

CSA - TFL30**Public Advisory Group Meeting**

June 15, 2006, 5:30 pm – 9:15 pm

Prince George Civic Centre – Hedrick Room 208

Minutes

Attendance:

<p><i>Public Advisory Group:</i></p> <p>Betty Abbs – Local Community (alternate)</p> <p>Doug Beckett – Public Interest</p> <p>Jo Graber – Historical/Cultural</p> <p>Dave Kim – Forestry Contractor - General</p> <p>Anne Migvar - Agriculture/Ranching</p> <p>Denis Pelletier – Small Business (non-forestry)</p> <p>Patience Rackochy – Small Business (non-forestry) (alternate)</p> <p>Len Shankel – Trapping</p> <p>Lee Sexsmith – Recreation – non-commercial (motorized)</p> <p>Dave Stevenson – Local Community</p> <p>Ray Vallee – McLeod Lake Indian Band</p> <p>Adrien Voyer – Hunting, fishing (recreational)</p>	<p><i>CSA Advisors:</i></p> <p>Kerry Deschamps – Canfor</p> <p>Len Stratton – BCTS</p>
<p><i>Facilitator & Scribe:</i></p> <p>Roxanne Yanishewski (R. Yanishewski & Associates)</p>	<p><i>Observers:</i></p> <p>Rhonda Thibeault (ILMB)</p>

A. Welcome & Introduction

1. Members signed in.
2. Introductions
3. Meeting evaluation results for April 22, 2006 meeting reviewed.
4. Confirmed agenda.
5. Minutes of the April 22, 2006 meeting accepted.

B. TFL30 SFMP

1. Comments on TFL30 SFMP:

- a. Stand Level Retention – concerned that 3.5 to 7% retention is not enough to sustain biodiversity.
- b. Coarse Woody Debris – Unrealistically small amount and not sufficient for biodiversity.
- c. Appreciate having a statement and description for each indicator.
- d. The layout makes it easy to read.
- e. The detailed description of each indicator in the SFM Plan early in the process would have made it easier to develop each indicator, target, & variance.
- f. Some statements seem to reflect a bias.
- g. The word “Target” seems to be used with several different meanings.
- h. Different currencies of percent used (i.e., interior old forest indicator).
- i. Targets are not always clear in the tables.
- j. Page 41 – Sought clarification on who provides the training to licensees’ staff on Species-At-Risk.
- k. References to MSRM needed to be updated to ILMB.
- l. Some websites need to be corrected.
- m. Concerned that forecasting scenarios for some targets are lower than legal standards.
- n. Concerned that Canfor/BCTS do not always have 100% as a target.
- o. Would like more input into developing forecasting scenarios, for example, Coarse Woody Debris.
- p. Free Growing forecasting statement is untrue.
- q. Page 101 – Forecasting and predicted trends did not match up with the target. Scenarios should be less than the target.
- r. Missing one of the reporting mechanisms on road maintenance, that is, reporting by staff.
- s. Would like a summary table listing all of the indicators comparing targets versus legal minimums.
- t. Would like to see commitments in SFMPs reflected in FSPs.
- u. Appreciate having Gilbert Proulx’s wildlife corridor information incorporated.
- v. Would like definition for SFM made more clear (that is, time frame).

- w. Preamble (page 6) – would like to see Canfor and BCTS break laws if it meant improved forest stewardship.
 - x. Page 106 – Would like to see BCTS involved in donations in non-monetary ways, for example, participating in educational activities.
 - y. Page 6 – Would like to know amount of FIA funding used in SFM.
 - z. Consider a “Research and Development” indicator.
 - aa. Page 1 – Would like to see acknowledgement that the public would like to see the concept of ecosystem-based management included with SFM.
 - bb. Like the preamble statement that focuses on the main goal of being able to prove sustainable management to buyers.
 - cc. Would like indicator 1.1d’s target measured as hectares rather than as a percentage.
 - dd. SCQI – make sure that forecasting is consistent with the indicator.
 - ee. SCQI – add explanation of “bold” items.
 - ff. Would help to know what the timeline is for meeting each of the targets.
 - gg. Include the main roads in indicator 5.2c.
 - hh. Clarify in the descriptions of Indicators 6.4a and 6.4b that the PAG is making decisions on what they will recommend to Canfor and BCTS.
2. Presentation on changes to TFL30 SFMP [Performance Matrix].
 3. Discussion on changes to TFL30 SFMP [Performance Matrix].
 4. Consensus or general agreement of PAG Members on changes to TFL30 SFMP [Performance Matrix]:
 - a. Indicator 1.1d’s target and variance accepted: Target: $\geq 70\%$; Variance: $\pm 10\%$.
 - b. Indicator 1.1e’s target accepted: Target: As per Table 6 in the SFMP plan dated June 2, 2006.
 - c. Indicator 1.3a’s target accepted: Target: As per Table 6 in the SFMP plan dated June 2, 2006.
 - d. Indicator 2.2c’s target accepted: Target: As per Table 6 in the SFMP plan dated June 2, 2006.
 - e. Indicator 1.2a’s target accepted: Target: ≥ 7171 ha in high value habitat and ≥ 5459 ha in corridors.

- f. Indicator 1.2c and its target and variance accepted: The amount of Species at Risk (wildlife) habitat (ha) within TFL30; Target: By June 30, 2007; Variance: + 6 months.
- g. Indicator 2.2h and its target and variance accepted: The amount of Species at Risk (wildlife) habitat (ha) within TFL30; Target: By June 30, 2007; Variance: + 6 months.
- h. Indicator 1.3b's target and variance accepted: Target: By June 30, 2007; Variance: + 3 months.
- i. Indicator 2.2f's target and variance accepted: Target: By June 30, 2007; Variance: + 3 months.
- j. Indicator 2.2d and its target and variance accepted: The area in hectares in wildlife biodiversity corridors within the DFA; Target: ≥ 82 ha; Variance: 0%;
- k. Indicator 3.2b's target and variance accepted: Target: 100% of the sub-basins will have <10% SCQI high concerns; Variance: -25% of the 100% of the sub-basins.
- l. Indicator 4.1c's target and variance accepted: Target: By June 30, 2007; Variance: + 3 months.
- m. Indicator 5.1f's target and variance accepted: Target: By March 30, 2007; Variance: + 3 months.
- n. Indicator 5.2c's target accepted with one dissension: Target: ≥ 200 km.
 - i. Dissension #1: It unfairly biases the upcoming process and discussions
- o. Indicator 5.3a accepted: Stumpage paid on time to Government – applies to Canfor only.
- p. Indicator 6.5c accepted: Number of items incorporated from the Continuous Improvement Matrix into the SFM Plan.

C. TFL30 Annual Report

1. TFL30 Annual report distributed to PAG members.

D. Registration Audit Reports

1. BCTS
 - a. Reviewed draft results of CSA Registration audit. It is expected that BCTS will be recommended for CSA certification.

2. Canfor

- a. Reviewed draft results of CSA Registration audit. It is expected that Canfor will be recommended for CSA re-certification.

E. Meeting Feedback (PAG questionnaire): TFL 30 PAG questionnaire distributed, completed, and collected.

F. Next meeting – Field Tour

1. Agenda: "Indicators in Action"
2. Time: TBD
3. Date: September 23, 2006
4. Place: TBD

G. Actions

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Jan 21 – 04	Follow up and report back on stand-level best practices standards.	Kerry Deschamps	February 2, 2006	Ongoing
Feb 13 – 03	Review the current indicators to ensure they fall within the natural range of variance.	Kerry Deschamps	Spring 2006	
Feb 13 – 08	Investigate the possibility of an indicator that indicates the number of products and services related to various processing facilities.	Kerry Deschamps	Spring 2006	
Feb 13 – 09	Develop an indicator regarding minimal harvest level within the DFA.	Kerry Deschamps	Spring 2006	
Feb 13 – 10	Investigate the possibility of an indicator regarding the ratio of money Canfor pays directly to employees versus government.	Kerry Deschamps	Spring 2006	Ongoing
Mar 25 – 01	Send Dave S. preferred research paper to Brad Sealy at UBC regarding Kimmons' carbon cycling modeling research.	Steering Committee	Spring 2006	Completed
Mar 25 – 02	Provide more information on the UBC carbon cycling modeling research.	Steering Committee	Spring 2006	Completed
Mar 25 – 03	Provide more information on how the UBC carbon cycling modeling research influences the timber supply model.	Steering Committee	Spring 2006	Completed

Mar 25 – 05	Review the timber forest product opportunities on the TFL and look at opportunities to encourage other timber products.	Kerry Deschamps	June 2006	
April 22 – 01	Determine why “Reduced Ecosystem Resilience” losses to Mountain Pine Beetle were very large (compared to the Base Case 1) if the MPB were not harvested.	Kerry Deschamps	June 2006	
April 22 – 02	Provide the multiplier figure used to determine the number of indirect jobs per direct employment in the forest industry.	Kerry Deschamps	June 2006	
April 22 – 03	Distribute Forecasting presentation and “Summary of Trends” listing all of the SFMP’s elements.	Steering Committee	May 2006	
June 15 - 01	Add to CII Matrix “consider developing an indicator for species-at-risk flora habitat.”	Roxanne Yanishewski	June 30, 2006	
June 15 - 02	Provide TFL30 2005-06 Annual Report to PAG members and ask PAG members to provide comments to Roxanne Yanishewski by June 30, 2006.	Steering Committee	June 22, 2006	
June 15 - 03	Distribute to PAG the Auditors’ final reports on BCTS and Canfor.	Steering Committee	June 30, 2006	