

## **CSA - TFL30**

### **Public Advisory Group Meeting**

January 20, 2009, 5:30 pm – 9:00 pm  
Prince George Civic Centre

### Minutes

#### Attendance:

Public Advisory Group: Betty Abbs - Local Community Doug Beckett - Public Interest David Kim - Forestry Contractor – Big & Small Dave King - Recreation- non-commercial Sandra Kinsey - Environment Patience Rakochy – Non-Timber Forest Products Lee Sexsmith - Recreation- non-commercial (motorized) Len Shankel – Trapping	CSA Advisors: Sara Fletcher – Canfor Janine Gervais - Canfor Tim Sproule - BC Timber Sales Bruce Bradley - Canfor
Facilitator & Scribe: Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer	Observers and Guests: Jeff Mohr – ATV BC (motorized recreation)

#### **Topic Refresher:**

***The following agenda items were deferred to the next PAG Meeting***

- ***PAG Questionnaire Review***
- ***TFL30 SFMP Priority Action Plan***

#### **1. Welcome & Introductions**

1. Members signed in
2. Meeting Called to Order/Introductions – Sara Fletcher
  - i. Jeff Mohr from the Quad Riders ATV Association of BC (ATV BC) attended as a guest.
3. The Licensee Steering Committee provided interested PAG members with some empty binders for archiving PAG meeting minutes.

#### **2. Meeting Evaluation Summary from October 29, 2008**

1. Last meeting was joint meeting of PG PAG and TFL30. All meeting targets met.
2. Meeting Evaluation Comments:
  - i. What is meant by this question? (“Your overall satisfaction with the meetings?”). Please

clarify.

- ii. Get ideas from the PAG as to changes in management that should be reviewed, discussed and changed appropriately.

### 3. Confirmed Agenda

1. Agenda accepted as written.

### 4. Reviewed minutes of October 29, 2008

1. Page 4. Conclusions 1, 3, and 4 on percentage change in temperature. PAG members requested clarification and context for these three comments.
2. Minutes accepted as written.

**Action Item 1:** Seek clarification from Vanessa Egginton (Ministry of Forests & Range/Regional Climatologist) on conclusions made in her presentation and noted in minutes.

### 5. BCTS Audit Result

1. Tim Sproule provided an update on the recertification audit held in December for both CSA and ISO.
  - i. One minor non-conformance noted regarding their Environment Management System (EMS):
    - Insufficient # of samples on operations with no conclusion drawn with respect to conformance to the standards with no clear description of the audit protocol used.
  - ii. BCTS has drawn up an Action Plan to address the findings (Action Plan satisfactory to the external auditors).
  - iii. Good practices noted by the Auditor:
    - Considerable amount of effort to communicate with local First Nations,
    - Good use of Sharepoint (file sharing website that Canfor and BCTS use for TFL30 information).
  - iv. Auditors also recognized the use of logging debris piles and shipping to pellet plant by a specific licensee (not BCTS).
  - v. BCTS has been recommended for recertification.

### 2. Discussion

- i. Question: Is there currently active logging on BCTS blocks on the TFL? Answer: Not at this time, but BCTS still needs to be audited for silviculture and other operations.
- ii. Question: How much time was PAG given to meet with auditors for external audit? Answer: The Facilitator circulated a note the week prior to the audit. PAG members expressed concern over the short notice and felt that it was missed opportunity for the Auditor to attend a PAG meeting and see the process. This idea has been suggested by PAG members in the past.
- iii. Question: Did the audit identify any process issues related to the changing CSA

standards (ie. Objectives for Old Growth and Ancient Forests)? Answer: The audit did not identify any process issues of this nature. PAG member concerns had been conveyed to the auditor during the PAG interview opportunity. According to the PAG member, it was inferred that the Terms of Reference limits the scope of what the CSA Auditors can report out upon with respect to complaints and concerns raised by concerned individuals including PAG members, and restricts PAG members from being effective in promoting improvements to management beyond legal minimums.

## 6. Review Terms of Reference

### 1. Revisions to the Terms of Reference

i. Section A Background: Remove “Canfor also announced that it would seek both CSA and FSC certification, and selected KPMG as its registrar and certifier.” Add “Canfor also announced that it would seek CSA certification and selected KPMG as its registrar and certifier.”

ii. Section D Timelines: Add:

PAG meetings	February, March, June & October 2008
Re-registration audit under one Canfor wide certificate (Canfor)	July 2008
Re-registration Audit (BCTS)	December 2008
CSA Z809-08 – new standard released	March/April 2009
Surveillance Audit (Canfor)	July 2009
TFL30 Licensee Steering Committee to propose workplan for conformance to new standard	Late Fall 2009
Surveillance audit (BCTS)	December/January 2009

iii. Section D Timelines: Add:

BCTS became certified on the TFL30 DFA June 2006

iv. Section E (3)(b) Communication and Information (Internal to Canfor): Delete “Strategic”.

v. Section F (1)(c) Meeting Expenses and Logistics: Delete “Expense forms for the above need to be submitted to Canfor for reimbursement.” Add “Expense forms for the above need to be submitted to Facilitator for reimbursement.”

### 2. PAG consensus on revisions to the Terms of Reference.

### 3. General Discussion on Terms of Reference

i. Section A Background: Reference to Canfor announcing that it would seek FSC certification

- This was removed since Canfor decided not to seek FSC certification. PAG interested in receiving some background information on this decision. It was noted that a PAG member was previously involved with FSC. Conflict of interest not an issue since he and his wife are no longer involved with FSC.

**Action Item 2:** Canfor to provide PAG with background on Corporate decision not to seek FSC certification.

ii. Section D Timelines: All audits referenced refer to external audit events only.

- iii. Section E (3)(b) Communication and Information (Internal to Canfor): Canfor's "Strategic Planning Team" is now called "Planning Team"
- iv. Section E (2)(b) Communication and Information (External): "Only authorized members of the Advisory Group are to speak on behalf of the PAG as agreed to by the group, Canfor, and BCTS (Prince George Business Area)"
  - The PAG briefly discussed that there is no appointed Public Chair, it would be decided by topic when the need arises.
- v. Section G (2)(c) Roles and Responsibilities (PAG Member's Role): "To be responsible for reaching consensus and decision making for the PAG".
  - Is there an obligation to reach consensus or simply participate in consensus process?
  - PAG member concerned that we don't have definition on "consensus". PAG member referred to the Terms of Reference Section I (1)(b) Decision Making and Methodology: "Consensus is defined as no member having substantial disagreement on an issue."
  - PAG acknowledged they are not obligated to reach consensus – general agreement is acceptable. Every effort will be made to reaching consensus.
- vi. Section B (4) Defined Goal and Objectives: "Annually provide advice on mechanisms or methods to improve communications and effective input in the SFM plan."
  - PAG member concerns over the effectiveness of the current Public Involvement Process and feels that PAG deals with administrative issues instead of on-the-ground management. PAG member concerned that the process has not been effective over the last three years since the Marten habitat and stream crossing evaluation provisions were put into place and wonders if Terms of Reference should be changed to allow PAG to work on more measurable outcomes.
  - Other PAG members are content with the process and the value of it.
  - PAG would like to set more measurable goals (based on group direction not individual goals).
- vii. PAG member suggestion that the next version of the Terms of Reference include a section on First Nations involvement and what that means (how it will be used).

## 7. PAG Questionnaire Review

1. Deferred to the next meeting

## 8. TFL30 SFMP Priority Action Plan

1. See *Priority Action Plan Jan 20, 2009* handout
2. The *Priority Action Plan* was distributed and will be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.
3. PAG members requested to send comments / questions to the Facilitator prior to the next meeting.
4. Request from PAG for a "Topic Refresher" be included in the front of the minutes and in the announcement of the next meeting. This "Topic Refresher" will highlight items deferred at this meeting that should be revisited.

**Action Item 3:** Facilitator to include a "Topic Refresher" in the front of the minutes and in the announcement of the next meeting.

## 9. Non-Timber Forest Products Presentation – Patience Rakochy (BCTS)

Patience Rakochy presented the results of a project to identify Non-timber Forest Products (NTFP) and uses on TFL 30. This project was completed while Patience was still working for

## Timberline.

### 1. Highlights:

- See handout.
- Three years ago, Timberline teamed up with Royal Roads University (Victoria, BC) and TerraTree Forestry Consulting (Duncan, BC) to deliver this project.
- Licensees in the Prince George TSA wanted to develop criteria and indicators for NTFPs.
- NTFPs are all of the plants and mushrooms of the forest other than timber, pulpwood, shakes, or other wood products.
- NTFPs include wild edibles, floral greens, art products (carvings, canoes), medicinals and nutraceuticals (the fastest growing class of product), landscaping material, horticultural and restoration products
- The project was delivered in three phases:
  - i. Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography
    - Develop a NTFP Baseline Profile for the Prince George Region
  - ii. Deliver a Workshop on NTFP Indicators for the Prince George District
    - To educate workshop participants on the overall project, as well as the latest NTFP status, ecological and economic information, policy, and research findings.
    - To ask participants to share the ideas and knowledge of local NTFPs so that this knowledge can be incorporated into local planning processes, leading to a greater sustainability in this sector.
    - Workshop participants focused on the following issues:
      - Regulation
      - Access to resources
      - Market access and pricing
      - First Nations considerations
    - Workshop participants identified species used for NTFPs
  - iii. Develop draft NTFP indicators for TFL 30.
    - including potential targets and monitoring plans for consideration by the TFL30 Licensee Steering Committee, in order to discuss with the TFL30 PAG
    - Local area considerations include
      - Harvesters (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal)
      - Management of overlapping values
    - Indicator Recommendations focused on the following subject areas:
      - Compatible management (policies and management)
      - Ecological sustainability
      - Values (market and non-market)
      - Income opportunities
- Recommended next steps include:
  - Work toward implementing direct indicators
  - Develop positive relationships with local NTFP harvesters.
  - Incorporate NTFPs within forest management plans.
  - Incorporate NTFP species within ongoing inventory projects.

### 2. Discussion:

- There is no regulation in BC at this time on the collection, sale or monitoring of most NTFPs.

- Bracken fern was not included in the list of local NTFP's.
- Harvesters had mixed feelings about regulation. They don't want regulation to impede their ability to use NTFPs. Harvesters know that certain NTFP's (e.g. moss and salal leaf) are becoming scarce and these need to be managed so they will be there in years to come. Best to have foresight when planning sustainability of NTFP's. People who make a secondary income from NTFP's are understandably reluctant to disclose their locations.
- NTFPs were classified in the workshop into "use" categories (T = traditional, cc = known active commercial use, Cp = commercial potential)

## 10. Indicator #37 - Public survey of non-timber uses within the DFA

1. Proposal to remove Indicator 37 to reflect the completion of the public survey of non-timber uses within the DFA.

Current Indicator:

<b>Statement of Indicator</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Public survey of non timber uses within the DFA	Target: At least every 4 years Variance: + 1 year
A list of quality and value of non-timber forest products from the DFA	Target: March 31, 2007 Variance: + 3 months

This indicator addresses the following CSA-SFM parameters

1) <b>CCFM Criterion:</b> Multiple Benefits to Society <b>CSA SFM Element:</b> Timber and Non-Timber Benefits <b>Value:</b> Short and long term benefits. <b>Objective:</b> Maintain a flow of non-timber benefits.
2) <b>CCFM Criterion:</b> Multiple Benefits to Society <b>CSA SFM Element:</b> Fair Distribution of Benefits and Costs <b>Value:</b> Fair Distribution of Benefits and Costs <b>Objective:</b> Maintain the distribution of benefits and costs.

Draft Indicator – Incorporate NTFP aspects into:

Indicator #35 – Public Input Opportunity and Response to Public Concerns

<b>Statement of Indicator</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The number of opportunities given to the public and stakeholders to express forestry-related concerns and be involved in our public planning processes.	Target: ≥3 types of media annually Variance: - 1
Percentage of Creating Opportunities for Public Input (Canfor) and Keeping in Touch (BCTS) communication strategy requirements met.	Target: 100% Variance: -5%
Percentage of timely responses to Non-Timber Forest Products resource users who provide input via the public input opportunities	Target: 100% annually Variance: 0

## 2. Discussion

i. Rationale for incorporating Indicator 37 into Indicator 35:

- Relatively low incidence of commercial NTFP interest in the Omineca region

- Low response to public survey
  - During the workshop, aboriginal use of NTFP was noted as being of high value in the north – this ties in with TFL 30 communication strategy and CI Matrix focus on First Nations and cultural heritage resources
  - On-going communication would appear to be of highest value
  - Have identified some NTFP users via the NTFP project, who will be contacted and incorporated into COPI and KIT if they're interested
- ii. PAG would prefer to use the NTFP information to improve management practices, rather than simply be notified about planned forest practices
  - iii. The number of harvesters in the region are likely much more than survey results show (only 27 respondents). Mushroom and fiddlehead harvesters are evident in TFL30, but will not respond to survey.
  - iv. Indicator #35 focuses more on uses of non-timber products rather than just a product list.
  - v. NTFP species list will have to be dynamic and clear boundaries need to be set as to how exhaustive the list should be
  - vi. Non timber uses are different from NTFP's.
  - vii. A UNBC survey was conducted in the field about activities in the TFL30.
3. Canfor will take feedback from this meeting and revise the proposed Indicator.

### 11. Review/Update Actions

1. Action Item **Nov 30-01** – Completed. A presentation on the Non-Timber Forest Products User Survey occurred at the January PAG meeting.

### 12. Meeting Evaluation Forms collected

### 13. Next TFL 30 PAG Meeting: March 24, 2009 5:30-9:00 pm PG Civic Centre

### Meeting adjourned

#### Actions

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Jan 21 – 04	Follow up and report back on stand-level best practices standards.		February 2, 2006	Ongoing
Feb 13 – 08	Investigate the possibility of an indicator that indicates the number of products and services related to various processing facilities.		Spring 2006	BCTS is unable to track past the scale. Canfor will provide a list of mills and likely products.
Feb 13 – 10	Investigate the possibility of an indicator regarding the ratio of money Canfor pays directly to employees versus government.		Spring 2006	Ongoing
Nov 30 – 01	Report out on the user survey (UNBC) on TFL30.	Janine Gervais	January 2009	Completed
Jan 20 - 01	Seek clarification from Vanessa Egginton (Ministry of Forests & Range/Regional Climatologist) on conclusions made in her presentation and noted in minutes.	Facilitator	Next meeting	

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Jan 20 - 02	Canfor to provide PAG with background on Corporate decision not to seek FSC certification.	Sara Fletcher	Next meeting	
Jan 20 - 03	Include a "Topic Refresher" in the front of the minutes and in the announcement of the next meeting.	Facilitator	Before next meeting	