

# Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, October 21, 2010

Civic Center, Prince George, BC

## MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<p><u><i>Public &amp; First Nations:</i></u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Doug Beckett – Public Interest Jocelyn Campbell – Natural Conservation Jo Graber – Cultural Conservation Ray Hourie – Recreation, Commercial, Motorized Michelle Hourie – Recreation, Commercial motorized, Tourism Melanie Karjala – Research &amp; Education Virginia Karr – Natural Conservation (Old Growth) Dave Kim – Forest workers &amp; contractors Anne Migvar – Ranching &amp; Farming Esther Perry – Ranching &amp; Farming Patience Rakochy – Non-timber Forest Products Lee Sexsmith – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized</p>	<p><u><i>Steering Committee:</i></u> <b>Chair:</b> Sara Fletcher - Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS</p>
<p><u><i>Facilitator &amp; Scribe:</i></u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer</p>	<p><u><i>Advisors &amp; Observers:</i></u> George Lloyd – Resident, Aleza Lake Jerry Noakes – Resident, Aleza Lake</p>

1. Welcome & Introductions – Sara Fletcher
  - a. Introduction of all attendees. Guests at tonight’s meeting are George Lloyd – Sinclair Mills Resident and Jerry Noakes – Sinclair Mills Resident.
  - b. Meeting evaluation results from the October 7, 2010 PG PAG meeting were posted. All targets met except Question M6 ” Was time allocated wisely?”. PAG felt that the agenda was very ambitious.
2. Reviewed Agenda
  - a. Agenda accepted as written
3. Reviewed Summary of October 7, 2010 PAG Meeting.
  - a. P. 6. Indicator #59 re “Impact of herbicide spraying on wildlife like coyotes,

beavers, and beef cattle. (strike “that are sold as organic”).

- b. P. 6 Indicator #41 typo in Paragraph 1 - remove extraneous word “will” in last sentence.
- c. P. 7. Indicator #7 Point 1 re: “natural range” – should be expanded to read “natural range of variability”.
- d. Minutes accepted as revised.

#### 4. Update on Merged Representative Lists

- a. Gerald Bird has not made it out regularly and it was suggested that he may want to find an alternate. Ray Hourie volunteered to be alternate for Gerald since he is Métis. Ray was encouraged to contact Gerald.
- b. Reminder to PAG members that in order to meet quorum there must be a minimum 50% + 1 of represented sectors attending each meeting. This translates to 10 PAG members or their alternates.
- c. Tan Calhoun request for Chamber of Commerce sector representation on the PG PAG.
  - The Facilitator read a letter from Tan requesting Chamber of Commerce sector representation on the PG PAG. The Chamber of Commerce had previously been a sector on the TFL30 PAG. PAG member asked about canvassing the community for representation from other sectors. PAG members noted that very little economic interests are represented. PAG member stated that there should be caution on getting too wide of a representation due to quorum requirements and also due to nature of certification process and sectors relevant to forest management.
  - PAG member discussed “consensus vs general agreement” argument (PAG members reminded the group that it is not a “majority rules” process). PAG member wondered if there were current gaps in sector representation and how this affects coming to a consensus. Another PAG member was concerned about the group getting too big and not being effective.
  - PAG endorsed adding Chamber of Commerce sector to list with Tan Calhoun as representative. No alternate at this time

**Action Item #1:** LSC to review Sector List and see if gaps in representation exist in relation to the new CSA standard. Due: Next meeting.

#### 5. Process for Amalgamation of the PG and TFL30 SFMP’s – Sara Fletcher

- a. Sara reminded the PAG that the amalgamation process includes merging the TFL30 SFM Plan and the PG SFM Plan into one document. This will be accomplished concurrently with the indicator review and revisions to meet the new CSA standard.

#### 6. Consensus Building and SMART Indicators – Dwight Wolfe

- a. Dwight reviewed the current definition of consensus as written in the terms of Reference. *“The PAG agrees to work by consensus. Consensus is defined as no*

*representative substantially disagreeing on an issue and being willing to proceed to the next step. Every effort shall be made to achieve consensus. When consensus is not reached on a specific issue, the general agreement and dissenting perspectives to be forwarded to Canfor and BCTS (Prince George Business Area). Where an impasse is reached, the person(s) with the outstanding issue shall offer solutions or options for resolution”.*

- The goal is to reach consensus. If consensus cannot be reached then the decision is described as “general agreement” with abstentions and dissensions noted.
- PAG wanted to know if this was substantially different than the old definition. LSC stated that the bulk of the definition has remained the same with the addition of the last sentence added from the TFL30 Terms of Reference.
- PAG member concerned that dissenting perspectives are only forwarded to Canfor and BCTS. Another PAG member pointed out that the auditors do act as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party.
- PAG member not happy with just noting in meeting summary that there is dissension. Wanted to know if there could be an indicator or some mechanism of tracking consensus decisions so that it is transparent to an auditor. PAG member would like to see a visual representation (ie. line or bar graph etc).

**Action Item #2:** LSC will develop a tool to track consensus decisions and dissenting opinions and present to the PAG for review. Due: Next meeting.

- b. Dwight reviewed a handout listing some definitions used in the CSA SFM Standard that would be important for PAG members to remember, including:
- Defined Forest Area (DFA) - a specified area of forest, land, and water delineated for the purposes of registration of a SFM System
  - Value - a DFA characteristic, component, or quality considered by an interested party to be important in relation to a CSA SFM element or other locally identified element
  - Objective - a broad statement describing a desired future state or condition of a value
  - Indicator - a variable that measures or describes the state or condition of a value
  - Target - a specific statement describing a desired future state or condition of an indicator. Targets should be clearly defined, time-limited, and quantified, if possible
- c. Dwight listed some characteristics of a SMART indicator, including:
- Measurability — targets can only be set for indicators that can be measured;
  - Predictability — indicators whose future levels can be predicted with

reasonable accuracy are needed;

- Relevance – indicators should be clearly applicable to their associated values;
- Understandability – indicators should be simple, clear, and easy to understand;
- Validity – indicators should be consistent with the scientific understanding of the value they measure and should be technically valid (objectively obtained, documented, comparable, and reproducible);
- Feasibility – the process of monitoring indicators should be practical, cost-effective, and efficient.

## 7. Presentation on Z809-08 standard – Dwight Wolfe

### a. Dwight provided a presentation on the new CSA SFM Standard.

- Time frame for transition is 3 years from date of publication (Fall 2009). Goal for the PG SFM Plan is to complete the transition by fall 2011 with one year to implement before the re-certification audit.
- Summary of key changes include rigorous public participation requirements and performance requirement frameworks
- Core Indicators (CI): new set of 35 mandatory core indicators added to bring consistency to SFMP's across Canada Non-Core Indicators can also be added
- Standard requires 27 key topics to be discussed
- Standard includes new Aboriginal Requirements
- Standard strengthens requirements around Safety, Worker Protection and Community Stability
- Standard requires company policies to honour all International Agreements & Conventions applicable to SFM
- A digital (pdf) version of the new Certification standard document can be found here:  
<http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf>

### b. Discussion:

- PAG member asked about adding an “indicator” to track consensus decisions in this section. PAG member not as interested in tracking # of dissensions as much as making dissensions transparent to auditors who can then deal with each issue individually. PAG member a big advocate for graphs so that it draws attention to an issue – all about transparency and focussing attention.
- Regarding Aboriginal Requirements: many of the indicators are already in place and there are some additions. PAG member lives in an Aboriginal area and would like to see mandatory participation where these

communities are affected (ie. Penny).

#### 8. Z809-08 Implementation Plan and Indicator Matrix – Lee Evans

- a. Lee provided PAG members with a copy of the new CSA SFM Standard (minus the Appendices), and a copy of Canfor's "Common Indicator Matrix". This Matrix compares the new core indicators to indicators already present in the TFL30 and PG SFM Plans.
- b. PAG members requested a full copy of the new CSA Standard.

**Action Item #3:** LSC to provide PAG members with a full copy of the new CSA Z809-08 standard. Due: Next meeting.

- c. PAG member could not find some indicators from the PG SFM Plan listed on the new matrix. PAG member wanted to know what happened to these items on the old matrix and when they will be discussed. LSC noted that all indicators are found in the matrices.
- d. LSC described how to review the Common Indicator Matrix showing current PG and TFL30 Indicators and Targets. PAG member noted that there are some proposed changes to indicators where there was common wording between the two so why should it change? LSC clarified that there is room for tightening up the indicator wording for efficiency sake. Canfor currently maintains 13 SFM Plans and is very interested in common indicator wording across all their SFM Plans.

**Action Item #4:** Facilitator to provide copies of original TFL30 and PAG matrices to PAG members. Due: Next meeting.

#### 9. Indicator Revisions – Lee Evans

Lee Evans introduced some recommended changes to specific indicators to meet the new CSA Standard.

- a. Indicator: 2.1.1 (New) – *Average Regeneration delay for stands established annually. Target: <= 3yrs artificial; <= 6yrs natural. Variance: +1 yrs*
  - LSC Recommendation: Maintain indicator under new combined plan, adopt the proposed indicator statement.
  - Discussion:
    1. LSC Comments: Existing indicator under both SFM Plans. The Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) requirement for regeneration of artificial (planted) stands is 4 yrs. The indicator statement allows for us to meet or exceed the requirement of our FSP's. This indicator relates to SFM Element 2.1: Forest Ecosystem Resilience and Core Indicator 2.1.1: Reforestation Success. Current PG Indicator is #28 - *Percent of net area regenerated within 3 years after the commencement of harvesting. Target: 100% Annually. Variance: -10%.* Current TFL30 Indicator is # 28 - *Percent of net area regenerated within 3 years after the completion of harvesting. Target: 100%. Variance: -5%.*

2. PAG member asked about tracking success later in the reforestation process. "Reforestation success", which is the intent of the indicator, should be tracked, not just Regeneration Delay.
3. PAG member noted that "Reforestation" is defined in the Standard (p. 9) as "re-establishment of trees", without specific size mentioned. PAG member noted that Regeneration Delay refers to the length of time between harvest until the trees are in the ground.
4. PAG member said it should perhaps be tracked at "free-growing" (as forested ground instead of just trees in the ground). LSC noted that legally it must reforest within 4 years. Canfor exceeds this legal requirement by having this indicator met within 3 years. PAG member noted that there already is an indicator for Free Growing in each existing SFM Plan (PG #30, TFL #29).
5. PAG member wants to know if the ecosystem is being maintained where it makes sense to do so and would like to see detail around the quality of what is grown. LSC stated that there are already indicators in the plan describing ecosystem quality (species composition, old growth, etc). PAG member felt that the term Ecosystem is too broad for this indicator and felt that this indicator should simply be about planting trees after harvest.
6. PAG member noted that companies have an obligation to plant within 4 years and the member is fine with this. PAG member says it's important to know what's happening block by block and not simply an "average" since this leaves the indicator open for non-compliance. PAG member wants to know how many blocks are planted within 3 years. By using an average (area-weighted), the target is too broad and would almost always be met.
7. PAG member would like to maintain the indicator wording as currently written in the SFM Plan (don't change to "average"). PAG member felt percent of area is more meaningful than average years.
8. PAG member note that the existing PG indicator states "commencement" and the TFL30 indicator states "completion". These are both very different starting points and produce different results on the ground.
9. PAG members would like to see reporting to include actual hectares reported annually that meet regeneration delay with a roll-up as a percentage. PAG member proposed new wording: "Regeneration delay by area for stands established annually". Target  $\leq 3$  years (artificial),  $\leq 6$  yrs (natural) Variance 0. For reporting, the PAG recommends: year/total planted per year/total planted in reporting year
10. PAG members disagreed that this revised statement has anything to do with "Ecosystem Resilience". PAG member stated that this is CSA wording and LSC cannot really do too much to change.

- PAG consensus on the revised indicator statement: *Regeneration delay by area for stands established annually*. Target  $\leq 3$  years (artificial),  $\leq 6$  yrs (natural) Variance 0.

10. Forest Practices Board – TFL30 Audit Results – Sara Fletcher

- a. The Forest Practices Board undertook an audit of forest practices of Canadian Forest Products Limited, Tree Farm Licence 30 (TFL 30) from September 27 to October 1.
- b. The audit examined planning, harvesting, roads, silviculture and fire protection activities for compliance with forest practices legislation.
- c. No non-conformances were identified but some “grey areas” were identified with regard to legislation which will be clarified for the benefit of licensees and the government.
- d. The Forest Practices Board will be preparing a report, and any party that may be adversely affected by the audit findings will have a chance to respond. The board’s final report and recommendations will then be released to the public and government.
- e. For more information on the Forest Practices Board, go to their website:  
<http://www.fpb.gov.bc.ca/>

11. Other:

- a. PAG member wondered if a contact list of all the PAG members could be made available to interested members. A list will be circulated next meeting where members can make contact information available if desired.

**Action Item #5:** Facilitator to provide template for PAG member contact list. Due: Next meeting.

12. Evaluation Forms requested and collected

13. Next Meeting: Tues November 9, 2010 Prince George Civic Centre 5:30-9:00 pm

## Actions- update

<b>PRINCE GEORGE PAG</b>				
<b>ID#</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
Nov 2 - 03	Provide updates on attempts to recruit representation for Non-Renewable Resource Extraction.	Steering Committee	Dec 2006	In progress: positive responses received from Enbridge, PMG, and BC Hydro.
Oct 7 - 01	Review PG SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator.	PAG	November 7, 2010	
Oct 7 - 02	Review TFL 30 SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator.	PAG	November 7, 2010	
Oct 21 - 01	Review Sector List and see if gaps in representation exist in relation to the new CSA standard.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	
Oct 21 - 02	Develop a tool to track consensus decisions and dissenting opinions and present to the PAG for review.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	
Oct 21 - 03	Provide PAG members with a full copy of the new CSA Z809-08 standard.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	
Oct 21 - 04	Provide copies of original TFL30 and PAG matrices to PAG members.	Facilitator	Next Meeting	
Oct 21 - 05	Provide template for PAG members contact list.	Facilitator	Next Meeting	