

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, February 24, 2011

Civic Centre, Prince George, BC

MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<p><u>Public & First Nations:</u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Chris Andreschefski – Private Landowners Shannon Carson – Public Interest (alternate) Teena Demeulemeester – West Moberly First Nations Ray Hourie – Small Business Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Dave King – Recreation, non-motorized Sandra Kinsey – Naturalists Esther Perry – Ranching & Farming Patience Rakochy - Non-timber Forest Products Laura Ryser – Research & Education (alternate) Lee Sexsmith – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Don Wilkins - Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters) Ian Wilson – Hunting and Fishing</p>	<p><u>Steering Committee:</u> Chair: Sara Cotter - Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS</p> <p><u>Advisors:</u> Dr. Greg Halseth – Professor, UNBC Geography Program</p> <p><u>Observers:</u> Jerry Noakes - Aleza Lake</p> <p><u>Facilitator & Scribe:</u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer</p>
--	--

1) Welcome & Introductions – Sara Cotter

- a) Introduction of members and guests:
 - i) Dr. Greg Halseth, Professor, UNBC Geography Program
 - ii) Jerry Noakes - Aleza Lake

2) Reviewed Agenda

- a) Accepted as written

3) Reviewed Minutes of February 10, 2011 PAG Meeting

- a) Page 2 Section 2 “Reviewed Agenda”: relabel last point as *d.* not *b.*
- b) Page 5 Section c. Reviewed Timber Supply Forecast Scenarios as considered by Chief Forester add additional point for clarification: *iii. Chief Forester adopted Scenario 2a – a reference scenario.*
- c) Page 5 Section d. “Discussion” subpoint ii. Add: “CN rail *beyond Ft. St. James ...*”

- d) Minutes accepted as revised

4) Reviewed Meeting Evaluation

- a) Meeting Evaluation results from the February 10, 2011 PG PAG meeting were posted. Comments reviewed. All items above target.

5) PG SFM Annual Report 2009/10 Follow-up – Lee Evans, BCTS

- a) When the draft PG SFM Annual Report 2009/10 was reviewed by the PAG on October 7, 2010 a number of indicators were tagged as “Pending”. 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). In 2010, the LOWG analysis was influenced by the Timber Supply Review (TSR) process. The analysis relied 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 now been released and the LOWG analysis is complete and these four indicators have been updated
 - i) Indicator 1 - Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit (NDU)
 - (1) NDU A15 is currently a “no harvest” unit as it now has an Old Forest deficit of 1,731 hectares. NDU A24 is currently a “no harvest” unit as it now has an Old Forest deficit of 968 hectares. The Licensees in the District have an obligation to prepare and implement approved recruitment strategies to restore the Old Forest target for these areas.
 - (2) PAG member wanted to know what A15 and A24 are. A15 is in the Wet Mountain NDU in the north-east corner of the District. A24 is in the Wet Trench NDU in the south – central part of the District that runs north from Dunkley Lumber’s TFL53. There is a map in the Appendix 1 of the Annual Report.
 - ii) Indicator 2 - Old Interior Forest
 - (1) There are several NDU’s that are currently in a “watch – communicate” status as they are approaching threshold levels.
 - iii) Indicator 3 - Young Patch Size Distribution and Indicator 6 - Wet Trench and Wet Mountain Young Patch Size.
 - (1) PAG member asked about trending of targets. LSC explained that last year’s numbers are used try to make predictions, but it is not an exact science. PAG member also added that Craig Delong’s research on Natural Disturbance is the basis for defining the patch objectives.
 - (2) PAG member added that the Forest Practice Code dictated that one couldn’t go above 60 hectares as a maximum cut block size so currently there are a disproportionate number of smaller blocks located in some of these NDU’s. Pine Beetle has also made significant impacts on targets.
 - (3) PAG member added that these small cutblocks are a legacy for patch and will remain in the system for a maximum of 20 years.

6) Results of BCTS External Audit, January 2011

- a) Lee Evans provided a brief update on the recent BCTS External SFM Audit.
 - i) One (1) minor non-conformance was identified regarding the Landscape –level indicators being tagged as “pending” for an extended period of time.
 - ii) Two (2) Opportunities for Improvement (OFI):
 - (1) Clearly track Issues and Strategies on the Continuous Improvement Matrix, and;
 - (2) Prepare an Action Plan to analyse 2-3 years of patch data to more clearly show trends.

7) Rural and Small Town Community Development – Dr. Greg Halseth, UNBC

- a) Dr. Halseth presented a talk on Rural and Small Town Community Development
- b) Dr. Halseth’s contact information can be found at <http://www.unbc.ca/geography/faculty/halseth>
- c) Highlights
 - i) 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.
 - ii) Background: (how we came to be economically)
 - (1) 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.
 - iii) There is fierce competition among small towns for resource suppliers.
 - iv) Over the last 50 years, the province of BC has a history of moving to a moderate industrial society:
 - (1) 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).
 - (2) 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.
 - (3) Example of Mackenzie: a planned town with massive public sector investment.
 - (4) As a result, small towns have become very focussed 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.
 - v) Rural BC populations are declining according to last 3 census reports.

- vi) 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.).
- vii) Current Question: “Are we getting all our wealth out of the forest sector to help future generations?”
 - (1) 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.
- d) Discussion:
 - i) PAG member asked about population declining if student population is getting higher. Presenter had no answer – “it doesn’t make sense”.
 - ii) PAG member asked about how to change the attitude of investment in the future. Public still thinks in hindsight instead of into the future. Many decisions are made for political reasons and not economic reasons. Example of Barrier – sawmill now gone. Presenter suggested that there are “cracks of sunlight” such as the Columbia Basin Trust (CBT) – Trusts are pools of investment funding that are not tied to external decision makers and we have some local control over the investment. Another example is the Norwegian Petroleum Fund (aka The Government Pension Fund of Norway) - a fund into which the surplus wealth produced by Norwegian petroleum income is deposited. The Fund has disciplined spending rules. There is no Trust Fund for Forestry.
 - iii) PAG member added that the Norwegian Trust fund is worth approximately \$500,000 per every man, woman and child however the government refuses to spend any of the Trust and in turn there is an HST that is higher than the 12% in BC.
 - iv) PAG member commented on a recent statistic stating that only 10% of Northern BC’s resource wealth is retained in the North. This percentage should be higher so that Trust’s can be established for Northern benefit. Presenter mentioned that there needs to be more risk-takers and entrepreneurs.

8) Indicator Revisions (CSA Element 5.1 Timber and Non Timber Benefits)

- a) Core Indicator 5.1.1.a: Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products and services produced in the DFA
 - i) LSC Recommendation: Add Core Indicator 5.1.1.a: *% of volume harvested compared to allocated harvest level. Target: 100% over 5 years. Variance +10%.*
 - ii) Discussion:
 - (1) This indicator statement is a Core Indicator and was endorsed by the PAG at the November 9, 2010 PAG meeting as Core Indicator 2.2.2. The new CSA Standard also references this indicator as a Core indicator under SFM Element 5.1 Timber and Non-timber Benefits. With the requirement in the Standard that this indicator also be added under SFM element 5.1.1, the LSC will update the Performance Matrix accordingly.
 - (2) PAG member feels that quantity is being discussed, but not quality and would like to see the proposed indicator expanded to include more of the intent of the

Core indicator. In light of the presentation earlier in the meeting, this is narrow view and seems to focus only on allocation. LSC stated that the quality components of the Core Indicator will be discussed under 5.1.1.b.

(3) PAG member asked for clarification about the 10% variance. Should it be + and – 10%.? LSC stated that if a licensee undercut, they can carry up to 10% over to the next Cut Control period. This is a legal requirement.

(4) PAG member asked about managing for 100% when some Timber Sales haven't been sold. Large under cuts are lost so this makes managing for 100% difficult.

- b) Core Indicator 5.1.1.b: Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products and services produced in the DFA
- i) LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #22, PG Indicator #24, PG Indicator #25, PG Indicator #26, PG Indicator #27, PG Indicator #35, TFL30 Indicator #10a, TFL30 Indicator #10b, TFL30 Indicator #22, TFL30 Indicator #25, TFL30 Indicator #27, TFL30 Indicator #34 with new Proposed wording of Core indicator 5.1.1.b.
 - ii) Existing PG Indicator #22: The percentage of forest operations consistent with terrain management requirements as identified in operational plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - iii) Existing PG Indicator #24: The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian management requirements as identified in operational plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - iv) Existing PG Indicator #25: The percentage of stream crossings that are installed or removed consistent with erosion control plans or procedures. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - v) Existing PG Indicator #26: The percentage of unnatural known sediment occurrences where mitigating actions were taken. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - vi) Existing PG Indicator #27: The percentage of new stream crossings that maintain natural stream flow. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - vii) Existing PG Indicator #35: The percentage of forest operations consistent with visual, cultural heritage, range, riparian, recreation and lakeshore requirements as identified in operational plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - viii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #10a: The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian reserve requirements as identified in site plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - ix) Existing TFL30 Indicator #10b: The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian management requirements as identified in site plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - x) Existing TFL30 Indicator #22: The percentage of forest operations consistent with terrain management requirements as identified in operational plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.
 - xi) Existing TFL30 Indicator #25: The percentage of all new or deactivated stream

crossings that shall maintain natural stream flow. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.

xii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #27: The percentage of unnatural sediment occurrences where mitigating actions were taken. Target: 100% annually. Variance: -10% over 2 years.

xiii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #34: The percentage of forest operations consistent with the following non-timber benefits: visual quality, cultural heritage, riparian, and lakeshore management requirements in site plans. Target: 100% annually. Variance: 0.

xiv) New Indicator 5.1.1.b: Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans. Target: No non-conformances for site level plans. Variance: 0.

xv) Discussion:

- (1) PAG member asked what the reporting would look like. Will the reporting still be transparent in the areas of visual quality, soils, cultural heritage, Riparian, fish passage, stream crossings etc. LSC stated that all the non-timber benefits associated with the existing indicators would still be reported.
- (2) PAG member wanted to know about non-conformances as related to compliance with plans. PAG member would like to see positive spin: change wording to Operational Plans to 100 % compliance.
- (3) PAG member wanted assurance that the types of Plans are detailed in the SFMP. LSC affirmed that these details would be there.
- (4) PAG member asked for clarification about how these indicators under this Criterion are represented elsewhere. PAG member also wanted transparency where there are non-conformances. LSC stated that both Canfor and BCTS use an Incident Tracking System to maintain records on incidents, non-conformances, and follow-up actions.
- (5) PAG member asked about the LSC's ability to achieve 100%. The LSC stated that they manage for legal commitments, and there are also non-legal obligations where Licensees will work with them one on one (eg. Trappers, Guides, Range Tenures, Water Licenses, etc.).
- (6) PAG member asked clarification on where the economic portion fits into 5.1.1. LSC explained that it is in SFM Element 5.2 Community and Sustainability.
- (7) PAG member is pleased that Licensees have been attempting to contact guides and trappers for their input.
- (8) PAG member asked about communication with private landowners. LSC explained that they do not go on private land, but if they butt up against a block or a road that is going past the private landowner's property, the landowners are not notified during referral of plans. PAG member said this is not the case in other Districts, where there has been trespass logging on private land. LSC can report out on private land also. PAG member asked about tenure also. LSC said it is possible to report out on "tenure type" – which will encompass private land. LSC will add "private land" to the reporting table.
- (9) PAG member says can't ignore the biofuel industry. This is a social benefit.

LSC explained that Core Indicator 6.3.1 will address this.

- (10) PAG member would like to note that he is in agreement with the LSC recommendation, but feels like he's buying half a car and would like to see the whole package. LSC will modify the presentation in the future to add more detail on the full scope of revisions for each Core Indicator. LSC encouraged all PAG members to bring the coloured document to refer to at each meeting.

Action Item #1: LSC will add "tenure/private land" to the reporting table for Indicator 5.1.1.b. Due: Next Annual Report.

xvi) PAG Consensus on replacing PG Indicator #22, PG Indicator #24, PG Indicator #25, PG Indicator #26, PG Indicator #27, PG Indicator #35, TFL30 Indicator #10a, TFL30 Indicator #10b, TFL30 Indicator #22, TFL30 Indicator #25, TFL30 Indicator #27, TFL30 Indicator #34 with proposed wording of Core indicator 5.1.1.b: *Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans. Target: No non-conformances for site level plans. Variance: 0.*

c) TFL30 Indicator #37a and TFL30 Indicator #37b

i) LSC Recommendation: remove TFL30 Indicator #37a and TFL30 Indicator #37b from the SFM Plan.

ii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #37a: Public survey of non-timber uses within the DFA, including non-timber forest products. Target: At least every 4 years. Variance: +1 year.

iii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #37b: Maintain lists of non-timber forest products and non-timber uses from the DFA. Target: Reviewed and updated at least every 4 years. Variance: +1 year.

iv) Discussion:

(1) LSC provided a brief history why the Non-timber Forest Products (NTFP) survey was conducted. It only occurred on the TFL at a cost of \$25-30K. The survey did not provide the level of detail originally expected regarding non-timber forest products and their uses.

(2) PAG member noted that it was intended as a background survey about what was there and who was using NTFP, not a tool for sustainable management of NTFP's

(3) PAG member asked about how many surveys were done. LSC said there was high level of dissatisfaction with survey methods, and it was reviewed and modified. Data was collected in 2005.

(4) PAG member not in agreement with removing because he feels there will be a change as years go by and there should be a public survey (ie. hunting/fishing, etc.).

(5) Other PAG member stated that his survey did not include hunting/fishing. PAG member wondered if there may be funding elsewhere to continue future surveys. (i.e. Universities). LSC explained that if this was done across the entire Prince George DFA it would be huge expense.

(6) PAG member said, considering this, he is in agreement to removing this

indicator

(7) PAG member does not see current use of indicator right now, but wonders about future harvesting in TFL30. LSC explained that it would be for the whole DFA not just TFL30 anymore.

v) PAG consensus on removing TFL30 Indicator #37a and TFL30 Indicator #37b from the SFM Plan.

9) **.Evaluation Forms requested and collected**

10) **Tabled other items to future meetings**

11) **Next PG PAG Meetings:**

a) The following schedule of future PAG meetings was presented. All meetings will be held in the Prince George Civic Center 5:30 – 9: 00 pm

- i) Thursday March 17, 2011
- ii) Tuesday April 5, 2011
- iii) Tuesday April 26, 2011
- iv) Tuesday May 17, 2011
- v) Tuesday June 7, 2011

Actions- update

PRINCE GEORGE PAG				
ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
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.
Feb 24 - 01	Add “tenure/private land” to the reporting table for Indicator 5.1.1.b	Steering Committee	Next Annual Report	