

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, November 30, 2010

Civic Centre, 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 Tan Calhoun – Chamber of Commerce Jo Graber – Cultural Conservation Ray Hourie – Small Business Dave King – Recreation, non-motorized Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Dave Kim – Forest Workers & Contractors Esther Perry – Ranching & Farming Anne Migvar – Ranching & Farming (alternate) Jeff Mohr – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized (alternate) Laura Ryser – Research & Education (alternate) Lee Sexsmith – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Don Wilkins – Commercial Wildlife Interests</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> Tim Sproule – BCTS</p>

1. Welcome & Introductions – Sara Cotter

- a. Meeting started 10 minutes late since we were waiting for quorum. PAG members reminded to confirm attendance with Facilitator.
- b. Introduction of Laura Ryser, new alternate for Melanie Karjala. Laura is Research Manager for the Community Development Institute at UNBC.
- c. Meeting evaluation results from the November 9, 2010 PG PAG meeting were posted. One question (#11) under target “Are you satisfied with the PAG process?”
- d. Facilitator will be using speaker list to ensure there is equitable distribution of comments.

2. Reviewed Agenda

- a. Add "Quorum Requirement" to Other on the agenda, as this should be revisited in the PAG Terms of Reference.
- b. Agenda accepted as revised

3. Reviewed Summary of November 9, 2010 PAG Meeting

- a. Minutes accepted as written.

4. Final Version of Annual Reports

- a. PG SFMP
 - Waiting for landscape level indicators to be finalized
- b. TFL30 SFMP
 - Has been finalized and will be posted to the website shortly

5. Discussion Items and Indicator Revisions (CSA Element 3.1 Soil Quality and Quantity)

- a. Reviewed Handouts
 - Map: Prince George District Sustainable Forest Management Plan Defined Forest Area
 1. LSC presented an updated map of the Prince George Forest District showing the Defined Forest Area for this SFM Plan.
 2. PAG members asked if parks and protected areas are included in the DFA? LSC says that this Map currently does include these areas. There may be some changes in the future pending review of more material.
 - Document: Links to Other Planning Processes
 1. LSC distributed a schematic diagram showing the hierarchy of provincial planning processes related to sustainable forest management.
 2. PAG member asked about the SFM Advisory Group and its relationship to the LRMP (Land and Resource Management Plan). LSC noted that contrary to the diagram (which was borrowed from the Kamloops SFMP) the Prince George LRMP is not a Higher Level Plan and the PG SFM Plan does not have direct links to the LRMP, which is used as a guidance document.
 - Document: The Planning Process
 1. LSC distributed an excerpt from the Kamloops SFM Plan that provides an introduction to the CSA Certification Process.
 - Document: Indicator Discussion for Core Indicator 3.1.1 Level of Soil Disturbance
 1. LSC distributed an Indicator Discussion paper providing

background information on the Criterion, Element, Value, Objective, Proposed Indicator and Target.

2. Additional detail was provided on Legal Requirements, a description of the Indicator, Current Practices, Record of Performance and existing, related Indicators in the SFM Plan.
- Document: Indicator Discussion for Core Indicator 3.1.2 Level of Downed Woody Debris
 1. LSC distributed an Indicator Discussion paper providing background information on the Criterion, Element, Value, Objective, Proposed Indicator and Target.
 2. Additional detail was provided on Legal Requirements, a description of the Indicator, Current Practices, Record of Performance and existing, related Indicators in the SFM Plan.
 - PAG reviewed and discussed feedback from last meeting on the transition process. Many of the PAGs comments were incorporated into the LSC presentation materials for this meeting.
- b. Core Indicator 3.1.1 Level of Soil Disturbance
- LSC Recommendation: replace Indicator #20 with new Proposed wording of Core indicator.
 - Existing Indicator #20: The percentage of forest operations consistent with soil conservation standards as identified in operational plans. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%
 - New Indicator 3.1.1: % of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans. Target: 100% of blocks meet soil disturbance objectives. Variance: none (0%)
 - Discussion:
 1. PAG member asked about comparison between soil disturbance in TFL30 vs Prince George. LSC responded that there is no difference in operations.
 2. Typo under Objective: The productive capacity of forest soil within the timber Harvesting Land Base *in* sustained.
 3. PAG member said it appears that there are no major changes to wording going from objectives to standards. LSC noted that there is no change to operations.
 4. PAG member would like to see changes tracked with underlines
 - PAG consensus on replacing Indicator #20 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator: *% of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans. Target: 100% of blocks meet soil disturbance objectives. Variance: none (0%).*
- c. Core Indicator 3.1.2 Level of downed woody debris

- LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #7, TFL Indicator #7a and TFL Indicator #7b with new Proposed wording of Core indicator.
- Existing Indicators :
 1. PG Indicator #7: The percentage of cut blocks consistent with coarse woody debris requirements in operational plans. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
 2. TFL Indicator #7a: The percentage of site plans that have Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) retention within the natural range appropriate for the site.
 3. TFL Indicator #7b: Percentage of cut blocks consistent with CWD requirements in operational plans. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- New Indicator 3.1.2: Percent of cutblocks reviewed where post harvest CWD levels are within the targets contained in Plans. Target: 100% of blocks reviewed annually will meet targets. Variance: 10%
- Discussion:
 1. LSC committed to exceeding CWD legal requirement and have had great past performance.
 2. PAG member asked about the variance and would it be up or down if target not met. The variance is currently only looking at exceeding the target.
 3. PAG member recalled a UBC computer model that projected CWD volumes into the future and would like to see how current practices affect future soil nutrient levels. LSC stated they were not aware of this model but noted that there are a number of recent studies looking at CWD retention levels on harvested blocks. There is an effort underway within Canfor to develop a science-based biodiversity conservation strategy, under which CWD is monitored as a Habitat Element. PAG member noted that in some areas there is currently an abundance of CWD.
 4. PAG member would like explanation of proposed statement re: cutblocks “reviewed/audited”. PAG member would like to know how the selection of cutblocks is made and how it affects the statistics. LSC explained that “reviewed/audited” refers to an in-house field review, not an external audit. Another PAG member clarified that it is a legal requirement for waste to be reviewed on every block.
 5. PAG member said this Indicator needs a more detailed target due to the variety of forest types found on the landbase. A single indicator covering all forest types is insufficient. The need for revising this indicator has increased exponentially. LSC stated that there is not enough information available to determine natural ranges of variability and there is a lack of provincial direction on a CWD strategy. There have been deadlines around policy reviews for Waste and Residue (removal of waste benchmarks for roadside

accumulations) but the pine beetle has caused postponement.

6. PAG members concur that this Indicator needs variation because of soil conservation, but there is even more concern about bioenergy impacts.
7. PAG member asked about the relationship between the SFMP and LRMP. In order to make this indicator meaningful, this should be changed to a higher target and higher variance rather than just meeting the minimum legal requirements.
8. PAG member asked for more background on how the cutblocks are reviewed. How often are cutblocks reviewed? There is a lack of baseline information to know how much CWD should be out there to satisfy long term requirements. In some areas fire management practices near urban centres are collecting CWD as it is deemed to be a fire hazard. LSC explained that reducing wildfire hazard takes precedence over CWD retention.
9. PAG member concerned with some of the rationale statements provided by the LSC and feels that CWD immediately after harvest is “frequently” a concern. PAG member noted that recent monitoring by the provincial Forest and Range Evaluation Program (FREP) indicated that more CWD is required in longer and larger pieces. PAG member takes issue with the current minimum standards. The FREP reports can be found here:
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/ftp/HFP/external!/publish/FREP/extension/FREP_Extension_Note_o8.pdf
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/ftp/HFP/external!/publish/FREP/extension/FREP_Extension_Note_o8.pdf
10. PAG member agrees with comment that this Indicator cannot encompass all the issues with CWD and that this is a “big monster” which cannot be resolved in this room. PAG member suggested it be parked temporarily in the Continual Improvement Matrix. LSC noted that it is already there.
11. PAG member noted that the LSC is currently operating within the legal requirements and must take wood or there are financial penalties.
12. PAG member would like to know if targets reflect the legal minimum. LSC confirmed that they do.
13. PAG member suggested variable targets depending on the area. Ecosystems are different so targets will be changing. The LSC agreed that differentiating by ecosystem may be in discussed in the future when reviewing CWD.
14. PAG member upset with the government imposing how much CWD is left on each hectare and not considering different ecosystems, and a lack of common sense with respect to actually going out and measuring the bits and pieces of CWD.

15. PAG member concerned about the gap between current legislation and practice and the objective of this indicator and doesn't see a good fit so suggests removing this indicator.
 16. PAG member would like to know what CWD standards are in other provinces for comparison purposes. If CSA is a National Standard, then there should be some calibration.
 17. PAG member clarified that the government permits more volume to be left than the minimum. The LSC is happy to exceed the minimums, but have no government direction as to what the minimums are by ecosystem.
 18. PAG member asked about other Indicators that could be used to help with soil conservation, soil quality and quantity.
 19. PAG member wants to know what general public at Home Depot would think if they knew what was happening out on the cutblock
 20. PAG member wants to know how to improve this Indicator since adopting the new wording keeps things at status quo. Now is the time to improve the indicator!
 21. PAG member noted that this has been sitting in the CI Matrix for years and would like to see LSC provide a working plan that shows how CWD will be dealt with in a timely manner.
 22. PAG member not sure if rationale re: costs are acceptable, doesn't think it takes much time to measure number of logs, piles etc.
 23. PAG member feels that numbers are not transparent (prove that you are doing better than bare minimum).
 24. PAG not wanting to endorse change because wording done in 2007 is not acceptable in 2010.
- 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 workplan showing how they plan to address the operational issues associated with achieving CWD targets. The request for consensus on this indicator will be deferred to a future meeting.

Action Item #1: LSC to provide work plan on CWD. Due: Next meeting.

d. CSA Element 3.2 Water Quality and Quantity

- Due to time constraints, this indicator will be tabled until the next meeting.

6. Other

- a. LSC would like topic "Quorum requirements" added on the next agenda.

7. Evaluation Forms requested and collected

8. Next Meeting:

- a. **January 13, 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.
Nov 30 - 01	Provide work plan on CWD	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	