

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:00 – 9:00 PM, September 27, 2011

Civic Centre, Prince George, BC

MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<u><i>Public & First Nations:</i></u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Chris Andreschewski – Private Landowners Doug Beckett – Public Interest Michelle Hourie – Tourism Ray Hourie – Métis Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Dave Kim – Forest workers & Contractors Anne Migvar - Ranching & Farming (alternate) Jeff Mohr – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized (alternate) Esther Perry – Ranching & Farming Patience Rakochy – Non-Timber Forest Products Laura Ryser – Research & Education (alternate) Don Wilkins - Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters)	<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> Gundula Meyer-Eppler Dale Wolfe Lyle Lambert - Métis
	<u><i>Facilitator & Scribe:</i></u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Tanya Milner

1. Welcome & Introductions – Lee Evans

- a. Introduction of members and guests:
 - i. Lyle Lambert – Métis. Lyle has been appointed the alternate for the Métis sector on the PG PAG.
 - ii. Dale Wolfe – Dwight’s mother, visiting from Nova Scotia
- b. Jocelyn Campbell, alternate to Natural Conservation Sector, has sent in her letter of resignation as she has taken a new job and moved to Fort St. John. PAG is looking for someone to fill this position.
- c. Doug Beckett offered an invite to anyone wanting to see his wife’s truck during break or at the end of meeting. The vehicle runs on lithium batteries.
- d. Reminder that the SFMP attachés are still available to PAG members. Members can pick them up at the end of tonight’s meeting.

2. Reviewed Agenda

- a. If there is time tonight, Jim McCormack will give an update on Canfor’s Biodiversity Strategy. If not, he will give a talk at next month’s meeting.
- b. Agenda accepted as revised.

3. Reviewed Minutes of June 7, 2011 PAG Meeting

- a. Minor grammatical errors noted and corrected.
- b. Minutes accepted as revised.

4. Reviewed Meeting Evaluation

- a. Meeting Evaluation results from the June 7, 2011 PG PAG meeting were posted. Comments were reviewed. All items were above target.
- b. LSC requested that PAG Representatives and Alternates add comments on the back of the sheet regarding satisfaction of Civic Centre facilities as Lee will present the comments to an upcoming meeting with the Civic Centre manager.

5. Audit Results

- a. Reviewed Handout –“Prince George and TFL 30 – Internal and External Audit Update (2011)”
- b. Canfor - Jim McCormack presented the results for both the internal and external summary.
 - i. Internal Summary:
 1. Audit conducted on June 27-30, 2011
 2. No non-compliances, major or minor non-conformities identified for the PG and TFL30 Defined Forest Areas.
 3. Opportunities for Improvement related to the SFM Plan included:
 - a. Overachievement of wildlife tree patch targets in PG and Mackenzie
 - ii. Discussion
 1. PAG wanted to know the difference between “non-compliance” and “non-conformities”. LSC stated that “non compliance” relates to legislation and “non-conformity” relates to the CSA Standard.
 2. PAG asked what OFI #8 relates to - “Site Plans may benefit from ID of resource feature and applicable strategies”.

Action Item #1: LSC to report Canfor Internal Audit details related to OFI #8 “Site Plans may benefit from ID of resource feature and applicable strategies”. **Due:** Next Meeting.

3. PAG noted OFI #7 “Overachievement of wildlife tree patch targets in PG and Mackenzie”. The LSC noted that the Auditor noticed a trend of overachieving wildlife tree patch targets. The licensee will determine what action to take in response to this OFI and the auditor will follow-up during the next audit.

iii. External Summary

1. Audit conducted on August 8-12, 2011

2. No new major or minor non-conformities identified for the PG and TFL30 Defined Forest Areas.
 3. Operational Strengths related to the SFM Plan included:
 - a. Planning staff and PAG members have expended considerable effort in working towards revising the PG/TFL30 SFM plan to meet the incremental requirements of CSA Z809-08.
 - b. Development of coarse woody debris best management practices to meet Chief Forester's guidance on CWD retention.
 4. Status of previous Non-conformances related to the SFM Plan included:
 - a. Lack of clear strategies in the PG SFM plan to achieve landscape level biodiversity targets. Progress made over the past year, although formal strategies for the achievement of the landscape-level biodiversity targets have yet to be incorporated into a revised SFM plan that has been endorsed by the PAG.
 5. Progress towards addressing previous OFI's related to the SFM Plan included:
 - a. Although a number of older OFI's have yet to be adequately addressed (e.g. lack of effectiveness monitoring under SFM plans, working with government and other licensees to develop and implement a landscape level harvest and retention planning process to address the 2009 FPB report etc.), good progress was made in a number of areas (e.g. ongoing revisions to the PG/TFL30 VOITs to address a number of previously-identified weaknesses etc.).
 6. New OFI's related to the SFM Plan included:
 - a. Isolated inconsistencies in reporting in the 2009/10 PG SFMP annual report (Table 1 Summary of Indicator Status reported two indicators as being off-target, when the report text indicates that results were within target (Indicator 41 Communication Strategies and Indicator 24 Riparian Area Conservation) (Note – both were reported as off-target to the PAG)
- iv. Discussion:
1. PAG asked if there were any changes to Free to Grow status in the last 15 years. PAG noted in the Prince George Land and Resource Management Plan (PG LRMP) recommendations they needed to relax the Free to Grow status. PAG explained in reference to the PG LRMP they thought they were wiping out biodiversity and, wanted to declare it earlier to let companies off the hook and,

thus create more biodiversity. LSC said there is no variable Free to Grow anymore. Companies need to achieve Free to Grow within 20 years after harvest. Also, there are Broadleaf Free to Grow standards now. The standards are evolving all the time and they are incorporated into the Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP).

2. PAG asked if spraying the blocks with herbicide is significantly decreasing biodiversity. LSC replied that it depends on the methods used and the species targeted. Member said he wants to get rid of aerial spraying and would like to see more manual brushing that would target specific species vs. broadcast method.
 3. PAG member raised concerns about the methodology used to calculate Equivalent Clearcut Area (ECA) targets in the SFM Plan, noting that the draft letter by the hydrologist also supports that mortality should contribute towards the calculation of ECA. Even so, it appears the mortality does not contribute to calculating the ECA in approach presented by the LSC. As such, the LSC approach does not appear to be a science-based approach.
 4. PAG Member asked if either the Internal or External audit considered the method used for ECA calculations, especially recognizing this question had been specifically raised by a PAG member. LSC said no findings were reported in either audits regarding the methodology used to calculate ECA. PAG member has concerns with the methodology used to calculate ECA thresholds and the associated strategies (primarily the PAG member believes the science suggests an ECA percent, which incorporates mortality as contributing towards the ECA, of 30% should be used to trigger having a professional hydrologist perform a hydrological assessment) in the SFM Plan.
 5. PAG member requests that the next audits shall include a review of the procedure for calculating ECA and review the ECA threshold used to trigger a detailed hydrological review.
- c. BCTS – Lee Evans presented the results of the recent External Audit.
- i. No extra findings since the January 2011 External Audit.
 - ii. BCTS did get recertified for the PG and TFL 30 Defined Forest Area.
 - iii. Status of previous Non-conformances related to the SFM Plan included:
 1. BCTS and Canfor need to complete a Trend Analysis related to Patch targets.

6. 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 6.4.3. Evidence of efforts to promote capacity

development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal communities.

- b. Core Indicator 6.4.3. Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal communities.
 - 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:
 - a. Value Statement: Public Participation in decision making processes
 - b. Objective Statement: A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM
 2. Proposed new indicator statement for Indicator 6.4.3(a): Evidence of best efforts to obtain input on management plans from Aboriginal communities. Target: ≥ 3 efforts for 100% of management plans, as required. Variance: none.
 - ii. Discussion:
 1. LSC noted that this indicator was originally introduced at the May 17, 2011 PAG meeting. At that time, the PAG had concerns that the indicator wording reflected one-way communication. PAG requested that the LSC revise the proposed indicator to show more back and forth communication.
 2. PAG member would like to see the word “efforts” replaced with “approaches”.
 3. PAG member would like to see the exact number of aboriginal communities mentioned in the proposed indicator. Member would like to see “6” as the number of First Nation and Métis communities.
 4. PAG member suggested that the LSC send a request to meet with Aboriginals at Annual General Meetings or other functions. Member also had question regarding the word “effort” in terms of contact. The member would like to have it replaced with “responsive effort” - to mean they did get feedback. Member wants to know how the LSC will keep track of responses. LSC said there is an existing tracking system in place that tracks the number of times and methods of communicating (i.e. letter, phone, email, etc). It is part of due diligence. LSC will report back on the both the qualitative and quantitative feedback of the discussion with the Aboriginals.
 5. PAG member proposed an alternative wording to the proposed indicator 6.4.3(a) to read: Evidence to gain collaborative input into the development of management plans from Aboriginal

communities. Member said the rewording allows for an early opportunity to collaboratively develop management plans with Aboriginal communities.

6. PAG member questioned the wording of “collaborative input” in that it may be perceived to be seen as ownership. LSC said they need to be clear about the definition of “collaborative input”, as decisions cannot negatively impact the timber supply. In regard to the Métis community, BCTS and Canfor have agreed to recognise local Métis communities as stakeholders.
7. PAG member made a statement of clarification with respect to the LSC comment "as decisions cannot negatively impact the timber supply". PAG member stated that this statement is not correct, and that in fact forest companies frequently make decisions which influence timber supply. PAG member noted that companies can and do voluntarily avoid harvesting in areas with known values.
8. PAG member said the word “Aboriginal” means Métis, Inuit, and First Nations, and that in British Columbia, communication with First Nations is a compliance issue (eg. required by law), but not for Métis.
9. PAG member said it would make more sense to collaborate when you know there are other interests. Member thinks it needs to be left up to Canfor. LSC said some plans would be easier than others for more site specific issues (i.e. proposed blocks and roads easier to collaborate on than a Forest Stewardship Plan).
10. PAG member would prefer Indicator statement version 6.4.3(a).
11. PAG member suggested another rewording to 6.4.3 version (c) to read as follows: Evidence of best efforts to approach Aboriginal communities for proactive input on management plans. Target >3 approaches/Aboriginal communities within DFA for 100% of management plans as required. Variance: None.
12. PAG member said they liked the indicator statement 6.4.3(c). Member said the new wording shows more intent with the addition of the word “approaches”.
13. Facilitator said if PAG members feel more comfortable with the changes in indicator statement 6.4.3(c), and it does not affect the associated implementation and reporting, then members should go with 6.4.3(c).
14. PAG member asked what are BCTS and Canfor’s efforts going to be and what is their strategy. LSC said Canfor is looking at moving to annual meetings in an open house format to meet with First Nations to show them plans, maps, etc. The Forest District is requiring a higher frequency of block level viewing of plans and more face to face meetings (per band) in the Prince George TSA.

LSC said Canfor also sends out referral letters, and offers to meet. Other Canfor operations often meet with the same First Nations as traditional territories can span more than one DFA. BCTS has public viewing dates with First Nations and they have two separate consultations on FSPs. BCTS sends out referral letters, emails, and phone calls – usually 4-5 tries to contact affected parties, and they document and track all contact efforts.

15. PAG said they see a great difference between “obtain” and “approach” and think we need to work on wording.
 16. Facilitator said members need to come up with one indicator statement, either a, b, or c, and reach a consensus.
 17. Member asked if there is comment section and suggested these terms “proactive” and “collaborative” go there in the SFMP. Facilitator said there is a glossary in the SFMP and can put the terms there.
 18. PAG member said we are arguing over semantics and what licensees actually DO is the important factor.
 19. Facilitator suggested members work on the wording of the proposed indicator statement 6.4.3(c) and go around the speaker list for those to agree or not on the proposed wording.
 20. PAG member said they like the “collaborative” direction.
 21. PAG member concerned as it stands right now with the Government of BC, Métis are not recognised the same as First Nations. Member wants Métis to be recognised just as much as First Nations. Two other PAG members expressed the same concern.
 22. PAG member supports the proposed revised indicator and sees the trend toward collaboration as proactive. PAG member also stated that not agreeing to allow Métis to access the same First Nations rights is a violation of Sub.sec.35(b) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.
 23. Facilitator reminds the PAG that when it is time to go around for consensus, it is at that point where you say “yes” or “no”, and not to bring up arguments as you have already had your time to speak.
- iii. General Agreement with 1 dissent on adding new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements to the PG SFM Plan:
1. Value Statement: Public Participation in decision making processes.
 2. Objective Statement: A clear process for a wide public participation in SFM.
 3. Revised Core Indicator 6.4.3 (a): *Evidence of best efforts to approach Aboriginal communities for proactive input on management plans. Target ≥ 3 approaches/Aboriginal*

community within DFA for 100% of management plans, as required. Variance: None.

- a. Reason for dissent: BCTS still doesn't legally recognize the Métis.

7. Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society's Responsibility, Element 6.2. Respect for Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge, and Uses and Criterion 1: Biological Diversity, Element 1.4. Protected areas and sites of special biological and cultural significance).

- a. Reviewed Handouts
 - i. Powerpoint presentation on Element 6.2
 1. LSC provided a background presentation on Core Indicator 6.2.1: Evidence of understanding and use of Aboriginal knowledge through the engagement of willing Aboriginal communities, using a process that identifies and manages culturally important resources and values
 - b. Core Indicator 6.2.1 Evidence of understanding and use of Aboriginal knowledge through the engagement of willing Aboriginal communities, using a process that identifies and manages culturally important resources and values and Core Indicator 1.4.2 Protection of identified sacred and culturally important sites.
 - i. LSC Recommendation: Add new indicator to the PG SFM Plan.
 1. For Element 6.2, 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:
 - a. Value Statement: Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses
 - b. Objective Statement: Incorporation of Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses in Forest Management
 - ii. Proposed new indicator statement 6.2.1 (a) AND 1.4.2: % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes. Target: 100% known forest values, knowledge and uses considered. Variance: 0.
 - iii. Discussion:
 1. LSC noted that not any one of these indicators stand alone; they all work together. There is a very strong correlation with Element 6.1 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights.
 2. LSC spoke about what they consider a meaningful relationship: a) a process for engagement and information exchange, b) the rise of Aboriginal knowledge in forestry planning and resource management, c) encouraging willing communities to identify important cultural resources, sites, and values.

3. LSC defined the following:
 - a. “Forestry Planning Process” - including information on site level plans, archaeological impact assessments, etc..
 - b. “Annual Reporting”- the number of instances where a discussion led to identifying an Aboriginal forest value, knowledge and use that required specific management or protection.
4. PAG member wanted to know if they going to be reporting out on the number of concerns raised or actions not taken. For example, if someone raises a concern, but licensees don’t see it as a concern. LSC said they already identify what specific things need management or action, and this would be most useful at face to face meetings where you can discuss how to manage for specific concerns, i.e. wetlands and hunting issues.
5. PAG member asked if accelerated cuts and slash pile burning is a concern for the LSC. LSC said it is possible to report out on types of information discussed.
6. PAG member mentioned that it might be better to have information tracked and presented in a data table.
7. PAG member likes the essence of the core indicator, but feels it is for First Nations and not related to Métis.
8. PAG member asked how John Prince Research Forest (JPRF) tracks their data. PAG member said JPRF has developed a process so First Nations could analyse their own values on their land, and then present strategies to government and industry. PAG member likes this strategy.
9. PAG member said they are very much in favour of this indicator, and would like to see detail in the SFMP describing types of strategies to improve communication with Aboriginal communities. Work needs to be done to make as many Aboriginal communities willing partners, as possible.
10. PAG member said the more we can do to get input from people, the better, but it’s not working yet. Member said these things are very good when getting consensus but it is not happening out there on the ground. Member said it is a very slow process and has a ways to go yet.
11. PAG member said it would be more advantageous for large licensees to work together. Member asked LSC to clarify what the target means. LSC said it would have to be careful when reporting out on sensitive issues.
12. PAG member does not like the wording “willingness of Aboriginal communities”. Member said we are past that language.

13. PAG member would like to put the following on record: "To whoever drafted up this standard (CSA), the PAG committee wished they (CSA) had included a Métis stakeholder committee at the ground level to develop the indicators."
 14. The LSC noted that the PAG can write a letter to the CSA with their feedback and concerns related to the wording of the CSA SFM standard.
 15. PAG member said Canfor and BCTS will comply with the indicator but if Métis have a conflicting value to the indicator, it does not matter as BCTS and Canfor can still go ahead and ignore the Métis.
- iv. PAG consensus on adding new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements to the PG SFM Plan:
1. Value Statement: Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses
 2. Objective Statement: Incorporation of Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses in Forest Management
 3. Core Indicator 6.2.1(a) AND 1.4.2(a): *% of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes. Target: 100% known forest values, knowledge and uses considered. Variance: 0.*

8. Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society's Responsibility, Element 6.5. Information for Decision Making. Core Indicator 6.5.1. Number of people reached through educational outreach).

- a. Reviewed Handouts
 - i. Powerpoint presentation on Element 6.5
 1. LSC provided a background presentation on Core Indicator 6.5.1: Number of people reached through educational outreach.
- b. 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:
 - a. Value Statement: Informed, fair and inclusive decision-making.
 - b. Objective Statement: Provide relevant information and educational opportunities to support involvement in public participation processes.
 - ii. Proposed Indicator Statement 6.5.1: The number of people who attended the educational opportunities provided. Target: >=50. Variance: -10

iii. Discussion:

1. Reviewed the Description of Indicator and Monitoring and Measurement
2. LSC noted there is no other indicator statement like this in the plan.
3. LSC said that for the purpose of this indicator “educational opportunities” include such things as field tours, open houses, knowledge transfer sessions, school visits and stakeholder meetings.
4. PAG member asked if 50 is a reasonable target and do they mean people. LSC it would be cumulative and they are willing to change the target number. LSC said they just picked the number 50. The LSC said an open house at Pine Centre Mall where they could count the number of people they talked to would work, but they need a methodology around the count.
5. PAG member said they need to make the events more educationally meaningful. Member suggested counting the number of events and people who attend.
6. PAG member agreed that 50 is a low number coming from a city with a population of approx. 80 000. Member said 100-200 would be better. Member said number is totally instinctual and not based on anything.
7. LSC likes member’s idea to count the number of events and people who attend.
8. PAG member agreed the number is too low and wants to see it higher. Member wants to see Canfor and BCTS get out and meet the people.
9. LSC said they can change the target number to one recommended by the PAG. The target was reset to 200.
10. PAG member asked if private landowners are included this target. LSC said they are going to incorporate private landowners as a non-timber interest value in another indicator (was already covered at a previous PAG meeting). LSC said open houses are advertised in the newspaper and therefore this would include private landowners as they are part of the public.
11. PAG member said they are more concerned around the quality of the event. Member said an open house at Pine Centre Mall is not an educational event.
12. PAG member mentioned a typo in the “Description of Indicator” and grammatical error in “Monitor and Measurement”. LSC corrected the errors.
13. PAG member suggested having people put their names into a draw as another way to track the number of people who stop by at

an open house. Member also suggested having different 'resource' stations set up where members can talk to people about their work.

14. PAG member likes the idea of an open house and having members from PAG set up displays to present on their area of expertise, i.e. trapping, ranching etc. LSC likes this idea and can see it being incorporated into an open house.
 15. PAG member likes the objective but is concerned whether it is a balanced fair presentation of information. Member said they need to have a joint partnership with other groups in order to have an open discussion i.e. David Suzuki Foundation, not just a white wash of industry, i.e. COFI field camp.
 16. LSC said they would put some thought into the idea of an invite.
 17. PAG member said they think the number of people should not be a core indicator but rather it should be the number of events. Member would like to see a modification made to the indicator target where it reads: ≥ 4 Events.
 18. LSC agreed and added to the target. Target ≥ 4 Events.
 19. PAG member said they understand why we cannot change the Core Indicator but does not like the wording of the proposed indicator statement. LSC said how they report out on it will be the same.
 20. PAG member requested that the LSC provide opportunities for guest speakers at educational sessions that are representative of dialectical and diverse values.
- iv. PAG consensus on adding new Value, Objective, Indicator and Target statements to the PG SFM Plan:
1. Value Statement: Informed, fair and inclusive decision-making
 2. Objective Statement: Incorporation of Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses in Forest Management
 3. Core Indicator 6.5.1: The number of people who attend the educational opportunities provided. Target: ≥ 200 and ≥ 4 Events. Variance: -10.

9. Indicator Revision (Criterion 6: Society's Responsibility, Element 6.5. Information for Decision Making. Core Indicator 6.5.2 Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public).

- a. Deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time.

10. Evaluation Forms requested and collected.

- a. Members reminded to fill out comments regarding Civic Centre facilities on back of the sheet and, to pick up a PAG attaché at the front of the room.

11. Next PG PAG Meeting:

- a. Prince George Civic Center 5:00 – 9:00 pm
- b. Tuesday October 18, 2011
- c. Presentation on Canfor's Biodiversity Strategy

11.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	
Sept 27 - 01	Report Canfor Internal Audit details related to OFI #8 "Site Plans may benefit from ID of resource feature and applicable strategies"	Steering Committee	Next meeting	