Nations consultation is being updated.

**Action #10: Nigel Fletcher will send the draft FFT First Nations consultation and information sharing guidelines to FFT contacts for review.**

Dave Cornwell noted that First Nations Relations Branch is trying to figure out the implications from the recent Williams court decision, and they are looking for feedback on the interim (“30-60-90 day” guidance they have provided. The court decision does not provide a map of the ‘strong claim’ area.

**Action #11: Neil Edwards with First Nations Relations Branch is looking for FFT feedback on the “30-60-90 day” changes to First Nations consultation and information sharing based on the recent Williams court decision. FFT contacts should send any comments they have to Neil with cc to Nigel.**

Dave said to continue to dial in to calls as government addresses the implications of the Williams decision. Implications are varied but could result in having to delay some FFT projects or changing the timelines for consultation.

There was comment that the shelf life of previous consultations may be affected by the decision. For example, for one project there was consultation over a year ago about a fertilization project; will we need to update the consultation now? There is at least the need to share information with First Nations should the project proceed to let them know.

First Nations often would like to be involved in doing some of the FFT work. The District Manager needs to decide if projects should go out for competitive bid vs direct award to First Nations.

## **Session 9: Seedling Requests and Seed Planning**

Susan Zedel initially provided an outline of topics she would be addressing in her presentation:

- Tree Improvement Branch
- BCTS – Seedling Services Section
- Stock Type Selection
- FFT Seeding Requests from 2006 to 2014 – quantities and species selection
- FFT Guidance – Species Management and Density Targets
- Chief Forester’s Standards for Seed Use and Amendments for Assisted Migration and Use of Western Larch
- Seedlot Availability and Ownership
- Future Seed Planning for FFT.

Tree Improvement Branch (TIB) includes:

- Headquarters including the Seed Policy and Planning Section
  - Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use
  - SPAR – Seed Planning and Registry system
- Tree Seed Centre in Surrey
  - Cone and seed processing, seedlot registration, seed preparation
  - Invoicing and Journal Vouchers for seed and services
- Seed Orchards at 6 sites in 4 locations: Saanich, Vernon, Skimikin, Prince George
  - Produce 40-50% of Class A seed used in BC
- Forest Genetics Section, including Kalamalka and Cowichan Lake Research Stations
  - Tree breeding, genecology, provenance and progeny testing, conservation
  - The goal is to increase growth and pest resistance.

BCTS – Seedling Services Section:

- Administers all of the seedling production for BCTS, FFT and FSMF
- Sets deadlines for seedling requests
- Tenders and contracts the seedlings to forest seedling nurseries considering both price and nursery performance/quality
- Information goes into the Nursery Shipping and Administration system (NSA)
- Monitors seedlings during growing season, performs QA testing on seedlings, communicates with FFT contacts about stock quality and acceptance of overruns or underruns, arranges lifting and cold storage (spring stock) or hot-lift (summer stock)
- Surplus seedlings may be re-allocated within FFT program or other ministry program.

There was decline in seedling requests a few years ago that led to nursery closures. Although more stable now, there is tight space for seedlings. The nursery business is very competitive, and costs have not gone up over the years.

Stock Type Selection:

BCTS recommended seedling stock type selection means about 40 different types of seedling containers are use. An observation was made from an attendee that there may be economies of scale by using fewer stock types.

FFT Seedling Requests from 2006 to 2014:

FFT seedling requests range a low of 4.5 MM in 2007 to a high of 23.8 MM in 2013 with 20.3 MM requested in 2014. For most years, the main species requested was lodgepole pine followed by spruce and interior Douglas-fir.

In 2014, 44% of FFT seed use was from Class A seed, 21% from Class B+ seed (lodgepole pine), and 35% from Class B seed. Class A seed is genetically diverse and is produced in a seed orchard and has Genetic Worth (GW). Class B seed is from natural tree selection, whereas B+ seed are from superior provenance.

There was a question if FFT is getting the seedlings it orders planted. The answer was 'yes' as the numbers in RESULTS matches the orders.

There was also a question about why so little western white pine is being requested given that there is a good supply of Pw seed that will produce seedlings resistant to white pine blister



rust. Some of the reasons appear to be lack of familiarity with Pw, need for early seedling request entry due to the long seed preparation process for Pw, higher cost seed compared to other species, and the 1400 m upward elevation limit. There was also a question about the availability of interior spruce with weevil resistance. Vernon Seed Orchard Company's orchard 211 produces weevil resistant spruce seed for the PG seed planning zone and there is seed available.

#### FFT Species Management and Density Targets

FFT guidance includes the following objectives:

- Species mixtures will be planted where appropriate and to the degree reasonable:
  - areas will be planted with a mixture of desirable species, and
  - on sites with more than one 'preferred' species, more than one preferred species will be planted
- Species management decisions will be informed by forest-level analysis
- Cumulative impacts, and impacts at the landscape scale, will be considered
- Density management will optimize productivity, future product value, and resiliency of the forest at the stand and landscape level.

FFT targets include:

- 80% of the area planted within a management unit, where funded by FFT, should have 2 or more species in the silviculture label at the time of establishment
- In ecosystems with more than one preferred species, where practicable, no one species should comprise more than 70% of stand at establishment to free growing
- At least 2000 sph for lodgepole pine dominated stands, and at least 1200 sph (interior) and 900 sph (coast) for non-lodgepole pine dominated stands
- Caveat: professional decisions to deviate from the targets will be recognized in those situations where it is ecologically appropriate.

During discussions it was noted that an important caveat is consideration of crop management. For example, for short rotations, there is no point to plant pine and spruce in the interior, and Douglas-fir and spruce on the coast – since the spruce will not reach merchantable size. In the interior, if you wait for the spruce to mature in mixed stand with pine, you may find the pine susceptible to MPB attack. Don't mix species at the site if it doesn't make sense to do so.

Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use includes:

- Seedlot registration
- Seed use – selection of Class A seed when available
- Seed transfer limits
  - For Class A seed, each species has its own set of Seed Planning Zones (SPZs) and elevation ranges
  - For Class B seed, all species use the same SPZs, biogeoclimatic zones, elevation range, and latitude/longitude range.

At least 95% of the seed needs to meet SPZ requirements in the standards, while 5% can vary. It is also possible to propose an alternative to the use of the standards; the process to do that is explained on the Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use website. BCTS and licensees have proposed alternative approaches to seed use and most have been accepted/approved.

Climate based seed transfer will start implementation in 2017. The scientific foundation is still underway and then policy development will start next. In the meantime there have been some interim changes to seed transfer where upper elevation limits have increased in 2008 for most species.

An amendment was made to the Standards entitled Assisted Range and Population Expansion of Western Larch for Use as a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy in BC. The amendment triples the seed planning zones where western larch can be planted.

### Seed Ownership

There is complex public and private ownership of seed. Various organizations within the ministry own seed including FFT (North and South), BCTS, TIB, field services - and 5 districts (for FSMF). Nearly half of the FFT seedling requests in 2014 used seed owned by FFT.

During discussions it was suggested that the ministry simplify its seed ownership. One of obstacles however to change is that some of the seed owners within the ministry receive revenue from the sale of their seed.

### Seed Planning considerations:

- A Seed Planning Working Group could be formed with members from regions/districts, RPB and TIB
- Identify SPZs where Class A seed should be purchased from TIB and private seed orchards
- Identify SPZs and BEC zones where Class B seed should be collected or purchased
- There will be changes with Climate Based Seed Transfer beginning in 2017
- May make sense to coordinate seed planning for FFT and FSMF programs together.

Regarding a proposed Seed Planning Working Group, a comment was made that it would be useful to review a draft Terms of Reference, and have sense that there is a level of Executive support for the TOR.

**Action #12: FFT contacts to provide Matt LeRoy feedback on forming an FFT Seed Planning Working Group with staff from regions, districts, RPB and TIB. Also if FFT delivery staff have any issues with seedling requests, please contact Susan Zedel at Tree Improvement Branch.**

## **Session 10: Safety and safety management system**

Dave Cornwell provided reminder that BCTS is safe certified so when they are involved in FFT projects, safe certified contractors are used.

The BC Forestry Safety Council is in the process of changing the certification process; the new process is expected in one or two years. This will likely mean that FFT will be using safe certified contractors as a program. Only some FFT activities, such as surveys and planting, are subject to safe certification. Not all LBIS programs or all FFT activities are subject to safe certification.

A local situation was raised where the access road to the treatment area was closed due to safety; the planters had to be flown in meaning the unit costs will be higher. There was

question if the costs to fly the planters is an activity cost or an access cost. The response was that use of a helicopter to access an area for planting is a planting cost as you will be including that cost in the planting contract. In contrast, if you had to do road repairs, you would be issuing that work to a different contractor – so this would be an access cost. If you know the access costs ahead of time, then build this into your ROI, but if an access issue happens after you have ordered seedlings for the site, then you need to proceed to plant them.

Dave recommends reviewing and using the Client Interaction Guide posted on the ministry website to guide staff interactions with contractors so it is clear in discussions who owns the work from a safety perspective, and issues such as use of volunteers is addressed.

There was question when will expected requirement for FFT to use safe certified contractors occur? Dave expects this to be phased in over time. It was noted in discussions that there will likely be exceptions for non-forestry activity like aerial spraying.

There was question if surveyors will need to be safe certified. It was noted in one timber sale office, and this may be indicative of TSOs too, that most surveyors are already safe certified given the work they do for industry and BCTS that requires certification.

Safe certified contractors go through an audit process in order to retain their certification; this process helps assure BCTS that the work will be performed safely.

At a recent WSCA conference, the VP for TimberWest indicated that if a company doing contract work is planning for safety well, that they are likely planning to do the work well – so this gives them some assurance of the quality of work as well as safety.

It was noted nearly all FFT contractors are already safe certified because they need work from industry and BCTS.

For danger tree assessments, need to hire Certified Danger Tree Assessor. There was comment to take advantage of Wildfire Management Branch for danger trees; as they may have crews available to do the work as a training exercise for them.

It was noted that FFT delivery staff that hire contractors need to be ‘knowledgeable owners’ with respect to safety by checking the contractor’s work.

There was question if FFT staff should review vs approve the contractor’s safety plan. Current guidance is that FFT staff should review the plan; if local WorkSafe BC staff insist that FFT staff approve the safety plan, then please raise this issue with Tom Jackson, FLNR Director, Resource Worker Safety.

It was noted that each TSO has a safety officer.

And a reminder that where more than one contract issued over same area, that it is important to designate the primary contractor.

Dave noted that staff should do their best to offset risk to the contractors doing the work; that said government always bears some risk. The key is for all of us to do our due diligence when it comes to safety.

If staff need contract management training that deals with safety, please let Dave Cornwell know.

You may be personally liable if you say to a contractor or worker that ‘that’s ok to do’ – if that results in an injury.

Dave Cornwell has an ‘open door’ when it comes to any questions from staff about safety. Please raise any questions, comments or concerns with Dave at any time.

## **Workshop Wrap-Up and Evaluation**

Matt reviewed Day Two action items on the flip charts (Monty reviewed Day One action items at the start of Day Two). The action items in the Synopsis are also listed in Appendix 3. Matt thanked workshop attendees and presenters for their participation at the workshop.

Nigel asked attendees to complete the Workshop Evaluation Form. The results from the completed evaluations are provided in Appendix 2.

**Thanks again for your participation!**

## Appendix 1: List of Workshop Participants

An attendance list was distributed but some participants may not have received it and may have been inadvertently overlooked in the list below.

Name	Organization
Clay Allison	SR Management
Tim Barker	BCTS Cariboo – Chilcotin
Paul Barolet	North Island – Central Coast District
Paul Braumberger	Expert Forest Consulting
Kerri Brownie	BC Timber Sales Branch
Scott Byron	BCTS Stuart-Nechako
Colin Campbell	PriceWaterhouseCooper
Tracy Coombes	Merritt District
Dave Cornwell	Resource Practices Branch
Simon Craig	BCTS Okanagan - Columbia
Nola Daintith	Cariboo Region
Tim Ebata	Resource Practices Branch
Tom Ethier	ADM, Resource Stewardship Division
Nigel Fletcher	Resource Practices Branch
Jevan Hanchard	Skeena Stikine District
John Hopper	BCTS Kamloops
Kerri Howse	Central Cariboo/Chilcotin
John Illes	Nadina District
Lyn Konowalyk	Rocky Mountain District
Matt LeRoy	Resource Practices Branch
Monty Locke	Resource Practices Branch
Heather MacLennan	Thompson Rivers District - Clearwater
Mike Madill	Thompson/Okanagan Region
Frank McAllister	BCTS Peace-Liard
John McClarnon	Resource Practices Branch
Leith McKenzie	Thompson/Okanagan Region
Ted McRae	Okanagan Shuswap District
Bill Olsen	100 Mile House District
Bernie Peschke	Thompson/Okanagan Region
Dave Peterson	Chief Forester
Allan Powelson	Resource Practices Branch
Lee-ann Puhallo	Quesnel District
Paul Rehler	Resource Practices Branch
Katherine Rogers	BCTS Babine
Andrew Snetsinger	Cascades District
Carolyn Stevens	Nadina District
Nicole Strand	Quesnel District
Jack Sweeten	Chilliwack District
Andrew Tait	Fort St James District

Kevin Telfer	Coast Region
Geoff Tindale	BC Timber Sales Branch
Miodrag Tkalec	Mackenzie District
Ron Van der Zwan	Thompson Rivers District - Clearwater
Terje Vold	Consultant for Resource Practices Branch
Barb Wadey	Selkirk District
Craig Wickland	Coast Region
Susan Zedel	Tree Improvement Branch

## Appendix 2: Workshop Evaluation

How useful do you feel the sessions of the Workshop were for you? Were you satisfied with Workshop logistics? Please put an **X** in the column that best reflects your views

Workshop Sessions	Not useful	Partially useful	Useful	Very useful
Conversation with Executive	0	5	12	5
1. FFT Strategic Plan – focus and priorities	0	6	19	1
2. LEAN – keeping up progress – moving into the control phase	2	10.5	10.5	3
3. AOP – priority filtering and compromise	0	4	17	3
4. Ramping up Current Reforestation	0	8	16	1
5. Evolution of Type 4 Silviculture Strategies – how they relate to TSR and AOP	0	2	23	1
6. Mapping needs	0	2	19	5
7. Forest health factors to consider when developing a stand management plan	0	4	14	8
8. First Nations consultation – implications of Williams decision ( <b>intended presenter did not attend; N/A-4</b> )	6.5	12.5	2	0
9. Sowing requests – sowing levels, stock types, seedling selection and seed planning coordination	0	6	16	4
10. Safety and safety management system	4	9	8	0
<b>Any Comments on Particular Sessions?</b> (please identify with Session #1, 2, etc) Use the back of this page if you need more room				
<p><u>General:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As a resource manager in charge of the FFT program, this was a very beneficial workshop</li> <li>- These meetings would be better if regions and districts were more involved in the organization. This would be a great opportunity for team building. Matt is a good presenter. Al never answers questions directly...bit confounding!</li> <li>- Great sessions; most were highlights with information on how to get further information and generate great conversations.</li> <li>- FFT program appears to be linked too much to the political whim!</li> <li>- The pre-written questions were a good way.</li> <li>- Too much detailed review in some presentations (3, 5); could have covered program in 1 day; although no shows!! resulted in shortened session</li> <li>- Have you considered having two different FFT meetings – one for the Coast and one for the Interior? I saw some coastal people tune out when we speak of mountain pine beetle.</li> <li>- If the intent of pre-soliciting comments from participants is to have them spoken to (where practicable) please ensure ADMs and presenters attempt to speak to them</li> <li>- LBIS should have a species diversity presentation on Lw operational trials? video? of what these issues look like in the field</li> <li>- Share operational successes and failures vs presentations from participants</li> </ul> <p><u>Conversation with Executive:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enjoyed ADM participation: reasonable audience participation</li> </ul> <p><u>Session 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to revisit the strategic goals of the FFT program</li> <li>- Certainly need to see a broadening of the program but a lack of funding will cause an issue to meet this</li> </ul>				

end

- Could have been more specific

Session 2:

- Current way to do business is now mapped, LEAN will happen once we follow the process and improve it. Communication of this process has not been adequate. This needs to be addressed.
- Additional feedback needed on LEAN processes. There is a need to better communicate (e.g. LEAN)
- Did the LEAN process actually find efficiency gains? What were they? Cost savings?
- Wrt the LEAN presentation, could have been better prepared, maybe some visuals

Session 3:

- Need to better explain/communicate prioritization process; presentation of area AOPs would have been beneficial
- Again not detailed or specific
- In the future a discussion of the mechanics or data sets used to determine priority rankings
- Too much #s; review just strategies for rationalization
- More time needed on AOP/planning and walking through decisions/considerations

Session 4:

- Concerned that we are trying to spend money due to a funding pressure to spend rather than because we need it and have planned for it and are going to do the right thing with it
- Could have provided more direction
- Seems odd that province has a planting target when disturbances fluctuate

Session 6:

- Consider demos or testimonial
- I am a strong supporter of knowing your data – we need to know more

Session 8:

- First Nations consultation needed more detail and emphasis on what requirements we have/need
- Disappointed we did not have speaker
- Speaker should have found a replacement
- Presenter not here
- Poor presentation
- FN consultation was only touched on due to Neil’s no show and should be reviewed on call or next meeting (spring)

Session 10:

- Don’t put safety last. It is important so put up from to keep people engaged.
- BCTS already hires safe certified contractors

<b>Workshop Logistics</b> If not satisfied, your comments to improve most appreciated	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Workshop organization	21.5	2.5	- Agenda not sent out ahead; no rooms available for everyone; communication not good - Agenda and timing a bit too loose - Room booking issue at meeting venue - Coffee room was the bomb



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Great location and food</li> <li>- Prefer to have everything on-site, coffee, etc. and lunch</li> <li>- Really appreciate the effort it takes; overall good</li> <li>- I registered for the workshop, but never received a direct e-mail about logistics</li> <li>- Send out any e-mails 2 days prior to workshop. Maps to walk to restaurant would help</li> <li>- Good job trying to keep costs down</li> </ul>
Workshop venue (meeting room, refreshments/ lunch)	<b>19.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was freezing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day</li> <li>- Recommend having coffee in the room rather than all leaving site to go to a room</li> <li>- Room was great, location was poor! Little around except casino; bring coffee in! lunch ok but should have more detail ahead of time</li> <li>- Lack of restaurants and pubs, etc. in the area; great meeting room</li> <li>- Meeting room fine, lunch of pasta two days in a row a bit much; good to have to walk between coffee room and meeting room; walked off pasta lunch</li> <li>- Room is fantastic</li> <li>- Basic refreshments in meeting room would have been nice e.g. coffee and tea</li> <li>- Let's keep the venue- hotel – meals together</li> <li>- Room 5 out of 5; refreshments 2 out of 5; lunch 3 out of 5; leaving the room during breaks was not conducive for discussions with peers</li> <li>- Great meeting room</li> <li>- Nice view; prefer block booking of rooms at the meeting site though; lunch – good but light on food for some tables</li> <li>- Nice venue; meeting room a little cold; same lunch 2 days?; thanks/appreciate the effort it takes</li> <li>- Keep on site, coffee and lunch</li> <li>- Great room</li> <li>- Excellent, can we afford coffee?</li> <li>- Location good, would not give the cheaper room rate! Would be better to just cater on sites, cut down time travelling to lunch</li> </ul>
Workshop agenda	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More discussion on roles and responsibilities</li> <li>- I would like more break out groups</li> <li>- Well organized – good flow</li> <li>- Agenda might have been a bit fuller but otherwise good</li> <li>- Agenda – little light for 2 day meeting; suggest more time for group exercises, successes, failures identified</li> <li>- Managed to quickly make up time in morning #1</li> <li>- Next time, how about some project successes presented. A video on fertilization, PITA findings. Devote some time to this operational piece.</li> <li>- Good topics</li> </ul>
Other (please specify)	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Well done Nigel. Location was great (except for the air conditioner)</li> <li>- One day would have been enough with a well thought out agenda and better organization</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coffee, team and snacks would be good in the meeting room</li> <li>- Could have reduced to 1 day (although ‘enjoyable’ – busy times...). Actually could have been phone call. District mgt staff criticizes # of face-to-face meetings for FFT – becomes sensitive issue</li> <li>- Perhaps consider 1 day meeting if agenda light</li> <li>- Some conversations were specific to an office and they went down a rabbit hole; these could have been taken off line</li> <li>- Not satisfied with coffee, tea</li> <li>- Access link to SharePoint with copies of presentations</li> <li>- Good at being fiscally responsible wrt venue, lunch and refreshments</li> <li>- Not satisfied: need to either include or exclude coffee, tea, pop with lunch. Prefer more options than H2O since we drank it all morning</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

## Appendix 3: Workshop Action Items

**Action #1:** Discussions need to be held with district managers and major licensees about the need for FFT reforestation activities outside BCTS operating areas in a variety of forums including:

- District Manager Community of Practice discussions
- Joint industry/ministry Resource Stewardship and Tenures Committee
- Provincial Forestry Forum
- Regional Operational Issues Forums

**Action #2:** Dave Cornwell to send draft Lean Control Points to FFT contacts for review and comment. When Resource Practices Branch talks with the district manager COP, they will raise the draft control points with them.

**Action #3:** Resource Practices Branch will update the FFT Roles and Responsibilities document so that it is consistent with the FFT Lean process.

**Action #4:** Matt LeRoy will send out the latest version of ‘Caribou GAR Areas Processing in RESULTS’ to appropriate FFT delivery staff.

**Action #5:** Matt LeRoy will provide link to certified tools in RESULTS website to FFT contacts.

**Action #6:** Al Powelson will determine how FAIB handles older cutblocks with respect to openings, growth, etc. – and what districts should do

- **Done:** Al reported on this action item at the Workshop. FAIB uses the latest label in RESULTS; so if the information is inaccurate, then this should be updated by district staff.

**Action #7:** All FFT delivery staff involved in FFT Current Reforestation should think about effective ways to ramp up CR in their AOP given the extra \$10 MM starting in 2015/16.

**Action #8:** FFT delivery staff should let Matt LeRoy know what their mapping needs are so those needs can be addressed on the RPB Gallery, and let Matt know if they have any issues using the Gallery. Also:

- Matt will send link to RPB Gallery to all FFT delivery contacts
- Matt will set up a mapping tutorial for interested staff regarding use of the Gallery
- FFT staff using the Gallery should ensure that they download the geodatabase as it is a much more effective way of using the mapping
- Matt will organize Avenza tutorial for handheld devices
- Matt will ask Duncan Richard to develop app for iPads given the number of people using iPads in the field
- For GAR mitigation openings, will provide link to whether some harvesting is possible or not in UWR and WHAs

**Action #9:** Nigel to provide further links on the LBIS [FFT Guidance website](#) to related guidance documents like the [Tree Species Selection Tool](#)

**Action #10:** Nigel Fletcher will send the draft FFT First Nations consultation and information sharing guidelines to FFT contacts for review.

**Action #11:** Neil Edwards with First Nations Relations Branch is looking for FFT feedback on the “30-60-90” changes to First Nations consultation and information sharing based on the recent Williams court decision. FFT contacts should send any comments they have to Neil with cc to Nigel.

**Action #12:** FFT contacts to provide Matt LeRoy feedback on forming an FFT Seed Planning Working Group with staff from regions, districts, RPB and TIB. Also if FFT delivery staff have any issues with seedling requests, please contact Susan Zedel at Tree Improvement Branch.