

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:00 – 9:00 PM, November 10, 2011

Civic Centre, Prince George, BC

MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<u><i>Public & First Nations:</i></u> Doug Beckett – Public Interest Shannon Carson - Public Interest (alternate) Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Virginia Karr – Natural Conservation Dave Kim – Forest workers & Contractors David King - Recreation, non-motorized Anne Migvar - Ranching & Farming (alternate) Jeff Mohr - Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Esther Perry – Ranching & Farming Ken Pickering - Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters) (alternate) Patience Rakochy - Non-timber Forest Products Don Wilkins - Commercial wildlife interests (guides, trappers, outfitters) Ian Wilson - Hunting and 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> Darwin Koch – BCTS Gundula Meyer-Eppler - Sinclair Mills
	<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) Darwin Koch- BCTS
 - ii) Gundula Meyer-Eppler - Sinclair Mills

2) Reviewed Agenda

3) Agenda as written.

4) Reviewed Minutes of Oct 18, 2011 PAG Meeting

- a) Minor typos corrected.
- b) Minutes accepted as revised.

5) Reviewed Meeting Evaluation Results

- a) Meeting Evaluation results from the October 18, 2011 PG PAG meeting were posted. Comments were reviewed.
- b) The following items fell below the target (4.0):
 - i) 5. Communication with PAG members between meetings is adequate (3.9).

- ii) 6. Licensees' share new information with PAG members regarding impacts to the environment, sustainability, forestry, etc. (3.8).
- iii) 11. What is your overall satisfaction with the PAG process (3.9).

6) Presentation of 2010/2011 Draft Annual Reports for PG and TFL30 (BCTS and Canfor)

a) PG Annual Report

- i) Forty-one indicators were met within the prescribed variances, 2 are pending, and 5 indicators were not met within the prescribed variances. For each off-target indicator, a corrective and preventative action plan is included in the Annual Report.
- ii) The following Indicator targets were not met:
 - (1) Indicator #1 Old forest by Natural Disturbance Unit (pg 4)
 - (a) Did not meet Old Growth targets in 3 Natural Disturbance Units (NDU) due to a deficiency in Old Growth. These three units are in lockdown and an Old Growth recruitment strategy in place.
 - (2) Indicator #3 Young patch size distribution (pg 7)
 - (a) According to the 5 year patch analysis results delivered in 2011, One NDU within the PG district does not meet the trending rules as agreed to by the Landscape Level Objectives Working Group (LLOWG). Because the Wet Trench NDU does not show a proper trending toward the targets of the PG order the unit requires a rationale to be drafted and submitted to PG District Manager to address the issue and propose a solution moving into the next 5 year period.
 - (3) Indicator #5 Stand level retention (pg 10)
 - (a) BCTS had one block with a 3.2% retention - one block of a two-block TSL did not meet the minimum 3.5%. BCTS will investigate the possibility of introducing consistency between this SFM indicator and BCTS's Forest Stewardship Plan.
 - (4) Indicator #54 Public sector participation in the PAG (pg 37)
 - (a) Two of the 22 sectors on the PAG were not represented during the reporting period; letters of invitation were not sent to solicit representatives for these sectors during the reporting period. LSC to send invitations to potential representatives for unrepresented sectors during the 2011/12 reporting period.
 - (5) Indicator #57 Watersheds assessed by qualified professional (pg 39)
 - (a) Two of Canfor's active watersheds are currently deemed to be high risk. One of these watersheds ("Unknown 44") was slightly over the Peak Flow Index target (by 2.6%) and was also impacted by a wildfire after the block was planned. The other watershed ("Unknown 46") was over the target and did not have an assessment. Both these watersheds were heavily impacted by the mountain pine beetle (MPB). Canfor's Planning staff have reviewed the past and planned level of harvest in conjunction with extenuating

circumstances, such as the heavily impacted stands by MPB. The forecast is for declining Peak Flow Indices. Reforestation of the areas within this watershed has the potential to accelerate this watershed's PFI trend towards the target more quickly than if the watershed was left to recover without intervention.

iii) The following Indicator results are pending:

(1) Indicator #33 Cut level volumes (pg 24)

(a) The final review for this indicator will be done at the end of the 5-yr cut control period (ends December 31, 2011). The indicator currently reports the status to the end of year 4 (December 31, 2010). Licensees are currently at a cut level of 68.8% of the apportioned amount.

(2) Indicator #58 Operations consistent with professional watershed recommendations (pg 40)

(a) Canfor has not completed their review of the total number of operations within high risk watersheds that were consistent with the recommendations of a qualified professional

b) TFL30 Annual Report

i) Forty-three indicators were met within the prescribed variances, 4 are pending, and 6 indicators were not met within the prescribed variances. For each off-target indicator, a corrective and preventative action plan is included in the Annual Report.

ii) The following Indicator targets were not met:

(1) Indicator 16 Distinct Habitat Types (pg 20)

(a) Canfor harvested two blocks during the 2010-11 reporting period, one of which contained a Distinct Habitat Types without the SFMP-defined management strategies implemented. The cutting permit was issued in 2003, five years prior to this indicator's incorporation into the SFMP. The issued permits are not reviewed against this indicator. Canfor will utilize the 2011 Ecosystem Representation Analysis to determine whether management strategies require updating.

(2) Indicator 17 Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use (pg 21)

(a) Approximately 21.7 ha of Canfor's ground were planted with seedlings that were outside of their elevation. The seedlings were for 705-1305m and the blocks on which they were planted were between 660-670m. This decision was made on block GISo26 during the plant, as the original seedling allocation for the fill plant was insufficient, and the fill plant was completed with the remaining available seedlings. On block BNYo40 the fill plant requirement was identified in the spring of 2010, and as it was believed the area should be planted as soon as possible, the remaining trees were planted. Both sites will be monitored for tree performance and to determine if additional treatments are required. The process will remain to ensure that the appropriate seedlings are allocated to and planted on blocks. For instances where additional trees are required and/or additional blocks are

added, priority will be to ensure appropriate seedlings are planted on that site.

(3) Indicator 31 Volume of Timber Harvested (pg 31)

- (a) The mountain pine beetle epidemic in the Prince George TSA has shifted harvest priority to the pine-dominated Prince George and Fort St. James DFA's, temporarily reducing the cut in TFL30. Government-supported forest management and business decisions has focused harvesting and reforestation efforts on dead and dying pine stands. No action plan is required, as the cut is shifting back to TFL30 in the Winter of 2011, reflecting the fact that beetle-attacked pine stands elsewhere in the Prince George Timber Supply Area have been addressed.

(4) Indicator 38 Local Contract Value (pg 37)

- (a) This target was not met as only one harvesting contractor conducted work on the DFA this period, and its head office is not located in the North Central Interior. No action plan is required, as the operators and supervisors employed by this contractor are based in the North Central Interior. The volume of work projected for completion during the 2011/12 reporting period will require more contractors and it is expected that the percentage of money spent in the North Central Interior will return to historical levels.

(5) Indicator 53 Public Sector Participation in the PAG (pg 46)

- (a) The TFL30 PAG formerly consisted of 12 sectors. However, the October 2010 merge with the Prince George PAG resulted in 22 sectors. Two sectors (Union/Labour and Non-Renewable Resources) were neither represented nor directly invited to PAG meetings during the reporting period. Due to changes to PAG sectors and Licensee Steering Committee representatives, there was a lack of awareness of the need to invite reps from these unrepresented sectors. Licensee Steering Committee to send invitations to potential representatives for unrepresented sectors during the 2011/12 reporting period.

(6) Indicator 55 Continuous Improvement Matrix (pg 48)

- (a) The Continuous Improvement (CI) Matrix was not reviewed in the last two reporting periods; a score of 3.4 was recorded for PAG satisfaction with CI Matrix progress in 2009/10, with no score recorded for 2010/11; and no items from the CI Matrix were incorporated into the SFMP over the last two reporting periods. The Prince George and TFL30 PAG's were merged in October 2010, to facilitate transitioning to one SFMP certified to the CSA's Z809-08 standard. In light of the 2010/11 workload associated with this transition, review of the CI Matrix was not considered a high priority as an agenda item. The meeting evaluation form for the PG PAG was used for the merged PAG's meetings in 2010/11, and did not include a question regarding PAG satisfaction for progress on the CI Matrix. The LSC will continue with the process of focusing PAG meetings on transitioning to the Z809-08 standard and evaluate the items on the CI Matrix at some point during the transition process.

iii) The following Indicator results are pending:

- (1) Indicator 1 Old Forest, Indicator 2 Interior Old Forest; Indicator 3 Young Forest Patches, and Indicator 4 Wet Trench and Wet Mountain Young Patch Size Distribution (pg 10-13).

c) Discussion:

i) TFL30 Indicator 17 Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use (pg 21)

- (1) PAG member asked about the risk of seedlings doing poorly at lower levels (better than having been planted at higher levels). LSC said it is definitely a lower risk that they were planted at lower levels.

- (2) PAG member concurred that seedlings cast-offs by tree planters that were planted wherever did poorly at first and then took off and are now thriving.

d) Draft Annual reports will be distributed to PAG members.

Action Item 1: PAG members to provide comments on the draft Annual Reports (PG and TFL30) to the Facilitator. **Due:** December 31, 2011.

7) Indicator Revision: (Criterion 1: Biological Diversity, Element 1.1 Ecosystem Diversity. Core Indicator 1.1.2 (a) Forest area by type or species composition).

a) Reviewed Handouts

i) Powerpoint presentation on Criterion 1: Biological Diversity.

- (1) The LSC is revisiting this indicator which was originally presented at the October 18th PAG meeting as there was insufficient time to reach consensus.

- (2) The presentation provided background information on the Mandatory Discussion Items for Criterion 1.

- (3) The presentation provided background information on Core Indicator 1.1.2 (a) Forest area by type or species composition.

b) Core Indicator 1.1.2 (a) Forest area by type or species composition

i) LSC Recommendation: Replace TFL30 Indicator # 14 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator 1.1.2 (a).

ii) This is a new indicator in the SFM Plan and will require PAG endorsement of a new Indicator and Target. Existing Value and Objective Statements for 1.1.2 will remain unchanged:

(a) Value Statement: Well balanced and functioning ecosystems that support natural processes.

(b) Objective Statement: Maintain landscapes that support the natural diversity, variety, and pattern of ecosystems.

iii) Existing Indicator TFL30 #14: Proportion of mature and old deciduous tree species by BEC subzone within the DFA. Target: Achieve the proportion of mature and old deciduous tree species by BEC subzone consistent with the targets in Table 8. Variance: -1%.

iv) Proposed Indicator: Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broadleaf, treed mixed) > 20 years old across the DFA. Target: Maintain the baseline ranges and distribution into the future. Variance: None.

c) Discussion:

- i) LSC presented PAG members with some options for the methodology for developing a range of targets for Core Indicator 1.1.2(a) (eg. setting minimum percentages with a variance of +/- 1-2 %).
- ii) PAG member asked if the current inventory data accounts for all the dead pine. LSC acknowledged that the provincial forest inventory (known as the Vegetation Resources Inventory or VRI) does not account for the pine trees killed by the Mountain Pine Beetle.
- iii) PAG member thinks it would be interesting to see the inventory data (species composition) for stands 20-40 years old in order to see the switch-over from conifer-leading to broadleaf (i.e. to trace the differences with species composition).
- iv) LSC agreed to provide the PAG with a report on the species composition of stands 20-40 years old in the DFA. This will be a onetime only report for interest's sake.

Action Item 2: LSC will report to the PAG on the species composition of stands 20-40 years old in the DFA. **Due:** Spring 2012.

- v) LSC stated that the current VRI data is more current than old inventory data sets, and will continue to use the VRI in the future.
- vi) PAG member prefers the three categories recommended in the proposed indicator and agrees with the LSC methodology that minimums are more critical. However, the PAG member prefers a target range rather than a minimum and suggests that the LSC check with Craig DeLong's research to see what his suggestions are.
- vii) PAG member would prefer to see two categories (conifer and deciduous). PAG member feels that one would normally look at leading species and this is a paradigm shift to look at it differently.
- viii) PAG member likes the 3 categories as the broadleaf category is associated with riparian areas (eg. cottonwood stands).
- ix) PAG member sees upland deciduous (ex. Aspen and birch) as having different management requirements and shouldn't be lumped into broadleaf or mixed.
- x) PAG member would like to see targets set for deciduous or mixed if it keeps herbicide use to a minimum.
- xi) LSC stated that harvesting will continue to be directed into the pine leading stands as long as possible. This could be up to 10 years or more depending on wood quality, markets, and type of product, in order to address the beetle kill and government direction.
- xii) PAG member is looking for a range of variation. (eg. Deciduous 1.5-6%, Mixed 5-15%, Conifer 70-90%) and then a commitment from the LSC to meet with Craig DeLong to see if these numbers are in alignment with his research.
- xiii) PAG member would like to go back to "mother nature" numbers

- xiv) LSC commits to revisit the natural range of variability targets at a future PAG meeting and requests the PAG to endorse the indicator statement.
- d) General agreement with 2 dissensions on LSC request to replace TFL30 Indicator # 14 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator 1.1.2: Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broadleaf, treed mixed) > 20 years old across the DFA. Target: TBD. Variance: TBD.
 - i) Reasons for dissension:
 - (1) Targets are “picked out of space”;
 - (2) Disagrees with the operational practice of aerial broadcast spraying of herbicides to achieve silviculture objectives.

8) Indicator Revision: (Criterion 1: Biological Diversity, Element 1.1 Ecosystem Diversity. Core Indicator 1.1.3 (a) Forest area by seral stage or age class and Core Indicator 4.1.1 – Net carbon uptake).

- a) Reviewed Handouts
 - i) Powerpoint presentation on Seral Stage.
 - (1) The presentation provided background information on seral stage (aka “old” forests), natural disturbance definitions and operating boundaries, landscape units (eg. Averil), etc.
 - (a) What is a seral stage?
 - (i) “Sere” = the series of biotic communities formed by the process of ecosystem development called succession. In forested landscapes, the various vegetation communities that occupy disturbed sites and make up a sere are called “seral stages”.
- b) Core Indicator 1.1.3 (a) Forest area by seral type or age class
 - i) LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #1 and TFL30 Indicator # 1 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator 1.1.3 (a) and 4.1.1.
 - ii) This is a new indicator in the SFM Plan and will require PAG endorsement of a new Indicator and Target. Existing Value and Objective Statements for 1.1.3 and 4.1.1 will remain unchanged:
 - (a) For Core Indicator 1.1.3(a)
 - (i) Value Statement: Well balanced and functioning ecosystems that support natural processes.
 - (ii) Objective Statement: Maintain landscapes that support the natural diversity, variety, and pattern of ecosystems.
 - (b) For Core Indicator 4.1.1
 - (i) Value Statement: Uptake and storage of carbon in forest ecosystems.
 - (ii) Objective Statement: Facilitate carbon uptake and storage within harvested areas.

- iii) Existing PG Indicator #1: The amount of old forest by NDU/merged BEC within the DFA. Target: As per the “Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA”; Variance: 0%.
 - iv) Existing TFL30 Indicator #1: The amount of old forest by landscape unit/Natural Disturbance Type within the DFA. Target: Maintain old forests consistent with the targets in Table 1; Variance: 0%.
 - v) Proposed Indicator: Percent late seral distribution by ecological unit across the DFA. Target: As per the “Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA: (applicable to operating areas within the PG District); and as per the Provincial Non-spatial Old Growth Objective (applicable to TFL30). Variance: 0%.
- c) Discussion:
- i) PAG member asked how old a forest has to be before it is called “old”. LSC responded that it varies: Depending on the BEC Zone, a forest can be considered “old” if it is over 120 years of age, or 140, and in some cases 250 years old.
 - ii) PAG member appreciates the gains made by forest companies in past years, but feels these new practices are still not acceptable. PAG member would like to see varying ages within each cutblock and this is why aerial broadcast spraying (which knocks everything down to one age level) is unacceptable.
 - iii) PAG member agrees with previous comments regarding aerial broadcast spraying and feels the practice needs to be more site-specific.
 - iv) PAG would like to see the LSC organize a field trip for Summer 2012 and include aerial spraying as a tour stop.

Action Item 3: LSC to organize a field trip for Summer 2012 and include aerial spraying as a tour stop. **Due:** Summer 2012.

- v) PAG member asked about future practices on TFL30. LSC stated that neither Canfor nor BCTS have planned many cut blocks in the TFL in recent years, and an old forest recruitment strategy is in development.
- vi) PAG member disagrees with the Provincial Non-spatial Old Growth Objective and feels that old growth should be spatially defined everywhere. PAG member requests that the LSC consider a Continual Improvement strategy to look at the possibility of going to spatial management of Old Seral in all management units. LSC agreed to add this request to the Comments section for this indicator.
- vii) PAG member can live with the Old Growth Order for now, but feels it should be updated at some point since the two plans have merged. PAG member also sees a need for much more public input on forest management.
- viii) PAG member agrees with spatially defining old growth, including ground – proofing to ensure that the forest is in fact, old growth. PAG member feels that the LSC should adopt a science – based approach to old growth management. LSC agreed to discuss with the Landscape Level Objectives Working Group (LLOWG) the PAG request to update the Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA.

Action Item 4: LSC will discuss Craig DeLong’s science – based approach to Old Growth management with the Landscape Level Objectives Working Group (LLOWG). **Due:** Spring 2012.

- d) General agreement with 2 dissensions on LSC request to replace PG Indicator #1 and TFL30 Indicator #1 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator 1.1.3(a) and 4.1.1 Percent late seral distribution by ecological unit across the DFA. Target: As per the “Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA: (applicable to operating areas within the PG District); and as per the Provincial Non-spatial Old Growth Objective (applicable to TFL30). The target to manage to the science mean with a variance to the minimum of the legal objectives (based on Craig DeLong’s research). Variance: as above. Add Comments: C.I. is to look at the possibility of going to spatial mgmt of OLD in all units.
- i) Reasons for dissension:
- (1) This indicator lacks protection for old growth forest and the forest will be logged anyway;
 - (2) Disagrees with the operational practice of aerial broadcast spraying of herbicides to achieve silviculture objectives.
- 9) Indicator Revision: (Criterion 1: Biological Diversity, Element 1.1 Ecosystem Diversity. Core Indicator 1.1.4 (a) Degree of within-stand structural retention**
- a) Reviewed Handouts
- i) Powerpoint presentation on Seral Stages.
 - (1) The presentation provided background information on wildlife tree patches (WTP’s), and dispersed retention.
- b) Core Indicator 1.1.4 (a) Degree of within-stand structural retention
- i) There are three proposed indicators relating to this Core Indicator:
 - (1) Proposed Indicator Statement 1.1.4 (a): Percent of stand structure retained across the DFA in harvested areas Target: average of 7% annually for blocks harvested within the DFA, with a minimum of 3.5%.
 - (i) Variance for BCTS: retention areas may relate to more than one cutblock within a timber sale license, the minimum retention on one block may be as low as 0% as long as the average on the TSL is 7%.
 - (ii) Variance for Canfor: 0%.
 - (b) LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #5 and TFL30 Indicator #6 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator 1.1.4 (a).
 - (c) This is a new indicator in the SFM Plan and will require PAG endorsement of a new Indicator and Target. Existing Value and Objective Statements for 1.1.4 will remain unchanged:
 - (i) Value Statement: Well balanced and functioning ecosystems that support natural processes.
 - (ii) Objective Statement: Maintain landscapes that support the natural diversity, variety, and pattern of ecosystems.

- (d) Existing PG Indicator #5: The average percentage of stand level retention in harvested areas within the DFA. Target: >7% annually within the DFA, with a minimum of 3.5% by block and no maximum %; Variance: 0%.
- (e) Existing TFL30 Indicator #6: The average percentage of stand level retention in harvested areas within the DFA. Target: On an annual basis, to achieve average stand level retention of >7%; Variance: >3.5% by cutblock, with 0% variance
- (f) Discussion:
 - (i) PAG member notes that Douglas-Fir left behind in clear cuts can suffer blowdown due to poor soil and root structures. PAG member would like to know what causes the most damage. LSC thinks it is hydrological reasons (soil drying out).
 - (ii) PAG member recently attended a university presentation on retention and thinks that a target of > 7% should be used. The LSC stated that they were not comfortable raising this number since the focus is pine harvest and the licensees do not want to encourage more retention at this time.
 - (iii) PAG member is fine with leaving the target as is and report out on the range (ex. how many blocks are below 7%, etc).
 - (iv) PAG member would not like to see retention targets go higher since the licensee has responsibility to manage the timber. More retention encourages the construction of more roads relative to the timber harvest.
 - (v) PAG member noted that the Chief Forester has provided “wobble room” in the Allowable Annual Cut (AAC) determination to allow government to have flexibility for greater retention.
 - (vi) PAG member is not happy with the practice of “stubbing” trees. LSC noted that most of the stubbing that occurs is to protect the location of (Culturally Modified Trees) CMT’s. PAG member also feels that Licensees should not be wasting Douglas-Fir.
 - (vii) PAG member doesn’t like a “one-size fits all” approach so is happy to leave an average range as the target for this indicator.
- (g) General agreement with 3 dissensions on LSC request to replace PG Indicator #5 and TFL30 Indicator #6 with new proposed wording of Core Indicator Statement 1.1.4 (a): Percent of stand structure retained across the DFA in harvested areas Target: average of 7% annually for blocks harvested within the DFA, with a minimum of 3.5%.
 - (i) Reasons for dissension:
 1. Feels that the PAG is being asked to rubber stamp the achievement of less than is currently being practiced;
 2. Also feels that the PAG is being asked to rubber stamp the achievement of a target that is less than supported by science;

3. Disagrees with the operational practice of aerial broadcast spraying of herbicides to achieve silviculture objectives.
- (2) Proposed Indicator 1.1.4 (b): Percent of blocks meeting dispersed retention levels as prescribed in the site plan/logging plan. Target: 100%, Variance 0%
- (a) LSC Recommendation: Add new indicator to the PG SFM Plan.
 - (b) Discussion:
 - (i) This proposed indicator only applies to Canfor. It does not apply to BCTS.
 - (ii) LSC noted that dispersed retention (ie stubbing or whole tree retention) is prescribed for specific species such as Douglas-fir, aspen and birch, and is based on site-specific information such as cruise data, diameter limits, pattern of distribution, and operability.
 - (iii) PAG member asked the LSC how foresters are determining what retention level to prescribe. LSC said that cruise data is used.
 - (iv) PAG member asked why the trees are left in the middle of a cutblock? LSC explained that it is left to contribute to structure and even if it blows down, will be part of CWD.
 - (v) PAG member questioned whether the licensees were picking retention trees base on economics or ecology. PAG member would like to see a commitment from the LSC to provide additional retention information such as basal area or stems/ha retained. LSC stated that these parameters would vary from block by block and may not be an easy thing to measure. LSC suggested using results from the Forest and Range Evaluation Program for additional statistics.
 - (c) PAG members could not reach General Agreement on LSC recommendation to add the following proposed Core Indicator to the SFM Plan:
 - (i) Percent of blocks meeting dispersed retention levels as prescribed in the site plan/logging plan. Target: 100%, Variance 0%
 - (ii) Only 3 PAG members were in Agreement with the proposed Indicator
 - (iii) Five PAG members dissented with the following reasons:
 1. This certification process is for both BCTS and Canfor and yet BCTS is not part of this indicator,
 2. Feels that BCTS should be part of this indicator,
 3. There are strong biological and ecological reasons for retention that need to be considered over the operational reasons in the site plan,
 4. This indicator lacks a good ecological rationale to help quantify/qualify the operational reasons for supporting it,
 5. Feels that BCTS should be reporting on this indicator.

- (iv) PAG requested that the LSC review this indicator prior to including it in the updated SFM Plan, given the fact that the PAG could not reach agreement on the proposed wording.

10) Evaluation forms requested and collected

11) Next PG PAG Meeting:

- a) Thursday, January 19, 2011
- b) Prince George Civic Center 5:00 – 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.
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	

PRINCE GEORGE PAG				
ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Oct 18 - 01	Work on methodology for range of targets for Core Indicator 1.1.2 and present methodology to PAG.	Steering Committee	Next meeting	Completed
Nov 10 - 01	Provide comments on the draft Annual Reports (PG and TFL30) to the Facilitator.	PAG	Dec. 31, 2011	
Nov 10 - 02	Report to the PAG on the species composition of stands 20-40 years old in the DFA (Core Indicator 1.1.2(a)).	LSC	Spring 2012	
Nov 10 - 03	Organize a field trip for Summer 2012 and include aerial spraying as a tour stop.	LSC	Summer 2012	
Nov 10 - 04	Discuss Craig DeLong's science – based approach to Old Growth management with the Landscape Level Objectives Working Group (LLOWG) (Core Indicator 1.1.3(a)).	LSC	Spring 2012	