



Fort St. James
Sustainable Forest
Management

Public Advisory Group

PAG Meeting

August 29, 2011 [5:00 PM – 9:00 PM]

Forest District Office, Fort St. James

Meeting Summary

Attendance:

<p><i>Public Advisory Group:</i></p> <p>Beulah Broen Peter Rooke Bob Frederick Joe Vogl Henner Grimm Joanne Vinnedge Bryan Muloin</p>	<p><i>Steering Committee & Advisors:</i></p> <p>Greg Yeomans – Canfor PG Sara Lazaruk – BCTS Jim McCormack- SFMP Coordinator - Canfor</p>
<p><i>Facilitator & Scribe:</i></p> <p>Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) – Facilitator Loni Spletzer - Scribe</p>	<p><i>Observers:</i></p>

Quorum based on past five meetings: 4

1) Welcome & Introduction

- a) Members signed in
- b) Welcome by the Chair of the Licensee Team (Greg Yeomans)
- c) Introduction of PAG members

2) Reviewed Agenda

- a) Agenda accepted as revised: change to Agenda item #8, add 1.4.2 Protection of Identified Sites

3) Reviewed Minutes of the July 11, 2011 Ft. St. James PAG meeting

- a) Accepted as written

4) Reviewed Evaluation Results of July 11, 2011 PAG meeting

- a) On or above the targets (min 4.0) for all evaluation points except the following:
 - i) Meeting and PAG Process A1. 3.9
 - ii) Meeting and PAG Process A3. 3.8
 - iii) Meeting and PAG Process A6. 3.4
 - iv) Meeting and PAG Process A7 3.9
 - v) Meeting and PAG Process A11. 3.9
 - vi) Meeting and PAG Process A12 3.7
 - vii) Meeting Logistics C20: 3.9

A. Meeting and PAG Process:

1. I have a good understanding of the purpose of the PAG and my role as part of that group.
2. Information provided in advance of meetings allows me to effectively contribute at meeting.
3. The meeting agenda is reviewed prior to the meeting and followed
4. The meeting minutes capture important aspects of the meeting including actions, progress updates, and any decisions.
5. Communication with PAG members between meetings is adequate.
6. Licensees' share new information with PAG members regarding impacts to the environment, sustainability, forestry, etc.
7. The PAG Terms of reference are followed.
8. Were most PAG members involved in meeting?
9. Was there a positive atmosphere for the meeting?
10. Was information presented clearly at the meeting?
11. What is your overall satisfaction with the PAG process?
12. Ex-officio, licensee, or technical team members were organized and prepared for meeting.

B. PAG Meeting Facilitation:

13. PAG meeting facilitator was organized and prepared.
14. PAG meeting facilitator strived for consensus decision making.
15. Facilitator actively listened to concerns and viewpoints expressed during the meeting.
16. PAG meeting facilitator addressed process issues.
17. PAG meeting facilitator remained neutral on content issues.
18. PAG meeting facilitator kept the meeting focused and moving.

C. Meeting Logistics:

19. Was the meeting location convenient?
20. Was the timing of the meeting convenient?
21. Was the meal provided for the meeting good?

5) Review Previous Actions:

- a) Mar 28-03: Request more information from Sandra Sulyma on social outreach.
 - i) The LSC had a brief meeting with Sandra and more meetings planned. Status: Ongoing.
- b) May 9-01: Meet and discuss PAG concerns of investment in local communities.
 - i) The LSC confirmed that this action will be discussed along with Criterion 6 at tonight's meeting.

6) Criterion 1 Biological Diversity: Indicator Comparison and Discussion

- a) Core Indicator 1.4.2: Protection of identified sacred and culturally important sites.
 - i) 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. LSC recommends using the following Value and Objective Statements:
 - Value Statement: Sites of Biological and Cultural Significance.
 - Objective Statement: Sites of Biological and Cultural Significance are identified and managed appropriately.
 - Proposed Core Indicator 1.4.2: % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes. Target: 100 %. Variance: 0%
 - ii) Discussion:
 - The proposed Value and Objective are slightly modified from the current Value and Objective for Element 1.4.
 - The proposed Indicator and Target are the same as Core Indicator 6.2.1, which was endorsed by the PAG on July 11, 2011.

- LSC recommends replacing Current Indicator 46:
 - (a) Percent of cutblocks and roads harvested that have incorporated information of known subsistence uses, recreational/cultural trails/sites, or spiritual sites that have been brought forward. Target 100%. Variance: 20%.
 - (b) The change is essentially an update to the wording of the indicator.
- PAG member requested clarification on the use of “special” in the matrix that is not used in the new value and objective. LSC agreed to add “special” to the Value and Objective statements.
 - (a) Value Statement: Sites of *Special* Biological and Cultural Significance.
 - (b) Objective Statement: Sites of *Special* Biological and Cultural Significance are identified and managed appropriately.
- PAG member asked about the use of the word “geological” in the descriptive text for the SFM Element and how this relates to the proposed Core Indicator. LSC noted that sites of special geological and biological significance will be addressed under Core Indicator 1.4.1. Proportion of *identified sites with implemented management strategies*.
- PAG member noted that the Variance for current indicator #40 is set at -20%. LSC explained that the new proposed indicator is more focussed and with a variance of 0% will be more restrictive.
- PAG member asked about the LSC responsibility to comply to this indicator. LSC stated that there is a legal process that still must be adhered to.
- PAG member noted the reference to “recreational sites” in the current indicator 46. PAG member doesn’t want to see this important value dropped when the indicator as a whole is replaced since this is a completely separate value. LSC state that recreation values and sites will be addressed under *Criterion 5 Economic and Social Benefits* during plan write up.

Acton Item #1: LSC to address Recreation values under Criterion 5 Economic and Social Benefits.
Due: Future meeting.

- iii) PAG consensus to replace Indicator 46 with proposed new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements:
 - Value Statement: Sites of Special Biological and Cultural Significance.
 - Objective Statement: Sites of Special Biological and Cultural Significance are identified and managed appropriately.
 - Core Indicator 1.4.2: *% of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes. Target:100 %. Variance: 0%*

7) Criterion 6 Society’s Responsibility: Indicator Comparison and Discussion

- a) Core Indicator 6.4.2 - Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general.
- i) 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. LSC recommends using the following Value and Objective Statements:
- Value Statement: Public Participation in the SFM process.
 - Objective Statement: A well designed and functioning public participation process.
 - Proposed Core Indicator: Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG. Target: ≥ 1 . Variance: 0%.
- ii) Discussion:
- The proposed Value and Objective are associated with SFM Element 6.3 in the current version of the SFM Plan.
 - LSC recommends replacing Current Indicator 63:
 - (a) Percent of PAG SFM information gap inquiries responded to within 3 months. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%
 - (b) LSC noted that a commitment to respond to information gap enquiries could be added to the Terms of Reference or use the Action Items tracking in the meeting minutes.
 - LSC noted that this indicator and target is meant to be an indicator for steady state when we have about 3 or less meetings per year. It is not intended for a year like 2011 when many more meetings are required to transition to an updated SFM standard.
 - LSC listed a number of examples of educational opportunities such as guest speaker/licensee on specific issue, tour to illustrate practice or procedure, invitations to training, etc.
 - PAG member asked about the term “capacity-development”. LSC explained that an increase in educational opportunities contributes to knowledge building for both industry and the public. PAG member sees this term differently and made point that industry should ask public what they want to know about, specific topics and so on. PAG members encouraged to make a comment on the evaluation form. PAG member noted that they are not always apprised in advance of the coming topics and would like to have input if appropriate. PAG and LT agreed that a specific section could be added to the back of the Evaluation form for future topics and ideas.
 - PAG agreed to use action items to track inquiries and questions.

Action Item #2: LSC to add comment section for future topics to evaluation form.

-

- iii) PAG consensus to replace Indicator 63 with proposed new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements:
- Value Statement: Public Participation in the SFM process.
 - Objective Statement: A well designed and functioning public participation process.
 - Core Indicator 6.4.2: *Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG. Target: ≥ 1 . Variance: 0%.*
- b) Core Indicator: 6.3.1 - Evidence that the organization has co-operated with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users, and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy.
- i) 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 Indicators and Targets. LSC recommends using the following Value and Objective Statements:
- Value Statement: Value Statement: Community well being.
 - Objective Statement: Support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community.
- ii) Proposed Core Indicator 6.3.1a: Investment in local communities. Target = Percent of dollars spent in local communities (5yr rolling average). Variance = -20%.
- This indicator is the same as Core Indicator 5.2.1 which was endorsed by the PAG at the May 9, 2011 meeting
 - Includes tenders, direct awards or annual contracts awarded to local businesses.
 - LSC recommends replacing Current Indicator 50: Percentage of bidding opportunities that are provided to qualified local forestry-based resource business. Target = 100%. Variance = 0.
- (a) LSC noted that this indicator works well for BCTS, but not so much for Canfor.
- iii) Proposed Core Indicator 6.3.1b: Effective communication with non-timber resource users and interested parties that have expressed interest in forest planning. Target = 100%. Variance = 0%.
- LSC recommends replacing Current Indicators 41, 43 ,and 44:
 - (a) Current Indicator 41: Percent of individuals who have expressed an identified interest in forest planning are communicated with. Target: Annually, 100%. Variance: -10%.
 - (b) Current Indicator 43: General notification to request expression of interest (newspaper ad). Target: Annual Notification. Variance: None.
 - (c) Current Indicator 44: Annual personal notification to every “known” non-timber licensed tenure holder. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.

- iv) Proposed Core Indicator 6.3.1c: The number of support opportunities provided in the DFA. Target 6. Variance -1.
- Types of support include: Cash donation, Product donation, Time or resource donation, Community events.
- v) Discussion:
- PAG member feels that “effective communication” in 6.3.1b is not the same as “cooperation” and would like to see some evidence of cooperation captured in the statement. LSC said that cooperation was implied in effective communication, not just communication, but acknowledged that this wording could be modified to “and cooperation” and use the same reporting as in Core Indicator 5.1.1.
 - PAG suggests changing Core Indicator 6.3.1b to Effective communication *and co-operation* with non-timber resource users and interested parties that have expressed interest in forest planning.
 - PAG member asked if another line could be added to the Evidence-Reporting chart that captures the attempts at cooperation.
 - PAG member expressed frustration re: working with forestry plans. There have been previous PAG discussions on the timing of plans versus operations already beginning on the ground. Trappers lose habitat for fur bearers, etc.
 - PAG asked about how the reporting chart for Core Indicator 6.3.1b adds up to 100%. LSC answered that this number includes contacting all stakeholders before harvesting. Dialogue is built up over time; interested parties give constant feedback about need for advance notification and other information.
 - PAG member sees huge gap between legal harvesting rights in large areas versus what is actually happening on the ground. The public does not always recognize their influence on what is currently done in forest practices. LSC stated there are open houses, three websites (Canfor, BCTS and sfmpgtsa.com) and other methods that apprise the public on current operations. PAG member noted an example of a brochure that was succinct and simple so that general public could understand the topic. PAG member commended LSC on progress made on support indicator (types of support). PAG member endorses the Public Relations that comes out of interacting with community members.
- vi) PAG consensus to replace Current Indicators 50, 41, 43 and 44 with the new Value, Objective, Indicators and Target statements to the SFM Plan:
- Value Statement: Community Well being
 - Objective Statement: Support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community
 - Core Indicator 6.3.1a: Investment in local communities. Target = Percent of dollars spent in local communities (5yr rolling average). Variance = -20%.

- Core Indicator 6.3.1b: Effective communication and co-operation with non-timber resource users and interested parties that have expressed interest in forest planning. Target = 100%. Variance = 0%.
- Core Indicator 6.3.1c: The number of support opportunities provided in the DFA. Target 6. Variance -1.

8) Criterion 3 Soil and Water: Indicator Comparison and Discussion

a) LSC reviewed the Criterion 3 Mandatory Discussion Items.

i) Soil productivity (long-term nutrient levels, shallow soils, best management practices for soil protection):

- Best management practices for soil protection start with site specific soil hazard assessments and early identification of sensitive soils and critical site conditions that affect timing of operations (done during the SP / Eco phase).
- Best management practices in place related to soil conservation, for respective licensees.

ii) Seasons of operations (operating windows, impacts on soil during frozen and unfrozen conditions):

- All sites could experience excessive soil disturbance if soils are wet enough.
- Some areas are more sensitive to machine traffic due to their site and soil characteristics i.e. wet, fine-textured soils like clays.
- Sites with fine-textured soils and depressions will remain wet longer, and as such are more prone to compaction and structural degradation.
- Timing of operations in relation to soil moisture condition and / or soil texture are key management considerations.
- To reduce likelihood of excessive soil disturbance during ground based operations it may be necessary to limit operations on specific soils to conditions that are either: Dry, frozen, covered with snowpack, or both.

iii) Site rehabilitation in areas of severe soil disturbance:

- Site rehabilitation may be required for compacted areas and corduroyed trails as well as other forms of excessive soil disturbance in the Net Area to be Reforested (if max. limits exceeded).
- Intent of rehabilitation activities is to restore site productivity and/or stability.
- Rehabilitation treatments can include:
 - (a) Drainage and erosion control (restoration of above and below ground water movement, bioengineering for slope stabilization).
 - (b) Restoring soil productivity (respreding/adding topsoil, fertilizer applications).

(c) Revegetation (establishing grasses, shrubs, hardwoods or softwoods).

b) LSC reviewed Key Terms and Definitions:

- i) Soil Disturbance: General term referring to temporary access structures, corduroyed trails, compacted areas and dispersed disturbance (dispersed trails, gouges, scalps, ruts). Legislated practice requirements are 10% for non-sensitive soils, 5% for sensitive soils and 25% for roadside work area
- ii) Sensitive Soils: Soils can be sensitive due to slope, textural class, moisture regime, or organic matter content because they have a very high risk of displacement, surface erosion or compaction
- iii) Net Area to Be Reforested (NAR): The area to be reforested within a block excluding reserves, roads, landings, and bladed skid trails that will not be reforested, and any non-commercial brush (NCBr) - if indicated in the site plan (SP) as being excluded from the NAR
- iv) Roadside Work Area: Area adjacent to road where decking, processing and loading of timber is carried out and/or piling or disposing of logging debris. Commonly experiences greater levels of repeat machine traffic

c) **Core Indicator: 3.1.1 – Level of Soil Disturbance.**

- i) The proposed indicator is very close to the existing and the value and objective are from the current plan:
 - Value Statement: Soil Distribution and productivity.
 - Objective Statement: Maintain a natural balance (distribution), dynamic cycles, and productivity.
 - Proposed Core Indicator: % of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans. Target: 100% of blocks meet soil disturbance objectives. Variance: -5%.
- ii) Discussion:
 - The proposed Value and Objective are associated with SFM Element 3.1 in the current version of the SFM Plan.
 - LSC recommends replacing Current Indicator 24:
 - (a) Percent of cutblocks harvested where the soil disturbance limits identified in the site plan are exceeded (typically 5% on sensitive soils and 10% on other soils). Target: 0. Variance: 0.
 - (b) Current and New proposed indicators are essentially the same. The new indicator is simplified while still meeting the same objective and intent.
 - PAG member asked for a definition of “disturbance”. LSC noted that this is defined according to soil sensitivity: examples include scalping, rutting, and gouging. LSC

explained that if the legal limit of 5% disturbance on sensitive soils and 10% on other soils is exceeded then there is a mandatory rehabilitation requirement.

- PAG member feels that there is an excessive amount of soil disturbance in the forest based on her interactions with other forest users.
- PAG member asked about tracking instances when soil disturbance limits are exceeded. LSC stated that they must be reported and there must be a rehabilitation plan put into place. The rehabilitation plan is monitored within the management systems for both Canfor and BCTS.
- PAG member noted the proposed Variance is now 5% (when it was 0% in indicator 24). LSC said that it is a provision for temporary access structures, but still meets legal requirements. Indicator 24 was met last year. LSC suggested that the Variance could remain 0% but without including temporary access structures. This can be explained in the Annual Report.
- PAG member asked for a definition of “temporary access structure”. LSC stated that it is usually a skid road or skid trail to access a block. It is usually rehabilitated and reforested after it is no longer needed.
- PAG members endorsed keeping the Variance at 0%, PAG consensus on this change.

iii) PAG consensus to replace Current Indicator 24 in the SFM Plan with the Value, Objective, Revised Indicator and Target statement:

- Value Statement: Soil Distribution and productivity.
- Objective Statement: Maintain a natural balance (distribution), dynamic cycles, and productivity.
- Core Indicator 3.1.1: % of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans. Target: 100% of blocks meet soil disturbance objectives. Variance: 0.

d) Core Indicator: 3.1.2 – Level of Downed Woody Debris

i) LSC reviewed the Criterion 3 Mandatory Discussion Items.

- Soil productivity (long-term nutrient levels, shallow soils, Best Management Practice’s (BMP) for soil protection).
 - (a) Forest Practices Code Biodiversity Guidebook assumes that “all native species and ecological processes are more likely to be maintained if managed forests are made to resemble those forests created by the activities of natural disturbance agents “(i.e. fire, wind, insects, mass wasting.)
 - (b) Ecologically, it is preferred to maintain / emulate the full range of decay and diameter classes of CWD.

- CWD plays numerous roles in natural and managed forests and aquatic ecosystems specific to Soils:
 - (a) Erosion Control / Balancing Hydrological processes
 - (b) Major inputs of organic matter to forest soils
 - (c) Contributes to stand level structural diversity
 - (d) Influences forest floor microclimate
 - (e) Essential to soil function, structure and productivity
 - (f) Wildlife Habitat: Voles, Raptors, Pine Marten, Fisher.
- Seasons of operations; operating windows, impacts on soils during various conditions:
 - (a) CWD volumes are approx. 30% higher after winter logging than if summer harvest (Houston-Lloyd, R.)
 - (b) Firmer CWD (classes 1 to 3) frequently damaged, esp. after summer harvest, but rarely destroyed.
 - (c) Softer CWD (class 4/5) protected by deep or packed snow in winter but can be destroyed by equipment during summer harvest.
- ii) LSC reviewed Key Terms and Definitions:
 - Coarse Woody Debris (CWD): Sound or rotting logs, stumps, large branches that have fallen or been cut and left in the woods, or trees and branches that have died but remain standing or leaning. Dispersed Wildlife Trees also contribute.
 - (a) CWD is defined under the FRPA - FPPR Sect 68(1) as 2m x 7.5 cm on one end.
 - Decay Classes: Down trees pass through a series of 5 classes as they decay, from sound wood to a reddish-brown powder.
 - (a) Class 1 represents sound wood while Class 5 represents decayed wood that is soft, brownish and often has a fibrous powdery, or greasy, textures (not easily distinguished from Soil or humus.
- iii) LSC reviewed current Best Management Practices
- iv) The proposed indicator statement focuses on the practices and guidance provided to logging operators rather than a number (volume post-harvest). The value and objective are from the existing plan:
 - Value Statement: Soil Distribution and productivity.
 - Objective Statement: Maintain a natural balance (distribution), dynamic cycles, and productivity.

- Proposed Indicator Statement: Percent of audited cutblocks where post harvest CWD levels are within the targets contained in Plans, Target: 100 % of blocks harvested annually will meet targets, Variance 10%

v) Discussion:

- LSC explained that contractors are given as much guidance as possible to exceed the legal requirements. Legal requirements fall short of what is considered ideal.
- LSC recommends replacing Current Indicator 23:
 - (a) Percent of audited cutblocks harvested where post-harvest CWD levels are within the acceptable natural range of variability (as stated in m3/ha), Target 100%, Variance -10%
 - (b) Selected indicator and target aligns with legislated requirement, practice requirements and best management practices. Revised indicator commits to meeting the practice requirements in legislation and commitments made in Site Plans specific to coarse wood debris. Includes a commitment to following CWD Best Management Practices, of respective licensees
- PAG member asked about the cost of how harvesters implement CWD. LSC discussed an anecdotal cost comparison between Canfor and BCTS and they are very close.
- PAG member asked about how natural range of variability is addressed in the new indicator. LSC explained that it is captured in the statement “within the targets contained in Plans”.
- PAG member asked for a definition of “within the targets contained in Plans”. LSC explained that a target would be based on the best prescription for the site by someone who has walked the block and knows the site well. This would be quantified at a post-harvesting inspection.
- PAG member approves of critter piles used by BCTS in BMP’s
- PAG members not comfortable with current wording of the proposed indicator. PAG concerns include the following:
 - (a) PAG would like more information on “targets contained in Plans”.
 - (b) Have planners discussed targets and Best Management Practices with the local trappers?
 - (c) The indicator lacks a number measuring the natural range of variability.
 - (d) PAG members would like more info on CWD studies and Best Management Practices.
- PAG member doesn’t know what the Plans for CWD currently are. If there is an energy plant that comes in the near future, will there still be enough CWD.

- PAG member would like to know what maximum CWD levels are. If there is no fine associated with leaving excess CWD than why not leave all of it?
- LSC agreed to defer the discussion of this indicator until a future meeting, thus giving the LSC time to respond to the PAG's questions and concerns.

9) Other

- a) LSC briefly reviewed what Core Indicators are left to discuss with the PAG following this meeting:
 - i) Complete review of CWD Indicator and discuss Watershed indicators to finish Criterion 3.
 - ii) Criterion 1 Biological Diversity
 - iii) Criterion 4 Role in Global Ecological Cycles

Action Item #2: PAG members asked to review the Performance Matrix and forward any information requests to the Facilitator. Due: Next meeting.

- b) LSC and PAG will look at organizing a Field Trip in the Spring of 2012

10) Next meeting:

- a) **October 17, 2011 5:00 – 9:00 pm at the Fort St. James Forest District Office**

Action Items:

	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Mar 28-03	Request more information from Sandra Sulyma on social outreach.	LSC	Ongoing	
May 9-01	Meet and discuss PAG concerns of investment in local communities.	LSC	Next Meeting	Complete
Aug 29-01	Address Recreation values under Criterion 5.1.1 Economic and Social Benefits during plan write up.	LSC	Future Meeting	
Aug 29-02	Add comment section for future topics to evaluation form.	LSC	Next Meeting	
Aug 29-03	Review the Performance Matrix and forward any information requests to the Facilitator.	PAG	Next Meeting	