

**Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group
April 28, 2011 Meeting
Birch Room, Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Vanderhoof**

In Attendance

Public

Dan Brooks	Ginny Springer
Randy Springer	Ron Stephen
Gerd Erasmus	Craig Frank
Ed Domhof	

Licensee Team

Ralph Hausot	Sara Lazaruk
--------------	--------------

Facilitation and Support

Dwight Scott Wolfe	Loni Spletzer
--------------------	---------------

Observers

Cathy Middleton – MFL&NRO	Jim McCormack- SFMP Coordinator, Canfor
---------------------------	--

Guests

Absent with Regrets

John DeGagne	Ray Brandner
George LaBrash	

Documents Distributed

- Draft Agenda for Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) Public Advisory Group Meeting
- Draft Minutes of Vanderhoof SFMP Public Advisory Group Meeting from March 24, 2011

1. Welcome and Introductions (Sara Lazaruk)

The meeting commenced at 4 pm.

2. Agenda, Meeting Summary and Action Items Review

1. Reviewed Agenda
 - Other: Add “Lengthening Meeting times – add 30-60 minutes to meetings either by starting earlier or staying later?”
 - accepted as revised.
2. Reviewed Minutes of the meeting from March 24, 2011
 - add Indicator number to last Action Item on Action Item Table (ex. “include the details of Best Management Practices for CWD in the SFM Plan for *Indicator # 3.1.2*”)
 - In the future, an Action Item Table will be included with the meeting minutes.
3. Reviewed Meeting Evaluation Results – average score 4.1/5, reviewed comments.

3. Reviewed Action Items from March 24, 2011 – Ralph Hausot, Sara Lazaruk

1. Action #03-24-11-1: Include the details of Best Management Practices for CWD in the SFM Plan for Indicator # 3.1.2. Due: Next Revision of SFM Plan

4. Element 2.2: Forest Ecosystem Productivity, Core Indicator 2.2.1 Additions and Deletions to the Forest Area

1. Ralph Hausot provided a background presentation on Additions and Deletions to the Forest Area.

- Reviewed Criterion, Element, Value and Objective
- This Core Indicator also relates to Element 4.2 Forest Land Conversion
- Reviewed definition of Gross Forested Landbase (GFLB) and what is included. GFLB does not include private land, reserve land or water bodies.
- Reviewed Rationale for revising this indicator:
 - i. Some Roads for forest activities are built outside the Timber Harvesting Land Base (THLB) (e.g. riparian reserve, low productivity sites, deciduous stands, alpine, etc.)
 - ii. Certification applies to the GFLB, not just THLB.
 - iii. Reflect changes to the DFA (i.e. Licensee partners); going from the entire District to just BCTS & Canfor Operating Areas.

2. Current Indicator #19: The percentage of area within the THLB of the DFA in permanent access. Target: Sustain < 4.2 % of area within the THLB of the DFA in permanent access. Reported every 5 years. Variance: +1%.

3. Proposed Indicator Statement: Percentage of **gross forested landbase** in the DFA converted to non-forested land use through forest management activities” Target: Less than 3.3% of GFLB in the DFA. Measured every 5 years. Variance: 0.5%,

4. Discussion:

- PAG member asked about the inclusion of gravel pits, landings, roads.
- PAG member feels that this is a road density calculation. LT said it is measurement of area of roads. PAG member noted that 7 million cubic meters of wood is lost for roads! Would like to know what the trend is compared to 2003 and 2007. LT will dig up these statistics from earlier monitoring reports. LT explained that it will get to a maximum and then as roads are deactivated and fall out of permanent access there will be a balance with the area of new roads built. PAG member feels that target deserves better scrutiny and wonders if 3.3 % accurately reflects what the goal should be.
- LT explained that the previous target of 4.2 % of the THLB was approved by the PAG and the new target is a smaller percentage than what was previously reported on the THLB. PAG member responded that the previous target was agreed to but is still not ideal.
- PAG member concerned that if the trend exceeds the target, then the target will simply be changed to meet the target rather than managing the trend.

Action Item #1: LT to provide actual numbers for Indicator # 19 from earlier monitoring reports. Due: Next Meeting.

- PAG member would like to see how the percentage of 3.3% was arrived at. Would like to see this in a very transparent manner. Is there an existing target for functionally non-roaded areas? LT stated that this subject will be addressed with Core Indicator 5.1.1 Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services produced in the DFA.
- PAG member asked about summer versus winter roads in the calculation. LT responded they are both added to the final number.
- PAG member concerned about public access on de-activated roads rather than percentages. LT responded that this subject will be discussed at a future meeting.
- PAG member concerned about destructive effects of new roads on other tenure holders. Also feels that a desirable target percentage should be further scrutinized – how much is too much? At what point do the numbers become detrimental? Does the math take into consideration guiders/trappers, etc? Perhaps the numbers should include other values instead of just timber harvesting goals.
- LT responded that the current numbers work within government legal requirements (max 7%). PAG member would like to know how government arrived at provincial statistics.
- PAG member feels that variance should be 0.25%. LT agreed that this is fine.

5. PAG consensus on revised proposed indicator: Percentage of gross forested landbase in the DFA converted to non-forested land use through forest management activities. Target: Less than 3.3% of GFLB in the DFA. Measured every 5 years. Variance: 0.25%.

5. Rural Economic and Community Development – Dr. Greg Halseth (via speakerphone)

1. Dr. Halseth presented a talk (via conference phone) on Rural and Small Town Community Development.

2. Dr. Halseth's contact information can be found at <http://www.unbc.ca/geography/faculty/halseth>.

3. Highlights:

- The Presenter prefaced his talk by stating that on the topic of Community Social and Economic Renewal the goal is to look for a broad platform of community and economic infrastructure, there is no silver bullet.
- Background: (how we came to be economically)
 - i. Canada and BC is a “staples economy with beginnings in fur, fish, and later coal, oil and gas, perhaps water in the future. Raw material is harvested and value-added is done someplace else. We are highly dependent on and dominated by export markets. There are limits: tremendous dependence on external capital. We are pigeon-holed into production of raw materials that are exported. This is truncated development. We are dependent on others needing our raw resources. Also, most administration and policy makers are external to the local region.
 - ii. Today 70% of export wealth is from forestry, energy, minerals and other raw materials.
- There is fierce competition among small towns for resource suppliers.
- Over the last 50 years, the province of BC has a history of moving to a moderate industrial society:

- i. In the W.A.C. Bennett era there was lots of change to government policies (school districts, BC Rail line through to the northern part of the province, etc).
 - ii. The three goals in this era were: 1) stable revenues to the Province, 2) provide collateral (in the form of long term resource tenures) to business to invest in buildings and infrastructure (ie. Pulp mills, and, 3) find many ways to recirculate wealth within communities.
 - iii. Example of Mackenzie: a planned town with massive public sector investment.
 - iv. As a result, small towns have become very focused as single-industry towns – hard to move this “titanic” in a different direction when everything (skilled labour etc) is all tied into one industry. Example of historic “view” of one’s town from former years ex. Prince Rupert “we are a fishing town” when in reality it is now a pulp and paper town.
- Rural BC populations are declining according to last 3 census reports.
 - Small resource sector value-added businesses are able to carve out niche markets despite the lack of government incentives and limited access to wood supply. (e.g. Scana windows used to supply pine book shelves to Ikea.).
 - Current Question: “Are we getting all our wealth out of the forest sector to help future generations?”
 - i. Access to wood and access to waste (pellet industry) – bulk of workforce is over 55. There is a tremendous skill base that will be lost if there is no advance preparation. Must have skilled workforce to be competitive in world market
 - Must investigate all the resources in each community. Forestry may not be all about logs, but about chemistry, and other aspects of the forest which can be economically beneficial. Job growth is in value-added and specializing, but even this presents challenges and obstacles for those trying to be entrepreneurs. Purchasing departments are generally not local anymore but in larger centres and their purchasing habits have changed – they will look at larger sources for supplies that they can buy cheaper.

4. Discussion:

- PAG member stated that the future lies in what is already here not looking to high tech solutions or the goals that other countries have for BC.
- PAG member asked about viable small industries that could work for the future: Presenter suggested pellet plants, custom tree harvesting (e.g. McBride businessman removes stumps and sandblasts them into tables). The Presenter also suggested botanicals and medicinal potentials that come from plant life.
- PAG member stated that hunting is a very high player when compared to agriculture but is not subsidized by government and in fact is squelched by single issues instead of being promoted. Presenter added that sports fishing and guiding etc are under the radar also and there is huge potential in these areas that is currently untapped.
- PAG member asked how Vanderhoof (and Canfor) is going to shift towards diversification so that other values become more of a reality and there can be significant impact on changing policy around logging and forestry industry to move to value-added.

6. Element 5.2 Communities and Sustainability, Core Indicator 5.2.1: Level of investment in initiatives that contribute to Community Stability

1. Sara Lazaruk provided a background presentation on Level of investment in initiatives that contribute to Community Stability.

- Reviewed Criterion, Element, Value and Objective
- Reviewed Mandatory Discussion Items:
 - i. Benefits for local communities and Aboriginal Peoples (cultural, spiritual, economic, health, etc)
 - ii. Fair distribution of benefits and costs
 - iii. Proportion of goods and services sourced from local communities (to the extent that they are available and reasonably cost-competitive)
- Reviewed Rationale for revising this indicator:
 - i. Previously North Central Interior, now Vanderhoof specific data,
 - ii. Local data more meaningful
 - iii. Using baseline data we can show increases or decreases over time
 - iv. Setting a target using a 5 year rolling average allows for fluctuations
 - v. The variance allows for fluctuations, is required for a smaller target and accommodates BCTS contracting rules.

2. Current Indicator #26: Money Spent in DFA: The percent of money spent on DFA forest management activities, provided from the northern central interior suppliers (stumpage not included). Target: > 80% of the expenditures on forest operations & management in the DFA are attributable to North Central Interior suppliers.. Variance: -5%.

3. Proposed Indicator Statement: Investment in local communities, Target: % of dollars spent in local communities against baseline, Variance +/- 20%

4. Discussion:

- PAG member asked if there is an advantage for local bidders. PAG member would like to know if tracking these numbers will result in proactively supporting the growth of this community? LT responded that they cannot change government policy, but this indicator is supplying information (not to build strategies around rewarding a local contractor).
- Canfor tries to hire as many local contracts as possible.
- PAG member wonders if again we should be setting a target not based on what the numbers are showing now, but shoot for a higher target like 80%.
- PAG member feels 5 year rolling average is meaningless, because the target changes and then the goal is reset to meet. It is more meaningful to have an annual target so that it is revisited every year.
- LT will look at percentage for target (currently is at 50%). Adjust variance or change rolling average. LT has no control over fluctuations.

- PAG member said in light of Greg Halseth presentation, there must be provision for incentive for local business or there is upside for change.
- PAG suggested changing target to 55% and proposed variance to -10%. PAG requests that the annual report explain the root cause for why target is not met.
- PAG member would like to see more accurate targets and lower variances. LT responded that Variances are “abnormality normally triggers”.

5. PAG consensus on revised proposed indicator: Investment in local communities, Target: 55% of dollars spent in local communities. Variance - 10%

7. Element 6.3: Forest Community Well-being and Resilience, Core Indicator: 6.3.2 Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities and Core Indicator: 6.3.3 Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented is periodically reviewed and improved.

1. Ralph Hausot provided a background presentation on Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities and Core Indicator: 6.3.3 Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented is periodically reviewed and improved.

- Reviewed Criterion, Element, Value and Objective
- BCTS and Canfor’s first measure of success is the health and safety of our people. This philosophy is embraced and promoted from the mill floor to the executive offices. This commitment is reflected in the work practices and safety programs employed at all worksites.
- This is a new indicator in the SFM Plan and will require PAG endorsement of a new Value Statement and a new Objective Statement along with the Indicator and Target. LT recommends using the following:
 - i. Value Statement: Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.
 - ii. Objective Statement: Forest management planning adequately reflects the interest and issues raised by the public in the DFA through an effective public participation process.
- Reviewed Rationale for revising this indicator:
 - i. Proposed Indicator, Target & Variance consistent with industry, licensees & government direction to continually improve safety for forest-related workers.
 - ii. Consistent with the CSA 08 Standard for Element 6.3
 - iii. Both BCTS & Canfor achieved Safe Company Certification in 2009, with the BCFSC

2. Proposed Indicator Statement: Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.

3. Discussion:

- PAG members felt that this indicator was meaningful.

4. PAG consensus on proposed new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements for Core Indicators 6.3.2 and 6.3.3.:

- Value Statement: Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.
- Objective Statement: Forest management planning adequately reflects the interest and issues raised by the public in the DFA through an effective public participation process.
- Core Indicator 6.3.2 and 6.3.3: Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.

8. Element 5.2: Communities and Sustainability, Core Indicator 5.2.2 Level of investment in training and skills development

1. Sara Lazaruk provided a background presentation on Level of investment in training and skills development.

- Reviewed Criterion, Element, Value and Objective
- Discussed that objective from old plan may not fit here and LT is open to suggestions.
- This is a new indicator in the SFM Plan and will require PAG endorsement of a new Value Statement and a new Objective Statement along with the Indicator and Target. LT recommends using the following:
 - i. Value Statement: Forest management contributes to a diversified local economy.
 - ii. Objective Statement: Forest management planning adequately reflects the interest and issues raised by the public in the DFA through an effective public participation process.
- Reviewed Rationale for revising this indicator:
 - i. Proposed Indicator, Target & Variance consistent with industry, licensees & government direction to continually improve safety for forest-related workers.
 - ii. Consistent with the CSA 08 Standard for Element 6.3
 - iii. Variance required for new staff and exemptions for Mapping contracts

2. Proposed Indicator Statement: Training in environmental and safety procedures in compliance with company training plans, Target: 100% of company employees and contractors will have both environmental & safety training. Variance: 5%.

3. Discussion:

- The LT noted that both Canfor and BCTS have developed and implemented a comprehensive Safety and Environment Training Matrix in each organization.
- PAG member requests that future slides be at readable magnification!
- PAG member asked about Apprenticeships within a company. LT stated that these may be tracked through HR departments. LT stated these are not measured in this indicator

Action Item #2: LT to report back on how Apprenticeships are tracked. Due: Next Meeting

- PAG member stated that Apprenticeships perhaps could be considered as part of this Indicator instead of just safety/environmental training.

Action Item #3: LT to provide a complete list of training (environmental and safety) from Canfor and BCTS.
Due: Next meeting.

4. PAG consensus on proposed new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements for Core Indicator 5.2.2:

- Value Statement: Forest management contributes to a diversified local economy.
- Objective Statement: Forest management planning adequately reflects the interest and issues raised by the public in the DFA through an effective public participation process.
- Core Indicator 5.2.2: Training in environmental and safety procedures in compliance with company training plans, Target: 100% of company employees and contractors will have both environmental & safety training. Variance: 5%.

9. Other:

1. Meeting Duration

- PAG agreed to meet from 4PM to 9PM for the next meeting.
- PAG member suggested that materials for access management be distributed ahead of the meeting and perhaps a guest speaker could be brought in for a presentation on current access management subject matter.

9. PAG Meeting Evaluation Survey Distributed

10. Next Meeting: Thursday June 23, 2011 4 - 9 pm

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, District Office (Birch Room), 1522 Highway 16, Vanderhoof, B.C.

Meeting adjourned at 8 pm.

Action Items

	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
12-09-11-1	Review suite of Core Indicators and identify those that could address the following habitat elements (rejuvenating riparian zones, deciduous seral stages, coarse woody debris and standing snags).	LT	Next Meeting	Completed
12-09-11-2	Provide reforestation options for discussion with the PAG that are legal yet still offer some flexibility in regeneration delay and stocking standards.	LT	Next Meeting	Completed
03-24-11-1	Include the details of Best Management Practices for CWD in the SFM Plan.	LT	Next Revision of SFM Plan	
04-28-11-1	Provide actual numbers for Indicator # 19 from earlier monitoring reports.	LT	Next Meeting	
04-28-11-2	Report back on how Apprenticeships are tracked.	LT	Next Meeting	
04-28-11-2	Provide a complete list of training (environmental and safety) from Canfor and BCTS.	LT	Next Meeting	