

Workshop Synopsis

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

Sponsored by

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

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



Workshop Organizer:

Nigel Fletcher, Resource Practices Branch

Prepared by:

Terje Vold, Contractor, LBIS Project Support

April 2014

Table of Contents

REMINDER OF WORKSHOP AGENDA	3
PURPOSE OF THIS SYNOPSIS	4
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	4
SESSION 1: IMPROVING PLANNING AND DELIVERY	5
1A. ACTION ITEMS FROM FALL MEETING	5
1B. LEAN 101	6
1C. FFT LEAN ACTION PLAN AND MAP	7
SESSION 2: PLANNING AND FUNDING	9
2A. FFT PLANNED TREATMENTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	9
2C. USING RESULTS FOR FORWARD PLANNING	9
2B. FFT BUDGET FOR 2014/15 AND ALLOCATION PROCESS	10
SESSION 3: DELIVERY CONSIDERATIONS.....	12
3A. PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS' (PwC) ROLE	12
3B. BC TIMBER SALES' ROLE.....	13
3C. FOREST CARBON PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM/FFT OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK.....	15
3D. MOUNTAIN CARIBOU MITIGATION.....	15
WORKSHOP WRAP-UP AND EVALUATION.....	16
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS	17
APPENDIX 2: WORKSHOP EVALUATION	19
APPENDIX 3: ACTION ITEMS.....	21
APPENDIX 4A: STRESS & SATISFACTION OFFSET SCORE	22
APPENDIX 4B: STRESS TEST RESULTS FROM FFT WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS	25

Reminder of Workshop Agenda

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

Location: Executive Airport Plaza Hotel
7311 Westminster Highway, Richmond, BC

THURSDAY, MARCH 27 TH , 2014	
Planning and Delivering the FFT Program in 2014/15, and Rolling Out the FFT LEAN project	
8:15 am	<i>Coffee/tea available – meet and greet</i>
8:30 am	Welcome and Introductions – Nigel Fletcher
9:10 am	Session 1: Improving Planning and Delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1a. Action items from Fall Workshop – Dave Cornwell• 1b. LEAN 101 – Ryan Forman, Corporate Initiatives
10:00 am	<i>Coffee break</i>
10:15 am	Session 1 (cont'd): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1c. FFT LEAN action plan, maps, and Qs & As – FFT LEAN Team
11:15 am	Session 2: Planning and Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2a. FFT planned treatments and accomplishments – Nigel Fletcher• 2b. FFT budget for 2014/15 and allocation process – Al Powelson and Monty Locke
12:00 pm	<i>Lunch - will be provided</i>
1:00 pm	Session 2 (cont'd): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2c. Using RESULTS for forward planning (<i>incorporated as part of 2a</i>) – Nigel Fletcher
1:30 pm	Session 3: Delivery Considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3a. PwC role – Colin Campbell and Kevin Bromley, PwC• 3b. BCTS expanded role and MOU – Kerri Brownie, BCTS
2:45 pm	<i>Coffee break</i>
3:00 pm	Session 3: (cont'd): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3c. Forest Carbon Partnership Program/FFT MOU – Al Powelson• 3d. Mountain Caribou mitigation – Al Powelson
4:00 pm	Action Items, Closing Remarks and Workshop Evaluation – Nigel Fletcher
4:30 pm	Adjourn
	Thanks to all who participated!

Purpose of this Synopsis

At least 59 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 March 27th, 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.

This Synopsis, the Workshop Workbook and workshop presentations will be posted on the following LBIS FFT website: www.for.gov.bc.ca/hcp/fia/landbase/fft/updates.htm

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.

Welcome and Introductions

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

Appreciation to the FFT Team

John McClarnon extended sincere appreciation to the entire FFT Team for all their hard work and accomplishments. Prior to the Workshop, John asked Lorne Bedford, A/Director, Resource Practices Branch, what jumped immediately to mind with respect to acknowledging the FFT Team. The two key attributes Lorne identified were:

1. Commitment to the FFT LEAN process – despite heavy workloads, the FFT LEAN Team saw the benefit of participating, committed the time, and their excellent collaborative efforts made it work. This exemplifies the wider FFT Team’s ‘Can Do/Get it Done’ attitude.
2. The FFT program has now been running for 10 consecutive years – the FFT program has broken all previous records for longevity of a government funded reforestation program and longevity is an absolute indicator of a successfully run program.

For John’s part, one of the discussions that occurred in this year’s estimates debates reflects on the great work of the FFT Team. The question to the minister began by noting that “....reforestation is arguably the most important public indicator of how the ministry is performing. It’s seen as a critical factor in managing the forests of British Columbia.” The question asked what the budget numbers for reforestation recently were and would be. The minister responded: “....for ’13-14, \$23.5 million; for ’14-15, \$31 million; and for ’15-16, \$37 million.” This is a significant and increasing commitment to the FFT current reforestation program.

Also in Hansard we provided estimates as to what would be planted. John was pleased to say we have exceeded those numbers in terms of seedlings planted in actuals for 2013: 22.7 million in 2013/14 and a projected planting of 25 million seedlings in 2014/15.

Exceeding the 20 million mark has been a significant collective effort by all involved in the program – branch, regions, districts, BCTS, PwC, individuals stepping up to fill in gaps – and these efforts are acknowledged by the minister on down within the ministry.

Stress Test

Nigel distributed a ‘Stress & Satisfaction Offset Score (SSOS): A Self Assessment’ to participants to complete (see Appendix 4a). The overall results are in Appendix 4b.

Session 1: Improving Planning and Delivery

1a. Action Items from Fall Meeting

Dave Cornwell reviewed the following 11 action items that stemmed from last Fall’s FFT Workshop:

Action #1: FLNR needs tools to help ensure impacted stands are harvested to reduce impacts on mid-term timber supply.

- Actively working on this including concrete tools via the FFT LEAN project

Action #2: Provide guidance on how we can deliver an enhanced FFT silviculture plan e.g. from Type 4 Silviculture Strategies

- Had professional development workshop on March 26th where was a session on Type 4 Silviculture Strategies and how they are intended to drive the FFT program

Action #3: Kevin Astridge will send subzone variant predictor over time.

- Need to check with Kevin if this was sent or was posted on website for staff

Action #4: Monty Locke will circulate first draft of the annual operating plan (AOP) for 2014/15 as well as timelines for submission of Draft 2 of the AOP.

- Completed

Action #5: Regions/districts to check sowing requests in AOP with SPAR.

- Completed

Action #6: Jennifer Burleigh will send a one- or two-pager on the black army cutworm with weblink that provides advice.

- Need to check with Jennifer if this was sent or was posted on website for staff

Action #7: Nola Daintith and/or Kerri Howse will send Dave Cornwell a copy of the Service Agreement with the BC Conservation Foundation so that this can be made available to others.

- Dave did receive the Agreement and will send out to the FFT Team

Action #8: Look into certifying larger areas as FFT eligible for BCTS ITSL, and outside BCTS chart areas.

- Considerable work has and is being done; will hear more about this at Workshop

Action #9: Build what you do in your Regional and District Work Plans, and link this with the FLNR Service Plan (e.g. Performance Measure 7) as the work plans are reviewed by Regional Management Teams (RMTs). This should help improve communication about the FFT program.

- Hopefully regions and districts are doing this; likely so given that FFT funds are being allocated to regions and districts where they are responsible for delivery

Action #10: Contact CTQ regarding RESULTS data quality issues in your district.

- Districts have been actively doing this

Action #11: Contact Tom Jackson if any questions about the Client Interaction Guide.

- On-going offer should you need further information or advice.

Action #1: Dave Cornwell will follow-up on three of the action items from the Fall 2013 FFT meeting:

- #3: Did Kevin Astridge send or post the subzone variant predictor over time
- #6: Did Jennifer Burleigh send a one- or two-pager on the black army cutworm with weblink that provides advice
- #7: Dave will forward the Service Agreement with BC Conservation Foundation

1b. LEAN 101

Ryan Forman with the ministry's Corporate Initiatives group provided an overview of the LEAN process. This is the third year the ministry has initiated LEAN projects. The FFT LEAN project is one of 8 LEAN projects the ministry is doing. A key purpose of LEAN is to strengthen internal capacity, to provide improved access to other programs and services, and to serve clients more efficiently.

Through the LEAN process, managers engage staff; the process provides increased understanding of the context of their work. Managers help guide the process by noting what is in and out of scope, but then empowering employees to make changes. During the FFT LEAN process, the team checked with the oversight group everyday about the 'no go zone'.

The LEAN method involves defining the problem, measuring the problem, analyzing the problem, improving the process (via the 'kaizen event'), and controlling the process. The five "S's" in the kaizenworld are sort; set in order; shine; standardize; and sustain. The 'kaizen mind' is looking to improve. Empowerment, continuous improvement and streamlining are an integral part of LEAN.

The first step in the process is: ‘What are we actually doing now?’ Eventually the process moves to: ‘What we should be doing’ (standardize). A ‘true value added’ approach is taken considering what it is that customer’s want. How do we measure true value added? e.g. process cycle time; measure pace of process; movement of product.

Non-Value Added or waste is ‘down-time’. Examples include product defect/need to re-work; overproduction; waiting; non-utilization of people’s skills; transportation; inventory; motion/people moves; and excess processing.

How do you test the efficiency of a new LEAN process? For permitting programs, this is easier to do (e.g. average time it takes to issue a permit); for financial programs like FFT it is harder to assess.

A Workshop participant noted that for the FREP program there is an annual satisfaction survey. Another participant noted that one of the FFT LEAN project value added findings was related to financial efficiency, and that this could apply to other programs like FREP.

There was a question that the ‘process maps’ are based on resources (people) but things can change given fluidity of staffing within the ministry. Ryan noted that by documenting ‘what we should be doing’ (standardize process), this should make it easier to communicate the process given changes in staffing. Also a participant noted that it is an argument for needed resources e.g. if you want this done, we need a person here to do this in order to accomplish the task.

It was noted that there is a ‘knowledge transfer’ benefit associated with a LEAN project where costs are clearly defined to accomplish what is really needed.

There was a question about the situation where clients have differing expectations; may need slightly different process. A participant comment underscored the importance of engaging clients, and asking them what their expectations are.

1c. FFT LEAN Action Plan and Map

The FFT LEAN Team reviewed the products of the recent FFT LEAN process including action plan and map (distributed at Workshop) that are available at the following LBIS FFT website: <http://lbis.forestpracticesbranch.com/LBIS/node/103>

By way of background, there was dissatisfaction in regions about how LBIS decisions were made, so a LEAN project request was submitted. It was decided to start with the FFT program where lessons learned from the LEAN process could be transferred to the other LBIS investment programs.

It was important to define the scope of the project and ‘no go’ zones, as the outcome of the LEAN project can affect what staff do. Once defined, the FFT LEAN oversight managers needed to accept that the people doing the FFT work are best suited to define the process. The FFT LEAN Team began by mapping the current state, and then mapped the desired future state.

Dave Cornwell introduced and acknowledged the hard work by FFT LEAN Team that consisted of Craig Wickland, Monty Locke, Carolyn Stevens, Kerri Howse, Mike Madill, John Hopper, Katherine Rogers, Al Powelson, Lyn Konowalyk, Ljiljana Knezevic and Dave.

The Workshop is the official roll-out of the new FFT LEAN process that will start April 1st. The FFT LEAN maps appear complex, which seems opposite of intent to streamline, but the maps address the 3-year planning cycle from Strategic to Tactical (e.g. Annual Operating Plan) to Operational where a delivery agent (such as FLNR, BCTS or PwC) needs to be selected. The role of the Executive is also identified in the process maps.

The Workshop participants were split into three groups to go over initially: (i) Strategic Planning; (ii) Tactical and Operational Planning; or (iii) Delivery Agent Selection. Then the groups shifted to another topic so each group had an opportunity to go over entire process map. The process maps were explained with an opportunity to ask questions, and to suggest improvements or corrections to the process.

Based on the group discussions, the following suggestions were recorded by an FFT LEAN Team member on a flip chart:

Strategic Planning

- Feedback to Deputy Minister regarding strategic prioritization
- Box to describe role of DM in prioritization process
- Decision Box needed in Strategic prioritization regarding above

Tactical and Operational Planning

- Contract ADM approval needed early in season (February suggested)
- Define role of Type 4 Silviculture Strategies in the planning process
- Consider moving endorsement box to 5-year Plan
- Start working on moving BCTS ITSL work outside of BCTS operating areas

Delivery Agent Selection

- Move ‘Factors’ prior to decision
- Check arrows between elements at front
- Caribou mitigation – should it be on this map?
- Need to revise process map - @ start of deliver to show that BCTS identifies eligible areas within BCTS operating areas, while District/Regions identifies potential areas within TSAs (outside BCTS operating areas)

Action #2: FFT LEAN process maps to be updated considering feedback at Workshop and posted on FFT website

Dave provided an overview of the FFT LEAN Action Plan which was provided in the Workshop Workbook and is now posted in the above noted FFT website. He noted that Lorne Bedford, A/Director, Resource Practices Branch is now Project Champion. The Action Plan identifies the deliverable, lead, status, target date and provides comments for each action item.

Some highlights discussed at the Workshop in the Action Plan include:

- 2014/15 AOP – Monty has sent this out
- Delivery Agent Selection Checklist – Kerri has completed and will post this
- Endorsement of AOP – this is a new template for RED endorsement
- Financial Management – Monty has provided clarity in the allocation letter on when to start; ideally with an approved AOP we would like to get blanket ADM approval

- Priority Setting – while clear in areas impacted by MPB, priorities need to be set for non-MPB impacted areas; Craig is leading with Monty chairing a group working on this; outcomes will feed into the 2015/16 AOP
- Process Communication – the Workshop today is a big part of this action along with the posting of the maps and action plan on the LBIS FFT website
- Salvage Opportunities – Lyn is leading; to make sure salvage is considered first before rehabilitation funding from FFT
- Stakeholder Templates – Al is leading; for example to inform the First Nation Forestry Council of expected FFT activities as they may have interest in building capacity to help support on-the-ground work
- BCTS MOU – John and Mike are leading with Kerri and Geoff Tindale closely involved; the intent is for a more streamlined partnership agreement
- WMB MOU – WMB wanted the MOU to be Fire Centre by Fire Centre; Dave asked participant if they would prefer a provincial MOU. WMB can use FFT sites for danger tree falling training and prescribed fire training where they take on the liability. It was noted though that WMB can't commit staff as they don't know what the fire season ahead will be. What is needed is an approach with respect to how FFT pays WMB where their staff work weekends or overtime on FFT projects. We also need wildfire perimeter maps.

Action #3: FFT LEAN products in the Action Plan will be posted when completed on FFT website

Session 2: Planning and Funding

2a. FFT Planned Treatments and Accomplishments 2c. Using RESULTS for Forward Planning

These topics were covered together. Nigel reviewed 2013/14 annual operating plan (AOP) planned treatments (goals and \$/unit) versus actual accomplishments including those reported by PwC for TFLs. He first addressed the need for doing this. Why does the branch need to know what is being planned, and what has happened on the ground? There are several reasons including:

- An FRBC audit noted that they did not have this information, and that may have contributed to the end of that program.
- During budget debates, we need to prepare the minister for possible questions that ask these questions in our briefing notes, and we get this information by querying RESULTS – therefore it is important that RESULTS be accurate.
- We need to provide this information in our ministry's Service Plan Annual Reports.
- The information is vital for any Treasury Board submissions to fund the program.
- If any end-of-year ministry surplus funds exist, we will have the information readily available about how FFT can effectively use those funds (e.g. purchase of fertilizers).
- Being able to respond quickly to potential alternative sources of funding e.g. via zero net deforestation, forest carbon.

- Describing the benefits of FFT relative to other LBIS investment categories.

Reviewing the AOP with RESULTS showed about 22.5 million seedlings planned for planting in the AOP with about 21.5 million seedlings planned for planting in RESULTS, and 19 million seedlings actually planted in RESULTS for the same year. This shows that Forward Planning using RESULTS is a reasonably good match with the AOP, but we need to ramp up the reporting of actual accomplishments in RESULTS.

That said, overall the reporting of FFT planned treatments and actual treatments (and expenditures) have greatly improved in RESULTS since this is a FFT reporting requirement. We, however, do not have a similar policy requirement for the Forest Stand Management Fund (FSMF). Not all of the people attending the Workshop deal with the FSMF, so other staff need to be contacted. There is also the need for some clean-up of RESULTS reporting for FRPA s. 108 treatments that are funded by FFT.

Action #4: 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 FFSMF. This will involve identifying staff looking after FFSMF activities, and conducting conference call(s) on developing policy/requirements around planning in RESULTS for this funding source.

A participant noted the need for some checking or monitoring of performance e.g. are actual costs for treatments matching planned costs, and to improve our estimates of unit costs. This is another reason why this should be reported in RESULTS.

2b. FFT Budget for 2014/15 and Allocation Process

Al Powelson and Monty Locke led discussions on this topic that addressed:

- Budget allocation process versus prioritization process
- Link with strategic investment document
- How government’s social objectives fit into the planning process
- 2014/15 AOP planned treatments (goals)
- Contract approval process for 2014/15
- Allocation letter and authority to carry out activities
- Expected FFT budget, and getting ready for, FY 2015/16
- Status of extra \$10 million for reforestation in 2015/16

Budget allocation process versus prioritization process

The Deputy Minister indicates priorities that are then reflected in the LBI Strategy (see LBI Goals).

There was question if this included monitoring. FFT is the ‘do’ program while FREP (along with research) is the program that monitors to determine if we are ‘doing the right thing’. That said, FFT monitors implementation (e.g. free to grow, fertilization, post-incremental surveys re: spacing).

One of the factors under ‘Investment principles’ in the *LBIS Silviculture Funding Criteria for FFT* is the magnitude of the impact. Other factors include maintaining adequate growth rates on existing government funded land based investments, address critical periods in mid-term timber supply (e.g. where Type 4 silviculture strategies show that FFT can make a difference), and reforesting catastrophic disturbances where the shelf life of killed timber may be short (which may mean delaying treatments in other areas that have a longer window of opportunity to treat).

The other consideration is to fund priority 1 management units to the extent there is capacity to deliver, then priority 2 units, and then priority 3 units. This is not unlike the ‘triage process’ for treating patients. Government is not giving up any management unit – and each one has its particular timber supply issues and challenges, but investments need to be made based on priorities so those units that have the most significant projected timber supply impacts are addressed.

There are also government commitments to treat other non-obligation NSR areas, caribou mitigation, s. 108, etc. that have to be accounted for. Another example is the Deputy Minister commitment to provide some fertilization funding for the coast i.e. that it should not all go to priority units in the interior.

How government’ social objectives fit into the planning process

Social objectives can in part be addressed by assessing forest sector vulnerability; published data was used to determine percent of jobs in various parts of BC that are in the forest sector. The priority ranking system of management units links closely to this social objective.

2014/15 Provincial AOP

Of the \$41 MM for FFT in 2014/15, about 48% is for current reforestation, 12% for timber supply mitigation, 32% used provincially primarily to purchase fertilizers and fund FRPA s. 108 treatments, with 8% in ‘general’ pot that addresses administration (e.g. overhead provided to regions).

Monty showed the planned funding by Area, by Region, and by Delivery Agent. In that regard, there was Deputy Minister direction that we continue to use woodlot licensees and community forests agreement holders as delivery agents.

Al pointed out that there is no ‘risk management’ in the budget (usually we have had 10% to cover this); however once we are aware of a bona fide surplus, we can then move the funds (e.g. maximum density spacing identified in some districts).

Allocation letter and authority to carry out activities/contract approval

The allocation letters will be sent to your Area ADM with cc to REDs, district managers and FFT contacts – that way FFT contacts know they can start spending. The funds and goals in your AOP, consistent with overall FFT budget allocation, will be reflected in the allocation letter. BCTS delivered projects will be handled through JVs.

Receipt of the allocation letter is the ‘go’ to start spending and action the FFT activities. The allocation letters will outline expectations regarding the use of overhead. The letters will go out as soon as the Deputy officially provides the final budget allocation.

We expect that the need for ADM approval for contracts will continue to be part of the contract approval process for 2014/15. Hopefully this will be straight forward with the allocation letters.

Expected FFT budget for FY 15/16 and status of extra \$10 million for reforestation in 2015/16

No new funding for FFT came with the Premier's mandate to provide an extra \$10 million for reforestation 2015/16. In estimates debate, the minister said the \$10 million additional funding for reforestation would come from timber supply mitigation (TSM). To reduce impact on TSM, be creative as some activities overlap with Current Reforestation (CR) e.g. survey program. The extra funding for reforestation means we need to ramp up to 28 million seedlings.

The past, current and projected FFT budget is therefore:

Fiscal Year	CR	TSM
12/13	\$42 MM	\$11.85 MM
13/14	\$23 MM	0
14/15	\$30.7 MM	\$9 MM
15/16	\$36 MM	\$3 MM

The new normal is to not expect a stable budget; it will fluctuate. So we need to be able to respond to both upward and downward budget pressures.

Session 3: Delivery Considerations

3a. PricewaterhouseCoopers' (PwC) role

Colin Campbell, RPF, provided an overview of PwC's role in FFT delivery with opportunities for questions and answers from participants for either him or Kevin Bromley. PwC is a global accounting firm, however PwC's Vancouver office has a full time staff of professional foresters and have provided delivery support for the Land Based Investment Program since 2002, as well as other government funding programs including the BC Forest Science Program, the Job Opportunity Program, and the Federal Mountain Pine Beetle funding program.

PwC focuses on the results and outcomes of the program that it provides delivery support for in addition to due diligence/auditing, flexibility/continuous improvement, and on-line reporting through systems such as FIRS (LBIP) and PINES (FFT).

PwC has an administrative agreement with Resource Practices Branch regarding LBIS FFT. PwC then enters into a Recipient (Contribution) Agreement with organizations to deliver on-the-ground such as forest and woodlot licensees. The tendering rules are generally to lowest qualified bidder.

PwC provides quarterly and year-end reporting, audits the work of Recipient Agreement holders, and reports to government.

The ministry sets project priorities, and PwC is held accountable to get those priorities delivered. PwC receives targets from government and PwC's performance is subject to an annual independent audit.

If PwC is unclear if an activity is eligible for FFT funding, PwC will check with the ministry. All instructions to the recipient must come from PwC (i.e. FLNR staff should not be providing instructions to recipients who hold agreements with PwC; if any concerns address them with PwC). Good communication is key to have clearly defined desired outcomes between district staff and PwC.

There was question about amendments to the recipient work plan, for example, where a TFL holder wants to use surplus FFT funds for other FFT eligible activities. In these cases, Colin at PwC would contact Dave Cornwell and/or Al Powelson about the TFL holder's request; Dave and/or Al in turn would check with regions and districts regarding the appropriateness of using the surplus funds for the other FFT eligible activity - and then Dave/Al would get back to Colin at PwC about whether or not the surplus funds could be used for those other activities.

3b. BC Timber Sales' role

Kerri Brownie addressed BCTS' role and the intended Forest Management Partnership Agreement while also covering the following topics:

- Refresh on what the opportunity is
- Update on accomplishments since last September's FFT Workshop
- Discussion of potential barriers
- Description of next steps.

Kerri acknowledged a Work Group addressing BCTS FFT role that consisted of Al Powelson, Dave Cornwell, John McClarnon, Geoff Tindale, Mike Madill and herself.

Refresh on what the opportunity is

For stands with >70% pine and >70% dead, that are considered NSR and are on sites with site index >15, where BCTS can not salvage enough economic volume to cover reforestation and other costs (i.e. can't do the regular sale given Total Cost Upset), then there is opportunity through FFT ITSL for BCTS to remove the overstory without incurring silviculture liability of having to pay for the site's reforestation. In these situations, FFT can cover reforestation costs.

Based on ministry estimates, there is a huge opportunity in most MPB-impacted TSAs but the opportunity will likely only last for about the next 5 years given the shelf-life of the dead pine.

The many benefits of BCTS being involved through ITSLs are:

- FFT costs are reduced as they don't have to pay for the removal of the overstory
- Economies of scale as BCTS is largest administrator of reforestation contracts
- Overstory that is used provides fibre to industry
- BCTS, FFT and the fibre that can be utilized all provide jobs
- Overstory removal increases the effectiveness of reforestation efforts
- Reforestation leads to faster-growing managed stands that help mitigate projected reductions in mid- and long-term timber

- Limits non-recoverable losses from low volume stands
- Limits pressures to cut green non-pine stands.

There was a question about using ITSLs for problem forest types. Although this opportunity exists in the future, the focus now is on the dead pine on site index >15 given the short window of opportunity to utilize the decaying volume. In the future, the ITSL tool can be used more widely such as for commercial thinning.

Through discussions it was acknowledged that a TSA, such as Prince George, may be a priority unit for FFT reforestation, but Prince George's fibre basket includes Mackenzie. So local knowledge is key to helping ensure that FFT funding is distributed in areas that matter most to addressing the areas timber supply issues, and in this example, may include investment opportunities in Mackenzie.

Progress since September 2013 FFT Workshop

1. Presentation to Timber Sales Leadership Team. Looked for show-stoppers; main one is resourcing (staff), but otherwise FFT delivery does have support
2. Geoff Tindale met with BCTS Business Areas about the ITSL opportunity
3. FFT LEAN project – John Hopper with BCTS was involved; BCTS involvement key piece of process map
4. Confirmation of BCTS resourcing to support implementation; John Hopper is a resource for other BCTS Business Areas about FFT
5. Forest Management Partnership Agreement
 - intent is to be flexible
 - expanded role
 - clarification of stand eligibility criteria
 - streamlining stand level approval
 - confirmation that development and reforestation costs can be covered by FFT (e.g. development cost such as providing access to the site).

Next Steps

- Ensure full salvage uptake in impacted BCTS operating areas
- Provide ability to use ITSLs outside BCTS operating areas
- Identify and address barriers.

The main barrier to getting BCTS to use ITSLs outside their operating area is to get agreement from the TSA committee. AI is working with Forest Tenures Branch on this issue.

Another issue is the results of the BCTS program review that is expected to be completed within a month or two, and how this might affect resourcing and BCTS's core mandate. BCTS support for FFT, fertilization, and planting outside FFT may be impacted by the program review.

It was pointed out that FFT ITSL harvesting is part of BCTS's mandate as it provides data for pricing as a value is established for low value stands.

Action #5: Completion of the Forest Management Partnership Agreement with BCTS following the program review of BCTS, and review of the draft Agreement by FFT staff.

3c. Forest Carbon Partnership Program/FFT Operational Framework

Al Powelson described the draft Forest Carbon Partnership Program (FCPP) and how this relates to FFT as provided in the Operational Framework (Version 3.1 in the Workshop Workbook). Appendix D in the Workshop Workbook provides the draft Guide to Activity Based Forest Carbon Projects in BC Forests.

FFT has been looking for leveraging opportunities and one potentially exists with the FCPP. The draft FCPP and FFT Operational Framework regarding forest carbon projects provides ‘ground rules’ about how the two program relate.

Action #6: FFT Workshop participants, and others in FFT Team, to review draft Forest Carbon Partnership Program document and provide comments to Al Powelson by April 30th, 2014

There will be a companion document that addresses how the proponent interacts with the district.

3d. Mountain Caribou Mitigation

Al Powelson addressed mountain caribou mitigation and the need to build this into FFT plans for 2015/16. The mitigation addresses impacts to forest licensees due the provincial government’s approval of the Mountain Caribou Recovery Implementation Plan (MCRIP).

Al also went over the document in the Workshop Workbook that outlines proposed mitigation through relief of existing silviculture opportunities recently provided by Canfor. Canfor will be working with districts about the blocks they seek mitigation for.

West Fraser, Tolko and others have already submitted their mitigation proposals, so Canfor’s is last major one expected. Meadow Creek will submit one later but it should only impact the Kootenay Lake portion of the Selkirk District.

As part of MCRIP, orders under FRPA’s Government Actions Regulation (GAR) were used as the tool to prohibit timber harvesting in areas needed to protect mountain caribou habitat. Forest licensees were exempted from their reforestation obligations within areas already harvested that are now in the ‘no-harvest’ zone. Because harvesting is now no longer permitted, current direction is that already harvested areas will not be reforested with FFT funding. That said, it is possible we may hear that there is habitat value to caribou to reforesting these sites in the future, and if so there could be pressure to spend LBIS funding for that.

In addition to loss of timber rights, licensees incurred development and other costs associated with the MCRIP decision such as planning and access (road development) costs to areas they can no longer harvest. Government’s mitigation decision is that licensees should be compensated for these overall costs. That means that silviculture costs licensees would normally incur outside the ‘GAR area’ are compensable using FFT funding.

Most of Canfor’s submission that impacts FFT is proposed funding for free-growing surveys outside of the ‘Caribou GAR area’; this includes their operations both in the interior and on the

coast. There is no specific time frame for completing the work; to certain extent it is in the licensee's court. The recent Canfor submission is not reflected in our current 2014/15 AOP but we will need to build it into future AOPs. One possible way to address part of the submission is to undertake a large provincial free growing survey contract in 2015/16.

It was noted that districts should check to see if the estimated costs for the compensable silviculture work are realistic. It was noted that this can be viewed similar to FRPA s. 108 proposals where staff need to check on the proposal and costs.

Action #7: Al Powelson will check that the mitigation relief amounts identified in the Canfor document are consistent with the agreed-to levels by government.

It is critical that we track caribou mitigation costs using RESULTS. Licensees remain responsible for putting the silviculture work paid for by FFT in RESULTS.

Action #8: Matt LeRoy will distribute process for tracking GAR caribou mitigation costs/treatments in RESULTS.

Workshop Wrap-Up and Evaluation

Special recognition was extended to Anna Monetta (between Sessions 3b and 3c) given her announced retirement plans, and her major contributions since the very beginning of FFT in 2005.

Nigel thanked the presenters and attendees for their participation at the workshop. He asked attendees to complete the Workshop Evaluation Form. The results from the completed evaluations are provided in Appendix 2.

The Workshop action items that were captured on the flip charts were reviewed. The Action items in the Synopsis are also listed in Appendix 3.

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
Delee Anderson	Vanderhoof District
Loni Arman	Mackenzie District
Tanja Armstrong-Whitworth	BCTS Cariboo-Chilcotin
Frank Barber	Resource Practices Branch
Paul Barolet	North Island – Central Coast District
Carolyn Beurskens	Mackenzie District
Wayne Bond	Fort St James District
Kerri Brownie	BC Timber Sales Branch
Kevin Bromley	PriceWaterhouseCooper
Colin Campbell	PriceWaterhouseCooper
Dave Cornwell	Resource Practices Branch
Simon Craig	BCTS Okanagan-Columbia
Nola Daintith	Cariboo Region
Mike D'Aloia	Fort Nelson District
Sam Davis	Mackenzie District
Scott Dunn	Campbell River District
Nigel Fletcher	Resource Practices Branch
Ryan Forman	Corporate Initiatives
Christine Gelowitz	Corporate Initiatives Division
Jeremy Greenfield	BCTS Prince George
John Hopper	BCTS Kamloops
Kerri Howse	Cariboo-Chilcotin
John Illes	Nadina District
Ljiljana Knezevic	Omineca Region
Lyn Konowalyk	Rocky Mountain District
Jodie Krakowski	Sea to Sky District
Katherine Ladyman	Okanagan Shuswap District
Kevin Lavelle	Selkirk District – Revelstoke office
Matt LeRoy	Resource Practices Branch
Monty Locke	Resource Practices Branch
Heather MacLennan	Thompson Rivers District
Mike Madill	Thompson/Okanagan Region
John McClarnon	Resource Practices Branch
Leith McKenzie	Thompson/Okanagan Region
Ted McRae	Okanagan Shuswap District
Anna Monetta	Omineca Region
Mark Palmer	South Island District
Bernie Peschke	Thompson/Okanagan Region

Martin Ponsioen	Cascades District
Allan Powelson	Resource Practices Branch
Lee-Ann Puhallo	Quesnel District
Michelle Roland	Client Services Branch
Katherine Rogers	BCTS Babine
Katrina Sigloch	Thompson Rivers District
Pam Silver	Campbell River District
Stephanie Smith	BCTS Peace-Liard
Andrew Snetsinger	Cascades District
Micheline Snively	Mackenzie District
Carolyn Stevens	Nadina District
Nicole Strand	Quesnel District
Jack Sweeten	Chilliwack District
Kevin Telfer	Coast Region
Geoff Tindale	BC Timber Sales Branch
Mary Viszlai-Beale	Fort Nelson District
Terje Vold	LBIS project consulting support
Barb Wadey	Selkirk District
Chris Walder	Cascades District
Craig Wickland	Coast Region

Appendix 2: Workshop Evaluation

How well did each Session topic meet your expectations? Were you satisfied with Workshop logistics? Please put an X in the column that best reflects your views. (Note: most comments are verbatim; a few were paraphrased)

Workshop Sessions/Topics	Not met	Partially Met	Met	Exceeded
1a. Action items from Fall Workshop	0	6	21	1
1b. LEAN 101	1	4	18	5
1c. FFT LEAN action plan and maps	0	6	19	3
2a. FFT planned treatments and accomplishments	0	5	22	1
2b. FFT budget for 2014/15 and allocation process	1	3	24	0
2c. Using RESULTS for forward planning	0	6	22	0
3a. PwC role	0	3	24	1
3b. BCTS expanded role and MOU	0	6	19	3
3c. Forest Carbon Partnership Program/FFT MOU	1	8	19	0
3d. Mountain Caribou mitigation	1	9	15	3
Any Comments on Particular Session Topic? (please identify with Session/Topic #1a, 2b, etc.)				
General: -Once we got into the meat of the agenda, the meeting went well				
1a: Action items should have been met or written into the agenda – not just listing them out				
1b: LEAN 101 was not needed – 50 odd people who have taken the training before				
1c: - FFT process maps – the session was too loud with all 3 breakout groups in one room -The LEAN sales pitch unnecessary; 1c needed more time -Was a little too tight time wise to fully discuss FFT process mapping within groups and no reporting back on key points -Not enough time allocated to roll-out FFT LEAN process maps -LEAN Team did a good job in many aspects				
2b: - Hoping to hear more definitive information on the past years costs by activity -Was hoping to see and discuss the AOP in more detail; wanted to be able to see each TSA's allocation				
3b: Clarification re: BCTS role in 14/15 and beyond needs resolution!				
3d: Caribou mitigation – not clear if government has accepted Canfor's proposals yet the numbers may change based on review of blocks put forward - Mountain caribou mitigation topic was confusing				

Workshop Logistics	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Comment
Workshop organization	23.5	0.5	-Great workshop, topics relevant, well organized -Great job Nigel -Nigel did great job
Workshop venue	20.5	4.5	-Crowded -Fruit/veggies needed at snack -Have lunch available from both sides of table to allow folks to move through quickly -Could be improved; noisy, hallway talking, microphone not loud enough -Room too small; good lunch -Room cramped -Room too small for group -Venue too small for group; food was great

			-Need better selection of food
Workshop agenda	23	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Too long on LEAN 101 and not enough on actual LEAN products -Some things were a bit rushed -With the tight flight schedule for some people; recognizing an earlier end to the meeting while <u>planning</u> the meeting would assist with not having to stay an additional night! Good agenda and time well utilized; wanted to have more discussion time; plan 2 days in the future
Other (please specify)	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Use SurveyMonkey post workshop or for other LBIS feedback -Good meeting -Perhaps no need to meet face-to-face twice a year

Appendix 3: Action Items

Action #1: Dave Cornwell will follow-up on three of the action items from the Fall 2013 FFT meeting:

- #3: Did Kevin Astridge send subzone variant predictor over time
- #6: Did Jennifer Burleigh send a one- or two-pager on the black army cutworm with weblink that provides advice
- #7: Dave will forward the Service Agreement with BC Conservation Foundation.

Action #2: FFT LEAN process maps to be updated considering feedback at Workshop and posted on FFT website.

Action #3: FFT LEAN products in the Action Plan will be posted when completed on FFT website.

Action #4: 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 FMSF. This will involve identifying staff looking after FMSF activities, and conducting conference call(s) on developing policy/requirements around planning in RESULTS for this funding source.

Action #5: Completion of the Forest Management Partnership Agreement with BCTS following the program review of BCTS, and review of the draft Agreement by FFT staff.

Action #6: FFT Workshop participants, and others in FFT Team, to review draft Forest Carbon Partnership Program document and provide comments to Al Powelson by April 30th, 2014.

Action #7: Al Powelson will check that the mitigation relief amounts identified in the Canfor document are consistent with the agreed-to levels by government.

Action #8: Matt LeRoy will distribute process for tracking GAR caribou mitigation costs/treatments in RESULTS.

Appendix 4a: Stress & Satisfaction Offset Score



Step 1

Circle the number that best describes how you feel about the following.

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	SCORE	
Control	I am satisfied with the amount of involvement I have in decisions that affect my work.	+1	+1	0	0	0	Add the first and second scores ...
Reward	I feel I am rewarded (in terms of praise and recognition) for the level of effort I put out for my job.	+1	+1	0	0	0	
Demand	In the last 6 months, too much time pressure at work has caused me worry, "nerves" or stress.	-1	-1	0	0	0	subtract the third score ...
Effort	In the last 6 months, I have experienced worry, "nerves" or stress from mental fatigue at work.	-1	-1	0	0	0	subtract the fourth score ...

Step 2

Put your score in the box.

Step 3

Tally the scores.

The Stress & Satisfaction Offset Score was developed by Dr. Martin Shain in collaboration with Health Canada and the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health

TOTAL

Enter total in the bottom box.

Please see reverse for interpretation of your results.

Organizational Culture

While short bursts of stress can be motivating, prolonged stress is always unhealthy. Constant stress increases a person's risk of heart disease, depression, back pain, some cancers, infections, decreased muscle mass and bone loss, among other things. As well, workers who are under a lot of stress are more likely to be injured on the job.

Your workplace can contribute to your stress by the presence of a class of hazards called "psychosocial" hazards. Examples are: excessive workload and unachievable deadlines, a lack of influence or control over how you do your work, harassment or lack of respect from supervisors or co-workers, or lack of recognition for the effort you put into your job.

Stress & Satisfaction Offset Score (SSOS)

A Self-Assessment

SSOS Interpretation

If your score is +2

You experience more satisfaction than stress at work. On the whole, you feel you are valued and are being treated fairly at work. Your self-reported health is likely to be excellent, and you have a sense of well-being. Your mental health related to work is characterized by high levels of commitment and engagement in your work. You are undoubtedly contributing to achieving your employer's business objectives. Congratulations! You are one of the fortunate ones, experiencing a very healthy workplace.

If your score is +1

You experience slightly more satisfaction than stress at work. On the whole, you feel you are being treated relatively fairly at work. Your self-reported health is likely to be very good. Your mental health related to work is characterized by quite high commitment to your employer and your job. Your employer is doing many things right, but there is still some room for improvement.

If your score is 0

The satisfaction you get from your job and the stress you experience at work tend to cancel each other out. Your self-reported health is likely to be neutral, or moderately good. Your mental health related to work may be characterized by complacency or disengagement. You are neither contributing to, nor detracting from, your employer's business objectives. Your employer could do a lot more to improve the health of your workplace, and gain your commitment and engagement.

If your score is -1

You experience slightly more stress than satisfaction at work. You may feel you are treated unfairly at work. You may be inadvertently working against the achievement of your employer's business objectives, whether these objectives are product-related or service-related. Your self-reported health is likely only fair. Your mental health at work may be characterized by disengagement and demoralization. You are at risk for a variety of health and capacity impairments. Your employer should take notice of the unhealthy workplace conditions that are contributing to your poor health and a lack of productivity in the business. There is much that can be done to improve both!

If your score is -2

You experience more stress than satisfaction at work. You likely feel you are treated very unfairly at work. You are likely inadvertently working against the achievement of your employer's business objectives, whether these objectives are product-related or service-related. Your self-reported health is likely to be poor. Your mental health at work may be characterized by disengagement, demoralization and depression. You are at risk for a wide variety of health and capacity impairments. Employees who consistently experience high levels of stress and low satisfaction at work suffer the following consequences:

Risk of Health Problems:

- 3 x risk of heart problems
- 3x risk of back pain
- 5x risk of certain cancers
- 2-3x risk of injuries
- 2-3x risk of infections
- 2-3x risk of conflicts
- 2-3x risk of mental health problems such as depression and anxiety disorders
- 2-3x risk of substance abuse problems (e.g., drugs, alcohol)

Risk of Work Capacity Problems:

- Reduced adaptability
- Reduced ability to cope with change
- Impaired learning
- Impaired memory
- Increased helplessness
- Increased passivity or aggression and conflict

Your employer is allowing you to work in a toxic work environment that is unhealthy for you, and contributing to poor business performance. There is a lot of room for improvement!

For more information about the validity and reliability of the SSOS tool contact IAPA.

Stress & Satisfaction Offset Score (SSOS)

A Self-Assessment

For more information, contact IAPA at
905-614-4272 or toll-free at 1-800-406-4272,
or visit the website at www.iapa.ca

April 2008

© Industrial Accident Prevention Association, 2008. All rights reserved.

As part of IAPA's mission to inform and educate, IAPA permits users to reproduce this material for their own internal training and educational purposes only. For any other purpose, including use in conjunction with fee for service or other commercial activities, no part of this material may be used, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recorded, or otherwise, without the express prior written permission of the Industrial Accident Prevention Association.

The information contained in this material is provided voluntarily as a public service. No warranty, guarantee or representation is made by IAPA as to the correctness, suitability, fitness, or sufficiency of any information contained in this material. Use of this material means that the user agrees that IAPA and its employees will not have and are released from any liability whatsoever, however caused or arising, in connection therewith. Users also acknowledge that it cannot be assumed that all acceptable safety measures are contained in this material or that additional measures may not be required in the conditions or circumstances that are applicable to the user or his/her organization, and that the user will personally make his/her own assessment of the information contained in this material.

While IAPA does not undertake to provide a revision service or guarantee accuracy, we shall be pleased to respond to your individual requests for information.

Appendix 4b: Stress Test Results from FFT Workshop Participants

Stress Test						
Control	Reward	Demand	Effort	C+R-D-E	C+R+D+E	
0	1	-1	0	2	0	
0	1	-1	-1	3	-1	
1	1	0	-1	3	1	
1	1	-1	0	3	1	
0	0	-1	-1	2	-2	
1	1	-1	-1	4	0	
1	1	-1	-1	4	0	
0	0	-1	-1	2	-2	
1	0	-1	-1	3	-1	
0	0	-1	-1	2	-2	
0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	0	-1	-1	3	-1	
0	1	-1	-1	3	-1	
0	1	0	-1	2	0	
1	1	-1	-1	4	0	
1	1	0	0	2	2	
0	1	0	-1	2	0	
1	0	0	0	1	1	
0	1	-1	-1	3	-1	
1	0	0	0	1	1	
1	1	-1	0	3	1	
0	0	-1	-1	2	-2	
1	1	-1	0	3	1	
0	0	-1	0	1	-1	
1	1	-1	-1	4	0	
Sample size (n)	26	26	26	26	26	26
Mean	0.5	0.576923	-0.69231	-0.61538	2.38462	-0.23077
Standard Deviation	0.509902	0.503831	0.470679	0.496139	1.13409	1.106623
Standard Error in Mean	0.1	0.098809	0.092308	0.097301	0.22241	0.217027

Key:

