

**Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group
December 10, 2009 Meeting
Village Inn, Vanderhoof**

For approval at next meeting in Feb 2010

In Attendance

Public

Dan Brooks
Ginny Springer
John Martens

John DeGagne
Gerd Erasmus

Licensee Team

Janine Gervais

Bruce Middleton

Facilitation and Support

Dwight Scott Wolfe

Loni Spletzer

Observers

Cathy Middleton

Guests

Jim McCormack

Jason Neumeyer

PAG Members Not in Attendance

Absent with Regrets

Dean Toll
Steve Little

Randall Springer
Ray Brandner

1. Documents Distributed

- Draft Agenda for December 10, 2009 – Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) Public Advisory Group
- Draft Minutes of Vanderhoof SFMP Public Advisory Group Meeting from March 5, 2009
- Action List from March 5, 2009 (updated November 6, 2009)
- Canfor Internal and External Audit Update
- BC Timber Sales (BCTS) Internal and External Audit Update
- Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan Terms of Reference
- Sustainable Forest Management Plan 2008/09 Annual Report
- Sustainable Forest Management Plan 2008/09 Annual Report Power Point Presentation December 10, 2009 (Thumbnails)
- Vanderhoof SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Measures (November 16, 2009)
- KPMG UPDATE Forest Certification Public Summary Report
- Vanderhoof SFMP Public Advisory Group Questionnaire (Satisfaction Survey)
- Draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan

2. Welcome and Introduction

The meeting commenced at 4:04 pm. Reminder to members who were not able to attend the last meeting that L & M Lumber Ltd. (Sinclair Group) is no longer part of the Vanderhoof SFMP process as they are now certified with the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI). For more info see: <http://www.sfiprogram.org/>

Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) was introduced as the new facilitator for the Vanderhoof Public Advisory Group (PAG) with Loni Spletzer as the scribe for the meeting minutes. Other guests were introduced: Jim McCormack (Planning Coordinator South-West, CanFor - Forest Management Group) and Jason Neumeyer (Certification Coordinator, CanFor - Forest Management Group).

Licensee and PAG Members were introduced.

Dwight Wolfe gave a brief overview of his experience (he is a Registered Professional Forester and is also the facilitator for a number of PAGs in the Region including the Prince George District PAG, TFL30 PAG, Fort St. James PAG, and the Mackenzie PAG). Dwight reviewed the ground rules for the Vanderhoof PAG meetings as written in the *Terms of Reference*.

There was a brief discussion on the level of involvement permitted to observers of the Vanderhoof PAG meetings. The Terms of Reference state that observers are *not* to participate in discussion without agreement of the PAG. The Vanderhoof PAG members agreed to have them participate in discussion at this meeting.

3. Meeting Summary and Action Items Review

Reviewed Agenda: accepted as written.

Reviewed Minutes of the meeting from March 5, 2009: accepted as written.

Reviewed Actions: (actions will be attached on separate sheets to all future agendas, so that they are clear)

Actions from March 5, 2009 updated Nov 6, 2009

Action #030509-1: Include names with reference numbers beside action items. DONE.

Action #030509-2: Circulate print or email copies of the final Riparian Sensitive Species Project research report, based on the sign-up sheet distributed. DONE: Janine sent out April 30, 2009.

Action #030509-3: LT to come back to PAG with recommendations on next step with respect to Riparian Sensitive Species study. DONE: To be discussed under Agenda Item "SFMP Proposed Plan Changes".

Action #030509-4: PAG members to fill out Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire, return completed questionnaire by the end of the meeting. Results to be reported back to the PAG. DONE: see Agenda Item "Membership Review/Terms of Reference/Satisfaction Survey".

Action #030509-5: Consider a future agenda topic regarding: Communication processes on planning and different ways of communicating between licensees and tenure holders. OPEN: LT will consider this for the March 2010 PAG Agenda.

Action #030509-6: Licensee Team (LT) to provide further information on the Draft Lakeshore Management Plan (provide copies to members – sign up list for copies passed around). Sent to those who requested copies April 2009. DONE: Handed out at tonight's meeting.

Action #030509-7: Licensees to bring a draft measure to the next meeting that could reflect: "Report on lakeshore management activities that vary from the draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan and address how values such as recreation opportunity, wildlife, visual quality, and biodiversity have been considered". OPEN: LT will consider this for the March 2010 PAG Agenda.

Action #030509-8: Future agenda items to include: Access Management with respect to Development Matrix and Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) with respect to Development Matrix. OPEN: LT will consider this for the February or March 2010 PAG Agenda.

Action #030509-9: Licensees to provide an update on the next agenda, with respect to what they think is coming (i.e. indicator changes, dropping/revising measures, changes to DFA etc). DONE: see Agenda Item "2009/2010 Focus and Priorities".

Actions Not Yet Complete from Nov 27, 2009 Updated March 5, 2009

Action #112709-1: The Annual Report will be revised to better reflect what is included in Coarse Woody Debris (as per the actual SFMP document). DONE: see Agenda Item "2008/09 Annual Report".

Action #112709-2: For (1-2.10) Develop Management Strategies for Riparian Sensitive Species, revise the target date to March 31, 2010 and to present Phase 2 to the PAG. DONE: see Agenda Item "2008/09 Annual Report". No management strategies yet to be presented.

Action #112709-3: For (1-3.1) Effectiveness Monitoring Plans for Indicator Species, revise the target date to March 31, 2011 and provide annual updates to the PAG. DONE: see Agenda Item "2008/09 Annual Report".

4. BC Timber Sales Update: 2009 Internal and External Audits: Bruce Middleton

Bruce Middleton reported on the 2009 BCTS Audits. There were 2 minor non-conformances in the external audit:

Minor #1: Lack of Continuous Improvement around SFM Plan Measures and Targets. Vanderhoof SFM Plan is quite dated and has not been fully revised since July 2006 despite significant changes on the landbase since that time (many of which are related to the impact of the mountain pine beetle).

Minor #2: Lack of Progress in Implementing Several Measures and Targets. The 2007/2008 Vanderhoof SFM Plan identified 8 measures (indicators) as being "In Progress", but there is no additional information as to whether these targets have been met.

Opportunities for improvement were reviewed. BCTS was recommended for re-certification.

5. Canfor Update: 2009 Internal and External Audits: Janine Gervais

Janine Gervais reported on the Canfor 2009 Audits. Vanderhoof was recommended for re-certification for their Environmental Management System (EMS), their Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and their Chain of Custody (CoC). There were two minor non-conformances in the internal audit.

Minor #1: Not all controlled documents contain a SCOPE section or a revision date or do not identify a document owner. **Action:** All Forestry Management System (FMS) documents to be reviewed in light of Canfor's new organizational structure.

Minor #2: Not all operational controls have been implemented. The current version of the Fuel Management Guidelines states “All references to Fire Extinguishers imply that they must be inspected and tagged on an annual basis by a licensed inspector”. **Action:** All contractors and staff updated on revised wording of Fuel Management documents and Fire Extinguishers inspected and tagged.

There were 2 minor non-conformances in the external audit:

Minor #1: Lack of Continuous Improvement around SFM Plan Measures and Targets. Vanderhoof SFM Plan is quite dated and has not been fully revised since July 2006 despite significant changes on the landbase since that time (many of which are related to the impact of the mountain pine beetle).

Minor #2: Lack of Progress in Implementing Several Measures and Targets. The 2007/2008 Vanderhoof SFM Plan identified 8 measures (indicators) as being “In Progress”, but there is no additional information as to whether these targets have been met.

6. 2008/09 Annual Report (Power Point Presentation) – Janine Gervais

Summary of 2008/09 Results:

- 56 measures are meeting target
- 4 measures not met
- 5 measures in progress

For each measure in the Annual Report the LT has clearly stated whether the target was met, not met or in progress. For each measure that was not met, the LT has provided details on What Happened, Root Cause and Action Plan.

Measures Not Meeting Target (4):

1. Plant Diversity Index (p. 6 Annual Report)

- 3 Grouped Site Associations were sampled in 2008
- Met targets for mean Shannon-Wiener index (spp richness & abundance) & mean Simpson’s Index (similar to S-W but more sensitive to shifts in dominant plant spp)
- Fell short of benchmarked Species Richness index target (a simple count of plant spp in plot)
- Evolving knowledge base – will consider recommendation to monitor every 2 years, and consider tying into Z08 core indicators for ecosystem resilience or rare plants

2. Support Opportunities in the Defined Forest Area (DFA) (p. 13 Annual Report)

- Target is ≥ 100 opportunities with a newly amended +/- 25 variance.
- 23 total opportunities noted for 2008/09
- A couple of the donations were of considerable value.

PAG discussed the challenge of knowing what to identify and record as support opportunities withing the community.

3. Business Opportunities with First Nations (p. 13 Annual Report)

- Target is ≥ 20 opportunities with the amended - 10 variance.
- Seven (7) opportunities were noted for this measure in 2008/09

BCTS finds it difficult to contribute to this measure as all their Timber Sales need to be based on an open competition.

4. Number of Socio Economic Opportunities Available to First Nations

- Target is ≥ 10 opportunities with a - 2 variance
- Seven (7) opportunities were noted for this measure in 2008/09

Riparian Reserve (p.4 Annual Report)

Canfor and BCTS have collaborated on a new strategy statement:

Annually provide the number of blocks harvested where the Riparian Reserve Zone strategies are consistent with the DLMP RRZ strategy. Where the Licensee or BCTS are not consistent with the DLMP RRZ strategy, rationale will be provided in order to address how values such as recreation opportunity, wildlife, visual quality, and biodiversity have been considered.

Janine reviewed an example application of the proposed strategy as it relates to the current Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP). The intent is to meet the draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan. This strategy will be embedded in the SFM Plan and the Annual Report. PAG concerns that reporting out was not enough. The PAG expressed concern about beaver habitat and feel that this strategy impacts Tourism/Wildlife very strongly. The beaver's habitat is being destroyed and the regulations need to be changed.

Key Items From 2008/09

- Two FIA projects (Forest Investment Account - <https://www.fialicensees.com>) were presented at PAG meetings:
 - Riparian Sensitive Species
 - Public Survey
- A new CSA standard was released (CSA Z809-08) (Canfor/BCTS will be presenting the new CSA standard at a future PAG meeting)
- Andy Motherwell, a long-serving member of the PAG, resigned to pursue other interests.
- L & M Lumber Ltd. (Sinclair Group) announced their decision to leave the Licensee Team and remove themselves from the SFM Plan.
- The Licensee Team identified in the Annual Report where the PAG needs to review targets and variance in light of only 2 Licensee Team representatives now providing SFMP data.

7. 2009/2010 Licensee Team Priorities

The LT presented their SFM Plan Implementation Priorities for 2009/10. The objective for the priorities document is: *To review ongoing projects, pending indicators, audit findings, continuous improvement matrix and other information in order to efficiently allocate time and resources to projects with the highest risk of impacting the SFMP commitments and certification.* This document will be updated by the LT and reviewed with the PAG periodically.

Priority Rankings are as follows:

1. Major Non-conformances
2. Minor Non-conformances and System Weaknesses
3. Pending Indicators
4. SFM Plan Maintenance
5. Continuous Improvement Matrix
6. Opportunities for Improvement (Audit Findings)
7. Other

Outstanding projects or actions include:

1. Major Non-conformances - None
2. Minor Non-conformances and System Weaknesses
 - a. Canfor/BCTS KPMG MNC - lack of continuous improvement in the SFMP.
 - b. Canfor/BCTS KPMG MNC – 8 measures that are “in progress” or “pending”.
3. Pending Indicators
 - a. See 2b above – must address these pending indicators by March 2010.
4. SFM Plan Maintenance/Core Projects
 - a. Annual Report
 - b. Evaluation of cost effectiveness and efficiency in implementation and monitoring
 - c. SFMP new draft for March 2010
 - d. Transition plan to the new CSA Z809 - 08 standard
5. Continuous Improvement Matrix (see CI Matrix)
 - a. Vanderhoof DFA SFMP currently does not maintain a CI Matrix – We will discuss this on December 10th. Should we start and maintain this type of document.
6. Opportunities for Improvement (Audit Findings) - None
7. Other
 - a. Carbon (Canfor External audit)
 - b. Government Actions

PAG expressed concern that the process is not addressing continuous improvement (echoes minor non-conformance from audit). Licensees responded that creating this prioritization list is the result of that minor non-conformance. Jim McCormack stated that the Morice TSA's SFM plan is updated annually. The Vanderhoof SFM plan was originally structured using the Slocan SFM framework. This framework is not common with other SFMP's. The LT will revise the Vanderhoof SFMP to align directly to CSA framework. This will be completed by the end of fiscal (March 31, 2010).

8. Terms of Reference/Satisfaction Survey – Bruce Middleton

The LT reviewed the Terms of Reference with the PAG and recommended the following revisions:

Section 1.2 Licensee Team

- Delete references to Lakeland Mills Ltd. And L & M Lumber Ltd.

Section 1.5 Linkage of Public Advisory Group with the Community Natural Resources Committee

- Delete Section 1.5, as Community Natural Resources Committee no longer exists

Section 3.2 Role of Licensee Team

- Section 3.2.c, replace “*outstanding parking lot items or*” with “*continuous improvement items*”

PAG member asked about including alternates if they are not able to make a meeting. PAG members want to make sure that all interest groups are represented, but do not want to have people who are not knowledgeable. PAG recommendation that this should be included in the Terms of Reference.

Section 3.1.3 Role of PAG Members

- Revise 3.1.3 to read:

The role of PAG members is to:

- a. Provide input related to the Defined Goals (defined in Section 2).

- b. Attend meetings regularly having reviewed meeting materials prior to meeting.
- c. Assume responsibility towards reaching consensus on recommendations to the Licensee Team
- d. *Inform her/his alternate and the facilitator if unable to attend a PAG meeting. and*
- h. *Ensure that the alternate is informed, up-to-date and prepared prior to the alternate participating in a PAG meeting. This includes providing the alternate with a past meeting summary in a timely, effective fashion.*

Based on consultation with the PAG, members may be replaced and/or removed if more than two consecutive meetings are missed without a valid reason (i.e. Absent with regrets) *and without notifying his/her alternate* and a Licensee Team representative if they cannot attend a meeting. It is recognized that PAG members may miss some meetings due to the nature of their work or other activities. If a member is unable to attend a particular PAG meeting, he/she is encouraged to provide input for discussion about an agenda item to the PAG, or *his/her alternate*, before the meeting.

- Add Section 3.1.4 as follows:

Role of PAG Alternates

An alternate may be appointed for each PAG member. The role of the PAG alternate is to:

- a) Attend PAG meetings on behalf of the member. When doing so, the alternate agrees to work according to the Terms of Reference; and
- b) When attending on behalf of the member, come informed, up-to-date, and prepared for discussions based on briefings by the member.

The alternate and member may both attend the same PAG meeting but only the member will participate. When both the member and alternate are in attendance, the alternate may participate in discussions, with agreement by the group or the Licensee Team, but may not take part in reaching consensus or decision-making by the PAG.

PAG consensus on recommended changes to the Vanderhoof *Terms of Reference* as noted above

Break for Dinner at 5:28 pm

9. SFMP Proposed Plan Changes – Janine Gervais

Reviewed handout “*Vanderhoof SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Measures, November 16, 2009*”

1. General Changes to the Plan

- a. **Layout and Numbering of the plan** - Remove all the duplicate measure statements that currently exist within the plan. Change the layout to having CSA elements listed under each indicator statement in the Plan. Update the Indicator numbering.
- b. **Function of the plan** - Change the overall look and appearance of the plan to follow the CSA standard (VOIT – Values, Objectives, Indicators, Targets) rather than use the old Slocan format (measures).
- c. **Principles of Plan changes:**
 - i. Complexity of measures has lead to uncertainty and pending issues – must make this SFM plan manageable. To date, it has been difficult to make SFM plan changes. We need to

consider the landscape condition, and ensure we have core indicators/measures that are relevant and can be reasonably implemented;

ii. Minor non - conformances (MNC) must be addressed:

- Measures must not be continuously 'in progress'
- Continuous Improvement (CI) is lacking, develop a CI Matrix in order to track and monitor ideas and concepts for potential improvement projects/measures. If we can't address now move to CI Matrix until such time as science, methodology and economic feasibility allow. LT will manage schedule of implementation.
- Will be moving to CSA Z809 - 08 standard soon and therefore, these changes should compliment this transition.
- Cost is critical, FIA dollars decreasing and may not be available in coming years. Resources are limited.
- Must republish the SFMP Version 3.0 - March 2010

2. Specific Changes to Measures

a. **Measure 2-1.2 – Landslides**

- i. Existing Measure Statement: Number of hectares of landslides resulting from forestry practices. Target: Landslide area < 20 cumulative hectares annually across the DFA. Variance: +2 ha.
- ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the plan.
- iii. Discussion
 - LT Comments: The LT has examined data on landslide occurrence within the DFA and there is little to no history of landslide events resulting from forestry practices. Terrain Stability Assessments are legally required where evidence of slope instability. This indicator is not providing value to the process, given that the DFA is generally considered flat (0.2 ha reported in 2006 - 07).
- iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the plan.

b. **Measure 2-4.1 – Research Plots**

- i. Existing Measure Statement: The percentage of active research plots protected from harvesting and silviculture activities. Target: 100% of established, active research plots protected from harvesting & silviculture activities. Variance: 10%
- ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the plan.
- iii. Discussion
 - LT Comments: The LT does not see any current value to this measure. Research Plots are now protected under legislation from harvesting and silviculture activities and MOFR does not accept status conflicts when issuing harvest authorities. This measure was developed prior to the aforementioned procedures being established.

iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the plan.

c. Measure 3-1.1 Total Forested Land and Measure 3-1.2 Water Bodies

i. Existing Measure Statement:

Existing Measure Statement: <i>The percent area change of total forested land.</i>	Target: 0% area change of total forested land	Variance: +/-2%
Existing Measure Statement: <i>The percent area change of water bodies.</i>	Target: 0% area change of water bodies	Variance: +/-2%

ii. LT Recommendation: Remove these measures from the Plan.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: These measures are Timber Supply Review dependant outcomes and completely out of the control of the LT. There is no relevance in reporting, or monitoring these measures. The LT has the ability to change the amount of forested land through creation of permanent access (i.e. roads, landings) which is reported out under measure 1 - 2.14. Timber Supply Review will be provided to all PAG members through documentation of Public Review and summary of AAC determination. The LT does not see any current value to this measure. Research Plots are now protected under legislation from harvesting and silviculture activities and MOFR does not accept status conflicts when issuing harvest authorities. This measure was developed prior to the aforementioned procedures being established.

iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove these measures from the Plan.

d. Measure 3-2.1 Carbon Monitoring

i. Existing Measure Statement: Carbon Monitoring Plan is developed and implemented for forest ecosystem biomass and carbon pools. Target: Develop and implement a Carbon Monitoring Plan by Dec 31, 2009. Variance: + 3 months

ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP and replace it with indirect measures that form the basis of a Carbon Plan for the DFA and its landscape condition. Consider updating with a Carbon Monitoring Plan once adequately researched, developed and deemed operationally and economically feasible to implement.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: The LT underestimated the scope of developing a Carbon Monitoring Plan for the DFA. Although BCTS is working on Provincial Government initiatives related to carbon storage/sequestration and Canfor through FIA is working on defining a set of corporate Carbon related indicators, the development of a Carbon Monitoring Plan for the DFA is still some time off. Given the landscape condition of the DFA and the salvage / reforestation efforts by the LT, indirect measures of carbon uptake and storage will be sufficient to demonstrate a Carbon Plan for the DFA. Current measures relating to

Regeneration Delay, Free Growing achievement, % Permanent Access, and the salvage of dead pine types will form the basis of this revised measure.

- iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP and replace it with indirect measures as discussed above.
- e. Measure 4-1.2 and 4-4.2 Total Projected Long Term Timber Supply**
 - i. Existing Measure Statement: Total Projected Timber Supply (m3/ha). Target: 2,570,000 m3/yr. Variance: +/-257,000 m3/year
 - ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP.
 - iii. Discussion
 - LT Comments: The LT has no control over this measure, nor does it determine the projected harvest level. The LT can and does report out the volume harvested within the DFA, but projected timber supply is not something that we can or should be measured on.
 - iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP.
- f. Measure 4-5.1, 9-4.3 Defined Forest Area (DFA) Managed under an Emergency Response Plan**
 - i. Existing Measure Statement: The percent of operating area managed under an Emergency Response Plan. (4,9). Target: 100% Annually. Variance: -5%
 - ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP.
 - iii. Discussion
 - LT Comments: This ERP is something that all members of the LT must complete under their Environmental Management System (mandatory component of ISO certification). The LT will define this process and add the relevant information to the front section of the SFMP rather than report this as a specific measure.
 - iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP.
- g. Measure 9-4.1 Number of Forestry Management Lost Time Accidents**
 - i. Existing Measure Statement: The number of company related forestry management operation accidents each year. (Lost Time Accidents -LTA). Target: 0 LTA. Variance: +/-2 LTA.
 - ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP.
 - iii. Discussion
 - LT Comments: Licensees and BCTS have all moved to Safe Certification according to the Industry Standard on safety. Safety is simply a policy within the CSA Standard and as such we would like to remove this as a measure and add a section to the front of the SFMP describing Safe Certification. The Safe Certification program contains its own set of development, implementation, and auditing procedures. LT would like to reference this program, but not report out on this within the SFMP.

iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP

h. Measure 9-4.2 Forest Road Inspections that meet a Defined Safety Standard

i. Existing Measure Statement: The percent of road inspections meeting defined safety standards. Target: Annually maintain 100% of road inspections that meet defined safety standards. Variance: -2%.

ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: Licensees and BCTS have an increasing focus on INDUSTRY ROAD SAFETY STANDARDS. All roads are inspected prior to industrial traffic and upgrades (bridges, brushing, pullouts, etc.) are carried out. LT representatives sit on a District Road Safety Committee whereby these road safety standards are better defined. This information should be part of a section in the introductory section of the SFMP similar to that of the Safe Certification.
- PAG comments: PAG member noted that road standards have improved greatly in last 5 yrs, but that some roads are deactivated to the point where they are hugely hazardous to the public. PAG member wants some assurance that there is some other area where this is addressed. Trappers have a tenure on the land (i.e. trails existed before roads were put in) that have been in place long before the licensees were given access. PAG member requested assurance that deactivation of roads and public safety will be looked at later

iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP.

i. Measure 5-1.5, 9-3.1 Site Plans with Cultural Heritage Features;

Measure 5-1.7 Site Plans with Range Resources;

Measure 5-1.9 Site Plans with Riparian Values;

Measure 5-1.11, 9-2.1 Site Plans with Scenic Areas that meet VQO's

i. Existing Measure Statement:

Existing Measure Statement: <i>The percent of Site Plans conserving unique or significant identified cultural features.</i>	Target: 100% of SP's conserve unique or significant cultural features when they are identified	Variance: 0%
Existing Measure Statement: <i>The percent of Site Plans conserving range resources for those areas that have identified range resources.</i>	Target: 100% of SP's conserve range resources for those areas with identified range resources	Variance: 0%

Existing Measure Statement: <i>The percent of Site Plans conserving riparian values for those areas that have identified riparian values.</i>	Target: 100% of SP's conserve riparian values for those areas with riparian management areas	Variance: 0%
Existing Measure Statement: <i>The percent of Site Plans within a Scenic Area that meet Visual Quality Objectives.</i>	Target: 100% of SP's conserve scenic values for those areas within	Variance: 0%

ii. LT Recommendation: Remove these four measures. These are covered off by four measures describing the actual results.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: These 4 measures are duplicated within the SFMP. Each measure contains a reference to the preparation and identification of a feature, or resource within the Site Plan, the legally required plan prepared prior to development. This is being reported out as one number – block harvested during the reporting period and the blocks consistent with the site plan whereby a resource feature or value is identified. These are Results-based measures and as such should speak to the result not the identification of a feature within a plan.
- The four measures describing the actual results are as follows:
 - 5-1.6,9-3.2 The percentage of forest management operations consistent with the conservation of unique or significant identified cultural features
 - 5-1.8 The percentage of forest management operations consistent with the conservation of range resources identified in Site Plans.
 - 5-1.10 The percentage of forest management operations consistent with the conservation of riparian values identified in the Site Plan.
 - 5-1.12, 9-2.2 The percentage of forest management operations which are consistent with the conservation of Visual Quality Objectives identified in the Site Plan
- Page 15 of the 2008-09 SFMP Annual Report shows these 4 measures all on one page for comparison.
- PAG member has issues with the existing wording of *Measure 5-1.12, 9-2.2 The percentage of forest management operations which are consistent with the conservation of Visual Quality Objectives identified in the Site Plan* in that it has the potential to cause a loophole when reporting management performance with respect to Site Plans.
- LT clarified that they do not have the ability to set their own VQO's.
- PAG member is concerned that the approved Site Plan would not meet VQO's.
- PAG recommends revising the wording of *Measure 5-1.12, 9-2.2 The percentage of forest management operations which are consistent with the conservation of Visual Quality Objectives identified in the Site Plan* to the following:
 - *Measure 5-1.12, 9-2.2 The percentage of forest management operations which are consistent with the conservation of Visual Quality Objectives identified in the Site Plan*

- The LT recommends revising the wording of *Management Objective - Annually, sustain 100% consistency between forest management operations and the strategies identified in the Site Plan to conserve Visual Quality Objectives. (-5% variance)* to the following:
 - *Annually, sustain 100% consistency between forest management operations and the strategies to conserve Visual Quality Objectives. (-5% variance)*

iv. PAG consensus on revised indicator statement and management objective.

v. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove the following measures from the SFMP:

- Measure 5-1.5, 9-3.1 Site Plans with Cultural Heritage Features;
- Measure 5-1.7 Site Plans with Range Resources;
- Measure 5-1.9 Site Plans with Riparian Values; and,
- Measure 5-1.11, 9-2.1 Site Plans with Scenic Areas that meet VQO's

j. Measure 1-2.1, 5-1.2 Snags and Live Trees Retained in Managed Areas

i. Existing Measure Statement: Number of snags and / or live trees per hectare over a prescribed area. Target: Avg > 8 snags and/or live trees/ha post harvest. Avg > 4 snags and/or live trees/ha at FG. Variance: -2 snag/live trees/ha. -1 snag/live trees/ha.

ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: This is addressed through % stand level retention. Original intention of this indicator was to measure dispersed retention, which was not practical given the landscape condition & high incidence of wind throw in single tree retention. The LT is currently using VRI as a surrogate to report out on this measure and this is continuously telling us that we have an abundance of snags in WTPs. Significant amount of research would be needed to determine actual value, given that landscape & stand level retention will have much higher level of dead snag retention than historical natural range of variability. Single tree retention of non-pine species may, in some instances, result in undesirable forest health consequences.
- PAG concern with the removal of this measure and would rather see it reworded. The original intent of the measure was to record the number of Snags separately and not lumped in with Large Live Trees. Snags are important on their own because of wildlife habitat and wind barrier. Also, size requirements are missing in this measure. PAG felt that this indicator would add value if the operational problem of blowdown can be addressed, but not sure of the solution. It was suggested that the best wildlife habitat is found in 30-40 year old fire-origin stands and in cut blocks harvested in the 1960's (left lots of debris).
- PAG suggested that it may be an issue to deal with this item due to operational cost restrictions. The LT said this is not the case – it is simply looking at whether this activity is adding value.
- The PAG also expressed concern with the suggestion of an “abundance of WTP's” because they are not dispersed over the block evenly.
- The LT suggested that this measure be removed from the SFM Plan and moved to the Continual Improvement (CI) Matrix as it is of high importance.

- PAG suggested that licensees work with PAG members on rewording this measure in draft and then bring back to the PAG as a whole for further discussion.

Action #1: LT will add “Snags and Live Trees Retained in Managed Areas” to the CI Matrix.

- iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP and place it on the CI matrix.

k. Measure 1-2.4 Proportion of Shrub Habitat by NDU

- i. Existing Measure Statement: The proportion of shrub habitat (%) by Natural Disturbance Unit. Target: Sustain > 5.7% shrub cover by NDU. Variance: 0.5%.

- ii. LT Recommendation: Remove this measure from the SFMP.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: Given that the percentage of shrub habitat is dictated early seral conditions, and the DFA has been severely impacted by MPB, this measure is not meaningful, even if measured periodically. The abundance of shrub habitat is in effect, the results of the MPB epidemic.
- PAG concern with the removal of this measure and would rather see it reworded.
- The LT suggested that this measure be removed from the SFM Plan and moved to the Continual Improvement (CI) Matrix

Action #2: LT will add “The Proportion of Shrub Habitat by NDU” to the CI Matrix.

- iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP and place it on the CI matrix.

l. Measure 1-2.5 Deciduous Tree Species

- i. Existing Measure Statement: The proportion of deciduous species (%) by Natural Disturbance Unit. Target: Sustain > 4.9% deciduous species by NDU. Variance: -0.5%.

- ii. LT Recommendation: Remove and revisit at such time that markets warrants harvest of Deciduous stand types.

iii. Discussion

- LT Comments: This is not a meaningful measure, given that LT does not currently harvest Deciduous stand types.
- PAG concern with the removal of this measure and would rather see it reworded.
- The LT suggested that this measure be removed from the SFM Plan and moved to the Continual Improvement (CI) Matrix

Action #3: LT will add “The Proportion of Deciduous Species by NDU” to the CI Matrix.

- iv. PAG consensus on LT recommendation to remove this measure from the SFMP and place it on the CI matrix.

m. The LT will continue with the review of the “*Vanderhoof SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Measures*” at the next meeting

10. Feedback on tonight's meeting:

- PAG members pleased with meeting (“got lots done”).
- Disappointment with the number of PAG members in attendance.
- PAG member asked about consensus and what would happen if there wasn't agreement – Dwight reviewed applicable areas in the Terms of Reference on “Dispute Resolution Mechanism”.

11 Next Meeting: Thursday, February 4, 2010

Meeting Adjourned 8:06 pm