

**Morice and
Lakes
Timber
Supply
Areas**

Sustainable Forest Management Report



March 31, 2007



Sustainable Forest Management Report

Table of Contents

Sustainable Forest Management Report3

Table of Contents.....3

Introduction 1

The Morice & Lakes Innovative Forest Practices Agreement 1

Sustainable Forest Management and the M&L IFPA.....2

M&L IFPA Public Involvement Process2

M&L IFPA Continual Improvement Process.....3

Applications of the M&L IFPA SFM Plans.....3

 IFPA Requirements 3

 BC Forest and Range Practices Act 4

 Forest Investment Account 4

 Forest Certification Requirements..... 4

 BC Government Sustainable Resource Management Planning Processes..... 4

 Bark Beetle Management Strategies 4

Indicator Reporting for the M&L IFPA.....5

 Summary of Reporting Results – Morice TSA..... 5

 Summary of Reporting Results – Lakes TSA..... 13

Prepared by:



For more information, please contact:

Jim Burbee, General Manager • Morice & Lakes IFPA
 3003 Riverview Road • Prince George, BC • Canada • V2K 4Y5
 Tel: 250-564-1518 • Fax: 250-562-1518 • Email: venturefc@telus.net



Morice
Timber Supply Area
&
Lakes
Timber Supply Area

British Columbia
Canada



Introduction

This document is the third annual **Sustainable Forest Management Report** for the **Morice & Lakes Innovative Forest Practices Agreement** (M&L IFPA) and addresses two years of reporting **sustainable forest management (SFM)** indicators on both the Morice and the Lakes Timber Supply Area (TSA) land bases.



A substantial amount of investment and effort has gone into the development of an *SFM Plan* for each TSA. With the implementation of the SFM Plans now underway, a significant amount of work is required to ensure that the forest management methods and practices being used are aligned with the SFM Plans and that they are performing as expected.



Both of the SFM Plans outline SFM performance indicators and targets that the partner licensees of the M&L IFPA have oriented with their forest management operations. An important aspect of SFM is continual improvement, and the monitoring and reporting of measurable SFM indicators is a critical element in evaluating the overall SFM system being used and seeking opportunities for its improvement.

This summary document provides an overview of the M&L IFPA process to date and presents a synopsis of the results of indicator monitoring and reporting from April 1st, 2005 to March 31st, 2006.

The Morice & Lakes Innovative Forest Practices Agreement

The M&L IFPA was awarded in 1999 and is a partnership between six regional forest licensees (Babine Forest Products, Canadian Forest Products, Decker Lake Forest Products, Fraser Lake Sawmills, Houston Forest Products, and L&M Lumber) and the provincial Small Business Forest Enterprise Programs operating in both the Morice and the Lakes Timber Supply Areas. The overall IFPA program was designed by the Province of British Columbia to support licensees in exploring new forest management ideas within an operational setting – with the intent to enhance timber supplies, improve community stability, and better integrate social and environmental values.



The provincial **IFPA program** was designed to enable licensees to explore new forest management ideas in an operational setting – to enhance timber supplies, community stability and social and environmental values.

The program was launched to advance seven goals of government:

- *Develop socially acceptable forest management plans and practices;*
- *Conserve environmental values;*
- *Increase timber supply;*
- *Improve the knowledge base to achieve specific forest management objectives;*
- *Implement a results-based approach to management;*
- *Communicate IFPA results to influence forest management; and*
- *Promote tenure reform.*



Sustainable Forest Management and the M&L IFPA

The principle behind sustainable forest management is to manage the forest ecosystem towards achieving a balance between social, ecological and economic values; doing so in a manner that satisfies current needs while still allowing future generations to enjoy similar benefits means planning responsibly – with insight, innovation and adaptability.

In Canada, a national framework for SFM has been developed by the *Canadian Council of Forest Ministers* (CCFM) that outlines six national criteria for SFM in Canada. In order to be applicable in the diverse local conditions and situations found across Canada, local-level values, objectives, indicators and targets are developed based on the CCFM criteria.

Developing and implementing SFM Plans for both the Morice and the Lakes TSAs is the central purpose of the M&L IFPA. These SFM Plans have been developed using enhanced approaches to public involvement, forest productivity, and natural disturbance-based management, and they are the instruments that enable the achievement of the M&L IFPA's goals.



Canadian Council of Forest Ministers' Criteria for SFM

1. *Conservation of Biological Diversity*
2. *Maintenance and Enhancement of Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity*
3. *Conservation of Soil and Water Resources*
4. *Forest Ecosystem Contributions to Global Ecological Cycles*
5. *Multiple Benefits to Society*
6. *Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development*



M&L IFPA Public Involvement Process

The Morice & Lakes IFPA includes a significant public involvement component. In developing the SFM Plans for the two TSAs, over 100 meetings were held with local participants who represented a wide range of stakeholder interests. Well over 200 people with an interest in how local resources are managed have contributed their knowledge and expertise to the development of the SFM Plans; these dedicated volunteers from the public have helped develop the goals, objectives and indicators needed to deliver the M&L IFPA SFM Plans.




M&L IFPA Continual Improvement Process

Continual improvement includes the incorporation of new information and knowledge as well as modifications to the SFM system as a result of what is learned from indicator monitoring. Indicator results provide a means to evaluate how well management objectives are being met, and determine whether desired values are being achieved. The continual improvement process may also reveal unforeseen issues with the SFM system being used. Addressing those issues may require adjusting the SFM system in part, or as a whole.

As part of the M&L IFPA continual improvement process (flowchart at right), a Technical Indicator Report is prepared to support each SFM Plan in terms of indicator monitoring, reporting and continual improvement.

The Technical Indicator Report compiles updated information in order to observe how management and practices are performing in relation to the indicator targets that have been established. This provides feedback to evaluate whether management and practices have been effective in achieving the indicator targets or whether adjustments are needed.



Once assembled, this information is reviewed with the Public Advisory Group(s) for their input and feedback. To ensure consistency and enable year-to-year comparisons, the licensees – and the M&L IFPA – report indicator status based on Standard Operating Procedures established for indicator reporting. In addition, comments and recommendations are provided by the licensees that assist the M&L IFPA in evaluating each indicator and making any changes that may be required. This information supports the M&L IFPA in making improvement recommendations for each indicator. Such recommendations can include operational adjustments, refinements to indicators, and continual improvement projects.

Applications of the M&L IFPA SFM Plans

Given the significant amount of investment and stakeholder involvement in their development, the SFM Plans for the M&L IFPA have been built to suit multiple applications and requirements. As such, the SFM Plans are linked to the following programs and processes:

IFPA Requirements

The primary purpose of the SFM Plans (and accompanying documents) is to provide a strategic and supporting role for the Forestry Plan required for Innovative Forest Practices Agreements under Section 59.1 of the Forest Act. ►

BC Forest and Range Practices Act

Under the BC Forest and Range Practices Act, these SFM Plans can be used to support results and/or strategies contained in Forest Stewardship Plans that are submitted by forest licensees.



Forest Investment Account

Under the Forest Investment Account (FIA) system, the SFM Plans provide Tweedsmuir Forest Ltd with the strategic direction to guide and support FIA investments (i.e. Land Based Investment Rationale).

Forest Certification Requirements



These SFM Plans have been developed to be “certification enabling”. As such, they follow the nationally recognized Canadian Council of Forest Ministers framework for SFM. M&L IFPA licensees have been able to take the SFM Plans and utilize them – as a whole, or in part – to meet voluntary forest certification standards (e.g. CSA SFM Z809-2002). To date, three of the M&L IFPA licensees have achieved certification under voluntary and independent SFM forest certification processes.

BC Government Sustainable Resource Management Planning Processes

Both of the SFM Plans have been integrated with the Land & Resource Management Plans developed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands’s Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) for the Morice and Lakes planning areas. As such, there has been an effective exchange of learning and information between the M&L IFPA and the ILMB planning processes. Where applicable, the M&L IFPA indicator targets have been developed to be consistent with the Land & Resource Management Plan (LRMP) guidelines. In addition, the M&L IFPA has adopted some objectives from Sustainable Resource Management Plans (SRMPs).



Bark Beetle Management Strategies



Given that the landscapes within the M&L IFPA are severely impacted by bark beetles, the SFM Plans have integrated Bark Beetle Management Strategies for the M&L IFPA area. The Plans include specific indicators and targets to address sustainable forest management in the midst of significant bark beetle infestations.


Indicator Reporting for the M&L IFPA

This is the third document prepared which summarizes the annual M&L IFPA indicator reporting results. The direct application of SFM in the M&L IFPA supports ongoing efforts to make improvements in the reporting process as more information is gained and understood about SFM performance monitoring using indicators.



Summary of Reporting Results – Morice TSA

Figure 1. SFM Indicator Reporting Results (Morice TSA)



The categories listed on the charts are as follows:

“Target met” – This refers to the number of indicators where the targets have been met (as specified in the SFM Plan).

“Partial” – This refers to the number of indicators where at least one licensee has not met the target (as specified in the SFM Plan). However, the majority of licensees have met their targets.

“No Targets” – This refers to the number of indicators where targets have not yet been established for the indicators. As such, a performance assessment cannot be completed. Further analysis is being completed to develop targets, and it is anticipated these will be in place for the next reporting period.

“No Data” – This refers to the number of indicators where data were not available in order to generate the modelling results (e.g. roads updates). It is anticipated these data will be in available for the next reporting period.

“5 year reporting” – This refers to the number of indicators that are being reported every 5 years.

“Target not met” – This refers to the number of indicators where the targets have not been met (as specified in the SFM Plan).

“New” – This refers to the number of new indicators that have been added during this reporting period. As such, monitoring results for new indicators will be reported in the next period.

“Dropped” – This refers to the number of new indicators that have been dropped during this reporting period. As such, monitoring results for dropped indicators will not be reported in the future.

Tables 1 – 6 shown on the subsequent pages relate to the above chart (Figure 1) and summarize the reporting results for each of the SFM indicators (in the categories described above).

Table 1. Morice TSA Indicators (targets met)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Number of communications by type by licensee	M02	Yes	The targets have been met. No further recommendations
Number of participation opportunities by opportunity type	M04	Yes	The target for the number of meetings has been reduced to a minimum of 2 per year considering that the SFM Plan process is in monitoring mode and the need for meetings has been reduced.
Number of aboriginal participation opportunities by licensee	M05	Yes	This indicator appears to be effective in ensuring that we are providing opportunities for First Nations to be involved in the planning process.
Number of continual improvement–related projects in the DFA by licensee	M06	Yes	The targets have been met. No further recommendations
Percentage of identified high hazard structures with action plans implemented by Licensee	M07	Yes	This Indicator was modified from “Action Plans Developed” to “Action Plans Implemented”. Also, the variance was adjusted from -5% to -50% to account for the time lag from developing the Action Plan to implementing the Action Plan.
Percent seral stage distribution by non-timber tenure license by forest licensee	M19	Yes	Targets have been met. No further recommendations.

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percentage of AAC harvested by licensee	M20	Yes	Canfor, HFP, and BCTS met the target in 2005. FLSM did not harvest in the Morice TSA in 2005 (in 2004, operations were moved out of the Morice TSA to address beetle infestations within the Lakes TSA and Vanderhoof Forest District). The target relates to the obligations under the licensee over a 5 year period; therefore it is expected that licensees that do not meet targets on an annual basis, must meet targets by the end of their 5 year period.
Ratio of annual mill consumption to AAC apportionment harvested by licensee	M21	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percentage of blocks meeting NAR disturbance objectives by licensee	M23	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percent of gross forest area converted to permanent access by licensee	M25	Yes	Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported. Due to changes in the Licensee Operating Areas the targets for this indicator will be reviewed with PAG in conjunction with the 2006 report.
Percentage of forest management commitments completed on time resulting from consultations regarding non-timber features and interests by licensee	M27	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Ratio of capital expenditures to depreciation by licensee	M28	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Area of arable land (Ha/5yr.) within contributing and non-contributing forest converted to agricultural lease by agricultural unit in licensee operating area	M42	Yes	Starting with the 2006 report, this indicator will be considered as an operational indicator that is "monitor only". Area converted to Agriculture Lease will be reported every 5 years.
Benefits directed into local communities by licensee	M43	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Road density by ecosystem and wildlife value class by licensee	M46	Yes	Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported. Due to changes in the Licensee Operating Areas the targets for this indicator will be reviewed with PAG in conjunction with the 2006 report.
Public Advisory Group established and maintained according to approved Terms of Reference	M50	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percentage of comments receiving response by type by licensee	M54	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percent of Fires Burning During Poor or Fair Air Quality Conditions by Licensee	M56	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Ecosystem Carbon Storage by tonnes/ha. by Licensee	M57	Yes	This Indicator was modified from "Ecosystem Carbon Storage by hectare by year (t) by licensee" to "Ecosystem Carbon Storage by tonnes/ha. by Licensee".

Table 2. Morice TSA Indicators (targets partially met)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent area less than 3m in height in stream RMAs by Sensitive Watershed by licensee	M10	Partial	<p>Canfor met the target in 48 of 63 watersheds. HFP met the target in 27 of 36 watersheds. BCTS met the target in 17 of 20 watersheds. Not meeting the target could have a potentially negative impact on riparian habitat. Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will review harvest plans to ensure they are not further impacting the target. Licensees will begin conducting Watershed Assessments.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent of area less than VEG by VQO class by Scenic Area by licensee	M12	Partial	<p>Due to changes in Operating Areas, the licensees are now harvesting in Scenic Areas that didn't previously have targets established. In Scenic Areas where a target has been exceeded, licensees will confirm that a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) has been completed.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent area in suitable forage opportunity class by LU by licensee	M13	Partial	<p>Canfor and BCTS met their targets. HFP met its target in all but one Landscape Unit (Thautil).</p> <p>Due to changes in Operating Areas, the licensees are now harvesting in Landscape Units that didn't previously have targets established.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent area retained in WTR by LU by BEC by licensee	M15	Partial	<p>Due to changes in Operating Areas, the licensees are now harvesting in Landscape Units that didn't previously have targets established.</p> <p>Reduced levels of retention will be prescribed in blocks proposed for harvesting within landscape units that have WTR levels above the target and variance to move toward the target as harvesting is conducted.</p> <p>Increased levels of retention will be prescribed in blocks proposed for harvesting within landscape units that have WTR levels below the target to move toward and achieve the target as harvesting is conducted.</p> <p>The time to meet the targets will vary by LU and BEC combination and harvest rate for the LU.</p> <p>Timber supply will be impacted where target and variance are continually exceeded over time (long term). Similarly, where retention is below target biodiversity will be impacted.</p>
Percent forest in each patch type by patch size class by BEC Variant by licensee	M17	Partial	<p>Canfor and HFP met their targets. BCTS met its target in all but one BEC Variant (SBS dk).</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percentage of total goods and services provided by local vendors by licensee	M24	Partial	<p>All licensees met target with the exception of BCTS. This is not expected to have any adverse implication in meeting the objective.</p>

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent seral stage distribution by ecosystem and wildlife value class by licensee	M31	Partial	<p>All targets have been met with the exception of BCTS in "Mountain Goat Key Habitats".</p> <p>Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. BCTS will review harvest plans to ensure they are not further impacting the target.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent Seral Stage Distribution by LRMP Biodiversity Emphasis Area / BEC Combination by licensee	M32	Partial	<p>This Indicator was modified from "Percent seral stage distribution by LU by NDT by BEC by licensee" to "Percent Seral Stage Distribution by LRMP Biodiversity Emphasis Area / BEC Combination by licensee".</p> <p>All targets have been met with the exception of BCTS in 1 of 20 categories. There are no adverse implications for not meeting these targets.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Road density by recreation class by licensee	M47	Partial	<p>Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported.</p> <p>All targets have been met with the exception of HFP in "Fly-in fishing (existing and proposed)". There are no adverse implications for not meeting this target.</p> <p>Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Road density index (RDI) by sensitive watershed by licensee	M52	Partial	<p>Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported.</p> <p>Canfor met the target in 41 of 56 watersheds. HFP met the target in 24 of 37 watersheds. BCTS met the target in 15 of 16 watersheds. Not meeting the target could have a potentially negative impact on riparian habitat. Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will review harvest plans to ensure they are not further impacting the target. Licensees will begin conducting Watershed Assessments.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent of Harvesting by Licensee where Recommended Operational Guidelines have been applied to Retain Structural Habitat Elements	M53	Partial	Canfor met the target. HFP and BCTS did not meet the target. These guidelines have not been implemented by HFP. BCTS does not report out on this Indicator until 2007.

Table 3. Morice TSA Indicators (no targets)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent area in Aspen Leading Stands within Existing and Potential Range by LU by licensee	M36	No targets	Targets have not been established for this indicator for this reporting period. This will be kept as a monitor only indicator.
Area treated by treatment type by licensee	M41	No targets	Targets have not been set for this indicator for this reporting period. This will be kept as a monitor only indicator.

Table 4. Morice TSA Indicators (no data for reporting)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent total area by wildlife value class by LU by licensee	M37	No data	This indicator was not reported this year due to logistical constraints (lack of required data to generate current status).

Table 5. Morice TSA Indicators (targets not met)


Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent of area less than VEG by recreation class by licensee	M11	No	Target was not met. Not meeting the target could have a potentially negative impact on recreational experiences. Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will review harvest plans to ensure they are not further impacting the target. Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.
Percent species composition of harvest volume by licensee	M35	No	Targets were not met. There are no adverse implications to not meeting the Balsam and Spruce targets. The focus for this indicator is meeting the pine targets to address the MPB. Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.
Percent of harvest area in Mountain Pine Bark Beetle attacked stands by licensee	M58	No	Target was not met, however as this is a new indicator and is not required to be reported until 2007 there should be no implications for not meeting the target.

Table 6. Morice TSA Indicators (deleted indicators)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent harvest volume by harvest method by licensee	M18	Dropped	In the Morice TSA, this was not considered to be an effective indicator since there is such a small proportion of the TSA that is suitable for cable harvesting (i.e. < 1
Percent of detected beetle infested tree removed / destroyed within one year by licensee	M26	Dropped	This indicator was not considered effective as a measurement to assess achievement toward the objective due to the progression of the beetle.

Summary of Reporting Results – Lakes TSA

Figure 2. SFM Indicator Reporting Results (Lakes TSA)



The categories listed on the chart above are as follows:

“Target met” – This refers to the number of indicators where the targets have been met (as specified in the SFM Plan).

“Partial” – This refers to the number of indicators where at least one licensee has not met the target (as specified in the SFM Plan). However, the majority of licensees have met their targets.

“No Targets” – This refers to the number of indicators where targets have not yet been established for the indicators. As such, a performance assessment cannot be completed. Further analysis is being completed to develop targets, and it is anticipated these will be in place for the next reporting period.

“No Data” – This refers to the number of indicators where data were not available in order to generate the modelling results (e.g. roads updates). It is anticipated these data will be in available for the next reporting period.

“5 year reporting” – This refers to the number of indicators that are being reported every 5 years.

“Target not met” – This refers to the number of indicators where the targets have not been met (as specified in the SFM Plan).

“New” – This refers to the number of new indicators that have been added during this reporting period. As such, monitoring results for new indicators will be reported in the next period.

“Dropped” – This refers to the number of new indicators that have been dropped during this reporting period. As such, monitoring results for dropped indicators will not be reported in the future.

Tables 7 - 14 shown on the subsequent pages relate to the above chart (Figure 2) and summarize the reporting results for each of the SFM indicators (in the categories described above).

Table 7. Lakes TSA Indicators (targets met)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Number of communications by type by licensee	L2	Yes	The targets have been met. No further recommendations
Number of participation opportunities by opportunity type	L4	Yes	The targets have been met. No further recommendations
Percent of area less than VEG by recreation class by licensee	L11	Yes	The targets have been met. Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.
Percentage of total goods and services provided by local vendors by licensee	L20	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percent of gross forest area converted to permanent access by licensee	L21	Yes	Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported. Due to changes in the Licensee Operating Areas the targets for this indicator will be reviewed with PAG in conjunction with the 2006 report.
Percentage of forest management commitments completed on time resulting from consultations regarding non-timber features and interests by licensee	L24	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percent species composition of harvest volume by licensee	L28	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Area harvested (ha/yr) within the agriculture / settlement RMZ by licensee	L34	Yes	This indicator is ineffective. Licensees will consider a different operational indicator to replace this one for presentation to the PAG
Benefits directed into local communities by licensee	L35	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Road density by ecosystem and wildlife value class by licensee	L38	Yes	Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported. Due to changes in the Licensee Operating Areas the targets for this indicator will be reviewed with PAG in conjunction with the 2006 report.
Road density by recreation class by licensee	L39	Yes	Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported. Due to changes in the Licensee Operating Areas the targets for this indicator will be reviewed with PAG in conjunction with the 2006 report..
Public Advisory Group established and maintained according to approved Terms of Reference	L42	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations.
Percentage of comments receiving response by type by licensee	L47	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations
Ecosystem Carbon Storage by tonnes/ha. by Licensee	L49	Yes	Target met. No further recommendations

Table 8. Lakes TSA Indicators (targets partially met)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Number of aboriginal participation opportunities by licensee	L5	Partial	Canfor and BCTS met the target. BFP did not meet the target. Need to further clarify the intent in the SFM Plan around "Invitations to consult or share information with licensees".
Percentage of AAC harvested by licensee	L6	Partial	All licensees in the Lakes TSA met the target with the exception of BCTS. The target will be met over the 5 year period.
Percent area less than 3m in height in stream RMAs by Sensitive Watershed by licensee	L9	Partial	<p>BFP met the target in 11 of 13 watersheds. FLSM met the target in 8 of 11 watersheds. BCTS met the target in 10 of 14 watersheds. Not meeting the target could have a potentially negative impact on riparian habitat. Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will review harvest plans to ensure they are not further impacting the target. Licensees will begin conducting Watershed Assessments.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent of area less than VEG by VQO class by Scenic Area by licensee	L12	Partial	<p>Due to changes in Operating Areas, the licensees are now harvesting in Scenic Areas that didn't previously have targets established. In Scenic Areas where a target has been exceeded, licensees will confirm that a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) has been completed.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent area retained in WTPs by LU by BEC by licensee	L14	Partial	<p>Due to changes in Operating Areas, the licensees are now harvesting in Landscape Units that didn't previously have targets established.</p> <p>Reduced levels of retention will be prescribed in blocks proposed for harvesting within landscape units that have WTR levels above the target and variance to move toward the target as harvesting is conducted.</p> <p>Increased levels of retention will be prescribed in blocks proposed for harvesting within landscape units that have WTR levels below the target to move toward and achieve the target as harvesting is conducted.</p> <p>The time to meet the targets will vary by LU and BEC combination and harvest rate for the LU.</p> <p>Timber supply will be impacted where target and variance are continually exceeded over time (long term). Similarly, where retention is below target biodiversity will be impacted.</p>
Percent forest in each patch type by patch size class by BEC zone by licensee	L15	Partial	<p>BFP did not meet its target. BCTS met its target in all but two BEC Zones (Lakes North SRPP/SBS and Lakes North SRMP/ESSF). FLSM met its target in all but one BEC Zones (Lakes South SRMP/SBS).</p> <p>No corrective action is planned at this time due to the beetle situation</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent seral stage distribution by non-timber tenure license by forest licensee	L17	Partial	<p>Licensees met their targets except for "All Range Licenses Combined". Licensees and BCTS to review Harvesting Plans to ensure that all targets are met.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percentage of blocks meeting NAR disturbance objectives by licensee	L19	Partial	<p>All licensees met targets with the exception of BCTS. For BCTS, no cases of exceeding NAR were encountered. However, there are 2 cutblocks that have not achieved objectives for dispersed soil disturbance and disturbance within roadside processing area. Both have potentially affected site productivity but do not meet the definition of the indicator.</p>

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent seral stage distribution by ecosystem and wildlife value class	L25	Partial	<p>All targets have been met with the exception of “Klaytunkut and Sutherland Grizzly Zones” and Moose Winter Range.</p> <p>Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will review harvest plans to confirm that Lakes South Landscape Corridor, Grizzly and Moose Winter Range targets will not be further exceeded in the future.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent seral stage distribution by LU by BEC by licensee	L26	Partial	<p>BCTS met the targets in 12 of 17 categories. BFP met the targets in 12 of 16 categories. FLSM met the targets in 16 of 22 categories. There are no adverse implications for not meeting these targets.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Road density index (RDI) by sensitive watershed by licensee	L45	Partial	<p>Road update data was available for the reporting period; therefore, the current status for this indicator was reported.</p> <p>BFP met the target in 6 of 16 watersheds. BCTS met the target in 10 of 16 watersheds. FLSM met the target in 7 of 16 watersheds. Not meeting the target could have a potentially negative impact on riparian habitat. Licensees will review the information used to measure this indicator for accuracy and completeness. Licensees will review harvest plans to ensure they are not further impacting the target. Licensees will begin conducting Watershed Assessments.</p> <p>Licensees will recommend new targets based on revised Operating Areas and review with the PAG when the 2006 monitoring report is presented.</p>
Percent of Harvesting by Licensee where Recommended Operational Guidelines have been applied to Retain Structural Habitat Elements	L46	Partial	<p>Target met for Canfor and BFP. FLSM and BCTS to begin reporting on this indicator in fiscal year 2006-2007</p>

Table 9. Lakes TSA Indicators (no targets)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Area treated by treatment type by licensee	L33	No targets	The Lakes SFM plan has not been completed. As such, targets have not been established for this indicator (based on modelling forecasts). Work to complete the Lakes SFM plan will occur in 2006, and once targets have been developed, the performance of these analytical indicators will be reported.

Table 10. Lakes TSA Indicators (no data for reporting)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent total area by wildlife value class by LU by licensee	L29	No Data	This indicator was not reported this year due to logistical constraints (lack of required data to generate current status).

Table 11. Lakes TSA Indicators (targets not met)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
N/A			All indicator targets were at least partially met by licensees

Table 12. Lakes TSA Indicators (new indicators)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percentage of identified high hazard structures with action plans implemented by Licensee	L07	New	There would not be any data for 2005. This Indicator was modified from "Action Plans Developed" to "Action Plans Implemented". Also, the variance was adjusted from -5% to -50% to account for the time lag from developing the Action Plan to implementing the Action Plan.

Table 13. Lakes TSA Indicators (dropped indicators)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent harvest volume by harvest method by licensee	L16	Dropped	The Lakes TSA, this was not considered to be an effective indicator since there is such a small proportion of the TSA that is suitable for cable harvesting (i.e. < 1
Percent of harvest volume from beetle attacked stands by licensee	L23	Dropped	This indicator was not considered effective as a measurement to assess achievement toward the objective due to the progression of the beetle.

Table 14. Lakes TSA Indicators (reported every 5 years)

Indicator	Indicator Number <i>M = Morice TSA</i> <i>L = Lakes TSA</i>	Targets Met?	Comments / Recommendations
Percent area of the THLB and non-contributing forest by beetle hazard type (extreme and high) by licensee	L13	5-yr	This indicator has a 5 year reporting interval; therefore, the next reporting period is 2009
Percent species composition by BEC by licensee	L27	5-yr	This indicator has a 5 year reporting interval; therefore, the next reporting period is 2009
Equivalent clear cut area (ECA) by watershed by licensee	L37	5-yr	This indicator has a 5 year reporting interval; therefore, the next reporting period is 2009
Mean annual increment (m ³ / ha / year) by BEC by licensee	L41	5-yr	This indicator has a 5 year reporting interval; therefore, the next reporting period is 2009

This report provides summary information on our sustainable forest management plans and monitoring systems. Detailed indicator performance monitoring reports and recommendations for both the Morice and Lakes SFM plans can be viewed by contacting the IFPA General Manager.

Jim Burbee, General Manager
Morice & Lakes IFPA
Tel: 250-564-1518
Email: venturefc@telus.net



