

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:00 – 8:30 PM, May 17, 2011

Civic Centre, Prince George, BC

MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<u><i>Public & First Nations:</i></u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Chris Andreschefski – Private Landowners Doug Beckett – Public Interest Shannon Carson – Public Interest (alternate) Jo Graber – Cultural Conservation Michelle Hourie – Tourism Ray Hourie – Métis Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Virginia Karr - Natural Conservation Dave Kim – Forestry Workers & Contractors Dave King – Recreation, non-motorized Anne Migvar - Ranching & Farming (alternate) Jerry Noakes - Recreation, commercial, motorized Esther Perry – Ranching & Farming Laura Ryser - Research & Education (alternate) Don Wilkins - Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters) Ian Wilson – Hunting & Fishing	<u><i>Steering Committee:</i></u> Chair: Sara Cotter - Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS <u><i>Advisors:</i></u> Jim McCormack – SFMP Coordinator, Canfor <u><i>Observers/Guests:</i></u> Jason Neumeyer - Canfor Certification Coordinator (Quesnel) Sandra Day - Métis <u><i>Facilitator & Scribe:</i></u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer
---	--

1) Welcome & Introductions – Sara Cotter

- a) Introduction of members and guests:
 - i) Jason Neumeyer, Certification Coordinator Canfor (Quesnel),
 - ii) Sandra Day – Métis.

2) Reviewed Agenda

- a) Agenda accepted as written.

3) Reviewed Minutes of April 26, 2011 PAG Meeting

- a) p. 6. Section 8 a) (2) spelling mistake “and”
- b) p. 3. Item 12. PAG member requested the addition of a the following text to add more context to the discussion about “Level of Aboriginal participation in forest economy”:
 - i) (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.

- c) p. 4. iv) (4) PAG member feels that dissension was not adequately described: amend to “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)”.
- d) Minutes accepted as revised.

4) Reviewed Meeting Evaluation

- a) Meeting Evaluation results from the April 26, 2011 PG PAG meeting were posted. Comments reviewed. All items above target.

5) 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 6.4.2 – Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general.

- b) Core Indicator 6.4.2 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general.

- 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 following Value and Objective Statements:

- Value Statement: *Public Participation in decision making processes.*
 - Objective Statement: *A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM.*

- ii) Proposed new indicator statement: *Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG, Target: >= 1 (annual), Variance: none.*

- iii) Discussion:

- (1) LSC reviewed examples of educational opportunities provided to the Public Advisory group since 2006.

- (2) PAG member asked for definition of “Capacity development”. LSC defined it as “in relation to “fair and effective decision making” and “meaningful participation”, capacity development is within context of CSA Framework and associated participation process. Simply put, have all the PAG members at a similar level of understanding.

- (3) PAG member feels that this is an output indicator rather than an input indicator. What is the measurement tool? LSC noted that indicator is simply meant to quantify the number of educational opportunities.
- (4) PAG member requested clarification on the phrase “ meaningful participation”, which is part of the Core Indicator statement. PAG member would like to see presentations on how the LSC has applied PAG recommendations in their operations. This feedback could also be provided through field trips. PAG member appreciates the value of the PAG process, but would like to see one of these opportunities presented each per year, so that it is science-based or environmental-based rather than social. PAG member wants to see good practices, evidence-based research and so on.
- (5) PAG member stated that there are many multi-use opportunities available for for future field trips or presentations.
- (6) LSC stated that by fall, harvesting contractors will be implementing best practices for coarse woody debris (as reviewed with Core Indicator 3.1.2 – Level of Downed Woody Debris) and other comments coming out of previous PAG meetings. (e.g. Janine Gervais now working in Harvesting and bringing PAG comments to the field)
- (7) PAG member would like to see slide presentations showing before and after examples for silviculture, harvesting, etc.
- (8) PAG member suggested adding a part “b” to this indicator “Number of changes in practice that have occurred as a result of the CSA participation. Target: 10”. PAG member wants to see a measure of the changes that are constructively used.
- (9) PAG member likes the “hands on” approach to public participation and field trips are a good way to educate people. Likes to physically see the changes and wonders if the proposed target is too low.
- (10) PAG member feels the target should be at least 2 so that there is continuing competency for new PAG members. LSC has noted that it has currently had at least two opportunities a year since 2006 so this is achievable. LSC supports changing the target to ≥ 2 .
- (11) PAG member noted the past performance of the LSC against the proposed target and is not sure if another indicator is necessary.
- (12) PAG member also wondered about the diversity of opportunities and suggests reporting the type or topic area of each educational opportunity.
- (13) PAG member feels that PAG meetings are very informative and educational already just by attending the meetings and agrees with previous comment that we all need to be validated where there are issues and concerns.
- (14) PAG member would like to see comments recorded at each educational opportunity and/or a summary report. LSC said they can report on how PAG input is affecting forest management.
- (15) PAG member would like to amend the suggested second indicator to report on how the PAG - recommended changes have influenced forest operations, rather

than a numeric value.

Action Item #1: LSC to consider PAG suggestion for a second indicator for Core Indicator 6.4.2 and report back to PAG. **Due:** Future meeting.

- iv) General Agreement with 1 dissension on adding new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements to the PG SFM Plan:
- (1) Value Statement: *Public Participation in decision making processes.*
 - (2) Revised Objective Statement: *A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM.*
 - (3) Proposed Core Indicator 6.4.2: *Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG, Revised Target: ≥ 2 (annual), Variance: none.*
 - (4) Reason for dissention: Feels the proposed indicator measures only quantity not quality of the indicator, would like to see the addition of a second indicator to assess the quality and effectiveness of each educational opportunity.
- c) Core Indicator 6.4.3 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation of Aboriginal communities
- i) LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #47, PG Indicator #48, TFL30 Indicator #46a, and TFL30 Indicator #46b with the proposed wording of Core Indicator 6.4.3.
 - (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 following Value and Objective Statements:
 - Value Statement: *Public Participation in decision making processes.*
 - Objective Statement: *A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM.*
 - ii) Existing PG Indicator #47: All Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal bands. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
 - iii) Existing PG Indicator #48: The percentage of Pesticide Management Plans (PMPs) and associated major amendments are referred to affected aboriginal bands. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
 - iv) Existing TFL30 Indicator #46a: All Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal peoples. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
 - v) Existing TFL30 Indicator #46b: Pesticide Management Plans (PMP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal bands. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
 - vi) Proposed new indicator statement: *Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities having a clear understanding of the plans, Target: 100% of management plans, Variance: none.*

vii) Discussion:

- (1) LSC noted that the phrase “management plans” refers to the following:
 - Forest Stewardship Plans (major amendments)
 - TFL Management Plans
 - Pest Management Plans
 - Block information sharing
 - SFM Plans
- (2) LSC noted that the following First Nations have Traditional Territories within the Defined Forest Area:
 - Lheidli T’enneh (Lheit-Lit’en) First Nation
 - McLeod Lake (Tsekani) First Nation
 - Nak’azdli Band
 - Nazko First Nation
 - Lhtako Dene (Red Bluff) First Nation
 - Saik’uz First Nation
 - West Moberly First Nations
 - Halfway River First Nation
- (3) PAG member has concerns about the clarity of the indicator and wonders if “clear understanding of the plans” can be measured? LSC admits this is a difficult description.
- (4) PAG member noted that the indicator detail sheet contains references to “First Nations” versus “Aboriginal”. LSC will update the indicator detail sheet to say “Aboriginal”.
- (5) PAG member noted that in Section 35 of the Constitution Act, the definition of Aboriginal includes First Nations, Métis and Inuit. LSC noted that in British Columbia the Métis have a different relationship with the government and are not consulted like First Nations. LSC noted that in the CSA SFM Standard (Z809-08), the definition of “Aboriginal” is the same as in Section 35 of the Constitution Act.
- (6) PAG member noted that “obtaining acceptance” of 100% of management plans might be a tall order and wonders if there are educational opportunities for First Nations to see the relationships between the Management Plans.
- (7) PAG member wonders what capacity development will be promoted and how has Aboriginal input changed Licensee practices and management decisions? LSC stated that *Core Indicator 6.1.3 Level of management and/or protection of areas where culturally important practices and activities (hunting, fishing, gathering)* will address the this.
- (8) PAG member wants to know what is involved in making “best efforts”. PAG member would like to see comments (contact and dialogue) around this, it need not be tabulated. LSC acknowledged that there are relationship building issues that also need to be resolved between the Licensees and Aboriginals.
- (9) PAG member noted the differences between Indicators 6.4.2 (General) and 6.4.3 (Aboriginal) and feels that the wording may be seen as pejorative or

condescending. The PAG member noted that the phrase “clear understanding” is not found in Indicator 6.4.2. LSC stated that the wording is not meant to be condescending. There is a legal requirement for information sharing with respect to legal status and traditional lands.

- (10) Observer added that this indicator is also intended to be used for *Core Indicator 6.1.2 Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities having a clear understanding of the plans*.
 - (11) PAG member is concerned that this indicator does not reflect a two-way process, or dialogue with Aboriginals.
 - (12) PAG member disappointed with Canfor at this time because Métis are not officially consulted on Management Plans. LSC noted that information can be provided to more contacts in the Métis community.
 - (13) PAG member observed that the LSC was not providing evidence of contacting the Aboriginal community. LSC stated that there are 8 First Nations with traditional territory within the Defined Forest Area. PAG member feels that Métis are excluded. Métis are broadly dispersed in Canada with ongoing Treaty negotiations.
 - (14) PAG member feels that capacity issues for Aboriginal participation in SFM are not adequately addressed (time, remuneration, education, etc.). LSC noted that the PAG Terms of Reference currently has no remuneration policy for Aboriginal participation in the public involvement process other than reimbursement of travel expenses.
 - (15) PAG member also uncomfortable with this indicator and suggests new wording: “*evidence to obtain input of management plans from Aboriginal communities*”.
 - (16) PAG member noted that the target of “100% of management plans accepted” is not a true measure of meaningful participation.
- viii) LSC stated that they would table Core Indicator 6.4.3 for now and revisit with the PAG at a future meeting once the LSC has had time to review the wording and intent.

6) Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society’s Responsibility, Element 6.1 - Aboriginal and Treaty Rights)

- a) Core Indicator 6.1.2 Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities having a clear understanding of the plans
 - 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 Value and Objective Statements currently associated with SFM element 6.1:
 - Value Statement: *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights*.
 - Objective Statement: *Recognition and respect for Aboriginal and treaty*

rights.

- ii) Existing PG Indicator #47: All Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal bands. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- iii) Existing PG Indicator #48: The percentage of Pesticide Management Plans (PMPs) and associated major amendments are referred to affected aboriginal bands. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- iv) Existing TFL30 Indicator #46a: All Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal peoples. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- v) Existing TFL30 Indicator #46b: Pesticide Management Plans (PMP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal bands. Target: 100%. Variance: 0%.
- vi) Proposed new indicator statement: *Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities having a clear understanding of the plans*, Target: 100% of management plans, Variance: none.
- vii) Discussion:

- (1) LSC noted that the proposed indicator statement for 6.1.2 is the same as the proposed indicator statement for 6.4.3.
- (2) PAG member wanted to know who wrote this Core Indicator?. LSC said it was prepared by the CSA Technical Committee. PAG members are very much in disagreement with this Indicator statement. LSC said that the wording of the Core Indicator cannot be changed but the wording of the proposed indicator can be changed.
- (3) PAG member asked what would be the consequence if this proposed indicator was not endorsed? LSC stated that they would like to take away feedback from this meeting and rework the wording of this Indicator. PAG noted that this is not the only indicator where PAG has had issues with CSA wording.
- (4) PAG member suggested new wording for this indicator: *“Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities and licensees having a clear understanding of each other’s interests and plans”*.
- (5) PAG member noted that Metis are recognized for cultural and traditional lands in BC as it relates to the right to harvest migratory birds.
- (6) PAG member suggested revised wording for this indicator: *“Evidence of contact with each Aboriginal community within the Defined Forest Area”*. and include a list of all the Aboriginal communities.
- (7) Concerns expressed by several of the PAG members that: “Métis have a constitutional right to engage, as per Section 35 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) on all BC land uses that impact their cultural and traditional interests rights as Aboriginals, therefore Metis have equal right to participate fully and equally, just the same as the other Aboriginal communities within the defined forest area.

- (8) PAG member noted that to exclude the Métis (from the consultation process), as BCTS is doing, is a constitutional violation and it is illegal and is grounds for discrimination. PAG member further noted that in Canada, our liberal democratic society, is based on principles of equal opportunity and equal access. Excluding Métis is discriminatory, thus illegal.
- (9) PAG member recommends the PAG formally include Métis in all Aboriginal references particularly to engage the Métis regarding their cultural and traditional interests as per Section 35 of the Constitution 1982. Facilitator noted that the definition of Aboriginal currently in the SFM Plan and the CSA standard is identical to the definition in Section 35 of the Constitution Act.
- (10) PAG member suggested developing a survey instrument for individual Aboriginal communities within the defined forest area as a primary measuring tool (including a “yes” or “no” on plan acceptance). It is important to know what is meaningful to Aboriginals so that they have a sense of ownership in the process.
- (11) BCTS provided the PAG Métis Representative with background material concerning BCTS contract requirements and processes. BCTS specified that the relationship was not being formed with the Métis community, but with an individual organization, which in essence does not acknowledge the Metis as Aboriginal. PG PAG member acknowledged that it is a step in the right direction, however the Métis are not being acknowledged, nor recognized and this is discriminatory, and in violation of the Section 35 Constitutional provisions.
- (12) PAG member is confused over what is really being measured (common practice, best practice, good practice). After the quality of the practice has been defined, how is this measured? LSC explained that “best efforts” will be defined in the SFM Plan.
- (13) PAG member is interested in knowing who represents the actual community? Is it a band council, a spokesman that will speak for the community? LSC will detail this information in the SFM Plan.
- (14) PAG member suggested revised wording for this indicator statement:
“Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on licensees having a clear understanding and respect of aboriginal community’s interests and plans”.
- (15) PAG member suggested adding a description of changes in practice that have occurred as a result of aboriginal participation.
- (16) PAG member asked about the discrepancy of recognition of Métis at the Provincial and Federal levels of government. LSC will arrange for a speaker to come in and explain the differences.
- (17) PAG member stated that this indicator could have huge potential for cross-cultural learning and, over time, could open up many levels of involvement.
- (18) PAG member asked about the repercussions operationally if Métis refused to accept a management plan put forward by the Licensees. LSC stated that ultimately, the provincial government would have to make a decision.

- (19) PAG member said it would be best to return to old indicators for now because that is the only thing the LSC has control over.
- (20) PAG member wants to see good reporting out on “best efforts”
- (21) PAG member compared a management plan that is accepted versus a management plan that is mutually worked on. Reasonable efforts must be made to come to an agreement. This would be part of demonstrating “best efforts”. There is nothing in the indicator right now on “partnership” and “relationship”.
- (22) PAG member noted that a relationship starts with recognition before there is “clear understanding and respect”.
- (23) PAG member would like to see someone from the Métis Association or the BC First Nations Forestry Council come in and speak to the process.
- (24) PAG member suggested contacting the Métis Director of Natural Resources for BC to see if he could come and speak to group.

7) **Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society’s Responsibility, Element 6.5 – Information for Decision-Making)**

a) Core Indicator 6.5.1 – Number of people reached through educational outreach.

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 following Value and Objective Statements:

- Value Statement: *Informed, fair and inclusive decision-making.*
- Objective Statement: *Adaptive forest management that is responsive to research, experience and public input s.*

ii) Proposed new indicator statement: *The number of people to whom education opportunities are provided.* Target: *50/licensee.* Variance *-10.*

iii) Discussion:

- (1) LSC reviewed examples of existing educational opportunities such as Field Tours and Open Houses.
- (2) PAG member asked why the LSC chose a target of 50 and proposed that it should be ≥ 50 with variance of 10.
- (3) PAG member asked if scholarships/bursaries are included. LSC responded they are not since this is indicator relates to educational outreach.
- (4) PAG member wondered if licensees are able to double count if they do something jointly. LSC agreed to report out which opportunities were joint and which were individual.
- (5) PAG member is troubled by the semantics of the word “provided” and feels the indicator would be stronger if it used the word “attended” instead. LSC agreed to revise the proposed indicator to “the number of people *who attended* the

educational opportunities provided.”

- (6) PAG member would like something included about the diversity of experiences and suggests reporting out by the types of educational opportunities outlined in the indicator description (public advisory group, field tour, open houses, notification/referrals to stakeholders, school classroom visits). PAG member would like to see more types of educational opportunities developed over time.
 - (7) PAG member feels that measuring the number of people who attended is not sufficient. The number of events is more meaningful and suggests that the indicator capture the number of events not the number of people because the LSC cannot force people to come to an event.
 - (8) PAG member feels that the proposed indicator does not relate well to the Objective Statement which states: “Adaptive forest management that is responsive to research, experience and public input”. PAG member feels that there is a disconnect here and is concerned that the proposed indicator doesn’t involve public input. LSC noted that this indicator should not be taken in isolation and is part of a suite of indicators that relate to the Objective Statement and Core Indicator.
 - (9) PAG member suggested that the LSC give the PAG an opportunity to look at the entire suite of indicators associated with each element. LSC will start providing these details at the next meeting.
 - (10) PAG member would also like to see details about the quality rather than the quantity of the educational event incorporated into the indicator reporting at a future date.
 - (11) PAG member suggested developing a survey instrument as a primary measuring tool for this indicator.
 - (12) PAG member suggested revising the wording of the proposed Indicator: “*The number of people who attended and responded to the information sharing and educational opportunities provided*”.
 - (13) PAG member would like to see a reciprocal indicator on the number of Licensees attending current research announcements and events – education has to be two ways.
- iv) LSC stated that they would table Core Indicator 6.5.1 for now and revisit with the PAG at a future meeting once the LSC has had time to reword the Objective Statement.

Action Item #2: LSC to revise objective statement for Core Indicator 6.5.1 and revisit with the PAG. **Due:** Future meeting.

8) Evaluation Forms requested and collected

9) Next PG PAG Meeting:

- a) Prince George Civic Center 5:00 – 9:00 pm
- b) 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	
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.	
May 17 - 01	Consider PAG suggestion for a second indicator for Core Indicator 6.4.2 and report back to PAG.	Steering Committee	Future meeting	
May 17 - 02	Revise objective statement for Core Indicator 6.5.1 and revisit with the PAG.	Steering Committee	Future meeting	