

Good afternoon,

Here are the notes from today's meeting. Below I have also attached an email that goes into detail about openings and the cutblock shift issue if you are interested.

I forgot to bring up the webinar, that was held a couple of weeks ago, in our discussion this afternoon. Over thirty people attended so that was a great turn out. Hopefully you found it useful. It is posted on the suite website if you need to refer back to it. Thanks to Ian D., Randy and Loreen for doing the presenting.

### June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting notes

Attendance: Adam Rodgers, Tara Reimer, Ian Dennis, Frances Swan, Kathleen Ennis, Gavin Fox, Anna Tobiasz, Randy Waterous, Mike Knapik, Ian Wiles

#### Budget update

- Ian D. sent the latest budget update to the group on June 16<sup>th</sup>. Ian reviewed where his time was spent in May. No questions or concerns raised.

#### Boundary ungulate winter range clarification update

- Mike Knapik reviewed Randy's email from last month which detailed a number of the issues with the UWR orders in the Boundary. He has compiled a draft companion document to address and clarify the issues raised. The document had not been previously sent to the group so no discussion took place. Ian W. has sent it to those licensees in the Boundary for their review and will be discussed further at the next meeting. Comments can be sent to Mike at [Mike.Knapik@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.Knapik@gov.bc.ca)

#### 2020 OGMA Update

- The newest update to the OGMA layer has now been completed in the BCGW. A couple of best practices are to try and not create new replacement OGMA areas that are < 2ha. Ideally they would be >15ha. Therefore when identifying small replacement areas try to add on to an existing OGMA if possible.
- When harvesting in an OGMA causes the OGMA to be split into smaller pieces you should be considering replacing those remaining areas as well as they may provide little old or biodiversity value now that they are no longer part of a larger contiguous area. Particularly if they are younger age class and could be harvested.

#### Roads data project update

- As discussed in previous meetings the road data used by the suite is missing many roads. Primarily in the arrow TSA and TFL's 3 and 23. See attached email from Ian D. to see some information on the problem.
- This ultimately effects the CFLB and therefore the targets.
- Ian D. had been corresponding with Kathleen McGuinness about updating the roads for the suite. Ian feels that it would be potentially challenging for a student to do and determine the appropriate road classifications.
- Randy didn't think it was appropriate for the suite to be paying to update a layer that should come from government datasets as with the other layers used by the suite
- If we continue to use the current roads layer than the old and mature targets remain higher as roads are not removed from the CFLB. However roads through OGMA's and old polygons are not recognized and therefore there area still counts as if old/OGMA exists on the landbase when it does not.
- Given the other provincial and regional process ongoing Ian W is hesitant to have changing targets.

- There was no other commentary for or against updating the roads. Ian W. will discuss internally with ministry and update the group via email

#### 2020 tables

- OGMA layer and VRI has been completed. Just need to finalize direction on roads to move forward with running the new tables. Ian D. to do this summer.

#### Cutblock shift

- Loreen was able to look into this issue. The consolidated cutblocks layer is the best information and will be used by the suite
- The consolidated cutblocks layer is a combination of the best information from these data sets:
  - 1) RSLT\_FOREST\_COVER\_INV\_SVW, 2) RSLT\_OPENING\_SVW, and 3) FTEN\_CUT\_BLOCK\_POLY\_SVW
- The email below provides further information

#### Next meeting date: TBD

- Ian W. to confirm date once Ian D starts to work on the 2020 update.

**From:** Rousseau, Marc E FLNR:EX <[Marc.Rousseau@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Marc.Rousseau@gov.bc.ca)>

**Sent:** May 13, 2020 8:35 AM

**To:** Salkeld, Tim H FLNR:EX <[Tim.Salkeld@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Tim.Salkeld@gov.bc.ca)>; Hodgkinson, Loreen FLNR:EX <[Loreen.Hodgkinson@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Loreen.Hodgkinson@gov.bc.ca)>

**Subject:** RE: Shift in FTA Cutblock data

Hi Loreen,

I'm the team lead for the FAIB Vegetation Update team, We are responsible for loading new inventories into the Provincial Forest Inventory as well as updating the Provincial Forest Inventory for depletions, mostly harvesting and wildfire. I will try to provide you with some back ground and information regarding the BCGW layers as best I can.

The Vegetation Update function make use of a custom built ArcMap application, Vegetation Resources, Information, Management System (VRIMS) to extract opening update information directly from the RSLT\_FOREST\_COVER\_INV\_SVW (BCGW Layer) annually in mid-June. The update team (3.5 FTEs) work diligently to verify accuracy and currency of these openings and integrate new updated Spatial and Attribute data for the openings at three milestones, Depletion, Regen, and Free Growing. This work is completed on a TSA basis whereby each update technician works on a TSA until all depletions are updated then they move on to the next TSA. The update technician, uses the BlackBridge Ortho layer, individual ortho imagery, and satellite imagery which ever is most current to verify the spatial location and shape of the opening. Then the attribute data is compared to the Inventory layer data reported to RESULTS\_FOREST\_COVER\_INV\_SVW for correctness. This data is then validated using custom validation routines to assume completeness and accuracy. Once this is completed the opening is flagged for integration and the system automatically cuts the opening into the Provincial Forest Inventory and resolves sliver issues based on tested sliver tolerance rules.

The other main function of the Update team is to load new VRI and other Inventory data into the provincial Forest Inventory. The reinventory work is typically completed under contract by Forest Inventory contractors. Prior to beginning an inventory project, the update team will extract a layer comprised of openings extracted from 1) RSLT\_FOREST\_COVER\_INV\_SVW, 2) RSLT\_OPENING\_SVW, and 3) FTEN\_CUT\_BLOCK\_POLY\_SVW, this layer is attributed with appropriate Inventory attributes. This layer is then sent to a contractor to verify spatial and attribute completeness and accuracy, clean any gaps and overlaps between openings and classify opening reliability based on the source of the data. The data is formatted into a structure that can be directly imported to VRIMS for integration. This cleaned data is then given to the Inventory contractor to use during their inventory project work, to free them up to concentrate on delineating and attributing non opening forest inventory. Once the inventory data is completed and QA'd it is provided to the update team to validate and integrate.

From a Forest Inventory perspective, we typically rank silviculture opening data based on the source of the data where RSLT\_FOREST\_COVER\_INV\_SVW is highest level of accuracy, RSLT\_OPENING\_SVW is next, and FTEN\_CUT\_BLOCK\_POLY\_SVW is the last. It was once explained to me when I started my career, doing inventory updates and Exhibit A, that FTEN\_CUT\_BLOCK\_POLY\_SVW is the proposed disturbance and is based on the Exhibit A process, RSLT\_FOREST\_COVER\_INV\_SVW is the actual disturbance base on post-harvest surveys. RSLT\_OPENING\_SVW is where actual disturbance data is stored until licensees start to report their silviculture activities. It is my understanding that Resource Tenures Branch is the custodian of the FTEN\_CUT\_BLOCK\_POLY\_SVW, Resource Practices Branch are

the custodians of the RESULTS layers and FAIB is the custodian of the Provincial Forest Inventory known as VEG\_COMP\_LYR\_R1\_POLY on the BCGW.

As far as why there appears to be a shift in the FTEN\_CUT\_BLOCK\_POLY\_SVW I could only guess that there was possibly a user error that shifted the data, but without confirming this with Resource Tenures Branch, I can't provide a better explanation. If I was asked to do an analysis of opening history given my knowledge of the various layers, I would use the three layers together and in the order of priority listed above.

I trust this information is helpful, should you or Chantelle require further information, please don't hesitate to contact me directly.