

# Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, October 7, 2010

Civic Center, Prince George, BC

## MEETING Summary

---

---

In Attendance:

<p><u><i>Public &amp; First Nations:</i></u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Chris Andreschefski – Private Landowners Teena Demeulemeester – West Moberly First Nation Jo Graber – Cultural Conservation Ray Hourie – Recreation, Commercial, Motorized Melanie Karjala – Research &amp; Education Dave Kim – Forest workers &amp; contractors Anne Migvar – Ranching &amp; Farming Jeff Mohr – Recreation, non-commercial, Motorized (Alternate) Esther Perry – Ranching &amp; Farming Patience Rokochy – Non-timber Forest Product Don Wilkins - Commercial Wildlife Interests</p>	<p><u><i>Steering Committee:</i></u> <b>Chair:</b> Tim Sproule – BCTS Alena Charlston – Carrier Lumber Lee Evans – BCTS Sara Fletcher – Canfor</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> Steve Webb - BCTS Ian Wilson – TDB Consulting Lloyd George – Resident, Sinclair Mills Terry Kuzma – Carrier Lumber Jon Erickson – Canfor Quesnel Paul Demeulemeester – West Moberly First Nation Shannon Carson – ILMB</p>

---

---

1. Welcome & Introductions – Tim Sproule
  - a. Tim Sproule announced his last meeting as chair for PG Licensee Steering Committee. Sara Fletcher, Canfor will be replacing him as new chair for the combined PG/TFL 30PAG. PG/TFL 30 PAG will be combined as one PAG as of this meeting.
  - b. Guest and Observers Introduced: Ian Wilson- TDB Consulting, Steve Webb - BCTS, Jon Erickson - Canfor Quesnel, George Lloyd – Sinclair Mills Resident,

Terry Kuzma – Carrier Lumber, Paul Demeulemeester – West Moberly First Nation, Shannon Carson – ILMB.

2. Reviewed Agenda

- a. Move agenda item #6 Carrier SFM Plan Update to before dinner break
- b. Agenda accepted as modified

3. Reviewed Minutes

a. PG PAG March 23, 2010

- Accepted as written

b. TFL 30 PAG January 14, 2010

- PAG member asked a question concerning the status of Indicator #48: *Aboriginal Participation in Planning Process*. LSC noted that this indicator will be revisited when the SFM Plan transitions to the new CSA standards.
- Accepted as written

4. Carrier SFM Plan Update (Alena Charlston)

- a. Carrier Lumber Ltd. announced that they will be changing from registration with CSA to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI). SFI is an independent and international standard (used by pulp mills) and still requires public input, but not in the form of PAG meetings. SFI meets the same rules and regulations as CSA. See <http://www.sfiprogram.org/> for more information. The rationale for changing to the SFI standard is entirely a business decision which is being made to capture the efficiencies of all of Carrier's operations working under one SFI Plan.
- b. PAG member asked how different SFI standards are different than CSA standards. Licensee responded that there is no public advisory component required with these standards. Robson Valley will be added to the SFI SFM plan for Carrier.
- c. PAG member asked about client/customer opinion on SFI – will this be a foreshadowing of all companies moving away from CSA towards SFI? Terry Kuzma responded that Environmental Non-government Organizations (ENGO's) prefer Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification

5. Reviewed Meeting Evaluation Results – posted

6. Annual Report Presentations

**Prince George SFMP – Alena Charlston**

The PG SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report was presented. The Licensee Steering Committee reviewed the list of Indicators found in Table 1 on page 2 and noted those

where targets were met, not met or pending. Overall, of the 59 indicators, 46 met the target, 5 are pending and 8 did not meet the target for this reporting period. The entire root cause, corrective action and preventative action discussion is available within the annual report.

a. Pending Indicators:

- Indicator 1 - Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit; Indicator 2 - Old Interior Forest; Indicator 3 - Young Patch Size Distribution, Indicator 6 - Wet Trench and Wet Mountain Young Patch Size.
  1. Indicators 1, 2, 3 and 6 rely on analysis completed through the Landscape Objectives Working Group (LOWG) process, which is tied to the Biodiversity Order for the Prince George Timber Supply Area (PG TSA). This year, the LOWG analysis has been influenced by the Timber Supply Review (TSR) process that has been ongoing in the PG TSA for the past few years. The analysis relies on the definition of the Crown Forest Land Base (CFLB), which is an output of the TSR process. The new definition of CFLB, as set by the government in the TSR process has not yet been released. Once the CFLB has been set, the LOWG analysis will be completed and these four indicators updated.
- Indicator 33 - Cut level volumes
  1. The final review for this indicator will be done at the end of the 5-yr cut control period (ends December 31, 2011).
  2. The indicator currently reports the status to the end of year 3 (December 31, 2009).

b. Indicators Not Met :

- Indicator #5: Stand level retention.
  1. Target >7% average stand level retention in harvested areas was met (11.2% was retained during this reporting period). Two blocks designed and harvested by BCTS had <3.5% retention (3.5% is the min. retention requirement per block). These blocks were designed to salvage dead pine in order reduce fire hazard within the Community of Bear Lake. Retention of dead pine was inconsistent with community Wildfire Management Plan. Reserves were established in non-pine areas, but area <3.5%
  2. Action Plan: BCTS to ensure Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) exemption in place to ensure compliance with higher level plans that over-write FSP requirements.
- Indicator #14: Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use.
  1. For both Carrier Lumber and BCTS, seedlings were planted outside of the Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use

2. Carrier:
  - a. Planting contractor transferred seedlings to other blocks in the same area without checking transferability and pre-approval
  - b. Action Plan: updated Planting Standard Procedures that contractor must review seed transfer guidelines and obtain approval from Carrier prior to transferring seedlings to other blocks.
  - c. No corrective action prescribed for the site, as the transfers were very minor in nature
3. BCTS:
  - a. This incidence is low risk, as most seedlings were planted <70 meters below their elevation range
  - b. Action Plan: Alternative Seed Use Policies for using Lw, Fdi and Pli seedlings have been submitted and approved by the Chief Forester. Cone collections have targeted areas with low seed supply (low elevation Fd and Pli) for future use.
- Indicator #24: Riparian area conservation.
  1. Harvest equipment went 1 meter inside a 5 meter machine free zone (MFZ) (default S4 creek) for a distance of 10 meters on a Canfor block in March 2010. Repeated machine traffic. Snow-free inspection found minimal damage to the understory within the MFZ
  2. Action Plan: Canfor staff reviewed procedures with the contractor – specifically “STOP WORK and report immediately to supervisor”.
- Indicator #35: Non-timber benefits.
  1. Target - Forest operations consistent with Visual Quality Requirements
  2. One Canfor block did not have a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) completed prior to harvesting
  3. Action Plan: The VIA for the block was conducted post-harvest to determine the impacts of the missed pre-harvest VIA. It was determined that the Visual Quality Objectives (VQO) in the area had not been impacted as the harvested block was not visible from either of the 2 recreation sites in the vicinity
- Indicator #41: Communication Strategies.
  1. Canfor:
    - a. Three stakeholders’ areas of interests were misidentified in Canfor’s database
    - b. Action Plan: Personal communications with the stakeholders resulted in clarification and correction to the information in Canfor’s database

## 2. BCTS:

- a. Referral list of cabin owners was developed from the Norman Lake community list, but 7 individuals had insufficient information to send referral letters and 9 referral letters were returned due to incorrect contact numbers
  - b. Action Plan: At future community meetings obtain a more complete directory of contact information as well as identify those who do not wish additional correspondence. Use other methods of providing notice (ie. Community bulletin boards)
- Indicator #57: Watersheds assessed by qualified professional.
    1. Canfor has 2 active watersheds currently deemed high risk (Shesta, Chilako). One of these watersheds (Chilako) was not assessed by a qualified hydrology professional. Canfor only has 1 block (MPB-attacked pine) remaining to be harvested in this watershed
    2. Action Plan: After harvest of this block, Canfor is expected to cease any further harvesting in this watershed
  - Indicator #58: Operations consistent with professional watershed recommendations
    1. Canfor:
      - a. Two blocks harvested in Shesta watershed were permitted prior to initiation of the Fisheries Sensitive Watershed process. At time of harvest, no professional recommendations were available. Four blocks were harvested in Chilako watershed and as an assessment was completed, professional recommendations were not available to follow.
    2. BCTS:
      - a. Two blocks harvested in Shesta watershed were permitted prior to initiation of the Fisheries Sensitive Watershed process. At time of harvest, no professional recommendations were available.
  - Indicator #59: Compliance with Species at Risk and Sites of Biological Importance management strategies
    1. 64% of Canfor staff trained (vs. target of 100%); root cause ID'd as deficient submission of training records
    2. Action Plan implemented in Spring 2010 – added SWP step for SAR Program Coordinator to confirm & follow-up on training by mid-June of each year – action plan resulted in 100% training rate for 2010

## c. Discussion:

- Indicator # 14 Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use.
  1. Questions from PAG members about continued monitoring in this

site since this was done, and clarification on the magnitude of the allowable variance within the standard.

2. PAG member asked about flexibility of licensees on what is planted in seed lot. LSC said it must follow chief forester's standards. For the BCTS blocks, the Chief Forester approved Rust resistant species even though there was a mistake. PAG member asked if this was seed availability issue. BCTS stated this was only part of the issue. The Action plan includes more frequent monitoring on this block.
  3. PAG member asked why there is a threshold at all. What is the long-term impact if this is not followed? LSC said it must contribute to future timber supply. As part of Carrier's corrective action, the Planting Contractor was let go.
- Indicator #24: Riparian area conservation.
    1. PAG member noted that the Indicator says YES in Annual Report as to being met in draft plan. Need to correct this typo.
  - Indicator #41: Communication Strategies
    1. PAG member expressed concern about Trappers not receiving notification of forest practices on their trap lines. Many trappers concerned – this topic comes up at many trapper meetings. Licensees (BCTS, Carrier, Canfor) send out requests for info to stakeholders every 2 years. Trapper contact info is often not current. MOE lists are often not current. It was noted that the Prince George Trappers Association has requested permission from BC Environment to take over maintenance of the Trapline Database for the Prince George Forest District.
    2. A PAG member expressed concern over a recent road deactivation in the Pass Lake Area that was not effectively communicated to local residents.
  - Indicator #57: Watersheds assessed by qualified professional.
    1. PAG member wondered if increased road activity was a major cause of siltation in this river. Licensee clarified it was not riparian features being affected rather the rate of harvest in the entire watershed. PAG member asked about impact on watershed in light of all of the fires this past summer. Will there be professional hydrologist looking at this? LSC confirmed that there will be impact assessments forthcoming.
  - Indicator #59: Compliance with Species at Risk and Sites of Biological Importance management strategies
    1. PAG member asked about impact of herbicide spraying on wildlife like coyotes, beavers and beef cattle. LSC stated that very little spraying is done and that these operations follow guidelines to minimize negative impact.

**Action Item #1:** PAG to review PG SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator. Due: November 7, 2010.

**TFL30 SFMP – Sara Fletcher**

The TFL 30 SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report was presented. The Licensee Steering Committee reviewed the list of Indicators found in the table on page 7 and noted those where targets were met, not met or pending. Overall, 74 targets are associated with 56 indicators. Of these 74 targets, 63 were met within the prescribed variances, 2 are pending, and 9 were not met within the prescribed variances. for this reporting period. The entire root cause, corrective action and preventative action discussion is available within the annual report.

a. Pending Indicators:

- Indicator 7 - Coarse Woody Debris.
  1. One target met, one target pending due to need to define “natural ranges of variability”.
  2. For this reporting period, the CWD target has been defaulted to the amount noted in the Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (FPPR) (a minimum of 4 logs per hectare, each being a minimum of 2 m long and 7.5 cm in diameter at one end). This target will be applied until a target for the natural range of CWD is established.
- Indicator 9 - Species at Risk Notice / Orders & Habitat.
  1. Target met for SAR Notice/Orders. Target pending for SAR (wildlife) habitat.
  2. Efforts to develop and implement Canfor’s biodiversity strategy will be linked in 2010/11 with the transition to the CSA Z809/08 standard. It is believed that implementation of the strategy will be a cost-effective and scientifically credible realization of the intent of this indicator.

b. Indicators Not Met:

- Indicator 11 - Personnel Trained to Identify Species at Risk & Sites of Biological Significance.
  1. BCTS met the target. Canfor did not meet the target. An insufficient number of appropriate Canfor Staff (64%) completed the required online training or the refresher training online in the spring of 2009. Canfor implemented an online SAR training and management program in the Spring of 2009. It was determined that 64 % of the appropriate Canfor personnel were trained on the identification of Species at Risk and Sites of Biological Significance. Submission of training records to the Canfor Office Manager were found to be deficient. Canfor conducted a root cause analysis to determine why this indicator was not met. The root cause was identified as ineffective monitoring of compliance with the training requirement.

2. Action Plan: Canfor's "Standard Work Procedure for the Species at Risk and Sites of Biological Importance" was revised in April 2010 to include a section for Canfor's SAR Supervisor to compare (by mid-June of each year) the SAR & SBI training records against Canfor's Training Matrix, to identify and follow up with staff and/or contractors who potentially missed the training.
- Indicator 16 - Distinct Habitat Types
    1. Canfor did not meet the target. Canfor harvested four blocks during the 2009-10 reporting period. Three of these blocks contained Distinct Habitat Types and the TFL30 SFMP-defined management strategies were not implemented. For two of the blocks, the plans were finalized and cutting permits issued prior to this indicator's incorporation into the SFMP. The third block was planned prior to the indicator being accepted into the SFMP but the fieldwork and permitting were conducted while the indicator was in place. The root cause was determined to be a lack of process to ensure staff awareness of the recommended management strategies for the Distinct Habitat Types.
    2. Action Plan: Include guidance in Canfor's standard work procedures for relevant functional groups (Planning, Permitting and Field Operations), to identify whether Distinct Habitat Types exist within proposed blocks and therefore require modified management.
  - Indicator 31 - Volume of Timber Harvested
    1. BCTS did not meet the target. Canfor did not meet the target. The mountain pine beetle epidemic in the Prince George TSA has shifted harvest priority to the pine-dominated Prince George and Fort St. James DFA's, temporarily reducing the cut in TFL30. The root cause is the Government-supported forest management and business decision to focus harvesting and reforestation efforts on dead and dying pine stands.
    2. Action Plan: No action plan is required. It is anticipated that the cut will shift back to TFL30 within the next three to five years, when the pine stands elsewhere in the Prince George Timber Supply Area have been addressed.
  - Indicator 48 - Aboriginal Participation in Planning Process
    1. BCTS did not meet the target. Canfor did not meet the target. A face-to-face meeting was not conducted with one of the four relevant First Nations groups. Root Cause: As there were no major public plan developments during the reporting period, it was not a priority for that First Nation's representatives to meet with Canfor or BCTS staff.
    2. Action Plan: A variance to the target was proposed at the January 14th 2010 TFL30 PAG meeting, as it is currently out of the licensees' realm of control. The PAG indicated comfort with leaving the target and variance "as is", particularly as the indicator will be revisited

when the SFMP is transitioned to the CSA Z809-08 standard.

- Indicator 54 - PAG and Interested Parties Satisfaction
  1. The PAG overall satisfaction score with the meetings was not met.
- Indicator 55 - Continuous Improvement Matrix
  1. The targets were not met. The CI Matrix was not reviewed at either of the two 2009/10 PAG meetings; a score of 3.4 was recorded for PAG satisfaction with CI Matrix progress; and no items from the Continuous Improvement Matrix were incorporated into the SFMP during the reporting period. Root Cause: The Continuous Improvement Matrix items that currently have the potential to be incorporated into the SFM Plan are either contingent upon the completion of other processes (i.e. analysis for Management Plan 10) or are dependent upon ongoing research (i.e. riparian species monitoring, and a species accounting strategy).
  2. Action Plan: 1) Incorporate a review of the Continuous Improvement Matrix into an agenda for the 2010/11 reporting period. 2) Evaluate the items on the Matrix during indicator discussions and revisions in 2010/11, while proceeding through the transition from the Z809-02 to the Z809-08 standard.

c. Discussion:

- Indicator 7 - Coarse Woody Debris
  1. PAG member asked about new Bioenergy plans – no issues in PG to date, but a learning process in Quesnel. An Observer contributed to the discussion by adding that there is always a balance between finding fiber for energy, but managing for CWD. Waste needs to be left for habitat, but also used for pellets.
  2. PAG member noted that the Aleza Lake Research Forest has collected CWD data.

**Action Item #2:** PAG to review TFL 30 SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator. Due: November 7, 2010.

7. External Audit Results

a. Carrier Lumber Ltd

- Alena Charlston gave an update on a recent external audit (Environmental Management System (EMS) – ISO 14001; Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) – CSA Z809-02; Chain of Custody (CoC) – PEFC).
  1. External Audit (conducted June 7-10, 2010 by Craig Roessler of KPMG)
    - a. Minor Non-Conformance:
      - i. Carrier is a signatory to both the Prince George and Fort St. James SFM plans. Carrier's internal audit

conducted in February 2010 documented that SMF requirements in the FSJ DFA were assessed by the internal auditor, but not in the PG DFA because operations had not been conducted for the operating year occurred in this DFA. Some SFM requirements in which pertain to both the PG and FSJ DFA's such as SAR, (Species at Risk) reviewed during the February 2010 internal audit but this was not documented.

- b. Several Good Practices were noted throughout the audit: 1. Excellent communication strategy to ensure stakeholders and interested public are kept informed of relevant forest planning, development, road deactivation and herbicide; 2. Low levels of site disturbances on blocks field reviewed; 3. High level of care was taken in maintaining stream bank integrity and water quality in the construction of temporary quad bridges, and; 4. due care in contacting First Nations re: modifying harvest plan to protect resources features discovered in planning phase
- c. Carrier recommended for re-registration to CSA Z809-02 (SFM), ISO 14001 (EMS) and PEFC Annex 4 Chain of Custody

b. Canfor

- Sara Fletcher reviewed recent external audit. (Environmental Management System (EMS) – ISO 14001; Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) – CSA Z809-02; Chain of Custody (CoC) – PEFC)
  1. External Audit: (conducted on July 19-21, 2010 by Dave Bebb KPMG)
    - a. Previous minor non-conformances: Weaknesses were ID'd in 2009 in the implementation of Canfor's Fuel Management Guidelines. No recurrence of this issue was noted during the 2010 audit site visits to the PG DFA or TFL30. However, due to similar incidents being ID'd in 2010 at other Canfor operations, this remains an open item on the corporate audit report.
    - b. Progress towards addressing previous OFI's: A number of older OFIs have yet to be adequately addressed (ie. lack of effectiveness monitoring under SFM plans, overstory retention on S4 streams etc.), but good progress was made in a number of areas (ie. development of an Environmental Management Plan for FMG East, level of effort devoted to reviewing the CoC system during the management review etc.). The 2011 audit will include a review of outstanding OFI's to assess their status and determine whether they should be closed, left open until fully addressed by Canfor, or elevated to the level of a non-conformance.
    - c. New Minor Non-Conformance: PG: Lack of clear strategies by which the licensees on the LOWG will achieve the

landscape-level biodiversity targets identified in the SFM plan.

- d. New (systemic) OFI's include: Address weaknesses and inconsistencies in the current version of the Fuel Management Guidelines, and strengthen contractor and Canfor staff understanding of certain legal requirements. PG: Current monitoring suggests that patch size is trending away from the targets in a number of LU's; the lack of a clear strategy for achieving the patch size targets, coupled with the lack of a timely response to this emerging issue by industry and government, brings the effectiveness of a five-year reporting period for this indicator into question.
- e. Canfor recommended for re-registration to CSA Z809-02 (SFM), ISO 14001 (EMS) and PEFC Annex 4 Chain of Custody.

#### 8. PG SFMP PAG Merged Terms of Reference

- a. PAG directed to Draft PG / TFL30 SFM Plan Draft Terms of Reference September 20, 2010. The Merged Terms of Reference (ToR) is based on the previous PG ToR that has been modified with salient points from the TFL30 ToR.
- b. Revisions to the Terms of Reference
  - There were many grammatical and readability edits as well as global changes to reference the Prince George/TFL30 SFMP. Specific process-related changes are noted below.
  - Section 1.1.a Purpose of Sustainable Forest Management Plan: Paragraph changed to read "*Transition the Prince George & TFL30 Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) from the current SFM standard requirements (Z809-02) developed by the Canadian Standards Association (CSA), to the CSA Z809-08 standard, and once the transition is complete, maintain the SFMP to meet the CSA Z809-08 standard*";
  - Section 1.2 PG/TFL30 SFMP Steering Committee: Deleted reference to Carrier Lumber Ltd.
  - Section 1.3 Defined Forest Area: Paragraph changed to read "*The SFMP is applicable to only the Defined Forest Areas (DFA's). A DFA is a specified area of forest, including land and water. The DFA for this SFMP is the Canfor and BCTS operating areas within the Prince George Forest District and TFL30, excluding areas such as private lands, woodlots, Indian reserves, Treaty 8 Lands, and Tree Farm License 53. The DFA boundaries are shown on the map provided in Appendix A.*"
  - Section 1.7 Progress to date: Deleted references to Carrier Lumber recertification and add sentence on the announcement of Carrier Lumber resignation from the PG SFMP Steering Committee. Added Section 1.7.2 TFL30 SFM Plan and content describing the progress if that plan.
  - Section 2 Defined Goal: Revised first paragraph to read "*The goal of the Prince George/TFL30 SFMP is to demonstrate commitment to*

*sustainable forest management principles for the DFA. The PG/TFL30 SFMP Steering Committee, with input from the PAG, will be responsible for developing and implementing the SFMP to the most up-to-date version of the CSA standard.”*

- Section 3 Annual Schedule: Changed date of Annual Report to “September”.
- Section 6.1.1. Membership Structure: Added “*Quorum for meetings will consist of at least a minimum of one more than 50% of represented sectors*”.
- Section 6.1.2 Selection of PAG: Deleted “*Members of the public and the PG/TFL30 SFMP Steering Committee will review the potential membership at the initial PAG meetings*”. Added “*Members of the PAG and the PG/TFL30 SFMP Steering Committee will periodically review membership at the PAG meetings*”.
- Section 9 Decision Making and Methodology: Added “*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).*”

c. Discussion:

- PAG member concern whether merging the two PAGs is consistent with the new CSA standard. The Facilitator noted this is allowed within the new standard.
- PAG member concerned about losing the details of the PG District and TFL30 and ending up with a homogenized view of the areas. The LSC said it will still report specific details on each area in the annual report.
- PAG member clarified that the TFL will have very distinct indicators – one is area based and one is volume based so indicators can be creatively defined for each.
- PAG member concerned that indicators are moved out of the plan and into the CI matrix so that compliance is met in an Audit. The LSC assured the PAG that audits pick up discrepancies and that indicators are not dropped or changed without PAG consensus.
- The new version of the CSA SFM Standard can be found here:  
<http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf>
- Re: Quorum – PAG member said there should be a minimum number of representative or alternates present (current PG ToR has no quorum requirement). The LSC suggested that quorum be defined as greater than 50% of the average number of PAG members attending the past five (5) meetings. PAG discussed changing to 2/3. PAG member said that it makes sense to have at least one member or alternate in attendance based on agenda items pertaining to their interest sector. PAG member suggested a minimum of 6 members in attendance to conduct business. PAG member wondered about need for quorum at all when consensus is

what is desired. PAG members agreed that quorum is needed.

- Re: Role of Subcommittees PAG member asked if subcommittees could be struck on species at risk. The LSC stated that if PAG is bogged on an issue then it would be appropriate.
- Re: Decision-making and methodology – where there is no consensus, dissensions noted in minutes and transparent to auditors. PAG member concerned that if no consensus is reached, LSC can get away with not resolving issues. PAG member would like to keep last sentence re: impasse.

d. Terms of Reference accepted as revised

#### 9. Merged Rep List

- The PAG reviewed the Representative and Alternate lists for each Interest Sector identified in the PG ToR and the old TFL30 ToR. The following Table of Representatives and Alternates for the PG/TFL30 SFM PAG was endorsed by the PAG (see below).
- The Public Interest, Non-renewable Resource Extraction, and Union/Labour sectors have been merged into the PG/TFL30 PAG list. Doug Beckett will be approached to continue as the Representative. Union/Labour is vacant for now.

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters)	Don Wilkins	Ken Pickering
Cultural Conservation	Jo Graber	N/A
Forest workers & contractors	David Kim	
Hunting and Fishing		
Local Government	Betty Abbs	Hillary Crowley
Metis	Gerald Bird	
Natural Conservation	Virginia Karr	Jocelyn Campbell
Naturalists	Sandra Kinsey	
Non-timber Forest Product	Patience Rakochy	
Private landowners	Chris Andreschefski	Norm Holt
Public Interest	Doug Beckett	
Ranching & Farming	Esther Perry	Anne Migvar
Recreation, commercial, motorized	Michell Hourie	
Recreation, non-commercial, motorized	Lee Sexsmith	Jeff Mohr
Recreation, non-motorized	David King	
Research & Education	Melanie Karjala	

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
Non-renewable Resource Extraction		
Small Business	Ray Hourie	Tan Calhoun
Small Timber Tenures	Mark Clark	Mike Torpe
Tourism	Michell Hourie	
Union/Labour		
West Moberly First Nation	Teena Demeulemeester	Bruce Muir

#### 10. Deferred Agenda Items

- a. Due to time constraints, the following agenda items were deferred to the next meeting:
- Detailed Implementation Plan
  - Other:
    1. Forest Practices Board - TFL30 Audit Results
    2. Consensus Building and SMART Indicators

#### 11. Evaluation Forms requested and collected

12. Next Meeting: Thursday October 21, 2010 Prince George Civic Centre 5:30-9:00 pm

#### Actions

<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.
March 23 - 01	Review new version of SFM Plan and send any comments to the Facilitator.	PAG	April 23, 2010	Completed
March 23 - 2	Provide color handouts of maps found in SFM Plan.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	Completed
October 7 - 01	Review PG SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator.	PAG	November 7, 2010	
October 7 - 02	Review TFL 30 SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator.	PAG	November 7, 2010	