

Prince George SFMP Public Advisory Group

9:00 AM – 2:30 PM, September 24, 2005

Civic Centre (Room 208), Prince George, BC

MINUTES

In Attendance:

Public Representatives
& Alternates, and First
Nations:

Betty Abbs

Joseph Gagne

Jo Graber

Kate Harvey

Norm Holt

Virginia Karr

Anne Migvar

Mike Morris

Ken Pickering

Earl Pickett

Dave Stevenson

Observers: Len Shankel Jim Reid

Licensee Steering Committee:

Chair: David Jewesson - Winton Global

Kerry Deschamps - Canfor

Cecil Gray – Lakeland Mills Ltd.

Shane Neukomm – Carrier Lumber Ltd.

Steve Webb - BCTS

Advisors: Shannon Carson
Colin Mahony

Antti Makitalo
Rhonda Thibeault

Facilitator: Roxanne Yanishewski (Roxanne Yanishewski & Associates)

Scribe: Chris Bailey (Roxanne Yanishewski & Associates)

1. Welcome & Introductions
 - a. Welcome by chair of Licensee Steering Committee.
 - b. Reviewed PAG September 15th, 2005 meeting evaluation results.

2. Reviewed Agenda
 - a. Agenda accepted.

3. Reviewed Minutes - PAG adopted the September 15th, 2005 minutes with the following changes (changes in *italics*):
 - a. 5.d. - Ensure that wildlife corridors are maintained between licensees' areas *where they are contiguous*.
 - b. 5.q. - Concern that the higher levels of retention *will not necessarily* increase patch size distribution nor increase fragmentation.
 - c. 5.t. - Describe actions to be taken to move towards the Old Interior Forest targets *where trends are away from the targets*.
 - d. 5.v. - Describe actions to be taken to move towards Young Patch Size Distribution targets *where trends are away from the targets*.
 - e. 5.dd. - Would like to know the percentage of volume cut by each licensee in the DFA *in the Introduction (in the SFMP) to the licensees*.
 - f. 5.gg. - Clarify what is meant by Winton Global Lumber Ltd.'s "minimizing adverse environmental impacts and striving to prevent pollution" *versus striving to prevent adverse environmental impacts*.

4. Update Actions:
 - a. See updated Action Table.
 - b. Nov 18-02: ADA lands have been removed and were not used in the analysis. ADA land contributes to the crown land but does not contribute to the timber harvesting land base that was used in the Base Case analysis.
 - c. Sept 15-02: All comments that were submitted were responded to and incorporated into the SMFP document.

5. Forecasting Results Presentation & Discussion (Forest Ecosystem Solutions Ltd. - Antti Makitalo & Colin Mahony):
 - a. Results are applicable to the PG Forest District DFA.
 - b. Models attempt to simulate real life. Modeling is about understanding complex situations and identifying trends rather than predicting. Models provide a reasonable picture of what the long-term implications may be for current actions. They reveal the short and long term effects.
 - i. A concern was raised about the false certainty raised by using modelling to predict the future.
 - ii. Appreciation was expressed for providing models to compare options.
 - c. Models are limited by the data they are based upon. While increasing amounts of data is becoming available on ecosystems, there is still much more data available on timber. The reliability of the model will only be as good as the

reliability of the data and this varies. The analysis must always be considered imperfect.

- d. Options such as accounting for the Mountain Pine Beetle are added when models are run again in the future. Events such as forest fires are factored in as best as possible.
- e. Six scenarios were modeled (see handout). Fire was included in scenario #5. Scenario 1: Timber Harvest Forecast is the SFMP base case, that is, it is the model based on the indicators and targets described in the SFMP. The remaining five scenarios are variations on the SFMP base case (scenario #1).
- f. There are four possible types of indicators. Some can be more directly modelled than others.
- g. A number of assumptions were relied upon:
 - i. Based on a timber supply analysis.;
 - ii. Old Forest Objectives;
 - iii. Mountain Pine Beetle (for example, wood value begins declining three years after being attacked);
 - iv. Limited to the Prince George Forest District; and
 - v. Stands are assumed to be clear-cut with an average of 7% retention for wildlife tree patches, riparian areas, etc.
- h. General forecasting results are summarized below. More details are shown in the attached powerpoint presentation:
 - i. Scenario 1: Timber Harvest Forecast (SFMP base case) - A large drop in the volume cut will be expected within approximately 50 years due to the Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic and setting area aside to meet Old Growth Forest objectives. Beetles and other infestations (for example, hemlock looper) were not modelled as a recurring event into the future due to their unpredictability. The long term is setting the context for the short term.
 - ii. Scenario 2: Enhanced Biodiversity – The volume cut will drop almost immediately and slowly return to higher levels in approximately 100 years.
 - iii. Scenario 3: Increased Conservation – This model would increase areas for biodiversity but would have a very large negative impact on social and economic factors such as employment.
 - iv. Scenario 4: Incremental Silviculture – This provides improved employment relative to all the other models that were forecasted and shows no negative effects.
 - v. Scenario 5: No Harvest – More old forest exists in the east of the forest district than in the western portion of the forest district. The long-term dips in the harvest flow get filled in when the beetle epidemic gets turned off.

- vi. Scenario 6: Worst Case Beetle Epidemic – This has a very negative impact on social and economic values.
- i. Forestry Related Employment - Over the first 10 years, forestry related employment was the same for all scenarios except for the no harvest scenario, which had no forestry related employment. In this scenario, employment would drop to 50% of current numbers between 11 and 85 years.
- j. Old Forests - There is slightly more old forest in the enhanced biodiversity scenario and significantly more in the no harvest scenario. Increased conservation did not result in significantly more Old Growth Forest.
- k. Mountain Pine Beetle Impacts – All the scenarios except the No Harvest and Worst Case Beetle scenarios have little effect on unsalvaged volume killed by MPB. The release of the advanced regeneration in natural stands affected by MPB would not contribute to significant volume increases. This was determined in consultation with Dave Coates, a specialist in Smithers. (Often analysts need to rely on expert opinions due to a lack of data, for example, large scale mountain pine beetle outbreaks. Analysts did not assume or use a number unless there is reliable research to back it up.)
- l. Visually Sensitive Areas on Base Case Results – Indicates that more stands are being retained in the visually sensitive areas (Retention, Partial Retention & Modification). The results indicate very minor variation between the scenarios.
- m. Harvest in Ungulate Winter Range – Fairly similar within all scenarios except the MPB scenario that brings the levels down close to the target level.
- n. Caribou Corridors were not modelled as contiguous corridors. All the scenarios are above the minimum, that is, Caribou High is three times above the target and Caribou Medium is at least two times greater than the target.
- o. Ecosystem Carbon – Estimate of the amount of carbon that currently exists in the forest (Trees, Plants, Coarse Woody Debris, Litter & Soil). There is more carbon in the district currently than there will be in the future. There is a large amount of carbon that will be transferred from the environment to products (houses, paper, etc.). The results indicate that total ecosystem carbon is significantly more for the No Harvest scenario than for all other scenarios.
- p. Snags – The results indicate more snags in the future in the Enhanced Biodiversity and the No Harvest scenarios. It is expected that there will be an increase in the amount of snags within the first five years due to the current MBP epidemic that is not currently indicated in the results.
- q. Coarse Woody Debris – The results indicate more Coarse Woody Debris in the future for the No Harvest scenario (#5). The modelling was based on defining as Coarse Woody Debris as greater than 20 cm in diameter.
- r. In future modelling exercises for the SFMP, additional data will be incorporated when it becomes available.
- s. Comments by individual PAG members:

- i. A PAG member disagreed with the “one size fits all” approach in applying strategies for a large area and believes instead that scenarios should be site specific. There should be a greater variety of silviculture practises used across the landscape. The LSC noted that their silviculture strategy will employ a wide variety of practices, such that they will likely vary within the larger blocks. Generally government has recognized impacts of the MPB and they are planning to implement some programs and workshops (fertilization, brushing, etc.).
 - ii. A combination of the existing scenarios should be used for future forecasts, as any one scenario may not be acceptable.
 - iii. It was not clear to some PAG members that they were going to choose one of the presented scenarios versus a combination of all the scenarios. The LSC noted that the CSA process requires the PAG to choose a scenario to move forward. The Registration auditors need to hold the Licensees and BCTS accountable for an outcome. A scenario reveals a general trend and is based on targets against which the Licensees and BCTS can be measured.
 - iv. There would be a benefit to creating a scenario where areas with large carbon sinks and uptakes are reserved (scenario #2) and held for the future. In the future, it would be useful to see how carbon storage is affected by each scenario.
 - v. The Licensees and BCTS should not be continuing to burn slash if there are concerns about carbon. The LSC noted that burning is used less frequently now than in the past and is only used when needed to reduce fire hazards, prepare sites, etc.
 - vi. Biodiversity is an important component for a number of other industries such as tourism, ranching & guiding, etc.
 - vii. Concern was expressed about how Scenario #4 would impact on the old growth in the eastern section of the PG Forest District. The LSC noted that an emphasis on Incremental Silviculture would create new forests more quickly and take the pressure off the harvesting of forests in the east.
 - viii. It was suggested that some stands be converted to species other than pine (for example, hardwoods).
 - ix. Concern was raised about being unable to trust the new genetics. This could be addressed by selecting scenario #2.
6. PAG Decision on Forecasting Results:
- a. LSC recommendation to the PAG that Scenario #4 - Incremental Silviculture be selected, as it is believed to be the best balance of social and economic and biological values. Adaptive management will be used to incorporate findings between forecasting exercises.
 - b. Consensus of PAG Representatives on selecting Scenario #4 – Incremental Silviculture with one objection and two conditional objections:

- i. Basis for objection: There should be a greater variety of silvicultural practices, more areas set aside for carbon sinks, and greater diversity of genetic species.
 - ii. Basis for the two conditional objections: Will agree with choosing Scenario #4 if it includes some of the enhanced biodiversity objectives from scenario #2.
7. Continuous Improvement Matrix:
 - a. The LSC is waiting for additional PAG members to rank the items on the Continuous Improvement matrix before tabulating the rankings. The LSC will then provide the results to the PAG.
 - b. Discussion on how to create a work plan to address the issues listed in the CI Matrix, for example, creating working groups to draft a work plan, the PAG developing the work plan, the LSC proposing a work plan, etc.
 - c. Consensus of PAG Representatives to invite PAG members to participate in working group(s) to draft work plans for those issues ranked as the highest priority. The working group(s) will report back to the next PAG meeting with their proposal for review by the PAG. The LSC will be responsible for organizing the work group(s), e.g., inviting members to participate in the work group(s), providing a meeting place, looking after travel arrangements, etc.
 - d. The LSC proposed that it may send a letter to the various government agencies (MoF, MSRM, MLA's, etc.) to inform them of the results from the SFMP plan and the issues noted in the CI Matrix.
8. Canfor/UBC PAG survey
 - a. Canfor (Kerry Deschamps) asked the PAG for permission to release the mailing information of PAG members to UBC for the purposes of participating in a survey of the public.
 - b. The PAG agreed to release the mailing information of PAG members to UBC for the survey.
9. Revised SFMP edition – The SFMP will be revised once input is received from the registration auditors. The new edition will be released to the PAG in late November 2005.
10. Access Plan Viewing – Access Plans of the Licensees and BCTS will be available for viewing on Thursday October 27, 2005 between 3:00 PM and 9:00 PM at the Pine Centre Mall.
11. Other:
 - a. LRMP field trip: To partake in the LRMP field trip, please register by October 4th, 2005, with Rhonda Thibeault (565-6187 or Rhonda.Thibeault@gov.bc.ca) or Shannon Carson (565-4463 or Shannon.Carson@gov.bc.ca).
 - b. TFL 30 PAG : The TFL 30 PAG is beginning the process of reviewing and renewing its SFMP to meet the latest standards of the CSA. The first meeting to

work on this will be held on September 29, 2005 at the Civic Centre (Room 204-205) from 5:30 PM to 9:00 PM. Anyone wishing to participate in this process should contact Roxanne Yanishewski (563-1365 or Roxanne@telus.net).

12. Evaluation forms completed

13. Next meeting

- a. Agenda:
 - i. Review reports of registration audits
 - ii. Review drafted work plan(s) for CI Matrix
- b. Time: 5:30 – 9:00 PM
- c. Date: November 24, 2005
- d. Place: Civic Centre

14. Actions

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Nov 18 -02	Report back on ADA and Crown land within City limits when it is appropriate in the plan.	Steering Committee	September 2005	Completed.
Dec 9 – 04	Find Representative for Commercial Fishing sector.	Steering Committee	Jan 15, 2005	Sector to be removed during the next review of the ToR.
Sept 15-01	Distribute results CI Matrix ranking prior to the next PAG meeting.	Steering Committee	September 21, 2005	Will be sent out along with an invitation to participate in a working group.
Sept 15-02	Distribute public comments on the SFMP and licensee responses.	Steering Committee	September 24, 2005	Completed – Distributed at meeting.
Sept 24 - 01	Distribute the Forecasting presentation summarizing results to the PAG.	Steering Committee	October 5, 2005	Note: maps are too big to distribution. They will be available on a web site in the future.