HLPORS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Aug 9, 2018
Time: 1:30 pm - 3:00 pm
Location: Arrow Boardroom, Castlegar

Chair: Ian Wiles
Attendees (in person): Ron Ozanne, Loreen, Tim Davis
Attendees (by phone): Randy, Frances, , Peter Lewis, , Tara Reimer of Vaagen, Ian Parfitt, Tom Bradley

Action: Ian Parfitt requests minutes are distributed from last meeting as well as this meeting.   These get posted to the website when Ian P. receives them.

Budget
- Subscription payments.

Ian P. only received signed agreements from BCTS, Kaslo Community Forest,
Article 5 and 6 in Nacfor agreement needs to be changed based on previous agreed upon conversation.
Article 5 should be updated to include process documentation, as well as user documentation.
Article 6 should be made the same for all parties.
Details?
Action: Ian P. to send out revised subscription agreements to everyone next week.
Actions: Group agrees to have revised agreements signed and sent back to Ian by the end of the August.

- Budget info and newest spreadsheet

Ian Parfitt is still on holidays so does not have the budget prepared for discussion at this meeting. He will do this when he gets back from holidays next week.
Action: Ian P. to send out budget update to group by email by end of next week.

- financial subcommittee update

Committee met in the spring of 2018
More detailed financial discussion next meeting to be scheduled for September.

Ian Parfitt shared that Selkirk was successful in getting the NSERC grant. He says this changes things (how?). He imagines this SC as the nucleus for that grant money.
Action: Ian P. to organize a separate meeting of the entire group in September to discuss the NSERC grant implementation.

Ian Parfitt says Ian Dennis has started on the depletion but has no timeline for finishing as yet.

Website homepage

- Consider having the college run all reports (UWR and biodiversity) once a year and then post a pdf and excel spreadsheet version on the site so that everyone is working from

the same table and not doing separate runs. This also give us a official snapshot in time. This could also be done for the biodiversity reports with a version for OGMA on and one with OGMA off. Yearly reports would remain on the site so you could see changes over time.

Action: Ian to post reports in different formats on the site with the spatial data.

- Organization of Current Results Sets drop-down menu (specific to a user, can we have more users?) Ian Wiles request to have more than one user per subscriber. Ian says this is possible, if within reason (Ian needs to clarify what is reason?).

  Action: Subscriber to request additional user accounts
  Action: Ian P. to ask Ian D. if it is possible to have standard result sets separated from user-defined results set somehow.

- How frequently do subscribers use the block update function in the system and whether it is worth the time and money for this function to remain? Yes, users use this function so it should remain.

- The BCTS report shows Age classes for each LU's. Should we rename this? Biodiversity Seral Stage by Age Class for recruitment? Yes, group agrees to rename report button.
  Action: Ian. P. to ask Ian D. to rename the BCTS report button to match the report title.

- Newest vegetation data is now available for Ian D. to run the model. He will include newest OGMA information that all licensees had submitted to Rhian this past year. Loreen asks if this consolidated data set can be distributed to all licensees.
  Action: Ian W. to look into this.

  Submitting OGMA to gov will become annual and this consolidated information will be incorporated into the suite update.
  Action: Ian W. to ask Rhian to standardize the OGMA submission format and send out to group.

- Do we want to have more frequent submissions so the system is updated more frequently? **NO**

  Action: Peter to send more information to group on the free and current imagery that may be available to assist users, e.g. Sentinel, similar resolution to Landsat.

- Change wording on Apply New Update, Apply Updates Table (~~FDPs~~, cutblocks, etc.) Group agrees.
- Action: Ian P will ask Ian D. to replace FDP with cutblock

<u>WK Ungulate winter range</u>

Subcommittee discussion on language in order
Tim discussed changing the order; Mike is working on the draft document. Will Burt will need to update the spatial files to coincide with the updated order.

Wording in appendix

- Clarify definition of broad leaf and mixed leaf stands and where it comes from. Use info below:

Definition is from the VRI dictionary and definition for broadleaf on page 14.

TB = Treed - Broadleaf
Defined as those trees classified botanically as Angiospermae in the subclass Dicotyledoneae. These
species are commonly referred to as deciduous or hardwoods. The polygon is classified as Broadleaf when
the total basal area (expressed as percentage species composition) of broadleaf trees is 75% or more of
the total polygon tree basal area, and trees cover a minimum of 10% of the total polygon area, by crown
cover.

- In appendix describe what dispersed or patches means in forage areas in table 1
- Direction on what to do if targets are not being met. Mike wants wording in appendix 1 bullet 7 to remain
- Add woodlot #'s to the management units in table 1 of the order and wording in appendix 1. They should be their own MU.
- Clarify that management units are composed of multiply separate polygons. The SIC calculation is conducted on the sum of polygons within a management unit. Therefore there should be 1 polygon ID but could have multiply areas.

Other
- Action: Mike K. to have Will Burt look at data sets and make the separated polygons in a management unit identified as 1 multi-part polygon. As well as make woodlots into separate MUs.

- Issue with crown closure measurement is that VRI does not project it so if it was last measured in 1991 the age and height changes but not the crown closure. Tim says the GAR will specify other accepted methods for measuring crown closure such as using lidar or field measurements

- Difference between ITG and BCLCS Tom says they are different; Ian W. and Tom to take discussion offline.
- Mike / Tim to change wording in draft order and send out to stakeholders for a referral. Action: Draft of the UWR order changes to be ready by the end of the month. Spatial changes may take longer.

Review WK UWR spreadsheet options

Attached is a spreadsheet showing a couple of options for the West Kootenay ungulate winter range tables. The tabs called proposed ungulate winter range summary table 1 and 2 show a revamped table that Loreen and I designed to try and simplify the existing format. There are some notes in the cells in row three that you can click on for some more info.

Another option that provides less details but may be more user friendly can be found in the tab called iPac report AC. Note the age class rows in this second version. Presumably we could build age class into our version as well and I am trying to confirm with Selkirk.

Whichever version is chosen we should have an accompanying table/document which explains each column in more details. Please take a look at each of these options prior to the meeting so we can discuss them.

Action: Group to review the new, proposed table formats and get back to Ian or Loreen with questions. Deadline of end of August for questions/comments. New table format will be voted on next meeting (September 13, 2018).

Data Discrepancies – not discussed, save until next meeting.

- Ian D to include correct private land layers in upcoming work. For code 40 schedule N the integrated cadastral fabric is still good to use in the Kootenays. Moving forward Parcel Map BC data will be the authoritative dataset. Both are not 100% right. Loreen uses both so we should confirm with group if both are to be used.

- Loreen to send Ian D. correct layer for woodlots
  https://catalogue.data.gov.bc.ca/dataset/forest-tenure-managed-licence
  FOREST_FILE_ID like 'W%' and ML_TYPE_CODE = 'SCHEDULE_B'
  (Schedule A is private land)

- Ian D to look into why the BCTS tables do not have matching numbers. How are they calculated? Need to ensure they are all consistent and with the standard tables as well. the discrepancy in the BCTS table is that it doesn't show inop for each age class, just a total,

     need approval from group to add breakdown of inop by age class

- There are differences in the CFLB between the biodiversity and UWR. UWR excludes certain site indexes but is not applicable to biodiversity. So need to have different CFLB's.
Wait on language from UWR changes to be finalized
 Need approval from group to make the UWR CFLB definition that same as the order.

- Outstanding item - CFA planned blocks shapes not in FTA because of 1CP