

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, November 9, 2010

Civic Center, Prince George, BC

MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<p><u><i>Public & First Nations:</i></u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Chris Andreschefski - Private Landowners Doug Beckett – Public Interest Jocelyn Campbell – Natural Conservation Jo Graber – Cultural Conservation Michelle Hourie – Recreation, Commercial motorized, Tourism Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Virginia Karr – Natural Conservation (Old Growth) Dave Kim – Forest Workers & Contractors Anne Migvar – Ranching & Farming Jeff Mohr – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Patience Rakochy – Non-timber Forest Products Lee Sexsmith – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Tan Calhoun – Chamber of Commerce Don Wilkins – Commercial Wildlife Interests Ian Wilson - Hunting and Fishing</p>	<p><u><i>Steering Committee:</i></u> Chair: Sara Cotter (nee Fletcher) - Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS</p>
<p><u><i>Facilitator & Scribe:</i></u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer</p>	<p><u><i>Advisors & Observers:</i></u></p>

1. Welcome & Introductions – Sara Cotter
 - a. Meeting started late since we were waiting for quorum
 - b. Introduction of Tan Calhoun as new rep for Chamber of Commerce. Dave King is in Romania, Esther Perry and Mark Clark send regrets, Sandra Kinsey is in Australia
 - c. Meeting evaluation results from the October 21, 2010 PG PAG meeting were posted. All targets met except Question MQ12 “Are you satisfied with the PAG process?” The score dropped below the target of 4.0 to 3.8.
 - d. PAG Representative Contact List was circulated. This was a response to Action

Item Oct 21 – 05.

- e. Facilitator reminded PAG representatives to RSVP to the meeting notices in a timely manner as there now is a quorum requirement that must be met at each meeting and the organizers need to know how many sectors will be represented well in advance.
2. Reviewed Agenda
 - a. Agenda accepted as written
 3. Reviewed Summary of October 21, 2010 PAG Meeting.
 - a. P. 5 Item 8e. is duplicated (strike 8e)
 - b. Correction on guest names: should be George Lloyd, not Lloyd George. George Lloyd and Jerry Noakes are from Aleza Lake.
 - c. p. 6 Point 6 typo: change from “simple” to “simply”
 - d. Reviewed Action List
 - Oct 21 – 01: Sector list – The LSC reviewed the new CSA Standard and determined that, as the Standard does not specify which sectors must be represented, the current PG/TFL30 PAG sectors are sufficient.
 - Oct 21 - 02: Provide tool to track PAG consensus/dissensions – PAG directed to the Performance Matrix posted on the wall. A new column has been added to track PAG decisions. The LSC noted that PAG decisions are also tracked in the meeting summaries. PAG member felt that the action was to develop an indicator to track consensus. LSC stated that the action was to develop a tool rather than an indicator. PAG member noted that another check and balance occurs when the auditor solicits comments directly from PAG members during the External Audit Process. PAG member felt that an auditor (if he/she is thorough) will see the issues through reading the meeting summaries. PAG member said that in the past, dissensions and issues were not captured in much detail. This has now been corrected in the meeting summaries.
 - e. Meeting Summary accepted as revised.
 - f. Update on Merged Representative List
 - Ian Wilson has been attending meetings as an Observer and wished to join the PAG as the Representative for the Hunting & Fishing Sector. Ian has a lifetime experience hunting and fishing and grew up with an agriculture background (range land etc). He has a bit of trapping and soils background also. He has plans to talk to someone in the Fish and Game Club regarding an Alternate.
 - PAG endorsed adding Ian Wilson as the Representative for the Hunting and Fishing Sector. No alternate at this time
 - Doug Beckett informed the PAG that Shannon Carson has expressed interest and will become the Alternate for the Public Interest Sector.

4. Indicator Revisions – Sara Cotter

Sara provided a new version of the Common Indicator Matrix. new columns added CSA standard and current PG and TFL30 Indicators

- a. Indicator: 2.1.1 (New) - *Regeneration delay by area for stands established annually. Target <= 3 yrs (artificial), <= 6 yrs (natural) Variance 0.*
 - LSC would like to revise the target statement to read: “100% of Net Area Reforested (NAR) regenerated within 3 years (artificial) and 6 years (natural) from harvest commencement”.
 - Discussion:
 1. PAG member asked about the legal requirement for regeneration delay. The legal standard is 7 years.
 2. PAG members expressed concern that the indicator is weak if this is what sums up measurement for Forest Ecosystem Resilience. LSC noted that this is a CSA Core Indicator and that other local indicators currently address the scope of Forest Ecosystem Resilience in the SFM Plan.
 3. PAG has concerns with CSA and the suite of Core Indicators being put forward in the standard. This is not a criticism of the PG PAG process or the Licensee Steering Committee. A compilation of issues related to the Core Indicators would be a good way to document feedback that could be later sent to CSA thus providing CSA with feedback on their own process at a future date. PAG member felt it reflects poorly on the work of the PAG if they go along with adopting indicators/elements that don't fit well with a “faulty” Core Indicator.
 4. PAG member had concerns with the hierarchy of terminology within the CSA framework (criteria, element, core indicator, etc) and finds the numbering system confusing.
 5. PAG member asked about the legal requirement for Free-growing in Forest Stewardship Plans. LSC responded that they are legislated for free growing within 20 years.
 - PAG consensus on the indicator statement with revised target: *Regeneration delay by area for stands established annually. Target 100% of Net Area Reforested (NAR) regenerated within 3 years (artificial) and 6 year (natural) from harvest commencement” Variance 0.*
- b. Indicator: 2.2.1 (New) - *Percentage of the gross forested land base in the DFA converted to non-forested land use thru forest management activities. Target: <3% of GFLB. Variance: TBD.*
 - LSC Recommendation: Adopt the proposed indicator statement.
 - Discussion:
 1. LSC Comments: Existing indicator under both SFMP's. The new indicator statement combines both the permanent access structure

- and forested to non –forested area into 1 analysis for reporting. Essence of the indicator is to get idea of total area no longer attributed to the Crown Forest Landbase within the DFA.
2. LSC would like to tighten up targets (net downs) and combine all 4 indicators (PG32, PG21, TFL21b, TFL21 a.) into one.
 3. PAG member asked about percentages from the Timber Supply Review - are they taken as gross or net forest area? PAG asked what land base area are you taking the percentage from? PAG member said it varies considerably from TSR to TSR and cautioned the LSC that before committing to targets they need to understand the base they are measuring from and recognize that different inventory standards can change the way a forest is defined. PAG member wondered, given that comment, have LSC been meeting the target? LSC responded that Site Plans for the most part accurately track the areas converted to non-forested land use within blocks and road right of ways.
 4. PAG member expressed concern that there is a perception that too many roads are going into areas, especially if more than one Major Licensee is present or if there are overlapping tenures (e.g. Forestry & Mining).
 5. PAG concerned that the DFA was not being represented in the indicator wording. Facilitator read out the current definition of DFA. The DFA has changed since Carrier, Lakeland etc have left. This issue has come into landscape – level indicators as well. PAG member wondering how the players who are now working independently in their own areas manage the DFA as a whole.
 6. PAG member asked about the 3% target and feels that the PAG needs a definition of gross forested area before understanding what the 3% represents.
 7. PAG asked why gross forested land base was the new measure when previously it was productive forested. Why the change in nomenclature? PAG member wanted to know the reason for changing this wording? LSC explained that it is for the purpose of better, efficient management and planning.
 8. PAG member noted that Canfor and BCTS can drop their CSA SFM Certification at anytime and then all the PAG work is for naught.
 - PAG could not reach agreement on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the plan until such time as Canfor and BCTS can provide a definition for Gross Forested Land Base. The review of this indicator will be deferred to the next meeting.
- c. Core Indicator 2.2.2 (New) - *% of volume harvested compared to the long term harvest level Target: 100% harvest over 5 yrs as defined by Timber Supply Forecast harvest flow*
- LSC Recommendation: Existing indicator under both SFMP's. The new

statement will report out the harvest numbers for the area based tenure of TFL 30 & the volume based tenure of the DFA for both licensees. Those #'s will be compared to the TSR #'s developed by the MOF under TSR 4 and future TSR's

- Discussion:
 1. LSC Comments: Maintain indicator under new combined plan, adopt the proposed indicator statement. BCTS will report out cut levels for operations on the DFA, Canfor will report out cut volumes for both TFL 30 and the DFA with attributed volume from BCTS for operations on the TFL.
 2. PAG member asked if there was any flexibility within the current Cut Control because in the past, cut could get taken away if you went over.
 3. PAG member asked for clarification of Allowable Annual Cut (AAC). LSC stated that it is volume based for BCTS and Canfor within the PG Timber Supply Area. The AAC is apportioned to the Major Licensees and BCTS at the District level.
 4. PAG member briefly described long term harvest level as defined in the Timber Supply Review.
 5. PAG member concerned that there is no mention of harvest by species.
 6. LSC said this is the best we have. They have to work within the boundaries of what they have. Will work with apportionment as the current standard and will be adjusted every 5 years.
 7. PAG member doesn't like using the term "sustainable yield". PAG member asked about what adjective "sustainable" defines. It is assumed that a forest is sustainable not a "sustainable harvest".
 8. PAG member asked about a variance for this Indicator that meets the legal requirement. LSC stated that the variance is 10% .
 9. PAG recommends revising the indicator and target to read: *% of volume harvested compared to allocated harvest level. Target: 100% over 5 years. Variance +10%.*
 10. PAG member offered a positive comment regarding the LSC being much more approachable compared to past years.
 - PAG consensus on the revised indicator statement and revised target: *% of volume harvested compared to allocated harvest level. Target: 100% over 5 years. Variance +10%.*
5. CSA Element: 3.1: Soil Quality and Quantity
 - a. Due to time constraints, discussion of *Core Indicator: 3.1.1 Level of soil disturbance and Core Indicator : 3.1.2 Level of downed woody debris* will be deferred until the next PAG meeting.
 6. Brainstorming on How to Make This Process Easier

The Facilitator asked the PAG members how they felt the process was going and if they had any comments to improve the process. Some PAG members stated that they would send comments directly to the Facilitator, others offered the following points:

- a. PAG member wants information on the screen, wants to use matrix at every meeting to see information in context.
 - b. PAG member wants to see broad picture first and then see the detail of how it fits into the big picture.
 - c. PAG member asked about discussion items (as referenced in the CSA Standard); will they be revisited or are they already done?
 - d. SFM Plans are a good resource. If you have one, please bring them to look at.
7. Evaluation Forms requested and collected.
8. Next Meeting Nov 30, 2010 Prince George Civic Center 5:30 – 9: 00 pm

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.
Oct 7 - 01	Review PG SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator.	PAG	November 7, 2010	Completed
Oct 7 - 02	Review TFL 30 SFM 2009-10 Draft Annual Report and provide questions or comments to the facilitator.	PAG	November 7, 2010	Completed
Oct 21 - 01	Review Sector List and see if gaps in representation exist in relation to the new CSA standard.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	Completed
Oct 21 - 02	Develop a tool to track consensus decisions and dissenting opinions and present to the PAG for review.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	Completed
Oct 21 - 03	Provide PAG members with a full copy of the new CSA Z809-08 standard.	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	Completed
Oct 21 - 04	Provide copies of original TFL30 and PAG matrices to PAG members.	Facilitator	Next Meeting	Completed
Oct 21 - 05	Provide template for PAG members contact list.	Facilitator	Next Meeting	Completed