



CANIM LAKE BAND
COMMUNITY LANDSCAPE LEVEL
PLANNING DRAFT

Reconciliation and Redress in Forestry

1. Forest Tenure Inclusion at around 100,000 m³ of AAC, enough to support a logging company and value added ventures.
2. Appropriate Stumpages and a level playing field with other community area based tenures. High stumpage rates limit value added opportunities.
3. The right to develop and implement Canim's own First Nations Land use plan on Canim's tenure. Canim zones, Canim values. Landscape Level Planning (LLP).
Collaboration with Crown.
4. Joint land use planning on areas outside of Canim's forest tenure. Full collaboration with Crown and industry.
5. Increased stumpage revenue sharing.

What is a Landscape Level Plan?

- Is a LLP a replacement for the FSP?
- Or is it a replacement for the CCLUP?
- Or is it a replacement for both?
- Or is it really just the old 5 Year Consolidated Forest Development Plan re-packaged and still bound by the old CCLUP?
- To be transformative and to meet UNDRIP and to meet Canim's values and objectives its need to replace the FSP, CCLUP and our SFSP. We have assumed this is the objective.

Today's Purpose #3

- Canim's own land use plan, Landscape Level Planning, LLP on Canim's Key Interest Area
- We will present a path or process towards a new and collaborative land use plan, we think that benefits will include:
 - More annual allowable cut, more jobs, more prosperity
 - A more dispersed cut, less negative cumulative impacts
 - Reduced wildfire risks, less intense wildfires, lower fire suppression costs
 - More and better wildlife habitat over the long run, Elders quote "*Look after the habitat and the habitat will look after the animals*"
 - A cleaner, simpler more practical plan that can be adaptively managed

Key Interest Area (KIA)

- The concept of Key Interest Area is a Crown construct
- A Crown paper suggested it, Canim implemented it
- Canim identified the KIA in 2006, specifically to be an area based forest tenure
- Canim has been after large tenure since the 80's
- Due to the perceived threat of accelerated harvesting, negative cumulative effects etc. Canim locked down the KIA in 2009, no third parties
- Since then Canim has secured a woodlot and an FNWL in the KIA
- Over the years various partnership proposals have been explored and rejected
- BCTS lacks tools and flexibility, Majors have not yet provided an attractive offer
- In response the Canim position on the KIA hardened
- Reconciliation now seems to have caught up to Canim and the KIA

Where we are now

- AAC in 100 Mile is dropping while much of the KIA is fallow, this makes no sense, potential to unlock +40,000 m³ of AAC
- Recent developments suggest we can proactively move forward on a Canim Landscape Level Plan
- We should go for it

Problems with what we have now

- The CCLUP is outdated and did not consider fire, not ecologically based
- CCLUP is viewed as overly bureaucratic, restricting and spatially static
- CCLUP never was and never will be Canim's Plan
- Canim's Snine Forest Stewardship Plan is under developed and incomplete
- Both plans have overlapping zones with different and possibly competing objectives
- Multiple overlapping zones can create accidental "retention", retention should be planned and not be a default result of overlapping zones
- Both plans are plagued by slivers, tiny and odd shaped pieces of zones as a result of overlap
- When you apply both of these plans at the same time, it's a bit of GRIDLOCK
- Canim, the Crown and industry have different values and goals, need to reconcile
- At this point we have just started to think about Landscape Level Planning, basically we have a bundle of ideas, and we have some supportive funding

Canim's Goals for a KIA forest tenure

- To produce large logs (mainly fir) on a long rotation, 120 years, over more area
- Long rotations produce essential ecosystem services Canim requires, watersheds, biodiversity, habitat, aboriginal practices etc.
- This is in contrast to a Crown vision of static retention paired with a 60 year rotation
- Large high value logs support house logs, peelers and value added at the community level, create jobs at Canim for Canim members
- With the longer rotation there may be opportunities for Carbon Offset Credits?
- Partner with third parties (value added, log sort yard) to leverage Canim's wood supply and the knowledge, experience and capital of third parties
- Forest management undertaken directly by Band members, but anticipate that industry partnerships will be needed to transition to this goal
- Support local bioenergy economy with residuals and low quality or damaged fiber, but Canim is not interested in grinding healthy, young green forests, Elders quote *"our forests are not just for fiber"*
- Make community fire protection a priority
- Practice Adaptive Ecosystem Based Forest Management guided by First Nations values and beliefs

Some core ideas for LLP-Draft

- No unresolved overlaps allowed under the new LLP, this means that each piece of land has one and only one set of clear objectives, a Regime. A plan with unresolved overlapping objectives is incomplete. It is not the job of the individual forester to resolve competing objectives, it is the job of the Landscape Level Plan. Land use Zones are flattened/resolved down to 2 dimensions, not 3 dimensions.
- No slivers. There will be a minimum size for any unit of land to be managed, 300 ha? No slivers allowed. Slivers will be lumped into adjacent zones.
- Any zonation will be delineated based on logical topographic features, i.e. watershed boundaries, stream boundary, mainline etc.
- Update zonation, things such as visual zones, SFSP Modified Harvest, MDWR etc should be reviewed and redigitized, based on both better data and on a review of objectives
- Hierarchy of Objectives. There will be a clear hierarchy of objectives applied to all lands. For example, fire protection and salvage logging are higher objectives than the general Regime. No need for special exemptions, if....then.....do. All built into the plan.
- Local forest management based on local forest ecology, fire ecology, rotation ages, species, opening size and characteristics, silviculture systems etc. must match the local ecology
- Moving away from a static retention model and more towards modified harvest and longer forest rotations
- Move towards more basal area retention on each block rather than area based wildlife tree patches
- This is a new LLP, to replace the CCLUP, continue to use and support standard Crown systems such as ECAS, RESULTS, SPAR, Waste, Stocking Standards etc. It all works
- Action damaged and diseased timber as a priority

Ecological Zones-3

- We have three distinct ecological zones on the KIA
 1. Dry IDF around Canim Lake
 2. Mixed pine and fir forests, SBS, mainly on the south side
 3. Wetbelt, fir, spruce and pine, ICH, mainly on the north side
- Goal is to produce a set of broad overarching principles and objectives per ecological zone to guide more detailed operational goals and objectives (expressed in Regimes)
- This could include NDT type, rotation ages, species, opening size and characteristics, silviculture systems, mature forest targets etc. Elders principle *“don’t fight the land, work with it”*
- This work is underway, draft assigned to biologists

3 Zones per Ecological Zone LLP

- We have found that we are in line with the Crown's recent Old Growth report, that calls for 3 zone management, as shown below.

Description	Old Growth Report	Canim
Static retention	Protected	WUFN
Softer harvesting (IRM)	Consistent	Modified
Manage for timber	Converted	Open

- Initially we think we will need 3 zones within each ecological zone

WUFN-Wild Unmanaged Forest Network

- This is a retention zone, mainly focused on fish bearing riparian features, scale 25-100 m?
- Riparian features are natural connectors, contain relatively more biodiversity and larger trees, First Nations use, values and historical sites more common in WUFN.
- The area of riparian features is included in the WUFN, Elders principle *“the forest and waters are one”*
- Foundation of this zone is Canim’s Historical Food Fishery dataset
- WUFN would replace Old Growth Management Areas and default retention (retention generated by multiple overlapping land use zones)
- WUFN expected to make up less total reserved land than what we have now, riparian WUFN must capture riparian values, nothing more. Use LIDAR?
- WUFNs only work in concert with longer forest rotations and a Modified Harvest Zone
- This zone also includes areas reserved for cultural heritage purposes, high value deciduous types and inoperable areas. WUFN is coded with five values; water, riparian, cultural, deciduous and inoperable. Total WUFN is simply Canim’s timber supply netdown.

WUFN-Management

- Elders quote *“the forest does not need managing, it is the managers who are the problem”*
- Nevertheless, WUFNs will be managed as below:
 - May be crossed by necessary roads
 - May be fuel managed if and as necessary
 - May be impacted for safety or emergency fire suppression
 - May undergo restorative/enhancement activities, i.e. planting
 - May not be salvage harvested for the purpose of fiber recovery
 - Beetle management to occur on WUFN edges, MCH and funnel traps permitted within the WUFN

Modified Harvest

- Canim already has a draft Modified Harvest zone spatially defined , needs work
- There is already a set of draft practices for Modified Harvest (SFSP), needs work
- The Modified Zone always encompasses the riparian WUFN
- Modified Harvest already overlaps many CCLUP constraints, this was not accidental, Canim combined its food fishery with CCLUP zones to counter balance perceived excess harvesting and negative cumulative effects, this was a defensive strategy
- Most CCLUP zones are there for a good reason, and they are mostly protected, suitable to start Modified Harvest within
- There will be a lot of work to do in the Modified Zone, to reconcile, resolve overlaps, remove slivers and to create Regimes
- Modified Harvest is really Integrated Resource Management, accepting a lower cut to promote and manage for other values
- It needs to be easier to access timber in Canim's Modified Harvest zone than it is right now under the CCLUP and SFSP
- For example nobody objects to MDWR as an objective, but many forest practitioners do not support the existing GAR orders

Open Harvest

- Open harvest zone has a focus on timber production.
- Open harvest is still bound by Ecological Zone principles.
- The Wildlife Urban Interface is always Open Harvest. Since communities have to live with the results of their fire protection efforts it makes sense to allow them to have full control over it

What does the Crown need to do?

- Give up on the concept of widespread static retention
- Join Canim on the concept of a longer rotation and a large Modified Harvest Zone that encompasses CCLUP and Snine Forest Stewardship Plan values
- Work with Canim on removing overlaps and slivers in the Modified Harvest Zone, create discrete management units in the Modified Harvest Zone, each with a specific Regime.
- Participate in Adaptive Management on Regimes.
- This is just for the KIA, a trial LLP

Silviculture Principles

- Canim already has ecological stocking standards in place, if a tree can reasonably grow into a commercial tree, it is included, this means we already have deciduous in our stocking standards.
- Pursue Restorative Silviculture Regimes, Elders comment *“Try and put it back the way you found it”* This can apply to planted species mixes and to natural successional processes
- Pursue higher basal area retention on all blocks, for other values and to facilitate natural regeneration, typically we will not be going back for basal area retention, so use more basal area retention instead of spatial WTRA
- Plant all blocks with some level of CBST seed, to manage for climate change

Outstanding Issues

- Watershed, the KIA does not follow watershed boundaries
- Island Management, KIA being managed as an island
- Do we actually have any uneven aged forests in the KIA?
- How to deal with natural disasters? AAC
- This LLP reduces static reserves and instead uses modified harvest and age classes to meet other objectives. Age class management, ie for mature/old needs to be more fully explored.
- Perhaps goals for hectares harvested in the Modified Zone and age class hectare targets in the Open Harvest Zone?