

# Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:00 – 8:30 PM, April 26, 2011

Civic Centre, Prince George, BC

## MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<p><u><i>Public &amp; First Nations:</i></u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Doug Beckett – Public Interest Jo Graber – Cultural Conservation Michelle Hourie – Tourism / Ray Hourie – Small Business/Métis Melanie Karjala – Research &amp; Education Virginia Karr - Natural Conservation Dave Kim – Forestry Workers &amp; Contractors Dave King – Recreation, non-motorized Anne Migvar - Ranching &amp; Farming (alternate) Jerry Noakes - Recreation, commercial, motorized Esther Perry – Ranching &amp; Farming Laura Ryser - Research &amp; Education Lee Sexsmith – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Don Wilkins - Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters) Ian Wilson – Hunting &amp; Fishing</p>	<p><u><i>Steering Committee:</i></u> <b>Chair:</b> Sara Cotter - Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS</p> <p><u><i>Advisors:</i></u> Jim McCormack – SFMP Coordinator, Canfor</p> <p><u><i>Observers:</i></u> Al Gorley, Forest Practices Board James Steidle, Wally Steidle, and Susan Steidle – Punchaw Lake Ranchers and Beekeepers</p> <p><u><i>Facilitator &amp; Scribe:</i></u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Gretchen Prystawik</p>
---	--

### 1) Welcome & Introductions – Sara Cotter

- a) Introduction of members and guests:
  - i) Al Gorley - Forest Practices Board
  - ii) James Steidle, Wally Steidle, and Susan Steidle – Punchaw Lake Ranchers and Beekeepers

### 2) Reviewed Agenda

- a) Agenda accepted as written.

### 3) Reviewed Minutes of April 5, 2011 PAG Meeting

- a) Replacement of “contractors” with “workers” in 5.v. 2 and 5.v.3.
- b) Minutes accepted as revised.

- c) Comment from PAG member that additional information is available regarding last meeting's discussion on "person years" in Core Indicator 5.2.3 Level of direct and indirect employment. The Prince George TSA Timber Supply Analysis Public Discussion Paper, January 2010 contains detailed employment information in Appendix B beginning on page 21. The weblink to this document is:  
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hts/tsa/tsa24/tsr4/24ts10pdp.pdf>.

#### **4) Reviewed Meeting Evaluation**

- a) Meeting Evaluation results from the April 5, 2011 PG PAG meeting were posted. Comments reviewed. All items above target.

#### **5) Special Notes**

- a) Ray Hourie has agreed to represent Métis.
- b) Teena Demeulemeester has been elected as a councillor with Saulteau First Nations and will no longer represent West Moberly First Nations on the PG PAG. PAG member suggested she be thanked for her contributions and comments. She will be missed.

#### **6) Indicator Revisions (CSA Element 5.2: Communities and Sustainability)**

- a) Core Indicator 5.2.4 Level of Aboriginal participation in forest economy
  - i) LSC Recommendation: Add new indicator to the PG SFM Plan.
    - (1) 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 same Value and Objective Statements found for SFM Element 5.2 in the PG SFM Plan:
      - (a) Value Statement: Community well-being.
      - (b) Objective Statement: Support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community.
    - ii) Proposed new indicator statement: Number of opportunities for Aboriginals to participate in the forest economy. Target:  $\geq$  number of realized opportunities from baseline assessment ( 3-year rolling average). Variance: -10% of baseline.
    - iii) Discussion:
      - (1) LSC Rationale: This indicator and target look specifically at First Nations' participation in the forest economy, evaluating the Licensees' efforts to build capacity within First Nations on matters related to the forest industry. The variance recognizes that there are occasions when First Nations, after being given the opportunity, elect not to participate and is respectful of those decisions.
      - (2) PAG member expressed concerns about the intent to evaluate BCTS and Canfor's efforts to build forest industry-related capacity with Aboriginals.
      - (3) PAG member questioned why established relationships are not listed, instead of just using examples. LSC stated that concerns could exist around confidentiality.

- (4) PAG member suggested that indicator should measure differences between relationships with Aboriginal governing bodies (for example, contracts with band government/band council) and Aboriginal contractors (for example, private companies owned by Aboriginals).
- (5) PAG member would like to see all Aboriginal communities in the DFA listed in the Plan, including Métis.
- (6) LSC described their processes for contacting Aboriginal groups to establish relationships and contractual arrangements (i.e., mail, phone, fax, email, and face to face where possible).
- (7) PAG noted that an indicator was not met last year on TFL 30 regarding annual meetings with all Aboriginals. The LSC plans to revisit this indicator at a future meeting and look at changing the indicator to reflect meeting only if necessary and requested by the Aboriginal community.
- (8) PAG member asked whether direct award contracts are possible for Canfor and BCTS. LSC stated that they are, but most contracts are awarded through competitive bid.
- (9) PAG member requested that in the target “Opportunities” be replaced with “Realized opportunities”, and defined further in the indicator detail sheet.
- (10) PAG member requested that “First Nations” be replaced with “Aboriginals” in the supporting text and defined in the glossary as First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. LSC noted that the Canadian Constitution (Section 35) states that Aboriginal peoples of Canada includes the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of Canada.
- (11) PAG member commented that tracking should distinguish between who gets the contracts (i.e., private company owned by Aboriginal person, or entity/corporate such as band government) as well as whether the opportunity was realized, and should show change from year to year. PAG member requested reporting on contracts, dollar value, MOU, number of entities, and nature of entity (i.e., corporations, band governments, or private companies).
- (12) PAG member recommended that BCTS develop their ability to direct award small contracts to build capacity. PAG member interested in seeing Aboriginals gaining capacity to complete contracts for BCTS and Canfor. BCTS representative noted that structural systems in government are not yet in place to make that happen. BCTS does not actively mentor Aboriginals to successfully bid on contracts. PAG members suggested this mentorship be provided. PAG discussed differences between bidding at BCTS and Canfor. PAG member suggested another indicator be developed around capacity building. LSC noted that additional discussion will occur around meaningful Aboriginal involvement in planning under Criterion 6.
- (13) PAG member asked BCTS how opportunities for contracts are communicated. BCTS stated that all information was posted on the Internet. PAG member felt more diverse communication mechanisms are needed to distribute information about bid opportunities as many Aboriginal communities do not have high speed Internet / may have computer literacy

issues.

- (14) PAG member suggested that BCTS split larger contracts to make work accessible for Aboriginal groups interested in participating.
  - (15) PAG member has concerns around equity of opportunities among Aboriginal communities in the DFA and requested that reporting include “offered” and “realized” – characterize what realized means in the context of various communities. Suggested “The number of capacity building initiatives offered to Aboriginal communities.” LSC to discuss the ability to report this detail and come back to PAG.
  - (16) PAG comment that “support” is the first word in the proposed Objective Statement and suggested change to “Provide/support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community.”
  - (17) Discussion of target with rolling average. A rolling average is intended to capture variation over time in the target and variance. The decision to use 3-year rolling average instead of 5-year was discretionary. PAG supports 3-year for the first reporting periods and can revisit later.
  - (18) PAG member suggested that the indicator be sorted by opportunity, not by group. Target should characterize breadth and depth of opportunities.
- iv) General Agreement with 1 dissension on adding new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements to the PG SFM Plan:
- (1) Value Statement: *Community well-being.*
  - (2) Revised Objective Statement: *Provide/support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community.*
  - (3) Revised Core Indicator 5.2.4: *Number of opportunities for Aboriginals to participate in the forest economy. Target: >= number of realized opportunities from baseline assessment ( 3-year rolling average). Variance: -10% of baseline.*
  - (4) Reason for dissention: Opportunities are not tracked equitably (due to lack of evidence for the attempt to engage each of the individual Aboriginal communities within the Defined Forest Area).

## **7) Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society’s Responsibility Element 6.3 – Forest community well-being and resilience)**

### a) Reviewed Handouts

- i) Powerpoint presentation on Criterion 6: Society’s Responsibility.
  - (1) The presentation provided background information on Core Indicator 6.3.4 – *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 and is periodically reviewed and improved.*
  - (2) 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.

- b) 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 and is periodically reviewed and improved.*
- i) LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #45 and TFL30 Indicator #44a, TFL30 Indicator #44b, TFL30 Indicator #44c, and TFL30 Indicator #44d with new Proposed wording of Core Indicators 6.3.2 and 6.3.3.
- (1) 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 same Value and Objective Statements found for SFM Element 5.2 in the PG SFM Plan:
- (a) Value Statement: Community well-being.
- (b) Objective Statement: Provide/support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community.
- ii) Existing PG Indicator #45: Number of loss time accidents (days) in Woodland Operations. Target: 0. Variance: 0.
- iii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #44a: Canfor and BCTS will maintain registration under the SAFE Certification Program. Target: 100% SAFE Certified. Variance: 0%.
- iv) Existing TFL30 Indicator #44b: Percentage of Contractors certified or registered under the SAFE Certification Program. Target: 2008 – 60%, 2009 – 80%, 2010 – 90%. Variance: -10%.
- v) Existing TFL30 Indicator #44c: Percentage of Canfor contractors registered under the SAFE Certification program. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- vi) Existing TFL30 Indicator #44d: Percentage of BCTS contractors and Timber Sale Licensees issued by BCTS registered under the SAFE Certification program. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- vii) Proposed new indicator statement: Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- viii) Discussion:
- (1) LSC Rationale:
- (a) Strong match for proposed core indicator
- (b) Slight wording change desired by LSC in order to be consistent with other Canfor and BCTS SFMPs which will facilitate reporting, trends analysis, and priority-setting
- (c) Matched intent for proposed core indicator.
- (2) PAG member requests reporting out of number and nature of accidents and fatalities. Concern that reporting provided under previous plans is eliminated

from reporting for this and subsequent plans.

- (3) LSC noted that BCTS will be able to report on this indicator now because all BCTS contractors must be SAFE certified.
  - (4) PAG member requested that the indicator detail sheet be updated to reflect a “top-down” safety philosophy. LSC stated that all DFA-related workers that work for BCTS or Canfor are covered by SAFE certification.
  - (5) PAG member suggested an addition to the continuous improvement matrix – add something about global initiative/objective – if we rely on a standard and the standard changes to a lesser standard, the company endeavours to continue at the same older/higher standard and make the PAG aware of this problem. LSC stated that this recommendation is in alignment with the philosophy of continual improvement for the entire SFM Plan, not just related to safety issues.
  - (6) PAG members feel that safety standards should not deteriorate in the future.
- ix) PAG consensus on LSC recommendation to replace PG Indicator #45 and TFL30 Indicator #44a, TFL30 Indicator #44b, TFL30 Indicator #44c, and TFL30 Indicator #44d with proposed new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements for Core Indicators 6.3.2 and 6.3.3.:
- (1) Value Statement: *Community well-being.*
  - (2) Revised Objective Statement: *Provide/support opportunities for maintaining a resilient and stable community.*
  - (3) Core Indicator 6.3.2 and 6.3.3: *Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.*

## **8) Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society’s Responsibility Element 6.4 - Fair and effective decision-making)**

### a) Reviewed Handouts

#### i) Powerpoint presentation on Criterion 6: Society’s Responsibility.

- (1) The presentation provided background information on Core Indicator 6.4.1 – *Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process.*
- (2) The SFM Public Advisory Group (PAG) was established to assist the Plan Proponents in developing the SFM Plan in part by identifying local values, objectives, indicators and targets. Ensuring the continuing interest and participation of the PAG is an integral part of a dynamic and responsive SFM Plan. The ability of people to share information, discuss and solve problems, and set and meet objectives is key to achieving and maintaining meaningful participation.

### b) Core Indicator: 6.4.1 - *Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process.*

- i) LSC recommendation: replace PG Indicator #51, PG Indicator #52, PG Indicator #53, PG Indicator #55, TFL30 Indicator #52a, TFL30 Indicator #52b, TFL30 Indicator #54a, TFL30 Indicator #54b, TFL30 Indicator #54c, and TFL30 Indicator #54d, with new Proposed wording of Core Indicator 6.4.1.

- (1) This indicator also requires 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:
  - (a) Value Statement: Public Participation in decision making processes.
  - (b) Objective Statement: A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM.
- ii) Existing PG Indicator #51: Percentage of PAG satisfaction with public participation process. Target: 100%. Variance: -20%.
- iii) Existing PG Indicator #52: PAG Terms of Reference reviewed per year . Target:  $\geq 1$ . Variance: 0.
- iv) Existing PG Indicator #53: Number of PAG meetings per year. Target:  $\geq 3$ . Variance: -1.
- v) Existing PG Indicator #55: Percentage of PAG satisfaction with amount and timing of information presented for informed decision-making . Target: 100%. Variance: -20%.
- vi) Existing TFL30 Indicator #52a: Number of times PAG Terms of Reference reviewed. Target:  $\geq 1$ . Variance: 0.
- vii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #52b: Number of PAG meetings per year. Target:  $\geq 1$ . Variance: 0.
- viii) Existing TFL30 Indicator #54a: PAG overall satisfaction with the meetings. Target: Score of 5. Variance: -0.75.
- ix) Existing TFL30 Indicator #54b: PAG overall satisfaction score with public participation process. Target: Score of 5. Variance: -0.75.
- x) Existing TFL30 Indicator #54c: Percentage of PAG satisfied with amount and timing of information presented for informed decision-making.. Target: 100%. Variance: -20%.
- xi) Existing TFL30 Indicator #54d: Percentage of interested parties satisfied with amount and timing of information presented for informed decision-making. Target: 100%, every 3 years. Variance: -40%.
- xii) Proposed indicator: PAG established and maintained, and satisfaction survey implemented according to the Terms of Reference. Target: PAG meeting satisfaction score of  $\geq 4$ . Variance: 0.
- xiii) Discussion:
  - (1) LSC Rationale:
    - (a) LSC distributed a revised meeting feedback form. Changes aim to make forms uniform across other PAGs, allow for synthesis of results, make forms easier to complete for PAG members, and are better able to capture feedback and identify corrective actions.
    - (b) Strong match for proposed core indicator
    - (c) Slight wording change desired by LSC in order to be consistent with

other Canfor and BCTS SFMPs which will facilitate reporting, trends analysis, and priority-setting

- (2) PAG member commented that guests should be encouraged to participate and fill out satisfaction surveys (to reflect the objective and value).
  - (3) Some PAG members have been involved since the LRMP. Interest in PAG satisfaction in other planning areas.
  - (4) Note that other processes for public involvement exist and other indicators exist to measure public participation. These will be discussed later.
  - (5) PAG member commented that they appreciate the changes to the survey, and suggest periodic updates and revisiting of the survey form.
  - (6) Discussion of role of PAG and LSC in proposed Rosebud Mountain ecological reserve.
- xiv) PAG consensus on LSC recommendation to replace PG Indicator #51, PG Indicator #52, PG Indicator #53, PG Indicator #55, TFL30 Indicator #52a, TFL30 Indicator #52b, TFL30 Indicator #54a, TFL30 Indicator #54b, TFL30 Indicator #54c, and TFL30 Indicator #54d with proposed new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements for Core Indicator 6.4.1.:
- (1) Value Statement: *Public Participation in decision making processes.*
  - (2) Objective Statement: *A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM.*
  - (3) Core Indicator 6.4.1: *PAG established and maintained, and satisfaction survey implemented according to the Terms of Reference. Target: PAG meeting satisfaction score of  $\geq 4$ . Variance: 0.*

#### 9) Meeting Time:

- a) PAG member suggested that meetings go from 5 to 9 PM.

#### 10) Evaluation Forms requested and collected

#### 11) Next PG PAG Meeting:

- a) Prince George Civic Center 5:00 – 9:00 pm
- b) Tuesday May 17, 2011, 5:00 to 9:00 PM

#### Actions- update

<b>PRINCE GEORGE PAG</b>				
<b>ID#</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
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	

<b>PRINCE GEORGE PAG</b>				
<b>ID#</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
Mar 17 - 01	Add Donations indicator into the SFM Plan and provide details at a future meeting.	Steering Committee	Future meeting.	
Mar 17 - 02	Work with experts to see if there might be ways to making the Investment Indicator more meaningful and effective. Possibly have the experts provide various indicator options for the PAG to select from. Presentation of some background as to what the options measure and some discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the various options should be included.	Steering Committee	March 2013	
April 5 - 01	Determine if there is information to track the root causes of "unsuccessful" relationships	Steering Committee	Next meeting.	