

CSA - TFL30
Public Advisory Group Meeting

June 16, 2009, 5:30 pm – 9:00 pm
 Prince George Civic Centre

Minutes

Attendance:

<p><i>Public Advisory Group:</i> Betty Abbs- Local Community Doug Beckett - Public Interest David Kim - Forestry Contractor – Big & Small Dave King – Recreation - non-commercial Teena Demeulemeester – West Moberly First Nation Len Shankel – Trapping Esther Perry – Agriculture/Ranching Anne Migvar – Agriculture/Ranching Jo Graber – Historical/Cultural Dave Stevenson – Local Community</p>	<p><i>CSA Advisors:</i> Sara Fletcher – Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS</p>
<p><i>Facilitator & Scribe:</i> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer</p>	<p><i>Observers and Guests:</i> Stella Gauthier - West Moberly First Nation Tan Calhoun – Timberline Natural Resource Group</p>

Topic Refresher:

The following agenda item was deferred to the next PAG Meeting

- **Z809/08 Certification Standard**

1) Welcome & Introductions

- i) Members signed in
- ii) Meeting Called to Order/Introductions – Sara Fletcher (Planning Forester-Canfor)
 - Tan Calhoun (Timberline Natural Resource Group) attending as an observer.

2) Review Meeting Evaluation Summary

- i) All items above target
- ii) Meeting Evaluation Comments:

iv. Facilitator Comments:

- "Likely needed more time."
- "Accommodating and patient as always."

vi. Your Suggestions:

- "Not a high priority to review PAG questionnaire."

3) Confirmed Agenda

- i) Agenda accepted as written.

4) Reviewed minutes of March 24, 2009

- a. p. 2 #3 correct spelling "Caribou"
- b. p. 3 Discussion Point 2. iii. Strike word "low"
- c. p. 5 Continuous Improvement Matrix: Point 3: Row # 5 re: Cultural Heritage mapping strategies.

Clarification: Cultural Heritage Likelihood Assessment is available to public, but Cultural Heritage Known Resources is not available to public (confidential).

- d. Minutes accepted as revised

5) Review decisions of March 24, 2009 in order to obtain consensus

A quorum was not present at the March 2009 PAG meeting therefore the following decisions need to be reviewed in order to obtain consensus:

a) Indicator # 37 – Public survey of Non-Timber Uses & Non-Timber Forest Products within the DFA

Proposal to change title of indicator #37 to Non-Timber Uses and Non-Timber Forest Products and change the indicator statement.

Current Indicator:

Statement of Indicator	Target and Variance
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) CCFM Criterion: Multiple Benefits to Society CSA SFM Element: Timber and Non-Timber Benefits
--

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

Draft Indicator #37 – Non-Timber Uses and Non-Timber Forest Products

<i>Statement of Indicator</i>	<i>Target and Variance</i>
Public survey of non-timber uses within the DFA, including non-timber forest products.	Target: At least every 4 years Variance: + 1 year
Maintain lists of non-timber forest products and non-timber uses on the DFA.	Target: Reviewed and updated at least every 4 years Variance: + 1 year

(1) Discussion

- PAG member asked for clarification on what value the list of NTFP's affords. Licensee explained that after much advertising, workshops, etc there was very little feedback and information gathered related to value or cost. The survey was done by the Centre for Non-Timber Resources (Royal Roads University), Timberline and TerraTree Forestry. The sample size was very small and respondents didn't include information on some NTFPs (ie. mushrooms).
- PAG member discussed that since dollar value is difficult to determine, it is important to realize that there is more value than just economic value. There was some discussion around methodology – but members were reminded that this survey was a first attempt at a baseline and there is much room for improvement.
- PAG members supported maintaining a list of NTFP's, and encouraged Canfor and BCTS to use this list for better forest management.
- PAG member asked to consider First Nations input but not through traditional survey methods since that is not always an effective way to capture data from First Nations.
- PAG member also added that much of the NTFP harvesting is secretive (ie. mushroom picking)
- Discussion on types of data to collect to improve the knowledge and use of NTFP's. Some suggestions included: determining trends in use (fall back, decreased use) and why; Determine uses and show trends of use and why.
- PAG member cautioned that NTFPs can become a huge category including water, fish, wildlife etc. More information is needed on the definition of NTFP's and then keep within that scope.
- PAG suggestion that development of NTFP Objectives be put on CI matrix and then reworked later.

Action Item 1: LSC to add the following issue to the Continual Improvement Matrix – “develop objectives for NTFPs and their use”, and respond to PAG with Suggested Strategy and completion date.

(2) General Agreement on above proposal from PAG representatives with one (1)

abstention, and three (3) dissensions.

- (i) Reason for Abstention: not familiar enough with the process
- (ii) Reason for Dissention 1: felt it was a step backward re: quality and value was dropped in new statement.
- (iii) Reason for Dissention 2: also felt it was a step backward re: quality and value was dropped in new statement.
- (iv) Reason for Dissention 3: also felt it was a step backward re: quality and value was dropped in new statement.

b) Indicator #15 – Effectiveness Monitoring

Proposal to change target date to March 31, 2010

Current Indicator:

<i>Statement of Indicator</i>	<i>Target and Variance</i>
Effectiveness Monitoring Plans (Wildlife) are developed and implemented for selected indicator species to keep common species common	Target: December 31, 2007 Variance: +3 months
Monitoring plan is developed and implemented for evaluating ecosystem resilience	Target: December 31, 2007 Variance: +3 months

Draft Indicator #15 – Effectiveness Monitoring

<i>Statement of Indicator</i>	<i>Target and Variance</i>
Effectiveness Monitoring Plans (Wildlife) are developed and implemented for selected indicator species to keep common species common	Target: March 31, 2010 Variance: +3 months
Monitoring plan is developed and implemented for evaluating ecosystem resilience	Target: March 31, 2010 Variance: +3 months

(1) Discussion

- PAG member raised concerns that auditor's response time is often very short (7-10 days) and is not enough time for adequate PAG input into audit. FIA projects are working toward completion within the projected target date, but often find that as data is collected, strategies are revised and often more time is needed as the process evolves.
- PAG member noted from previous minutes that these targets were established in late 2006/early 2007.
- ii) PAG member made comment that biodiversity conservation strategy should be looked at cumulatively not individually.

(2) General Agreement on above proposal from PAG representatives with two (2) dissensions.

- (i) Reason for Dissension 1: loses the magnitude of when the target was missed and when it will finally be achieved.
- (ii) Reason for Dissension 2: don't know enough about the indicator to agree with recommended changes.

c) Indicator #9 – Species at Risk

Proposal to change target date to March 31, 2010

Current Indicator:

<i>Statement of Indicator</i>	<i>Target and Variance</i>
The amount of Species at Risk (wildlife) habitat (ha) within TFL30.	Target: June 30, 2007 Variance: +6 months

Draft Indicator #9 – Species at Risk

<i>Statement of Indicator</i>	<i>Target and Variance</i>
The amount of Species at Risk (wildlife) habitat (ha) within TFL30.	Target: March 31, 2010 Variance: +6 months

(1) Discussion

- Applies to Sections 1.2c and 2.2h in the Performance Matrix.
- Move target date to March 31, 2010 since this indicator is linked to Indicator #15
- PAG member questioned rationale for moving target date when it is already late. PAG member noted in Annual Report that there were objectives that weren't reached and noted by the auditors. PAG request to record indicator establishment dates in order to better track the progress – Licensees are now recording "revision dates" on Performance Matrix.
- PAG would like to see revision dates in the Annual Report. Licensees agreed to add to Annual Report.

(2) General Agreement on above proposal from PAG representatives with two (2) dissensions.

- (i) Reason for Dissension 1: loses the magnitude of when the target was missed and when it will finally be achieved.
- (ii) Reason for Dissension 2: don't know enough about the indicator to agree with recommended changes.

6) 2008/2009 Annual Report – Sarah Fletcher

- PAG reminded that this is a DRAFT report. PAG requested that a list of acronyms and definitions be added.
- PAG was informed of changes in reporting and the overall format. Many of the objectives and indicators are summarized for clarification.

i) Reviewed Pending Indicators:

(1) Indicator #7 (Coarse Woody Debris) - Licensees are planning to do some

benchmarking to determine natural range of Coarse Woody Debris and are waiting for new residue and waste legislation to be completed. Waste and Residue legislation is being changed in light of bioenergy policy.

- PAG member raised question about whether this legislation has any actual bearing on Coarse Woody Debris objectives. Licensee will provide more information on how it will be monitored.
- PAG member discussed an ideal methodology of having to assess a block before it is logged to figure out what the natural range is. PAG member requested continued information on science-based approach to monitoring Coarse Woody Debris. PAG member asked for clarification on who monitors how much waste is left that should have been taken. Canfor and Forestry Service do residue and waste surveys.

- (2) Indicator #9 and #15 – based on PAG discussion earlier this evening, results will be changed to “target not met” in the final version of the Annual Report.
- (3) Indicator #51 (PAG Follow-up Survey) – As a result of one long time PAG member announcing departure during reporting period due to personal relocation, a follow-up survey will be completed.

ii) Reviewed Indicators Not Met:

- (1) Indicator #11 (Personnel Trained to Identify Species at Risk & Sites of Biological Significance)
 - Root cause and actions to resolve are in the draft report.
 - Discussion on training requirements to identify Species at Risk and Sites of Biological Significance (BCTS every 2 yrs, Canfor every 3 years)
- (2) Indicator #13 (Native Plant Species Diversity) –
 - Root cause and actions to resolve are in the draft report.
 - PAG member voiced concern about capturing diversity accurately. It was noted that David Coates (Research Silviculturist –MoFR - Smithers) is a specialist in the field of plant species diversity.

Action Item 2: LSC to contact David Coates regarding his perspectives and preferred approach to plant diversity

- PAG member requested presenting data on “deviation from natural” as opposed to more detailed data. This would be more meaningful especially to the lay person reading the report.
 - LSC is not convinced that the sampling technique or management objectives for this indicator are appropriate. LSC will provide recommendations to the PAG at a future meeting.
- (3) Indicator #48 (Aboriginal Participation in Planning Process)
 - Root cause and actions to resolve are in the draft report.
 - (4) Indicator #55 (Continuous Improvement Matrix)
 - Root cause and actions to resolve are in the draft report.

iii) Highlights of 2008/2009

- Silviculture-related field tour
- Presentation on climate change and forest carbon

Action Item 3: PAG to review draft Annual Report and provide comments to the Facilitator by June 30, 2009

7) Z809/08 Certification Standard – Dwight Scott Wolfe

- Z809/08 Certification Standard – tabled for next meeting

8) TFL30 SFMP Priority Action Plan – Sarah Fletcher

- TFL30 SFMP Priority Action Plan – will mail out before next meeting

9) Licensee Steering Committee Update

- No forest management activities planned on TFL30 for the rest of this year
- The following Canfor mills (Rustad, Radium, Vavenby) are closed indefinitely. Also a significant restructure within Forest Operations at Canfor is in process (it is more regionally based now).
- PAG requested new organization chart once it is completed.
- FIA funding will be limited this fiscal, so where feasible, there will be joint TFL30 and PG PAG meetings.

10) Other**i) Acceptance of New PAG member**

(1) Tan Calhoun is replacing Denis Pelletier as the Member for the “Small Business- non-forestry” Interest Area.

(2) PAG members accepted Tan Calhoun as the Member for the “Small Business- non-forestry” Interest Area.

11) Review Update Actions

- i) Action Item **Mar 24 – 01:** Sara Fletcher circulated a draft Priority Action Plan. This document will be discussed in more detail at the next PAG meeting. Action Completed.

12) Meeting Evaluation Forms collected

Next Meeting: October 2009 TBA

Actions

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
March 24 - 01	Circulate updated Priority Action Plan to PAG.	Sara Fletcher	Next meeting	Completed
June 16 - 01	Add the following issue to the Continual Improvement Matrix – “develop objectives for NTFPs and their use”, and respond to PAG with Suggested Strategy and Completion Date.	Sara Fletcher	Next meeting	
June 16 - 02	Contact David Coates (Research Silviculturist – MoFR - Smithers) regarding his perspectives and preferred approach to plant diversity.	Sara Fletcher	Next meeting	
June 16 - 03	Review draft Annual Report and provide comments to the Facilitator.	PAG	June 30, 2009	