HLPO Steering Committee
Conference Call Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2015

Present: Ian Parfitt, Peter Lewis, Tom Bradley, Richard Marchand, Kathy Howard & Julie Castonguay,
Date: July 9, 2015 – 9am
Scribe/chair Julie Castonguay

I.   Issues with CFLB definition

The old FIP forest inventory standard provided an easy way to determine crown forest land base using the non-productive codes (NP). The new VRI forest inventory standard still has the NP attribute but it's only populated for polygons rolled over from FIP.

The attribute intended to replace NP in VRI is forest management land base (FMLB). According to FAIB it includes all harvested or vegetated non-alpine crown polygons greater than or equal to 5m SI as CFLB. This differs from the old landscape unit planning definition in that stands less than 7m were not included. Another issue was that a number of high elevation parkland polygons were called FMLB when they are clearly avalanche chutes or old burns. In hind sight, some of these areas are NDT 5 and have no seral targets.

The table below shows the range of variation in CFLB and OGMA areas for Kootenay Lake. It is important to note that the OGMA area identified is over twice the required target. The surplus is predominantly outside the THLB.

At the moment it appears that the FMLB definition excluding SI <7 will provide a reasonable CFLB definition. This will need to be confirmed once the resultants are processed for Kootenay Lake, Arrow and Boundary TSAs. Some variation between reinventory's in these TSAs has been noted.

CFLB Source	Forest Inventory	Year	CFLB Area (ha)	OGMA Target	OGMA Area	Comments
ILMB	FIP	2009	624,000	52,000	121,000	
MOF TSR 3	FIP	2009	571,000	N/A	113,000	
BCTS iPAC	FIP/VRI	2010	728,000	N/A	N/A	Transitional VRI
BCTS iPAC	FIP/VRI	2011	781,000	N/A	N/A	Transitional VRI
BCTS iPAC	VRI	2014	885,000	N/A	N/A	
HLPORS	VRI	2015	816,000	65,000	182,000	ILMB script
FAIB	VRI	2015	829,000	N/A	N/A	FMLB code (includes SI 5 to 7)

II.   Kootenay Lake resultant

The Kootenay Lake resultant has been uploaded by Ian Dennis at SGRC and run through the biodiversity and UWR models. Initial response is that the HLPO biodiversity reports is okay but the BCTS seral report and the UWR report need work. The BCTS seral report was designed with THLB which is no longer calculated.

Action item 1: Ian to upload two Landscape Units from the Kootenay lake resultants for QA by licensees on the FTP site. Matt Maddess had suggested K25 for QA.

Action item 2: Ian to contact Kathy Howard to identify one additional Kootenay Lake LU to be QA.

III. Arrow resultant

Next step is to apply and adapt the script from Kootenay Lake TSA to Arrow TSA. Arrow resultant expected to be ready for QA by end of summer.
The following three LUs will be uploaded by Ian: N515, N520 & N526

IV. Boundary UWR

Ron Fretwell is more than 50% completed the UWR model and report template and should have it done by the fall. He is currently working with the old boundary data set until Ian produces a new one.

   The Boundary resultant and netdown script is different from the West Kootenay TSAs due to a different UWR GAR order. This requires using different data layers attributes. The UWR GAR order for woodlots in Boundary was never completed, consequently there is no requirement for woodlots to manage for UWR.

Action Item 3: Ian Parfitt to schedule and meeting/conference call with Ian Dennis, Ron Fretwell, Peter Lewis, Kathy Howard and Randy Waterhouse to discuss the data layers and attributes for the Boundary UWR reportsand how they will be incorporated into the Boundary CFLB netdown script.

Action Item 4: Ian Parfitt to contact Randy Warehouse to identify a few LUs in Boundary to upload for depletion and resultants QA.

V. Depletion layer

Depletion layers for Kootenay Lake, Arrow and Boundary completed.

Action Item 5: Ian to upload the depletion layers for few LUs in Kootenay Lake (K25 & one other more), Arrow (N515, N520 & N526) and Boundary (see action item4).

VI. Dana's cost

Dana's cost is being carried as a deficit for Selkirk College. The expectation and understanding is that over time, Selkirk College will recoup this cost with licensees' annual subscription to the suite however, Selkirk will not invoice the licensees directly for this deficit. Over time the deficit should disappear and be repaid with annual subscriptions.

VII. Annual Subscriptions

Licensees are working in good faith that the suite/product will be functioning this fiscal year.

Action item 6: Ian to send annual subscription agreement request to participating licensees by July 31.

Action item 7: Ian to send email to remaining major licensees not yet subscribing by July 31.

VIII.   2015 draft work plan and draft financial plan

Ian would like to send the 2015 draft work plan and draft financial plan along with the annual subscription agreement request to participating licensees

Action item 8: Ian to send the 2015 draft work plan and draft financial plan by July 15 & the committee to review and comment back to Ian by July 22. The final draft will be sent to all subscribing licensees along with subscription request.

The final 2015 draft work plan and draft financial plan will be further discussed during next committee meeting.

IX. Uploading previous committee minutes

Kathy made a suggestion/request for previous meeting minutes to be accessible.

Action Item 9: Tom, Richard and Ian to email all previous minutes to Julie by July 22. Julie will gather minutes and send to Ian for upload.

Action item 10: Ian to upload all minutes onto the ftp site by July 29 and send link and password to group once completed.

Adjourned: 10:15am

Next meeting: Thursday, August 13th at 9am.