



Fort St. James
Sustainable Forest
Management

Public Advisory Group

Minutes from the November 19th 2005 Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Location: Fort St. James Senior's Centre

<p>In Attendance:</p> <p>Henner Grimm Larry Erickson Ron Timothy Beulah Broen Barb Rooke Bryan Muloin</p> <p>Absent:</p> <p>Joanne Vinnedge Randy Sulyma Orville Koette Joe Vogl Paul Swartz Bob Frederick Susan Grainger</p> <p>Darwyn Koch-Apollo Glen - Canfor Houston</p>	<p>FSJ Licensee Representatives:</p> <p>Larry Brown - BCTS Christy Hoy - SLL Kevin Bedford - Carrier Kerry Deschamps - Canfor</p>
<p><u>Facilitator:</u> Brian Robinson, RPF, Industrial Forestry Service Ltd. <u>Scribe:</u> Anthony Giannotti, RPF, Industrial Forestry Service Ltd.</p>	<p>Guests</p>

Meeting Called to Order at 9:00am Saturday, November 19, 2005

Agenda

4. Review/discuss CANFOR CSA Audit Results – Kerry Deschamps.
5. Provide the present status of the SFMP indicators
6. Rank and discuss the Items in the Continual Improvement Matrix



Kerry Deschamps Summary of the Audit Results and Present Status of Indicators:

Canfor was the first licensee to get the Audit which took place Nov 7-10th /05

Beulah – What about the sale of the FSJ mill and the effect it has on this SFMP?

Kerry - Sold to P&T. We have some relationships in terms of sharing some computer systems and information. They will be a licensee on their own in the future. In this TSA, Canfor has planning cells with volume that P&T harvests.

Ron - What is the CANFOR's cut in the District?

Kerry - It can vary, but we cut about 800,000 and another 200,000 as Takla Track and Timber. About half of this volume is now P&T. The next reporting period will be just CANFOR numbers. Most of our area will be up north and a little bit down south.

Kerry - CSA called a few of you and also had a look at the field operations. The audit is not final as the Auditors will fly up to the Sustut to review the northern portion. We are confident in our practices so we do not anticipate any problems.

Barb – what about Vanderhoof operations?

Kerry – They risk managed the Audit because Vanderhoof only logged maybe one block; most of their activities were silviculture. The auditors look at activities that pose the most risk. For example, road building in steep ground would be a higher risk.

Kerry - We used KPMG and they are certified by CSA to audit.

Ron – Qualifications – are they accountants?

Kerry – They have branched out and now do many of these forest management certification audits. The Audit team comes up and sends audit out to a head audit team and then it goes to CSA. There are not many people that can do the audits because they have specific training. They had a forester, a biologist and an accountant on the audit team. You can appeal audits. Sierra Legal Defence has appealed some audits (around Caribou), so there is a process and an appeal board.

Beulah – Why did P&T pull out? I was not satisfied as to lack of explanation.

Kerry – from my perspective, we CANFOR were SFI which was American, CSA is Canadian. Then we decided to move to CSA. It is good business and financial sense to move to CSA. For P&T the company as a whole uses SFI, so it made sense for them to keep with the SFI certification.

Larry – What monitoring board do they have if they do not have the PAG?

Kerry – For Canfor this is the national standard (CSA) because the forests belong to the public so it made sense to have a PAG, whereas P&T, which is American, used the SFI as most of the States is private land forestry. A



percentage of our chips must be certified, for Canfor to keep in the market. CANFOR has a chain of custody certification so the forest is certified and not just the company. We are getting the people who we buy chips from to track the wood and ensure the chain of custody.

The auditors break things down in three ways

1. Opportunity for improvement: This could be practices in the field, or the PAG process. It is just a suggestion and not a requirement. The PAG may need to reword some of the indicators to make it more measurable etc. There may be things where one licensee has something not place but the other licensees don't.
2. Minor non conformance - meets standards but something is not quite there. We are given thirty days to come up with an action plan and take care of the problem.
3. Major non conformance – not meeting the standards; We come up with action plan in thirty days and have three months to fix the problem

Ron – Why do you even get non-conformance (NC)?

Kerry – When you see some of the NC's, some are really picky. When you understand what we actually do in the field and see where things could go wrong, the NC's are rather small. The audit results will be sent to PAG members when they are finalized.

NRFL – Non Replaceable Forest Licences, SSS – Small Scale Salvage

Major – NC - documentation of Risk.

Background: This was originally the DFA; now it is the Area under the Plan. There are other players. They pose a risk to Canfor at achieving the objectives. Originally the risk was the DFA and the others not signed on to the plan. They are NRFL, SSS and others. From the 3 million in AAC, you must have control of 90% of the area under the plan, so you need to have a risk matrix for the total 90%. Of the 3 million in the TSA Canfor's chunk is small, so the risk to the area is small. Risk assessment has not been completed to assess risk of not meeting targets in the DFA for Canfor. We need a risk matrix for the whole plan and then one for each licensee area.

SFMP does not adequately address cut levels

Canfor's cut included P&T and things were not so clear.

This will be an easy fix; things are now more separate and clear.

Current status in report is a rolled up number in the DFA and should have been a separate set of numbers for each licensee.

PAG received handout on replaced appendix for the SFMP outlining present status of all indicators.

Indicator results were rolled up as one; they are now split out by licensee

Minor NC around wording between the appendix and the plan: Missed “plants” in the plan for Red and Blue listed species.

Concerns around quality of WTP and representation

Barb - Thermal cover in MPB area is a concern

Larry - Undergrowth of MPB areas: You should leave the undergrowth.

Kerry – Vanderhoof has a red, green map that shows the level of understory regeneration. We want to keep the understory.

Indicator 15 – target of 100 and variance of 0 – actually had 75. The auditor might suggest changing the variance.

Beulah - Question around number of planted stems and what will be there in the end (mature). (It varies from 50 to 1200 stems/hectare)

Darwyn will implement practices to meet targets

Larry’s climate change discussion – what about planting species that are appropriate to the climate change?

Indicator 16 – Auditor comments that not really much value in this.

Beulah – This indicator is important to us and we want to leave it in
Kerry – No problem. We will leave it in.

Indicator 18 - Auditor comments – opportunity to improve. A lot of this is already in place.

Indicator 19 - Auditor comments – opportunity to improve. There should already be some management strategies that exist. Focus on those that do not (Red and Blue list) and remove wording for things that do exist.

Indicator 20 - Auditor comments- should report back on those sites that you already know. The indicator should be focused on red and blue listed species as they are not yet developed.

Indicator 21 – There was one NC block because this looks backward. At the next reporting period, the practice will be changed and should be 100%



Ron - where the Non Productive, Non-forested exists, you should be planting grasses to encourage feed for other animals.

Beulah – does the auditor understand our intentions for this indicator? – Yes

Indicator 23 - No Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) audits, just a visual check. Targets were met but no plots done. Next year we will do this.

Larry – It is important to have CWD in the correct orientation and you should not be piling CWD.

Kerry – We are trying to get a project going to quantify this.

Indicator 25 - minor NC for Canfor – Converting timber to roads; only applies inside cutblock. It should be applied to all roads. The auditor also said 5% is too high because the average is 3.6%. Licensees will re-evaluate this and report back to PAG. Licensees will have to evaluate practices to deal with this if they reduce the number.

Indicator 26 - Canfor needs to track this better.

Indicator 28 - Canfor does not record it, they just fix it. Apollo tracks this. Others will have to find a way to track it.

Will there be risk to riparian areas in MPB stands? Will it be a problem and how will you deal with it?

Kerry - Groups are looking at that. One strategy is to ID high value streams and take a closer look.

If you can't log in a riparian area, what about beetle?

Kerry - We will not cut these trees. They may not provide shade anymore, so we should look at trying to get the shade back by under-planting brush species to encourage growth.

Indicator 35 - Licensees need to manage the watersheds together. Currently, whoever has more area controls the watershed. We will work together in the future.

Also problems with impact from beetle. Impact has already happened. We may look at how to recover the hydrology.

Indicator 39 - Audit improvement noted - include roads as well in known scenic areas.

What effect will the government money have on you (licensees)?

Kerry – Federal money will stay out of provincial requirements. Fed money will stay away from things like increasing AAC. Money not targeted at operations.



Notification to the public should go back to the old system – forestry shows with licensees and the plans. Go beyond the ad in the paper. Operations maps should be available at all times in the MOF office and kept current. Place ad in the free newspaper. Timing is critical, because some people are not around.

Kerry - PG licensees created an indicator to provide public viewing for road access in the winter. There was minimal interest in this when it was advertised.

Indicator 44 – Canfor queried to see how many non timber tenure holders wanted to be notified. Apollo looked at all known tenure holders and then looked at how many wanted to get letters. We need to get all licensees on the same page for the numbers.

Indicator 44 - Clarification –

1. notify everyone once a year of a map viewing
2. notify only those who are affected (Beulah)
3. notify only those who are affected, but have a room open where I can see a map (Larry)
4. notify all once a year (Henner)
5. notify only those who are affected, but have a room open where I can see a map (Ron)

Indicator 46 – need to include roads in the title. Currently very low numbers

Indicator 48 – auditor comment: reduce target as it may not be feasible.

Indicator 49 – Auditor thought it was a strange one. Canfor could not report on this one. Wording will change to reflect jobs in the area to be advertised in area paper.

Beulah - Where FN has been in an area for fishing, hunting etc, how much weight do you give to this? There are traditional use studies and other things to find out as much info as we (licensees) can get. You should include non-native things as well (guides and trappers and others).

Indicator 64 – put a link in the FSJames web site to the CNRC website

Indicator 66 – Larry feels that a lot of Douglas-Fir was removed and has not been replaced so the number represented here may be artificially low. Need some historic numbers

Beulah – wants more mixed species

Indicator 68 – things like this should also go in a room at the MoF office for others to review.



Indicator 5 - Large opening design – Canfor has some of the indicators so our numbers are not that bad, but others and Canfor will be working towards meeting this. Auditor comments – target is too high? We will look at numbers next year and figure out how to meet these numbers over time. We will eventually catch up to this.

Indicator 7 - Auditors would like to see the numbers localized to FSJames. Licensees will add in a date for completion.

Indicator 1 - Licensees will keep these numbers in the short term, but will need to reduce this in the long term. FSJames has a surplus of old growth and in the future, PG and Vanderhoof will be coming here. In the long term we will need to move to a different long term target.

Ron – Why have these numbers if you are going to reduce these anyway?

Beulah would like some information on why log prices are lower now than 10yrs ago.

Ron - Wood in supply block A should come to FSJames and not other mills – We need an indicator around this.

Beulah wants benefits from the wood in this district to stay in this district.

Indicator 3 - Mid term may impact these numbers

Indicator 4 - Ron does not like the numbers. He notes it makes things easier for licensees. The auditors noted that the model did not try to reach these numbers.

In summary, the auditors had some findings as noted above. PAG will get a final copy of the audit report. PAG will also receive a current status on the Area under the plan.

QMI will audit Apollo in January.

Once more minor Non-Conformance – CSA requires policy around forest health and respecting aboriginal rights.

Comments from today will be reviewed to see if anything needs to be included in the action items or put in to the CI matrix to discuss at a later date.

The Continuous Improvement Matrix (CI Matrix):

The CI matrix contains info that is outside the realm of CSA certification. **(Note to remove acronyms from CI matrix)**



The PAG ranked the CI Matrix items to determine the order that items will be dealt with. See CI Matrix.

Kerry notes that PAG could see four meetings a year. There is the possibility to have a meeting in January as well as February and possibly March.

Kerry would like to see a meeting for the two or three indicators that need to be changed (NC's) by March or April. The meeting would also include any suggestions from Apollo's Audit. Next meeting February 4th

Also need to review the TOR at next meeting.

Need to determine how to deal with the CI matrix. Are the issues for PAG or do we need to send these issues to Government? Should licensees come up with a plan?

Kerry – could form subcommittees that look into an item, and get back to the PAG on how to deal with issues. (PAG members did not like this idea).

CI #6 was discussed today, action was agreed upon.

Beulah – send the CI matrix out to the PAG by E-mail to receive input. Figure out what we can do quickly and check them off. PAG can suggest a strategy for others. Set date for February 4th meeting.

Kerry may send out email on WTP info (or other information) and set up a meeting? PAG likes the idea. Would be a meeting outside of regular PAG meetings. Licensees may send out information via email to PAG for consideration on Fir and WTP information.

Need to find out who may no longer want to be on PAG. Some individuals may not have the time commitments.

Ron would like a meeting with just the PAG members to discuss things.

Christy – Need a template before we send out the CI matrix so PAG knows what is required.

Tentative Meeting on March 4th.

Kerry – can wording changes be voted on over email? Darwyn may send out changes after Apollo's audit. (yes).



Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Last Updated on March 6, 2005

ITEM NUMBER	ACTION ITEM	WHO	WHEN	STATUS (Achieved, Late, Pending)
1	Initial version of DFA from FSJ licensee steering committee	DK	Dec. 4/04	Achieved
2	PAG to list their interests and have interests incorporated into the TOR	BR, AG	Dec. 4/04	Achieved
3	AG to call FN to see if anyone is interested in participating in one PAG meeting to see what it's all about.	AG	Before Dec.4th/04	Achieved
4	Approve TOR from Nov.6 meeting.	PAG/Licensee	Dec 4/04	Achieved
5	Licensees to complete matrix from Dec4th meeting and finish biodiversity.	Licensees (DK)	Jan 8/05	Achieved Jan. 26
6	Send background information to new PAG members	BR	Dec 10/04	Achieved
7	Send PAG, licensee and observer contact list, with interests, to PAG members	BR	Dec 10/04	Achieved
8	Contact PAG members who have not attended first two meetings and ask if they want to remain in PAG	BR	Dec. 10/04	Achieved
9	Send agenda for Jan. 8 PAG meeting, approved TOR and Dec. 4	BR	Dec. 10/04	Achieved



Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Last Updated on March 6, 2005

ITEM NUMBER	ACTION ITEM	WHO	WHEN	STATUS (Achieved, Late, Pending)
10	Send glossary of forestry terms and acronyms to PAG members	BR	Dec. 10/04	Achieved at Jan. 29 meeting
11	Send info from Jan 8 PAG meeting and agenda for Jan. 29 PAG meeting	BR	Jan. 14/05	Achieved
12	Complete biodiversity matrix information	Licensees	Jan 29/05	Achieved
13	Minimum old growth requirements in PG TSA: look into it to see why they use the minimum instead of the average.	Licensees	Feb. 18/05	Achieved
14	Bring local NDU, BEC, satellite image and Landscape Unit maps to next meeting	Licensees	Feb. 19/05	Partially Achieved at meeting
15	Arrange for Guest speakers (MSRM, NDU specialist)	Licensees	Feb. 19/05	Achieved
16	Licensees to provide info on the local use of herbicides (ha treated)	Licensees	Feb. 19/05	Achieved
17	Licensees to provide ideas about connectivity on large blocks and how this would look on the ground	Licensees	Feb. 19/05	Achieved
18	Develop best management practices for brushing, which achieve free growing requirements and preserve native plant species.	Licensees	May/05 ?	Pending
19	Develop more comprehensive strategy for retention of Douglas-fir and advanced regeneration on cut blocks	Licensees	May/05 ?	Pending



Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Last Updated on March 6, 2005

ITEM NUMBER	ACTION ITEM	WHO	WHEN	STATUS (Achieved, Late, Pending)
20	Update TOR, Section 8a: Add the following sentence. A PAG member abstaining from voting on an issue is deemed not to be in substantial disagreement and to indicate a willingness to proceed to the next step	Facilitator	Feb. 21/05	Achieved
21	Provide UWR condition requirements to PAG for their information	Licensees	March 19/05	Achieved
22	Provide definition of regionally important wildlife to PAG	Licensees	When available	Pending
23	Provide wildlife habitat features information to PAG	Licensees	When available	Pending
24	Determine a target and variance for the indicator: "the number of individuals satisfied with the communication process" in MBTS matrix	Licensees	May/05 ?	Pending
25	Determine the % of operational forestry contract value within the DFA serviced by north central BC to see if it agrees with the MBTS target of 90%; Define north central BC	Licensees	May/05 ?	Pending
26	Determine percentage of advertised employment opportunities target and variance in MBTS matrix.	Licensees	May/05 ?	Pending
27	Develop proposed matrix information for Criterion # 6 and #2	Licensees	March 19/05	Achieved



Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Last Updated on March 6, 2005

ITEM NUMBER	ACTION ITEM	WHO	WHEN	STATUS (Achieved, Late, Pending)
28	Develop target and variance for "Percent of individuals satisfied with the communication process", element 6.1	Licensees	May/05	Pending
29	Determine variance for note 2.7 (% compliance to archaeological and cultural prescriptions)	Licensees	? May/05	Pending
30	(2.9) Determine type of resources to help First Nations develop forest values list (report to PAG)	Licensees	? May/05	Pending
31	Mail Canfor audit results from November/05 to PAG members as well as current status of the Area Under the Plan	KD	Dec. 31/05	
32	Add appropriate items from Nov. 19/05 meeting minutes to the continuous improvement matrix for PAG to approve by E-mail, mail or attendance at a PAG meeting.	DK	Feb. 28/05	
33	Send research and other information related to some of the continuous improvement matrix items to PAG (e.g.: WTP and Fd retention info)	DK, KD	Feb. 28/05	
34	Contact PAG members: Joanne, Bob, Orville, Joe and Randy to see if they are still interested in being PAG members	BR	Dec. 5/05	Achieved Nov. 24/05
35	Provide comments on the continuous improvement matrix	PAG	Jan. 27/05	
36	Fill out the PAG meeting evaluation form	PAG	Feb. 4/05	
37	Beulah would like information as to why log prices are lower now compared to 10 years ago.	KD/DK	Feb. 4/05	



Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Last Updated on March 6, 2005

ITEM NUMBER	ACTION ITEM	WHO	WHEN	STATUS (Achieved, Late, Pending)
38	Indicator 66: Determine an approximate number of hectares of Douglas-fir leading forest cover types before settlement	Licensees	May/06	
39	Indicator 64: Put a link in the Fort St. James web site to the CNRC web site.	KD	Feb. 4/05	
40	If available, send proposed matrix indicator revisions to PAG as a result of the Apollo CSA January audit.	DK	Jan. 27/05	

