

# Prince George

## Sustainable Forest Management Plan



## 2005/06 Annual Report





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
1.0 Introduction .....	4
1.1 Executive Summary .....	4
2.0 SFM Indicators, Targets and Strategies .....	7
1.1.A.a.i Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit .....	7
1.1.A.a.ii Old Interior Forest .....	7
1.1.A.a.iii Young Patch Size Distribution .....	8
1.1.A.a.iv Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves .....	10
1.1.A.a.v Stand Level Retention .....	10
1.1.A.a.vi Wet Trench & Wet Mountain Young Patch Size Distribution .....	11
1.1.A.a.vii Coarse Woody Debris .....	12
1.2.A.a.i Caribou Ungulate Winter Range .....	12
1.2.A.a.ii Mule Deer Winter Range Requirements .....	13
1.2.A.a.iii Species at Risk Notice/ Orders .....	14
1.2.A.a.iv Riparian Reserves .....	14
1.2.A.a.v Personnel Trained to Identify Species at Risk .....	15
1.2.A.a.vi Species at Risk & Management Strategies .....	15
1.2.A.a.vii Forest Operations & Species at Risk Management .....	16
1.2.A.a.viii Site Plan Review for Species at Risk .....	16
1.2.A.a.ix Site Plans with Identified Species at Risk .....	17
1.3.A.a.i Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves .....	18
1.3.A.b.i Stand Level Retention .....	18
1.3.A.b.ii Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use .....	19
1.4.A.a.i Sites of Biological Significance Training .....	19
1.4.A.a.ii Sites of Biological Significance Management Strategies .....	20
1.4.A.a.iii Sites of Biological Significance Management Strategies Implementation .....	20
1.4.B.a.i Harvesting within Landscape Level Reserves .....	21
2.2.A.a.i Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit .....	21
2.1.A.a.ii Old Interior Forest .....	22
2.1.A.a.iii Young Patch Size Distribution .....	23
2.1.A.a.iv Areas Planted Consistent with Operational Plans .....	24
2.1.A.a.v Wet Trench & Wet Mountain Young Patch Size Distribution .....	25
2.2.A.a.i Caribou Ungulate Winter Range .....	25
2.2.A.a.ii Mule Deer Winter Range Requirements .....	26
2.2.A.a.iii Species at Risk Notice/ Orders .....	26
2.2.A.a.iv Riparian Reserves .....	27
2.2.A.a.v Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves .....	28
3.1.A.a.i Soil Conservation Standards .....	28
3.1.A.a.ii Cutblock Area Occupied by Permanent Access Structures .....	29
3.1.A.a.iii Terrain Management .....	29
3.1.A.a.iv Reportable Spills .....	30
3.2.A.a.i Riparian Area Management .....	30
3.2.A.a.ii Stream Crossing Management .....	31
3.2.A.a.iii Mitigating Sedimentation .....	32
3.2.A.a.iv Maintenance of Natural Stream Flow .....	32
3.2.A.a.v Area Harvested vs. Area Regenerated .....	33
3.2.A.a.vi Peak Flow Index Calculations .....	34
4.1.A.a.i Net Area Reforested .....	34
4.1.A.a.ii Free Growing Requirements .....	34
4.1.A.a.iii Stand Damaging Agents .....	35
4.2.A.a.i Cutblock Area Occupied by Permanent Access Structures .....	36
4.2.A.a.ii Forest Land Conversion .....	36
5.1.A.a.i Cut Level Volumes .....	37
5.1.A.a.ii Area Harvested vs. Area Regenerated .....	38
5.1.A.a.iii Stand Damaging Agents .....	39
5.1.A.a.iv Forestry Related Industrial Fires .....	39

5.1.A.b.i Visual Quality Requirements .....	40
5.1.A.b.ii Cultural Heritage Requirements .....	40
5.1.A.b.iii Range Requirements .....	41
5.1.A.b.iv Riparian Area Management .....	41
5.1.A.b.v Recreation Requirements .....	42
5.1.A.b.vi Lakeshore Requirements.....	43
5.1.A.b.vii First Order Wood Products .....	43
5.1.A.b.viii Volume Advertised through Competitive Bid .....	44
5.1.A.b.ix Public and Stakeholder Input .....	45
5.1.A.b.x Viewing of Access Plans .....	46
5.1.A.b.xi Responses to Written Public Inquiries .....	46
5.1.A.b.xii Communication Strategies.....	47
5.2.A.a.i Support of North Central Interior Suppliers and Contractors .....	47
5.2.A.a.ii Volume Advertised through Competitive Bid .....	48
5.3.A.a.i Payment of Taxes.....	49
5.3.A.a.ii Stumpage Paid to Government .....	49
5.3.A.a.iii Loss Time Accidents .....	49
6.1.A.a.i Legally Recognized Treaty Areas .....	50
6.1.A.a.ii Forest Stewardship Plan Referral to First Nations .....	51
6.1.A.a.iii Pesticide Management Plan Referrals to First Nations.....	51
6.2.A.a.i Cultural Heritage Requirements.....	52
6.2.A.a.ii Heritage Conservation Act.....	52
6.3.A.a.i PAG Satisfaction with Public Participation .....	53
6.3.A.a.ii PAG Terms of Reference.....	54
6.3.A.a.iii Number of PAG Meetings .....	54
6.3.A.a.iv Public Sector Participation in the PAG.....	54
6.4.A.a.i PAG Satisfaction with Information Presented for Decision Making .....	55

## 1.0 Introduction

This is the first Annual Report of the Prince George Sustainable Forest Management Plan. It covers the reporting period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006. The Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) is a result of the combined efforts of four major licensees and British Columbia Timber Sales (BCTS) to achieve and maintain Canadian Standards Association (CSA) certification to the CSA Z809-02 standard. The signatories to the plan are:

1. BC Timber Sales, Prince George Business Area
2. Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Prince George Operations
3. Carrier Lumber Ltd.
4. Lakeland Mills Ltd.
5. Winton Global Lumber Ltd.

The CSA Standard provides SFM specifications that include public participation, performance, and system requirements that must be met to achieve certification. These specifications were the framework for the development of the Prince George SFMP. Each Licensee and BCTS has existing management systems that contribute to the overall SFM strategy. These may include existing management systems such as ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems, standard operating procedures, and internal policies.

One of the public participation strategies suggested in the CSA SFM Standard is the formation of a local group of interested and affected members of the public to provide input on an ongoing basis. This strategy provides the base for the formation of a Public Advisory Group (PAG) whose purpose is to achieve CSA standard's public participation requirements. The Licensees/ BCTS established a PAG in the fall of 2004 to assist with the development of the SFMP. A wide range of public sector interest groups from within the Prince George Forest District were invited to participate in the SFM process through the PAG. In all, fifty members of the public including First Nation peoples attended at least one PAG meeting and/or received the agenda and minutes for each PAG meeting. After completing the Terms of Reference in December 2004, the PAG established the SFMP Criteria and Elements Performance Matrix with the SFMP being completed in September of 2005. It is important to note, the Prince George SFMP is a working document and is subject to continual improvement. Over time, the document will incorporate new knowledge, experience and research in order to recognize society's environmental, economic and social values.

This Annual Report measures the signatory's performance in meeting the indicator targets outlined in the SFMP over the Prince George Defined Forest Area (DFA). The DFA is the Crown Forest land base within the Prince George Forest District as defined by the Ministry of Forests and Range, excluding woodlots, Parks, Protected Areas and private land. The intent of this Annual Report is to have sustainable forest management viewed by the public as an open, evolving process that is taking steps to meet the challenge of managing the forests of the Prince George DFA for the benefit of present and future generations.

The following Table summarizes the results for the current reporting period. For clarification of the intent of the indicators, objectives or the management practices involved, the reader should refer to the Prince George Sustainable Forest Management Plan Document.

## 1.1 Executive Summary

Of the 82 indicators listed in Table 1. 62 indicators were met within the prescribed variances, 13 indicators are pending due to 2006 targets or outstanding licensee information and 7 indicators were not met within the prescribed variances. A corrective and preventative action plan is contained in the indicator discussions for each non-conformance indicator.

**Table 1: Summary of Indicator Status, April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006.**

No.	Indicator Number	Cross Reference	Indicator Description	Target Met	Pending	Target Not Met
1.	1.1A.a.i	2.1.A.a.i	Old forest			X
2.	1.1A.a.ii	2.1.A.a.ii	Interior old	X		
3.	1.1A.a.iii	2.1.A.a.iii	Patch size		X	
4.	1.1A.a.iv	1.3.A.a.i	Landscape reserves	X		
5.	1.1A.a.v	1.3.A.b.i	7% Stand level retention	X		
6.	1.1A.a.v	1.3.A.b.i	min 3.5% retention			X
7.	1.1A.a.vi	2.1.A.a.v	Wet Trench patch size		X	
8.	1.1.A.a.vii		Coarse Woody Debris Levels	X		
9.	1.2.A.a.i	2.2.A.a.i	Caribou UWR	X		
10.	1.2.A.a.ii	2.2.A.a.ii	Mule deer UWR	X		
11.	1.2.A.a.iii	2.2.A.a.iii	SAR notices	X		
12.	1.2.A.a.iv	2.2.A.a.iv	Riparian reserves	X		
13.	1.2.A.a.v		SAR training	X		
14.	1.2.A.a.vi		Develop SAR management strategies		X	
15.	1.2.A.a.vii		Following SAR management strategies		X	
16.	1.2.A.a.viii		SP review by SAR trained person		X	
17.	1.2.A.a.ix		% SP with SAR management strategies		X	
18.	1.3.A.a.i	1.1A.a.iv	Landscape reserves	X		
19.	1.3.A.b.i	1.1A.a.v	7% Stand level retention	X		
20.	1.3.A.b.i	1.1A.a.v	min 3.5% retention			X
21.	1.3.A.b.ii		Chief Foresters Seed use standards	X		
22.	1.4.A.a.i		Biological significance training	X		
23.	1.4.A.a.ii		Develop Bio significance strategies	X		
24.	1.4.A.a.iii		Following Bio significance strategies	X		
25.	1.4.B.a.i		Trespass in 1.1.A.a.iv (landscape res.)	X		
26.	2.1.A.a.i	1.1A.a.i	Old forest			X
27.	2.1.A.a.ii	1.1A.a.ii	Interior old	X		
28.	2.1.A.a.iii	1.1A.a.iii	Patch size		X	
29.	2.1.A.a.iv		Planting consistent with plans	X		
30.	2.1.A.a.v	1.1A.a.vi	Wet Trench patch size		X	
31.	2.2.A.a.i	1.2.A.a.i	Caribou UWR	X		
32.	2.2.A.a.ii	1.2.A.a.ii	Mule deer UWR	X		
33.	2.2.A.a.iii	1.2.A.a.iii	SAR notices	X		
34.	2.2.A.a.iv	1.2.A.a.iv	Riparian reserves	X		
35.	2.2.A.a.v	1.1A.a.iv	Landscape reserves	X		
36.	3.1.A.a.i		Soil conservation	X		
37.	3.1.A.a.ii	4.2.A.a.i	% roads on cut blocks	X		
38.	3.1.A.a.iii		Terrain Management requirements	X		
39.	3.1.A.a.iv		Legally reportable spills	X		
40.	3.2.A.a.i	5.1.A.b.iv	Riparian management requirements			X
41.	3.2.A.a.ii		Erosion control plans at crossings	X		
42.	3.2.A.a.iii		Unnatural sediment occurrences			X
43.	3.2.A.a.iv		Maintain natural stream flow at crossings	X		
44.	3.2.A.a.v	5.1.A.a.ii	4 year regeneration delay		X	
45.	3.2.A.a.vi		Peak Flow Index		X	
46.	4.1.A.a.i		3 year regeneration delay		X	
47.	4.1.A.a.ii		Free to Grow		X	
48.	4.1.A.a.iii	5.1.A.a.iii	Stand Damaging agents	X		
49.	4.2.A.a.i	3.1.A.a.ii	% roads on cut blocks	X		
50.	4.2.A.a.ii		% of roads in THLB	X		
51.	5.1.A.a.i		Cut control	X		
52.	5.1.A.a.ii	3.2.A.a.v	4 year regeneration delay		X	
53.	5.1.A.a.iii	4.1.A.a.iii	Stand Damaging agents	X		
54.	5.1.A.iv		Forest industry fires	X		
55.	5.1.A.b.i		Visual quality requirements	X		
56.	5.1.A.b.ii	6.2.A.a.i	Cultural heritage requirements	X		
57.	5.1.A.b.iii		Range requirements	X		

No.	Indicator Number	Cross Reference	Indicator Description	Target Met	Pending	Target Not Met
58.	5.1.A.b.iv	3.2.A.a.i	Riparian management requirements			X
59.	5.1.A.b.v		Recreation requirements	X		
60.	5.1.A.B.vi		Lakeshore requirements	X		
61.	5.2.A.b.vii		Wood products produced	X		
62.	5.1.A.b.viii	5.2.A.a.ii	Wood Volume openly tendered	X		
63.	5.1.A.b.ix		Number of public opportunities	X		
64.	5.1.A.b.x		Access plan viewing opportunity	X		
65.	5.1.A.b.xi		Number of written responses	X		
66.	5.1.A.b.xii		Number of communication strategies	X		
67.	5.2.A.a.i		% spent on local businesses	X		
68.	5.2.A.a.ii	5.1.A.b.viii	Wood volume openly tendered	X		
69.	5.3.A.a.i		Taxes paid on time	X		
70.	5.3.A.a.ii		Stumpage paid on time	X		
71.	5.3.A.a.iii		Lost time accidents	X		
72.	6.1.A.a.i		Respect treaty areas	X		
73.	6.1.A.a.ii		Referral of FSP's to FN	X		
74.	6.1.A.a.iii		Referral of PMP's to FN	X		
75.	6.2.A.a.i	5.1.A.b.ii	Cultural heritage requirements	X		
76.	6.2.A.a.ii		Heritage conservation Act requirements	X		
77.	6.3.A.a.i		PAG satisfaction with process	X		
78.	6.3.A.a.ii		PAG ToR review	X		
79.	6.3.A.a.iii		# of PAG meetings	X		
80.	6.3.A.a.iv		% of public sectors invited to PAG	X		
81.	6.4.A.a.i		Satisfaction with timing of information	X		
82.	6.4.A.a.i		Satisfaction with amount of information	X		
			<b>Totals</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>

## 2.0 SFM Indicators, Targets and Strategies

### 1.1.A.a.i Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit

Target and Variance	Indicator Statement
Target: As per the "Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA" Variance: 0%	The amount of old forest by NDU/ merged BEC within the DFA

This indicator is intended to quantify the amount of the landscape occupied by "old forests" at a point in time. Maintenance of old forest stands is crucial to forest management for the conservation of landscape ecosystem biodiversity. The Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic presents its own challenges as older pine leading stands are the most susceptible to infestation.

The Landscape Objective Working Group (LOWG), which has representation from the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands - Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB), MoFR (Ministry of Forest and Range) and timber licensees has developed Landscape Biodiversity Objectives and Old Forest Retention requirements for the Northern Interior Forest Region, which includes the Prince George District.

The current status of old forest within the DFA is shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit Merged BEC**

NDZ	NDU	Total CFLB (ha)	OLD Forest Threshold		Current Status as of March 31, 2006			
			%	Hectares	% of CFLB	Hectares	Surplus / Deficit	Licensee Action
Boreal Foothills	A1	7,255	33%	2,394	54.0%	3,917	1,523	No Action
McGregor	A2	10,349	26%	2,691	48.5%	5,022	2,331	No Action
McGregor	A3	71,779	12%	8,613	32.3%	23,151	14,538	No Action
McGregor	A4	219,256	26%	57,007	26.7%	58,546	1,539	<b>Recruitment Strategy</b>
Moist Interior	A5	12,396	29%	3,595	36.4%	4,511	916	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A6	16,417	29%	4,761	47.5%	7,801	3,040	No Action
Moist Interior	A7	5,928	17%	1,008	35.0%	2,075	1,067	No Action
Moist Interior	A8	9,145	12%	1,097	35.1%	3,211	2,114	No Action
Moist Interior	A9	33,443	12%	4,013	16.6%	5,549	1,536	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A10	39,088	17%	6,645	35.7%	13,965	7,320	No Action
Moist Interior	A11	128,566	12%	15,428	25.4%	32,615	17,187	No Action
Moist Interior	A12	179,032	12%	21,484	25.5%	45,741	24,257	No Action
Moist Interior	A13	370,589	12%	44,471	29.5%	109,285	64,814	No Action
Wet Mountain	A14	154,009	50%	77,005	85.9%	132,304	55,300	No Action
Wet Mountain	A15	27,832	84%	23,379	86.9%	24,181	802	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Mountain	A16	33,914	26%	8,818	38.3%	12,978	4,160	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Mountain	A17	114,673	50%	57,337	68.4%	78,443	21,107	No Action
Wet Trench	A18	33,997	80%	27,198	93.8%	31,893	4,695	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Trench	A19	65,010	48%	31,205	83.9%	54,552	23,347	No Action
Wet Trench	A20	98,712	80%	78,970	90.5%	89,335	10,365	No Action
Wet Trench	A21	114,753	48%	55,081	58.1%	66,637	11,556	No Action
Wet Trench	A22	27,176	53%	14,403	67.0%	18,201	3,798	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Trench	A23	145,660	53%	77,200	61.7%	89,883	12,683	No Action
Wet Trench	A24	131,802	30%	39,541	28.5%	37,552	(1,989)	<b>Recruitment Strategy</b>
Wet Trench	A25	152,701	46%	70,242	44.9%	68,597	(1,645)	<b>Recruitment Strategy</b>
<b>Totals</b>		<b>2,203,482</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>733,584</b>	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>1,019,945</b>	<b>286,361</b>	

Source: LOWG 2005-06 Analysis



**Indicator Discussion:** As shown in the table above, most units have a surplus of old forest as of March 31, 2006. Only two units (A24 & A25) are currently in deficit in old forest amounts and will require a recruitment strategy to be developed over the next year. A24 currently has a recruitment strategy developed and approved by government however it may need to be updated. In addition a recruitment strategy is recommended for A4 as the amount of old forest is near the threshold limits and a few other units have been identified to watch closely.

**1.1.A.a.ii Old Interior Forest**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The amount of old interior forest by NDU/ merged BEC within the DFA.	Target: As per the "Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA" Variance: 0%

Old interior forest conditions are achieved when the impact of adjacent openings no longer influences environmental conditions within the stand. Many species are dependent upon old interior forest conditions to meet their habitat requirements.

The LOWG, which has representation from ILMB, MoFR and timber licensees, aided ILMB in the development of landscape biodiversity objectives for old interior forest conditions for the Northern Interior Forest Region, which included the Prince George DFA. Old interior forest retention objectives have been established for each Natural Disturbance Unit (NDU) that occurs within the Prince George DFA.

The current status of the old interior forest retention objectives within the DFA is shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Old Interior Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit merged BEC**

NDZ	NDU	Old Forest Threshold (ha)	Interior OLD Forest Threshold		Current Status as of March 31, 2006			
			%	Hectares	%	Hectares	Surplus / Deficit	Licensee Action
Boreal Foothills	A1	2,394	40%	958	163.6%	3,917	2,959	No Action
McGregor	A2	2,691	40%	1,076	151.0%	4,062	2,986	No Action
McGregor	A3	8,613	25%	2,153	94.4%	8,130	5,977	No Action
McGregor	A4	57,007	10%	5,701	43.8%	24,980	19,279	No Action
Moist Interior	A5	3,595	40%	1,438	67.8%	2,438	1,000	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A6	4,761	40%	1,904	90.0%	4,283	2,379	No Action
Moist Interior	A7	1,008	10%	101	150.4%	1,516	1,415	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A8	1,097	25%	274	108.1%	1,186	912	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A9	4,013	10%	401	58.8%	2,358	1,957	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A10	6,645	25%	1,661	106.0%	7,042	5,381	No Action
Moist Interior	A11	15,428	25%	3,857	64.5%	9,955	6,098	No Action
Moist Interior	A12	21,484	10%	2,148	104.0%	22,342	20,194	No Action
Moist Interior	A13	44,471	25%	11,118	114.7%	51,007	39,889	No Action
Wet Mountain	A14	77,005	40%	30,802	162.3%	124,943	94,141	No Action
Wet Mountain	A15	23,379	40%	9,352	101.1%	23,633	14,281	No Action
Wet Mountain	A16	8,818	25%	2,204	93.2%	8,219	6,015	No Action
Wet Mountain	A17	57,337	25%	14,334	100.6%	57,705	43,371	No Action
Wet Trench	A18	27,198	40%	10,879	113.5%	30,872	19,993	No Action
Wet Trench	A19	31,205	40%	12,482	159.3%	49,713	37,231	No Action
Wet Trench	A20	78,970	40%	31,588	104.4%	82,472	50,884	No Action
Wet Trench	A21	55,081	40%	22,033	82.8%	45,623	23,590	No Action
Wet Trench	A22	14,403	40%	5,761	71.6%	10,309	4,548	No Action
Wet Trench	A23	77,200	40%	30,880	80.4%	62,038	31,158	No Action
Wet Trench	A24	39,541	10%	3,954	39.2%	15,494	11,540	No Action

NDZ	NDU	Old Forest Threshold (ha)	Interior OLD Forest Threshold		Current Status as of March 31, 2006			
			%	Hectares	%	Hectares	Surplus / Deficit	Licensee Action
Wet Trench	A25	70,242	25%	17,561	59.1%	41,493	23,932	No Action
<b>Totals</b>		<b>733,584</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>224,620</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>695,730</b>	<b>471,110</b>	

**Indicator Discussion:** As shown in the table above, all units have a surplus of interior old forest as of March 31, 2006. Four units (A5,A7,A8,& A9) within the moist interior natural disturbance zone have been identified to watch closely over the next year to ensure interior old forest amounts don't go below the threshold limits.

**1.1A.a.iii Young Patch Size Distribution**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The young forest patch size distribution by NDU within the DFA	Target: As per the "Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA" Variance: +/- 15%

A patch is a forest unit with identifiable boundaries and vegetation different from its surroundings. Often patches are even aged forests established from natural disturbances such as fire, wind or pest outbreaks, or from harvesting. Natural disturbances maintain plant and animal diversity over time and space by creating structural complexity within stands and by influencing the size distribution, edge characteristics, and dispersion of stands across the landscape (Zackrisson 1977).

The table below shows the updated current status of young patch size distribution as of March 31, 2005

PATCH SIZE	Current Status as of March 31, 2005					Future Patch Size Trending
	< 50	50-100	100 - 1000	> 1000	Total	
<b>Moist Interior Plateau Target</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards larger blocks in order to reduce the percentage of smaller blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	20,362	20,960	29,085	150,503	220,910	
<b>PG (%)</b>	9.2%	9.5%	13.2%	68.1%	100.0%	
<b>Moist Interior Mtn Target</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards smaller blocks in order to reduce the percentage of larger blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	622	1,115	3,470	2,006	7,213	
<b>PG (%)</b>	8.6%	15.5%	48.1%	27.8%	100.0%	
<b>McGregor Plateau Target</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the midsized blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	7,441	13,043	16,424	35,080	71,988	
<b>PG (%)</b>	10.3%	18.1%	22.8%	48.7%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Trench Valley Target</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the smallest and mid-sized blocks and away from the largest blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	10,952	14,529	26,097	84,425	136,003	
<b>PG (%)</b>	8.1%	10.7%	19.2%	62.1%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Trench Mtn Target</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the smallest and mid-sized blocks and away from the largest blocks.
<b>8463)PG (ha)</b>	3,235	6,833	6,137	34,748	50,953	
<b>PG (%)</b>	6.3%	13.4%	12.0%	68.2%	100.0%	

PATCH SIZE	Current Status as of March 31, 2005					Future Patch Size Trending
	< 50	50-100	100 - 1000	> 1000	Total	
<b>Wet Mtn Target</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the smallest and mid-sized blocks and away from the largest blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	4,270	7,875	13,148	5,526	30,819	
<b>PG (%)</b>	13.9%	25.6%	42.7%	17.9%	100.0%	

**Indicator Discussion:** As harvesting continues, it is anticipated that the distribution of patches will mimic the natural range of patch size distribution. While current trends will take most patch size distributions toward targets, others will actually be further from achieving objectives due to previous harvesting patterns and the effects of the massive infestation of mountain pine bark beetle. This indicator has a five-year measurement criterion as established in the PG TSA LOWG Reporting Protocol. The next reporting date is scheduled for the spring of 2010.

**1.1.A.a.iv Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The amount of landscape level biodiversity reserves within the DFA	<u>Target:</u> Hectares set aside to maintain natural forest conditions across DFA as per the latest Prince George Timber Supply Review <u>Variance:</u> -1%

There are two levels of Biodiversity Reserves: **stand level**, which includes mapped wildlife tree patches and riparian reserve areas, and **landscape level**, which includes provincial parks and all other large reserve areas that are removed from the timber harvesting land base. This indicator illustrates the amount of productive forest put into landscape level biodiversity reserves. Government of BC currently classifies landscape level retention through higher level and strategic planning initiatives. Some examples of this include Crown Land Plans and the Parks and Protected Areas Strategy.

The current status is shown for the operating year of April 1 2005 to March 31 2006 in the following table.

**Table 4: The Amount of Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves within the DFA**

Landscape Reserve		Total Reserve Area in the PG District (ha)
<b>Protected Areas &amp; Parks</b>		256,295
<b>Old Growth Management Areas</b>	<b>Dome</b>	31,780
	<b>Slim</b>	56,310
	<b>Humbug</b>	35,487
<b>Herrick Old Growth Reserve</b>		4,481
<b>Crown Land Plan Reserves</b>		45,324
<b>Caribou High</b>		94,468
<b>Total</b>		<b>524,145</b>

\* THLB - Timber Harvesting Land Base

\*\* TSA - Timber Supply Area

**1.1.A.a.v Stand Level Retention**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The average percentage of stand level retention in harvested areas within the DFA	<u>Target:</u> >7% annually within the DFA, with a minimum of 3.5% by block and no maximum %. <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Stand level retention consists primarily of wildlife tree patches (WTP) and riparian management areas. WTP are forested patches of timber within or adjacent to a harvested cutblock while riparian management areas are associated with water features within or adjacent to the harvest cutblock. Stand retention provides a source of habitat for wildlife, sustains local genetic diversity, and protects important landscape or habitat features, such as mineral licks and raptor nesting sites. Maintenance of habitat through stand retention contributes to conservation of ecosystem diversity by conserving a variety of forest age classes, stand structure and unique features at the stand level.

Within the DFA each Licensee and BCTS manages stand level retention for each cut block. Retention levels in each block is documented in the associated Site Plan, recorded in the Licensee/ BCTS database systems and reported out in RESULTS (Ministry of Forests and Range data base) on an annual basis.

The current status for average stand level retention for all cutblocks with completed harvesting between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 in the DFA is found in Table 5.

**Table 5: Stand Level Retention in Harvested Areas (April 1/05 to March 31/06)**

Licensee	Net Area Harvested (ha)*	Associated Total Retention	Average % Retained **	Total Number of Blocks	Blocks Achieving 3.5% Min. ***	% of Blocks Achieving 3.5% Minimum
Canfor	13,072.4	1993.1	13.2%	170	169	99.4%
Winton Global	1831.4	346.1	15.9%	45	45	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	586.6	168.5	22.3%	14	14	100.0%
BCTS	5376.5	914.7	14.5%	82	82	100.0%
Carrier	551.7	95.2	14.7%	10	10	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,418.6</b>	<b>3517.6</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>99.7%</b>
Target			≥7%			100.0%
Variance			0.0%			0.0%

\* Only blocks >15 ha with completed harvesting measured

\*\* Average % retention = (total reserve area with 100% retention / total reserve area with 100% retention and net area to be reforested) X 100. Does not include permanent access structures and non-productive ground or other areas not included in the productive forest.

\*\*\* Number of blocks achieving the 3.5% / total number of blocks harvested

**Indicator Discussion:** Of the 170 blocks harvested by Canfor during this reporting period, one 25.5 ha block was harvested with less than 3.5% stand level retention. This was a beetle priority block where adequate quality retention was not evident on or adjacent to the block. Canfor has updated its business process for stand level retention to avoid this from occurring in the future.

### 1.1.A.a.vi Wet Trench & Wet Mountain Young Patch Size Distribution

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Trend towards the percentage of area of patches in 101-500ha range within the Wet Trench and Wet Mountain of the young patch size distribution class 101-1000ha	Target: 75% Variance: -5%

Patch size categories used in Prince George Forest District include the following: < 51 hectares, 51-100 hectares, 101-1000 hectares and > 1000 hectares. However in the higher elevation areas (Wet Trench and Wet Mountain natural disturbance units) the range of 101- 1000 hectares is too large a range to actually account for the natural disturbance ecology. Therefore the range was sub divided into 101-500 hectares and 501-1000 hectares.

The table below shows the updated current status of Wet Trench and Wet Mountain young patch size distribution in the as of March 31, 2005

NDZ	TARGET	Patch Size Range (ha)			Future Patch Size Trending
		100-500	500-1000	Total	
<b>Wet Mountain Target</b>					Trend towards smaller patch sizes and away from larger patch sizes.
PG (ha)		9,606	4,032	13,637	
PG (%)	≥ 75%	70.4%	29.6%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Trench Mountain Target</b>					Trend towards smaller patch sizes and away from larger patch sizes.
PG (ha)		4,670	2,038	6,708	
PG (%)	≥ 75%	69.6%	30.4%	100%	

NDZ	TARGET	Patch Size Range (ha)			Future Patch Size Trending
		100-500	500-1000	Total	
<b>Wet Trench Valley Target</b>					Trend towards larger patch sizes and away from smaller patch sizes.
<b>PG (ha)</b>		19,708	7,728	27,436	
<b>PG (%)</b>	<b>≥ 75%</b>	71.8%	28.2%	100%	

**Indicator Discussion:** The LOWG which has representation for Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, MoFR, and Licensees, developed Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for patch size distribution for the Northern Interior Forest Region, which includes the Prince George DFA. This indicator has a five-year measurement criterion as established in the PG TSA LOWG Reporting Protocol. The next reporting date is scheduled for the spring of 2010.

**1.1.A.a.vii Coarse Woody Debris**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of cut blocks consistent with coarse woody debris requirements in operational plans.	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Coarse woody debris (CWD) is defined as material being a minimum of 2.0 meters in length and greater than 7.5 cm in diameter at one end, in all stages of decay and consists of above-ground logs, exposed roots and large fallen branches (F.P.P.R. Sec. 68, 2005). CWD is a vital component of a healthy functioning forest ecosystem in that it provides habitat for plants, animals and insects. It is also an important source of soil nutrients and aids in soil moisture retention. Targets for CWD requirements are identified in operational plans, typically the site plan for each specific cutblock.

The Licensees and BCTS have met the target of 100% consistency with CWD requirements in operational plans for the operating period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 (Table 6). Licensees and BCTS will continue to implement pre-work checklists, interim inspections, and final reviews to ensure targets continue to be met.

**Table 6: Cut Blocks Consistent with Course Woody Debris Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)	
Licensee	Total Number of Blocks Harvested with CWD Strategies*	Number of Blocks Harvested Consistent with CWD Strategies	Overall %**
Canfor	170	170	100.0%
Winton Global	56	56	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	14	14	100.0%
BCTS	49	49	100.0%
Carrier	7	7	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Blocks must be > 15 h

\*\* % = (Blocks harvested in accordance with prescribed strategies/total blocks harvested with CWD strategies) X 100

**1.2.A.a.i Caribou Ungulate Winter Range**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with approved provincial Caribou Ungulate Winter Range requirements as identified in operational plans.	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Mountain caribou populations are highly sensitive to disturbance and predatory pressures within their habitat. Caribou numbers are in decline due to a variety of causes. The B.C. conservation data center has placed mountain caribou on the provincial red list. All cutblocks within approved ungulate winter ranges must be consistent with the management guidelines in the approved Order for Ungulate Winter Range

#U7-003. The Order prescribes specific objectives to maintain mountain caribou winter range, to provide high suitability snow interception, cover, and foraging opportunities. Site plans prepared for these areas will reflect these objectives.

During this reporting period there were no operations within caribou ungulate winter range hence the target for this measure was achieved.

**Table 7: Forest Operations Consistent with Caribou Ungulate Winter Range Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Caribou Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) Requirements				Forest Operations Consistent with UWR Requirements	% in DFA**
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture*	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Silviculture refers to Mechanical Site Preparation only

\*\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with identified requirements/total operations with Caribou UWR requirements) X100

**1.2.A.a.ii Mule Deer Winter Range Requirements**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with approved provincial Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range requirements as identified in operational plans.	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

The mule deer is an important ungulate found in many parts of the DFA. It is dependent on suitable winter range conditions in order to survive the severe winters that often occur within the DFA. As such, mule deer were included in the Order for Ungulate Winter Ranges. An "Ungulate Winter Range" (UWR) is an area that contains habitat that is necessary to meet the winter habitat requirements of an ungulate species. As many UWR can be directly and indirectly affected by forest harvesting activities it is important that Licensees and BCTS in the Prince George DFA track the UWR locations and establish management objectives.

Areas harvested within mule deer UWR within the DFA during this reporting period are found in Table 8.

**Table 8: Forest Operations consistent with Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) Requirements				Forest Operations Consistent with UWR Requirements	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	3	7	0	10	10	
Carrier	0	2	0	2	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* % = (Operation meeting identified requirements/ total operations with Mule Deer ungulate Winter Range requirements) X 100

**1.2.A.a.iii Species at Risk Notice/ Orders**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with approved provincial Species at Risk Notice/ Orders requirements as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100%  <u>Variance:</u> 0%

This indicator is intended to monitor the consistency of forest operations with approved provincial Species at Risk Notice/ Orders requirements as identified in operational plans. Being consistent with these requirements will ensure that the habitats that are required to support these Species at Risk will be maintained.

No harvesting occurred within areas with approved provincial Species at Risk Notice/ Order requirements during the reporting period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006.

**Table 9: Forest Operations consistent with Species at Risk Notice/ Orders Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100%(variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Species at Risk Notice/Order (SAR) Requirements				Forest Operations Consistent with SAR Requirements	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with identified requirements/total operations with Species at Risk requirements) X100

**Indicator Discussion:** Licensees have produced maps that show the amount and distribution of species at risk in the DFA from the Species at Risk Notice (Northern Caribou / Mountain Caribou). Further refinement this data will be conducted over the next year.

**1.2.A.a.iv Riparian Reserves**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian reserve requirements as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100%  <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Riparian areas are the zones adjacent to lakes, streams, and wetlands. They encompass the area covered by continuous high moisture content and the adjacent upland vegetation. In British Columbia legislation has identified Riparian Management Areas (RMA) which consist of a Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) and, where required, a Riparian Reserve Zone (RRZ).

Currently, riparian reserves are identified in the site plan for the cutblock and in the field. A site plan is completed prior to harvesting for most areas within the DFA. The riparian requirements within the site plan identify the type of riparian features present within or adjacent to a proposed harvest area, the size of the RMA (which includes the RRZ where applicable), and a prescription for specific activities within the RMA to protect water quality and habitat values.

Forest operations conducted between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA are shown in Table 10.

**Table 10: Forest Operations Consistent with Riparian Reserve Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100%(variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations with Riparian Reserve Requirements*				Number of Forest Operations Completed	% in DFA**
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total Operations**		
Canfor	N/A	35	8	43	43	
Winton Global	N/A	32	13	45	45	
Lakeland Mills	N/A	13	5	18	18	
BCTS	N/A	47	0	47	47	
Carrier	N/A	4	0	4	4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Measured by block

\*\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with identified requirements / operations with riparian reserve requirements) X 100

**1.2.A.a.v Personnel Trained to Identify Species at Risk**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of appropriate personnel trained to identify Species at Risk	Target: 100% Variance: -10%

Identification of those species and plant communities that have been declared to be at risk is crucial if they are to be conserved. Appropriate personnel are key staff and consultants that are directly involved in operational forest management activities. By implementing training to identify Species at Risk the potential for disturbing these species and their habitat decreases. Maintaining all populations of native flora and fauna in the DFA is vital for sustainable forest management, as all organisms are components of the larger forest ecosystem.

**Table 11: Appropriate Personnel Trained to Identify Species at Risk**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**Target 100%, Variance -10%**

Licensee	Total Number of Key Staff **	Key Staff Trained to Identify Species at Risk	%in DFA*
Canfor	50	46	
Winton Global	6	6	
Lakeland Mills	3	3	
BCTS	31	26	
Carrier	5	5	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>90.5%</b>

\* % = (Personnel trained to identify SAR / number of personnel directly involved in operational forest management activities) X 100

**1.2.A.a.vi Species at Risk & Management Strategies**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of Species at Risk that have management strategies developed by April, 2006	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Some Species at Risk in British Columbia are found in areas of forestry development. Sustainable forest management must consider their needs when preparing and implementing operational plans. Appropriate management of these species and their habitat is crucial to ensuring populations of flora and fauna is sustained within the DFA. Specific management strategies are required to ensure that Species at Risk are maintained within the DFA. This indicator will ensure that appropriate management strategies are developed to conserve and manage Species at Risk and maintain flora and fauna native to the DFA.

Development and implementation of management strategies for Species at Risk requires knowledge of how many forest-dependant species inhabit a managed area. A review of Species at Risk flora and fauna in relation to the Prince George DFA should ideally consider all forest dependent species. For this indicator, the review of fauna will generally focus on vertebrates such as fish, mammals, birds, amphibians and reptiles currently identified as provincial red and blue listed species. Provincially



Identified Wildlife, red and blue listed Plant communities, and Red listed plants will also be reviewed for the DFA based on a summary listing from the BC Conservation Data Center.

This indicator is not due until April 2006 however; Canfor has developed management strategies for all Species at Risk in their operating area within the DFA. All of the other signatory licensees within the PG SFMP are developing species at risk management strategies as scheduled.

**Indicator Discussion:** A draft set of management strategies has been developed for the DFA. Licensees are currently applying these strategies for their own operating areas for implementation in 2006.

**1.2.A.a.vii Forest Operations & Species at Risk Management**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percentage of forest operations consistent with Species at Risk Management strategies as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100% commencing after April 2006 <u>Variance:</u> -5%

This indicator evaluates the success of implementing specific management strategies for Species at Risk as prescribed in operational plans. As discussed in the previous indicator, various species at risk exist in the Prince George DFA and the Licensees/ BCTS have set a target date of April 2006 to develop management strategies for these species. All Licensees and BCTS currently have systems in place to evaluate the consistency of forest operations with operational plans

This indicator is not due until April of 2006, after which management strategy prescriptions will be incorporated into operational plans. Licensees are developing management strategies for species at risk within the DFA. During this reporting period Canfor has management strategies in place for species at risk and 100% of the forest operations were consistent with these strategies.

**Table 12: Forest Operations Consistent with Species at Risk Management Strategies**

**April 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007** **TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Species at Risk Management Strategies				Forest Operations Consistent with Identified Strategies	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	2	0	2	2	<b>100%</b>
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	

\* % = (# of operations in accordance with identified strategies/ total operations with Species at Risk management strategies) X 100

**1.2.A.a.viii Site Plan Review for Species at Risk**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percent of Site Plans reviewed by a person trained in Species at Risk	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Site plans are the principle operational plans that direct forestry activities at the cutblock level. They are developed prior to harvesting and contain management strategies for the area to be harvested. By having site plans reviewed by personnel trained in Species at Risk management, an assessment of the prescribed management activities can be made. Tracking the percentage of site plans that are reviewed will allow licensees to evaluate how well Species at Risk management concerns are addressed during site plan development.

Registered Professional Foresters (RPF) prepare or oversee the preparation of site plans. Currently, all site plans are reviewed or prepared by a RPF, but only areas with Species at Risk concerns receive specific attention from persons with Species at Risk management training.

The following table covers site plans harvested between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 13: Site Plans Reviewed by Personnel Trained in Species at Risk**

April 1/05 - March 31/06		Target 100% (variance 0%)	
Licensee	Total Number of Site Plans	Site Plans Reviewed by Trained Staff**	Total % for DFA
Canfor	105	105	100.0%
Winton Global	37	24	64.9%
Lakeland Mills	14	11	78.6%
BCTS	112	76	67.9%
Carrier	10	6	60.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>79.9%</b>

\*% = (Number of site plans reviewed by a person trained in Species at Risk / total number of site plans reviewed) X 100  
 \*\*Site plans reviewed by a person trained to identify Species at Risk

**Indicator Discussion:** This indicator captures all plans reviewed during the reporting period (starting April 1, 2005) however SAR training for most licensees did not occur until June of 2005. As a result, some plans did not get reviewed as required by this indicator. All site plans for the subsequent reporting period are to be reviewed by trained personal.

**1.2.A.a.ix Site Plans with Identified Species at Risk**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of Site Plans with identified Species at Risk that have appropriate management activities	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

If there are Species at Risk identified in, or in proximity to areas to be harvested it will be the site plans that will describe the appropriate activities that must be performed to manage for those species. By tracking the number of Site Plans that have prescribed appropriate management activities Licensees and BCTS will be able to evaluate the success of those activities over time. They will also be able to evaluate the consistency of their procedures, and compare them to guidelines and other Licensee approaches to managing Species at Risk.

**Table 14: Site Plans with Appropriate Management Strategies for Identified Species at Risk**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		Target 100% (variance 0%)	
Licensee	Number of Site Plans with Identified Species at Risk (SAR)	Number of Site Plans containing SAR Management Strategies	% Total*
Canfor	2	2	100%
Winton Global	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*% = (Number of site plans with appropriate SAR Management strategies/ total number of site plans with identified SAR) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** This indicator is not due until April of 2006 therefore there is limited data to report for this reporting period. Going forward, licensees are developing management strategies for species at risk in the DFA for next reporting period. During this reporting period, Canfor identified 2 site plans

requiring species at risk management strategies. Both site plans incorporated management strategies for species at risk.

### 1.3.A.a.i Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The amount of landscape level biodiversity reserves within the DFA	<u>Target:</u> set aside to maintain natural forest conditions across DFA as per the latest Prince George Timber Supply Review <u>Variance:</u> -1%

There are two levels of Biodiversity Reserves: **stand level**, which includes mapped wildlife tree patches and riparian reserve areas, and **landscape level**, which includes provincial parks and all other large reserve areas that are removed from the timber harvesting land base. This indicator illustrates the amount of productive forest put into landscape level biodiversity reserves. Government of BC currently classifies landscape level retention through higher level and strategic planning initiatives. Some examples of this include Crown Land Plans and the Parks and Protected Areas Strategy.

The current status for the operating year of April 1 2005 to March 31 2006 is shown in the following table.

**Table 15: Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves within the DFA**

<b>Landscape Reserve</b>		<b>Total Reserve Area in the PG District (ha)</b>
<b>Protected Areas &amp; Parks</b>		256,295
<b>Old Growth Management Areas</b>	<b>Dome</b>	31,780
	<b>Slim</b>	56,310
	<b>Humbug</b>	35,487
<b>Herrick Old Growth Reserve</b>		4,481
<b>Crown Land Plan Reserves</b>		45,324
<b>Caribou High</b>		94,468
<b>Total</b>		<b>524,145</b>

\* THLB - Timber Harvesting Land Base

\*\* TSA - Timber Supply Area

### 1.3.A.b.i Stand Level Retention

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The average percentage of stand level retention in harvested areas within the DFA	<u>Target:</u> >7% annually within the DFA, with a minimum of 3.5% by block and no maximum %. <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Stand level retention consists primarily of wildlife tree patches (WTP) and riparian management areas. WTP are forested patches of timber within or adjacent to a harvested cutblock while riparian management areas are associated with water features within or adjacent to the harvest cutblock. Stand retention provides a source of habitat for wildlife, sustains local genetic diversity, and protects important landscape or habitat features, such as mineral licks and raptor nesting sites. Maintenance of habitat through stand retention contributes to conservation of ecosystem diversity by conserving a variety of forest age classes, stand structure and unique features at the stand level.

Within the DFA each Licensee and BCTS manages stand level retention for each cut block. Retention levels in each block is documented in the associated site plan, recorded in the Licensee/ BCTS database systems and reported out in RESULTS (Ministry of Forests and Range data base) on an annual basis.

The current status for average stand level retention for all cutblocks with completed harvesting between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 in the DFA is found in Table 16.

**Table 16: Stand Level Retention in Harvested Areas**

**April 1/05 to March 31/06 TARGET 100% (>7%in DFA, >3.5% in block) (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Net Area Harvested (ha)*	Associated Total Retention	Average % Retained **	Total Number of Blocks	Blocks Achieving 3.5% Min. ***	% of Blocks Achieving 3.5% Minimum
Canfor	13,072.4	1993.1	13.2%	170	169	99.4%
Winton Global	1831.4	346.1	15.9%	45	45	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	586.6	168.5	22.3%	14	14	100.0%
BCTS	5376.5	914.7	14.5%	82	82	100.0%
Carrier	551.7	95.2	14.7%	10	10	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,418.6</b>	<b>3,517.6</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>99.7%</b>

\* Only blocks >15 ha with completed harvesting measured

\*\* Average % retention = (total reserve area with 100% retention / total reserve area with 100% retention and net area to be reforested) X 100. Does not include permanent access structures and non-productive ground or other areas not included in the productive forest.

\*\*\* Number of blocks achieving the 3.5% / total number of blocks harvested

**Indicator Discussion:** Of the 170 blocks harvested by Canfor during this reporting period, one 25.5 ha block was harvested with less than 3.5% stand level retention. This was a beetle priority block where adequate quality retention was not evident on or adjacent to the block. Canfor has updated its business process for stand level retention to avoid this from occurring in the future.

**1.3.A.b.ii Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent compliance with Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Adherence to the Chief Forester's Seed Use Standards is crucial for sustainable forest management as the standards are designed to establish healthy stands composed of ecologically and genetically appropriate trees. Planting unsuitable genetic stock could result in stands that will not meet future economic and ecological objectives.

Table 17 shows the area planted with seedlings and seeds within the DFA in accordance with the Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use for this reporting period.

**Table 17: Compliance with Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use**

**April 1/05 to March 31/06 TARGET 100% (0% variance)**

Licensee	Total Area Planted (ha)	Area Planted in Accordance with Chief Forester's Standards*	Total % DFA**
Canfor	10,289.4	10,289.4	100.0%
Winton Global	1338.1	1338.1	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	398.0	398.0	100.0%
BCTS	730.5	730.5	100.0%
Carrier	1681.0	1681.0	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,437</b>	<b>14,437</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Measured in terms of number of trees purchased

\*\* % = (Area planted in accordance with Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use / total area planted) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** Final reporting of this indicator will be accomplished once the relevant BCTS data has been included.

**1.4.A.a.i Sites of Biological Significance Training**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of appropriate personnel trained to identify sites of biological significance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%

Sites of biological significance are sites that support red and blue listed plant communities and rare ecosystems. Sites of biological significance also include protected areas, national, provincial parks, multiple use management areas, wildlife reserves and such features as raptor nests or mineral licks. The government identifies Species at Risk habitats and Sites of Biological Significance. Appropriately trained personnel include key Licensee/ BCTS staff and consultants that are directly involved in operational forest management activities.

Training to identify Sites of Biological Significance commenced in June of 2005 (in conjunction with Species at Risk training) for key personnel. Biannual refresher training is planned once initial training is complete. Newly hired staff will have their training needs evaluated and receive training if required. Training records will be reviewed annually to identify training needs and to ensure appropriate personnel are trained.

**Table 18: Appropriate Personnel Trained to Identify Sites of Biological Significance**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance -10%)**

Licensee	Key Staff** Involved in Management Activities	Key Staff trained to Identify Sites of Biological Significance	% in DFA
Canfor	50	46	
Winton Global	6	6	
Lakeland Mills	3	3	
BCTS	31	26	
Carrier	5	5	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>86</b>	

\* % = (Biological significance sites trained personnel / number of personnel directly involved in forest activities) X 100

\*\* Key Staff includes consultants directly involved in operational forest management activities

**1.4.A.a.ii Sites of Biological Significance Management Strategies**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of sites of biological significance that have management strategies developed by April, 2006	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Many types of sites of biological significance are sufficiently known to allow for the development of special management areas, or prescribed activities that will appropriately manage these areas. This indicator will ensure that specific management strategies are developed to conserve and manage sites of biological significance. Training on Sites of Biological Significance is provided in conjunction with the Species at Risk training. An individual trained in SAR will review site plans prepared prior to the development of Management Strategies. Once strategies are developed in 2006, staff must ensure strategies for sites of biological significance are met in the site plan.

This indicator is not scheduled to begin reporting until April of 2006 therefore there is no data to report at this time.

**Indicator Discussion:** A draft set of management strategies has been developed for the DFA. Licensees are currently applying these strategies for their own operating areas for implementation in 2006. (See 1.2.A.a.vi.)

**1.4.A.a.iii Sites of Biological Significance Management Strategies Implementation**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of forest operations consistent with sites of biological significance management strategies as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% annually commencing after April 2006 Variance: -5%

This indicator evaluates the success of implementing specific management strategies for sites of biological significance as prescribed in operational plans. Once harvesting and other forest operations are complete, an evaluation is needed to determine how well these strategies were implemented. Tracking this consistency will ensure problems in implementation are identified and corrected in a timely manner.

**Indicator Discussion:** This indicator is not due to be reported on until after April of 2006. Going forward, licensees are collaborating on the development of management strategies for site of biological significance in the DFA for the scheduled date.

**1.4.B.a.i Unauthorized Harvesting within Landscape Level Reserves**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Hectares of unauthorized forestry related harvesting or road construction within landscape level biodiversity reserves	<u>Target:</u> 0 ha <u>Variance:</u> 0 ha

Landscape level biodiversity reserves/ Protected Areas are areas protected by legislation, regulation, or land-use policy to control the level of human occupancy or activities (*Canadian Standards Association, 2003*). These include Old Growth Management Areas (OGMA), parks, and new protected areas. As forestry activities may occur near these areas the chance exists for unauthorized harvesting or road construction to happen within these sites. In addition to being an obvious violation of legislation, such an act would also damage sites and organisms that were set aside for protection. Tracking the number of unauthorized hectares within landscape level biodiversity reserves will allow forest managers to determine if there are improvements needed in the planning and implementation of forestry activities.

Table 19 shows the amount of unauthorized forestry operations within landscape level biodiversity reserves between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 19: Unauthorized Forestry Operations within Landscape-Level Biodiversity Reserves**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 0ha (variance 0ha)**

<b>Licensee</b>	<b>Number of Unauthorized Harvesting Incidents*</b>	<b>Total Area of Unauthorized Harvesting (ha)</b>	<b>Number of Unauthorized Road Construction Incidents</b>	<b>Total Area of Unauthorized Road Construction (ha)</b>
Canfor	0	0	0	0
Winton Global	0	0	0	0
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0
BCTS	0	0	0	0
Carrier	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

\*As per internal tracking systems

**2.2.A.a.i Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit**

<b>Target and Variance</b>	<b>Indicator Statement</b>
<u>Target:</u> As per the "Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA" <u>Variance:</u> 0%	The amount of old forest by NDU/ merged BEC within the DFA

This indicator is intended to quantify the amount of the landscape occupied by "old forests" at a point in time. Maintenance of old forest stands is crucial to forest management for the conservation of landscape ecosystem biodiversity. The Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic presents its own challenges as older pine leading stands are the most susceptible to infestation.

The Landscape Objective Working Group (LOWG), which has representation from the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands - Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB), MoFR (Ministry of Forest and Range) and timber licensees has developed Landscape Biodiversity Objectives and Old Forest Retention requirements for the Northern Interior Forest Region, which includes the Prince George District. The current status of old forest within the DFA is shown in Table 20 below.

**Table 20: Old Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit Merged BEC**

NDZ	NDU	Total CFLB (ha)	OLD Forest Threshold		Current Status as of March 31, 2006			
			%	Hectares	% of CFLB	Hectares	Surplus / Deficit	Licensee Action
Boreal Foothills	A1	7,255	33%	2,394	54.0%	3,917	1,523	No Action
McGregor	A2	10,349	26%	2,691	48.5%	5,022	2,331	No Action
McGregor	A3	71,779	12%	8,613	32.3%	23,151	14,538	No Action
McGregor	A4	219,256	26%	57,007	26.7%	58,546	1,539	<b>Recruitment Strategy</b>
Moist Interior	A5	12,396	29%	3,595	36.4%	4,511	916	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A6	16,417	29%	4,761	47.5%	7,801	3,040	No Action
Moist Interior	A7	5,928	17%	1,008	35.0%	2,075	1,067	No Action
Moist Interior	A8	9,145	12%	1,097	35.1%	3,211	2,114	No Action
Moist Interior	A9	33,443	12%	4,013	16.6%	5,549	1,536	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A10	39,088	17%	6,645	35.7%	13,965	7,320	No Action
Moist Interior	A11	128,566	12%	15,428	25.4%	32,615	17,187	No Action
Moist Interior	A12	179,032	12%	21,484	25.5%	45,741	24,257	No Action
Moist Interior	A13	370,589	12%	44,471	29.5%	109,285	64,814	No Action
Wet Mountain	A14	154,009	50%	77,005	85.9%	132,304	55,300	No Action
Wet Mountain	A15	27,832	84%	23,379	86.9%	24,181	802	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Mountain	A16	33,914	26%	8,818	38.3%	12,978	4,160	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Mountain	A17	114,673	50%	57,337	68.4%	78,443	21,107	No Action
Wet Trench	A18	33,997	80%	27,198	93.8%	31,893	4,695	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Trench	A19	65,010	48%	31,205	83.9%	54,552	23,347	No Action
Wet Trench	A20	98,712	80%	78,970	90.5%	89,335	10,365	No Action
Wet Trench	A21	114,753	48%	55,081	58.1%	66,637	11,556	No Action
Wet Trench	A22	27,176	53%	14,403	67.0%	18,201	3,798	<b>Watch</b>
Wet Trench	A23	145,660	53%	77,200	61.7%	89,883	12,683	No Action
Wet Trench	A24	131,802	30%	39,541	28.5%	37,552	(1,989)	<b>Recruitment Strategy</b>
Wet Trench	A25	152,701	46%	70,242	44.9%	68,597	(1,645)	<b>Recruitment Strategy</b>
<b>Totals</b>		<b>2,203,482</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>733,584</b>	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>1,019,945</b>	<b>286,361</b>	

**Source: LOWG 2005-06 Analysis**

**Indicator Discussion:** As shown in the table above, most units have a surplus of old forest as of March 31, 2006. Only two units (A24 & A25) are currently in deficit in old forest amounts and will require a recruitment strategy to be developed over the next year. A24 currently has a recruitment strategy developed and approved by government however it may need to be updated. In addition a recruitment strategy is recommended for A4 as the amount of old forest is near the threshold limits and a few other units have been identified to watch closely.

**2.1.A.a.ii Old Interior Forest**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The amount of old interior forest by NDU/ merged BEC within the DFA.	Target: As per the "Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA" Variance: 0%

Old interior forest conditions are achieved when the impact of adjacent openings no longer influences environmental conditions within the stand. Many species are dependent upon old interior forest conditions to meet their habitat requirements.

The LOWG, which has representation from ILMB, MoFR and timber licensees, aided ILMB in the development of landscape biodiversity objectives for old interior forest conditions for the Northern Interior

Forest Region, which included the Prince George DFA. Old interior forest retention objectives have been established for each Natural Disturbance Unit (NDU) that occurs within the Prince George DFA.

The current status of the old interior forest retention objectives within the DFA is shown in Table 21 below.

**Table 21: Old Interior Forest by Natural Disturbance Unit merged BEC**

NDZ	NDU	Old Forest Threshold (ha)	Interior OLD Forest Threshold		Current Status as of March 31, 2006			
			%	Hectares	%	Hectares	Surplus / Deficit	Licensee Action
Boreal Foothills	A1	2,394	40%	958	163.6%	3,917	2,959	No Action
McGregor	A2	2,691	40%	1,076	151.0%	4,062	2,986	No Action
McGregor	A3	8,613	25%	2,153	94.4%	8,130	5,977	No Action
McGregor	A4	57,007	10%	5,701	43.8%	24,980	19,279	No Action
Moist Interior	A5	3,595	40%	1,438	67.8%	2,438	1,000	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A6	4,761	40%	1,904	90.0%	4,283	2,379	No Action
Moist Interior	A7	1,008	10%	101	150.4%	1,516	1,415	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A8	1,097	25%	274	108.1%	1,186	912	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A9	4,013	10%	401	58.8%	2,358	1,957	<b>Watch</b>
Moist Interior	A10	6,645	25%	1,661	106.0%	7,042	5,381	No Action
Moist Interior	A11	15,428	25%	3,857	64.5%	9,955	6,098	No Action
Moist Interior	A12	21,484	10%	2,148	104.0%	22,342	20,194	No Action
Moist Interior	A13	44,471	25%	11,118	114.7%	51,007	39,889	No Action
Wet Mountain	A14	77,005	40%	30,802	162.3%	124,943	94,141	No Action
Wet Mountain	A15	23,379	40%	9,352	101.1%	23,633	14,281	No Action
Wet Mountain	A16	8,818	25%	2,204	93.2%	8,219	6,015	No Action
Wet Mountain	A17	57,337	25%	14,334	100.6%	57,705	43,371	No Action
Wet Trench	A18	27,198	40%	10,879	113.5%	30,872	19,993	No Action
Wet Trench	A19	31,205	40%	12,482	159.3%	49,713	37,231	No Action
Wet Trench	A20	78,970	40%	31,588	104.4%	82,472	50,884	No Action
Wet Trench	A21	55,081	40%	22,033	82.8%	45,623	23,590	No Action
Wet Trench	A22	14,403	40%	5,761	71.6%	10,309	4,548	No Action
Wet Trench	A23	77,200	40%	30,880	80.4%	62,038	31,158	No Action
Wet Trench	A24	39,541	10%	3,954	39.2%	15,494	11,540	No Action
Wet Trench	A25	70,242	25%	17,561	59.1%	41,493	23,932	No Action
<b>Totals</b>		<b>733,584</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>224,620</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>695,730</b>	<b>471,110</b>	

**Indicator Discussion:** As shown in the table above, all units have a surplus of interior old forest as of March 31, 2006. Four units (A5,A7,A8,& A9) within the moist interior natural disturbance zone have been identified to watch closely over the next year to ensure interior old forest amounts don't go below the threshold limits.

**2.1.A.a.iii Young Patch Size Distribution**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The young forest patch size distribution by NDU within the DFA	Target: As per the "Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA" Variance: +/- 15%

A patch is a forest unit with identifiable boundaries and vegetation different from its surroundings. Often patches are even aged forests established from natural disturbances such as fire, wind or pest outbreaks, or from harvesting. Natural disturbances maintain plant and animal diversity over time and space by creating structural complexity within stands and by influencing the size distribution, edge characteristics, and dispersion of stands across the landscape (Zackrisson 1977).



The table below shows the updated current status of young patch size distribution as of March 31, 2005

PATCH SIZE	Current Status as of March 31, 2005					Future Patch Size Trending
	< 50	50-100	100 - 1000	> 1000	Total	
<b>Moist Interior Plateau Target</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards larger blocks in order to reduce the percentage of smaller blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	20,362	20,960	29,085	150,503	220,910	
<b>PG (%)</b>	9.2%	9.5%	13.2%	68.1%	100.0%	
<b>Moist Interior Mtn Target</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards smaller blocks in order to reduce the percentage of larger blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	622	1,115	3,470	2,006	7,213	
<b>PG (%)</b>	8.6%	15.5%	48.1%	27.8%	100.0%	
<b>McGregor Plateau Target</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the midsized blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	7,441	13,043	16,424	35,080	71,988	
<b>PG (%)</b>	10.3%	18.1%	22.8%	48.7%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Trench Valley Target</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the smallest and mid-sized blocks and away from the largest blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	10,952	14,529	26,097	84,425	136,003	
<b>PG (%)</b>	8.1%	10.7%	19.2%	62.1%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Trench Mtn Target</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the smallest and mid-sized blocks and away from the largest blocks.
<b>8463)PG (ha)</b>	3,235	6,833	6,137	34,748	50,953	
<b>PG (%)</b>	6.3%	13.4%	12.0%	68.2%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Mtn Target</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>	Trend towards the smallest and mid-sized blocks and away from the largest blocks.
<b>PG (ha)</b>	4,270	7,875	13,148	5,526	30,819	
<b>PG (%)</b>	13.9%	25.6%	42.7%	17.9%	100.0%	

**Indicator Discussion:** As harvesting continues, it is anticipated that the distribution of patches will mimic the natural range of patch size distribution. While current trends will take most patch size distributions toward targets, others will actually be further from achieving objectives due to previous harvesting patterns and the effects of the massive infestation of mountain pine bark beetle. This indicator has a five-year measurement criterion as established in the PG TSA LOWG Reporting Protocol. The next reporting date is scheduled for the spring of 2010.

**2.1.A.a.iv Areas Planted Consistent with Operational Plans**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percent of areas planted consistent with operational plans	Target: 100% Variance: -5%

To ensure a minimum regeneration delay and complete stocking, nearly all harvested sites are planted with ecologically suitable coniferous species to prescribed densities. Species are prescribed within the site plan on the basis of ecological suitability, and the management objectives for the stand. Densities are prescribed based on forest health concerns and historic levels of natural regeneration in those areas.

Areas planted between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA are shown in Table 22.

**Table 22: Areas Planted Consistent with Operational Plans**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance -5%)**

Licensee	Total Area Planted (ha)	Area Planted in accordance with Operational Plans (ha)*	% in DFA**
Canfor	9,574.90	9,574.90	
Winton Global	1338.06	1338.06	
Lakeland Mills	398.00	398.00	
BCTS	730.5	730.5	
Carrier	1681.08	1681.08	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,722.54</b>	<b>13,722.54</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Licensees may address what they consider significant factors (density, species, spacing etc.)

\*\* % = (Area planted in accordance with operational plans / total area planted) X 100

**2.1.A.a.v Wet Trench & Wet Mountain Young Patch Size Distribution**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Trend towards the percentage of area of patches in 101-500ha range within the Wet Trench and Wet Mountain of the young patch size distribution class 101-1000ha	Target: 75% Variance: -5%

Patch size categories used in Prince George Forest District include the following: < 51 hectares, 51-100 hectares, 101-1000 hectares and > 1000 hectares. However in the higher elevation areas (Wet Trench and Wet Mountain natural disturbance units) the range of 101- 1000 hectares is too large a range to actually account for the natural disturbance ecology. Therefore the range was sub divided into 101-500 hectares and 501-1000 hectares.

The table below shows the updated current status of Wet Trench and Wet Mountain young patch size distribution in the as of March 31, 2005

NDZ	TARGET	Patch Size Range (ha)			Future Patch Size Trending
		100-500	500-1000	Total	
<b>Wet Mountain Target</b>					Trend towards smaller patch sizes and away from larger patch sizes.
PG (ha)		9,606	4,032	13,637	
PG (%)	≥ 75%	70.4%	29.6%	100.0%	
<b>Wet Trench Mountain Target</b>				<b>100%</b>	Trend towards smaller patch sizes and away from larger patch sizes.
PG (ha)		4,670	2,038	6,708	
PG (%)	≥ 75%	69.6%	30.4%	100%	
<b>Wet Trench Valley Target</b>				<b>100%</b>	Trend towards larger patch sizes and away from smaller patch sizes.
PG (ha)		19,708	7,728	27,436	
PG (%)	≥ 75%	71.8%	28.2%	100%	

**Indicator Discussion:** The LOWG which has representation for Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, MoFR, and Licensees, developed Landscape Biodiversity Objectives for patch size distribution for the Northern Interior Forest Region, which includes the Prince George DFA. This indicator has a five-year measurement criterion as established in the PG TSA LOWG Reporting Protocol. The next reporting date is scheduled for the spring of 2010.

**2.2.A.a.i Caribou Ungulate Winter Range**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent	Target: 100%

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
with approved provincial Caribou Ungulate Winter Range requirements as identified in operational plans.	<u>Variance:</u> 0%

Mountain caribou populations are highly sensitive to disturbance and predatory pressures within their habitat. Caribou numbers are in decline due to a variety of causes. The B.C. conservation data center has placed mountain caribou on the provincial red list. All cutblocks within approved ungulate winter ranges must be consistent with the management guidelines in the approved Order for Ungulate Winter Range #U7-003. The Order prescribes specific objectives to maintain mountain caribou winter range, to provide high suitability snow interception, cover, and foraging opportunities. Site plans prepared for these areas will reflect these objectives.

Operations within caribou ungulate winter range are found in Table 23.

**Table 23: Forest Operations Consistent with Caribou Ungulate Winter Range Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Caribou Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) Requirements				Forest Operations Consistent with UWR Requirements	% in DFA**
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture*	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Silviculture refers to Mechanical Site Preparation only

\*\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with identified requirements/total operations with Caribou UWR requirements) X100

**2.2.A.a.ii Mule Deer Winter Range Requirements**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with approved provincial Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range requirements as identified in operational plans.	<u>Target:</u> 100%  <u>Variance:</u> 0%

The mule deer is an important ungulate found in many parts of the DFA. It is dependent on suitable winter range conditions in order to survive the severe winters that often occur within the DFA. As such, mule deer were included in the Order for Ungulate Winter Ranges. An "Ungulate Winter Range (UWR)" is an area that contains habitat that is necessary to meet the winter habitat requirements of an ungulate species. As many UWR can be directly and indirectly affected by forest harvesting activities it is important that Licensees and BCTS in the Prince George DFA track the UWR locations and establish management objectives.

Areas harvested within mule deer UWR within the DFA during this reporting period are found in Table 24.

**Table 24: Forest Operations consistent with Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) Requirements				Forest Operations Consistent with UWR Requirements	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	3	7	0	10	10	
Carrier	0	2	0	2	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* % = (Operation meeting identified requirements/ total operations with Mule Deer ungulate Winter Range requirements) X 100

**2.2.A.a.iii Species at Risk Notice/ Orders**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with approved provincial Species at Risk Notice/ Orders requirements as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

This indicator is intended to monitor the consistency of forest operations with approved provincial Species at Risk Notice/ Orders requirements as identified in operational plans. Being consistent with these requirements will ensure that the habitats that are required to support these Species at Risk will be maintained.

Table 25 reports on harvesting within areas with approved provincial Species at Risk Notice/ Order requirements during the reporting period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006.

**Table 25: Forest Operations consistent with Species at Risk Notice/ Orders Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Species at Risk Notice/Order (SAR) Requirements				Forest Operations Consistent with SAR Requirements	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with identified requirements/total operations with Species at Risk requirements) X100

**Indicator Discussion:** Licensees have produced maps that show the amount and distribution of species at risk in the DFA from the Species at Risk Notice (Northern Caribou / Mountain Caribou). Further refinement of this data will be conducted over the next year.

**2.2.A.a.iv Riparian Reserves**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian reserve requirements as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Riparian areas are the zones adjacent to lakes, streams, and wetlands. They encompass the area covered by continuous high moisture content and the adjacent upland vegetation. In British Columbia legislation has identified Riparian Management Areas (RMA) which consist of a Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) and, where required, a Riparian Reserve Zone (RRZ).

Currently, riparian reserves are identified in the site plan for the cutblock and in the field. A site plan is completed prior to harvesting for most areas within the DFA. The riparian requirements within the site plan identify the type of riparian features present within or adjacent to a proposed harvest area, the size of the RMA (which includes the RRZ where applicable), and a prescription for specific activities within the RMA to protect water quality and habitat values.

Forest operations conducted between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA that are consistent with riparian reserve requirements as identified in operational plans is found in Table 26.

**Table 26: Forest Operations Consistent with Riparian Reserve Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations with Riparian Reserve Requirements*				Number of Forest Operations Completed	% in DFA**
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total Operations**		
Canfor	N/A	35	8	43	43	
Winton Global	N/A	32	13	45	45	
Lakeland Mills	N/A	13	5	18	18	
BCTS	N/A	8	0	8	8	
Carrier	N/A	4	0	4	4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Measured by block

\*\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with identified requirements / operations with riparian reserve requirements) X 100

### 2.2.A.a.v Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The amount of landscape level biodiversity reserves within the DFA	<u>Target:</u> set aside to maintain natural forest conditions across DFA as per the latest Prince George Timber Supply Review <u>Variance:</u> -1%

There are two levels of Biodiversity Reserves: **stand level**, which includes mapped wildlife tree patches and riparian reserve areas, and **landscape level**, which includes provincial parks and all other large reserve areas that are removed from the timber harvesting land base. This indicator illustrates the amount of productive forest put into landscape level biodiversity reserves. Government of BC currently classifies landscape level retention through higher level and strategic planning initiatives. Some examples of this include Crown Land Plans and the Parks and Protected Areas Strategy.

The current status for landscape level biodiversity reserves for the operating year of April 1 2005 to March 31 2006 is found in Table 27

**Table 27: Landscape Level Biodiversity Reserves within the DFA**

Landscape Reserve	Total Reserve Area in the PG District (ha)
<b>Protected Areas &amp; Parks</b>	256,295
<b>Old Growth Management Areas</b>	
<b>Dome</b>	31,780
<b>Slim</b>	56,310
<b>Humbug</b>	35,487
<b>Herrick Old Growth Reserve</b>	4,481
<b>Crown Land Plan Reserves</b>	45,324
<b>Caribou High</b>	94,468
<b>Total</b>	<b>524,145</b>

\* THLB - Timber Harvesting Land Base

\*\* TSA - Timber Supply Area

### 3.1.A.a.i Soil Conservation Standards

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with soil conservation standards as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

Conserving soil function and nutrition is crucial to sustainable forest management. To achieve this, forest operations have limits on the amount of soil disturbance they can create. Soil disturbance is expected to some extent from timber harvesting or silviculture activities, but these activities are held to soil conservation standards outlined in site plans (where they are more commonly known as "soil disturbance limits"). The site plan prescribes strategies for each site to achieve activities and still remain within acceptable soil disturbance limits.

Forest operations conducted between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA within soil conservation standards as identified in the operational plans are found in Table 28.

**Table 28: Forest Operations Consistent with Soil Conservation Standards**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations			Forest Operations Consistent with Soil Conservation Standards	% in DFA*
	Harvesting and Roads	Silviculture**	Total		
Canfor	150	15	165	164	
Winton Global	56	38	94	94	
Lakeland Mills	14	5	19	19	
BCTS	82	4	86	86	
Carrier	10	0	10	10	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>373</b>	

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with soil conservation standards / total operations completed) X 100

\*\* Refers to maximum levels addresses mechanically site prepared blocks only

**Indicator Discussion:** Of the 150 blocks harvested by Canfor during the reporting period, one block had soil disturbance levels in excess of the amount specified in the site plan. A rehabilitation plan has been developed for the site. Canfor has updated its management systems for soil conservation and to avoid this from occurring in the future.

**3.1.A.a.ii Cutblock Area Occupied by Permanent Access Structures**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of cutblock area occupied by total permanent access structures	Target: ≤ 5% - averaged annually Variance: +1%

This indicator measures the amount of area developed as permanent access structures (PAS) within cutblocks, in relation to the area harvested during the same period. Permanent access structures include roads, bridges, landings, gravel pits, or other similar structures that provide access for timber harvesting. Area that is converted to non-forested land, as a result of permanent access structures and other development, is removed from the productive forest land base and no longer contributes to the forest ecosystem

The area occupied by permanent access structures in cut blocks harvested during this reporting period within the DFA are found in Table 29.

**Table 29: Cut Block Area Occupied by Total Permanent Access Structures**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET ≤5% (variance +1%)**

Licensee	Total Cutblock Area Harvested (ha) *	Total cutblock Area in Permanent Access Structures	% of Cutblock Area**
Canfor	15,389.6	488.6	3.2%
Winton Global	2368.3	99.6	4.2%
Lakeland Mills	603.7	17.1	2.8%
BCTS	6555.6	229.4	3.5%
Carrier	685.6	31.8	4.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25,602.8</b>	<b>866.5</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

\* Total cutblock area = gross area less natural NP.

\*\* % = (Area of permanent access structures / total cutblock area) X 100

**3.1.A.a.iii Terrain Management**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with terrain management requirements as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Some areas subject to forest operations occur on slopes that warrant special terrain management requirements in operational plans (usually the site plan). These unique actions are prescribed to minimize the likelihood of landslides or mass wasting. Terrain Stability Assessments (TSA) are completed on areas with proposed harvesting or road development that has been identified as either unstable or potentially unstable. The recommendations of the TSA are then integrated into the site plan or road layout/design and implemented during forest operations.

Table 30 indicates forest operations with terrain management requirements on blocks harvested between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 30: Forest Operations consistent with Terrain Management Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Terrain Management Requirements (TMR)				Forest Operations in Compliance with TMR	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	1	1	1	
Winton Global	1	0	0	1	1	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	2	2	2	
BCTS	1	9	0	10	10	
Carrier	1	2	0	3	3	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with terrain management requirements / total operations completed) X 100

### 3.1.A.a.iv Reportable Spills

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The number of legally reportable spills	Target: 0 (annually) Variance: < 5 (annually)

The Spill Reporting Regulation of the *BC Waste Management Act* requires any spill in excess of the reportable level for that substance to be immediately reported by the person involved or an observer to the Provincial Emergency Program.

This indicator is intended to monitor the number of spills that may occur as a result of forest operations and evaluate the success of measures to reduce such spills. The use of heavy equipment for forest operations may result in accidental petroleum/ antifreeze release into the environment. As these materials can be toxic to plants and animals, avoidance of such spills or ensuring their proper containment will contribute to sustainable forest management. By tracking spill occurrence, guidelines and procedures can be adjusted to improve handling and transportation procedures to avoid a reoccurrence of the spill.

**Table 31: The Number of "Legally" Reportable Spills**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 0 spills (variance < 5)**

Licensee	Number of Legally Reportable Spills
Canfor	0
Winton Global	0
Lakeland Mills	0
BCTS	0
Carrier	0
<b>TOTAL for DFA</b>	<b>0</b>

### 3.2.A.a.i Riparian Area Management

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian management requirements as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Riparian areas occur adjacent to streams, lakes and wetlands. They include both the area dominated by continuous high moisture content and the adjacent upland vegetation that exerts an influence on it. Riparian habitat can be critical for providing wildlife cover, fish food organisms, stream nutrients, large organic debris, stream bank stability and maintenance of water quality and quantity. Riparian features are also well appreciated by humans for recreation, aesthetics, and sustaining water quality.

This indicator is intended to ensure that the strategies identified in operational plans (such as site plans) to conserve riparian values have those strategies implemented on the ground. Once a strategy to conserve riparian values is included in a Forest Stewardship Plan, there is a legal obligation for the licensee to implement and adhere to the strategy. Harvest, road and silviculture inspections ensure that strategies are implemented as stated in the Site Plan document.

**Table 32: Forest Operations Consistent with Riparian Management**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations with Riparian Management Requirements			Number of Forest Operations with Requirements Met	% in DFA*
	Harvesting/Roads	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	103	15	118	117	
Winton Global	41	25	66	65	
Lakeland Mills	14	5	19	19	
BCTS	55	4	59	59	
Carrier	6	0	6	5	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>265</b>	

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with riparian management requirements / total operations completed) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** Winton Global had one incident where a feller buncher lost control on a steep slope and rolled down a gully into a S4 machine free zone. No one was injured and there was no damage to the stream or stream bank. Standard Operating Procedures were reviewed with the operator to avoid a reoccurrence of this accident. Carrier Lumber Ltd. had one incident where timber was decked in a riparian management area contrary to company standard operating procedures regarding harvest operations. The incident was reviewed and company standard operating procedures were revised to prevent future occurrences.

### 3.2.A.a.ii Stream Crossing Erosion Control Plans

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of stream crossings that are installed or removed consistent with erosion control plans or procedures	Target: 100% Variance: -5%

Forestry roads can have a large impact on water quality and quantity when they intersect with streams, particularly by increasing sedimentation into water channels. Increased sedimentation can damage spawning beds, increase turbidity, and effect downstream water users. Erosion control plans and procedures are used to ensure installations and removals are done properly. To measure the success of this indicator it is important to ensure that a process is in place to monitor the quality of stream crossings, their installation, removal, and to mitigate any issues as soon as possible.

Streams and crossing structures are identified during operational plan preparation. Pre-work forms are completed for all projects, including stream crossings, as part of EMS/Standard Operating Procedures. Stream crossing installations are usually planned for timeframes when conditions are favorable (i.e. fish windows). Appropriate erosion control devices are also installed during the installation process, such as silt fences.

Table 33 illustrates the number of stream crossings installed or removed between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006.



**Table 33: Stream Crossings Consistent with Erosion Control Plans or Procedures**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

TARGET 100% (variance - 5.0%)

Licensee	Number of Stream Crossings with Erosion Control Plans	Number of Stream Crossings Completed According to Erosion Control Plans	% in DFA
Canfor	63	63	
Winton Global	4	4	
Lakeland Mills	3	2	
BCTS	19	18	
Carrier	6	6	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>97.9%</b>

\*% = (Stream crossings treated in accordance with erosion control plans / total stream crossings activities) X100

**Indicator Discussion:** Lakeland Mills Ltd. had a bridge that separated in the middle and had the potential for introducing sedimentation into a stream. The procedures for bridge installations were reviewed to ensure this situation does not happen again.

### 3.2.A.a.iii Unnatural Known Sedimentation

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of unnatural known sediment occurrences where mitigating actions were taken	Target: 100% Variance: -5%

Sedimentation can damage water bodies by degrading spawning beds, increasing turbidity, and reducing water depths. Forest management activities may create unnatural inputs of sedimentation into water bodies. In addition to the effects of roads, sedimentation may also occur from slope failures as a result of forestry activities. Once sedimentation occurrences are detected, mitigating actions must be taken to stop further damage and rehabilitate the site. Tracking these mitigation actions contributes to sustainable forest management by evaluating where, when and how sedimentation occurs and the monitoring results of mitigation actions.

Forestry personnel detect sedimentation occurrences during stream crossing inspections, road inspections, silviculture activities, and other general activities.

**Table 34: Unnatural Known Sediment Occurrences where Mitigating Actions were Taken**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

TARGET 100% (variance -5%)

Licensee	Total Number of Unnatural Known Sedimentation Occurrences	Total Number of Mitigation Actions Required	Total Number of Mitigation Actions Taken	% DFA *
Canfor	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	2	2	2	
BCTS	5	5	3	
Carrier	2	2	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77.8%</b>

\*% = (Total number mitigation actions taken/ total number of mitigation actions required) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** All 5 occurrences have been acted on by BCTS. 3 occurrences have been mitigated. 2 occurrences where instructions were issued have yet to be followed up on to confirm conformance.

### 3.2.A.a.iv Maintenance of Natural Stream Flow

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of new stream crossings that maintain natural stream flow	Target: 100% Variance: 5%

When forest roads are constructed it is often necessary to build structures (i.e. culverts, bridges) that intersect fish-bearing streams. In order to maintain the number and diversity of fish species, stream

crossings cannot be a barrier to fish migration. As fish are also an important food source, the success of these stream crossings contributes to the population maintenance of other faunal species within the DFA. Careful consideration of the size of the crossing structure must be made to ensure that the structure can manage natural high water events. This indicator will measure the success of maintaining fish movement and managing peak flow at all new stream crossings within the DFA.

Streams and crossing structures are identified during operational plan preparation. The streams are surveyed for their fish bearing potential and qualified personnel determine their probable peak flow volumes. The appropriate crossing structure size and installation procedure is then prescribed for the stream crossing.

**Table 35: New Stream Crossings that Maintain Natural Stream Flow**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance -5%)**

Licensee	Total Number of New Stream Crossings Installed	Number of New Stream Crossings Maintaining Natural Stream Flow*	% in DFA**
Canfor	63	63	
Winton Global	2	2	
Lakeland Mills	3	3	
BCTS	14	14	
Carrier	6	6	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Unrestricted stream flow which accommodates fish passage

\*\* % = (Stream crossings that maintain natural flow / total number of stream crossings) X 100

**3.2.A.a.v Area Harvested vs. Area Regenerated**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The area regenerated within 4 years of harvesting compared to the area harvested.	Target: 100% annually Variance: -2%

Trees have a profound influence on water quality and quantity. They intercept precipitation, shade streams, bind soil particles, and draw moisture from the soil. When harvesting occurs there can be immediate impacts to the hydrologic cycle. Water tables may rise, water temperatures may increase, and stream levels may become more erratic as the mitigating influence of the forest is absent. One of the objectives to regenerating harvested areas quickly and efficiently is to restore the balance to the hydrology in the area. Tracking the area regenerated in comparison to the area harvested on a landscape level will ensure that harvesting does not outpace the ability of the DFA to adjust to changes in its hydrology. In addition to hydrological and ecological benefits, prompt reforestation benefits society in the short and long term. Regenerated cutblocks improves aesthetics, provides recreational opportunities, and contributes to the economic future of the forest industry.

Site plans define the standards to which regenerated blocks will be held to, and the timeframe to which they must reach Free to Grow status. The prescribed legal date for regenerating a cutblock is the "regen" date, and varies depending on the ecosystem association being reforested. This indicator measures harvesting and reforestation on a landscape level which provides a different perspective than traditional reforestation goals set at the individual cutblock level.

**Table 36: Net Area Regenerated vs. Net Area Harvested**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance -2.0%)**

Licensee	Net Area Harvested (ha)	Net Area Regenerated of those Harvested*	% in DFA**
Canfor	7,675.3	7,568.3	
Winton Global	1,259.5	1,259.5	
Lakeland Mills	556.9	556.9	
BCTS	2,525.8	889.1	
Carrier	236.8	236.8	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,254.3</b>	<b>10,510.6</b>	<b>85.8%</b>

\* Area qualified as regenerated as soon as planting takes place

\*\* % = (Total area regenerated/ total area harvested) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** BC Timber Sales' ability to accurately report on silviculture accomplishments has been impaired by database issues largely as a result of converting to a new data storage structure. The effort required to get this system fully operational is detailed in an action plan being monitored by the BCTS management.

### 3.2.A.a.vi Peak Flow Index Calculations

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percent of watersheds with Peak Flow Index calculations calculated	<u>Target:</u> 100% by June, 2006 <u>Variance:</u> +7 months

Peak flow is the maximum flow rate that occurs within a specified period of time, usually on an annual or event basis. The peak flow index (PFI) is a measure of the potential effect forest harvesting has on water flow within a particular watershed.

The Licensees and BCTS have determined that 100% of PFI can be calculated by June 2006. Once the PFI calculations are complete, the results will be reported back to the PAG. Watersheds will then be evaluated to establish PFI targets. Once these targets are established, harvesting plans will have to consider the impact harvesting will have on the watershed in which it occurs. The goal is to maintain peak flows within the target PFI to avoid excessive amounts of peak flow runoff.

**Indicator Discussion:** Licensees are currently delineating watershed boundaries and calculating peak flow index. As of March 31, 2006, Canfor has calculated peak flow for 77 of 300 watersheds. Licensees are expected to be able to report watershed peak flow indexes by December 2006 (within the 7-month variance).

### 4.1.A.a.i Net Area Reforested

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percent of net area regenerated within 3 years after the completion of harvesting. The indicator does not include sites logged under the Bark Beetle Regulation (BBR).	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> -10%

Prompt reforestation of harvested areas is a major component of sustainable forest management. In addition to creating wildlife habitat, maintaining hydrologic processes, and providing future timber for harvesting, regenerating cutblocks absorb significant amounts of carbon through photosynthesis. Because young plantations are typically healthy and rapidly growing, they sequester more CO<sub>2</sub> through photosynthesis than they release through decay. By reducing atmospheric greenhouse gases such as CO<sub>2</sub>, regenerating cutblocks can contribute to reducing climate change. The sooner cutblocks are regenerated after the completion of harvest the sooner this process can begin.

Tracking plantation establishment will allow forest managers to assess how quickly and successfully regeneration is occurring, and if possible, adjust operations to reduce the time it takes to achieve reforestation.

**Table 37: Net Area Regenerated within Three Years after the Completion of Harvesting**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET 100% (variance -10.0%)	
Licensee	Net Area Harvested (ha)	Net Area Regenerated (ha)	% in DFA*
Canfor	7675.3	7568.3	
Winton Global	1016.9	1016.9	
Lakeland Mills	456.3	456.3	
BCTS	3592.4	1459.6	
Carrier	1071.4	1071.4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,812.3</b>	<b>11,572.5</b>	

\* % = (Hectares regenerated / hectares harvested) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** BC Timber Sales' ability to accurately report on silviculture accomplishments has been impaired by database issues largely as a result of converting to a new data storage structure. The

effort required to get this system fully operational is detailed in an action plan being monitored by the BCTS management.

#### 4.1.A.a.ii Free Growing Requirements

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percent of cut block area that meets Free Growing requirements as identified in Site Plans	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

This indicator measures the percentage of harvested blocks that meet free growing obligations across the DFA. A free growing stand is a stand of healthy trees of a commercially valuable species, the growth of which is not impeded by competition from plants, shrubs or other trees (BC MOF 1995b). A free growing assessment is conducted on stands based on the time frame indicated by the site plan. If a survey indicates that the stand has not achieved free growing status by the required date, corrective actions will be prescribed immediately in order to remedy the situation while still meeting the late free growing deadline.

While this percentage is an important legal requirement for Licensees and BCTS, it is also important for sustainable forest management. Stands that meet free growing standards are deemed to have reached a stage where their continued presence and development is more assured. They are of a stand density, health, and height that make them less vulnerable to competition and more likely to reach maturity. Producing a free to grow stand means that the forest ecosystem will continue to evolve. It means that carbon sequestration will also continue, locking up additional green house gases as cellulose in the growing plantation.

For the reporting period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 the target for this measure was met as demonstrated in Table 38.

**Table 38: Cut Block Area that Meets Free Growing Requirements as Identified in Site Plans**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)	
Licensee	Cut Block Area Required to Meet Late Free Growing Status (ha)	Cut Block Area Meeting Free Growing Status (ha)	% in DFA*
Canfor	11,533.5	11,533.5	100.0%
Winton Global	0	0	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	842.8	842.8	100.0%
BCTS	1052.5	1007.0	95.7%
Carrier	711.9	711.9	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,140.7</b>	<b>14,095.2</b>	<b>99.7%</b>

\* % = (Cut block area achieving free to grow status/ cutblock area required to meet free to grow status) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** Free growing status on Winton Global's blocks begins 20 years after 1987. The blocks will be reported on in the next annual report. BC Timber Sales' ability to accurately report on silviculture accomplishments has been impaired by database issues largely as a result of converting to a new data storage structure. The effort required to get this system fully operational is detailed in an action plan being monitored by the BCTS management.

#### 4.1.A.a.iii Stand Damaging Agents

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Areas with stand damaging agents will be prioritised for treatment	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> -10%

Damaging agents are considered to be biotic and abiotic factors (fire, wind, insects etc.) which reduce the net value of commercial timber. At present, the most serious stand-damaging agent in the Prince George DFA is the Mountain Pine Bark Beetle, which has killed millions of mature, commercially viable Lodgepole pine. Prioritizing infested stands for treatment can contribute to sustainable forest management in several ways. Removing infested trees can slow the spread of beetles to adjacent healthy stands and allow Licensees to utilize trees before they deteriorate. Also, once harvesting is complete the area can be replanted, turning an area that would have released carbon through the decomposition of dead trees into the carbon sink of a young plantation.

All Licensees and BCTS target damaged stands in a similar manner. Each year the volume of damaged timber is assessed within the DFA. Of this volume, licensees prioritize planning and harvesting activities based on levels of attack, stage of attack, wood quality and milling capacity/needs. This indicator measures the success in ensuring areas with stand damaging agents have been assessed and have been prioritized for treatment, if required and thereby minimizing value losses within the DFA.

Table 39 shows the areas with stand damaging agents that were prioritized for treatment between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 39: Areas with Stand Damaging Agents Prioritized for Treatment**

April 1/05 to March/06

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

Licensee	Total Area with Stand Damaging Agents Identified	Area with Stand Damaging Agents that are Prioritized for Treatment (ha)	% for DFA*
Canfor	1,268,696	1,268,696	100.0%
Winton Global	264,603	264,603	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	85,277	85,277	100.0%
BCTS	555,699	555,699	100.0%
Carrier	189,109	189,109	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,363,384</b>	<b>2,363,384</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* % = (Area with damaging agents prioritized for treatment / total area with stand damaging agents identified) X 100

**4.2.A.a.i Cutblock Area Occupied by Permanent Access Structures**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of cutblock area occupied by total permanent access structures	<p><u>Target:</u> ≤ 5% - averaged annually</p> <p><u>Variance:</u> +1%</p>

This indicator measures the amount of area developed as permanent access structures (PAS) within cutblocks, in relation to the area harvested during the same period. Permanent access structures include roads, bridges, landings, gravel pits, or other similar structures that provide access for timber harvesting. Area that is converted to non-forest, as a result of permanent access structures and other development, is removed from the productive forest land base and no longer contributes to the forest ecosystem

Table 40 shows the cutblock area occupied by permanent access structures in cut blocks harvested during this reporting period within the DFA.

**Table 40: Cut Block Area Occupied by Total Permanent Access Structures**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET ≤5% (variance +1%)**

Licensee	Total Cutblock Area Harvested (ha) *	Total Cutblock Area in Permanent Access Structures	% of Cutblock Area**
Canfor	15,389.6	488.6	3.2%
Winton Global	2368.3	99.6	4.2%
Lakeland Mills	603.7	17.1	2.8%
BCTS	6555.6	229.4	3.5%
Carrier	685.6	31.8	4.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25,602.8</b>	<b>866.5</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

\* Total cutblock area = gross area less natural NP.

\*\* % = (Area of permanent access structures/ total cutblock area) X 100

**4.2.A.a.ii Forest Land Conversion**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The total percentage of forested land within the timber harvesting landbase that is converted to non-forested land.	<p><u>Target:</u> &lt;5% annually</p> <p><u>Variance:</u> 0%</p>

Forested land is converted to non-forested land as a result of forest operations through the development of permanent roads, bridges, landings, gravel pits and other similar structures in order to provide timber harvesting access. These structures remain in place after forest operations are complete. As roads are constructed, the ability of the landbase to support forests that contribute to ecosystem diversity, productivity as well as soil and water conservation is either eliminated or reduced. Minimizing the loss of total forest landbase contributes to the sustainable forest management of the forest ecosystem for the DFA.

This indicator monitors on an annual basis the conversion of forested land in relation to the MoFR, Timber Supply Review standard of 5% THLB conversion to permanent access structures. The indicator was developed on the recommendation of the PAG during this reporting period and is reported out below.

**Table 41: Forested Land Converted to Non-Forested Land**

April 1/05 to March/06		TARGET <5% (variance 0.0%)			
Licensee	Total THLB* (ha.)	Total Area of THLB in Permanent Access Structures** (ha)	% of THLB Area in DFA (ha.)	Area of New Permanent Access Structures Constructed (ha.)	% of THLB Area in DFA
Canfor	807,307	11,297	1.4%	68	
Winton Global	168,661	4,052	2.4%	104	
Lakeland Mills	64,683	1,942	3.0%	56	
BCTS	301,578	4,918	1.6%	148	
Carrier	101,014	3,104	3.1%	107	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,443,243</b>	<b>25,313</b>	<b>1.75%</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>0.03%</b>

\* THLB: total harvestable landbase = gross area less non-productive landbase

\*\* Area of Permanent Access Structures = Road Length (km) X Road Width (Forest Service Roads (25.0 m), Road Permit (15.0 m), On-Block (10.0 m), Non-Status (13.0 m)).

\*\* % in DFA = Area of permanent access structures / THLB area) X 100

### 5.1.A.a.i Cut Level Volumes

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The cut level volumes compared to the apportionment across the Timber Supply Area	Target: ≤100% Over each 5 year cut control period Variance: +10%

To be considered sustainable, harvesting a renewable resource such as timber can not deplete the resource on an ecological, economic or social basis. During the Allowable Annual Cut (AAC) determination, various considerations are examined including the long term sustainable harvest of the timber resource, community stability, wildlife use, recreation use, and the productivity of the DFA. The AAC is generally determined every five years by the Chief Forester of British Columbia, using extensive data and forecasts to assess the many resource values that need to be managed. On behalf of the Crown, the Chief Forester makes an independent determination of the rate of harvest that is considered sustainable for a particular Timber Supply Area (TSA). The Prince George DFA comprises about 44% of the larger Prince George TSA area.

The harvest level for a TSA must be met within thresholds that are established by the Crown. Maintaining the rate of harvest consistent with what is considered by the province to be sustainable ecologically, economically and socially within the DFA is considered sound forest management. The final review for this measure will be undertaken at the end of the cut control period.

**Table 42: Cut Level Volumes Compared to the Apportionment across the Timber Supply Area**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET ≤100% / 5 year cut control period (variance+10%)		
Licensee	5 year AAC Volume for DFA	Actual Volume Cut for Reporting Period*	Number of Years into Cut Control Period	Overall % of 5 Year Cut Control for DFA**
Canfor	12,693,718	9,978,308	4	78.6%
Winton Global	2,694,835	1,740,412	4	64.6%
Lakeland Mills	1,343,879	1,013,306	4	75.4%
BCTS	5,055,327	3,470,265	4	68.6%
BCTS CLL Data <sup>+</sup>	6,555,327	4,039,125	4	61.6%
Carrier	1,332,671	626,765	4	47.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29,675,757</b>	<b>20,868,181</b>		<b>70.3%</b>

\*Actual volume cut / 5 year volume apportioned

\*\*% = (Actual cut level volume / AAC volume apportioned) X 100

\*\*\* The calculation for BCTS will be different

+BCTS data from cut control letters for forest licenses or best information available at the time

**5.1.A.a.ii Area Harvested vs. Area Regenerated**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The area regenerated within 4 years of harvesting compared to the area harvested.	Target: 100% annually Variance: -2%

Trees have a profound influence on water quality and quantity. They intercept precipitation, shade streams, bind soil particles, and draw moisture from the soil. When harvesting occurs there can be immediate impacts to the hydrologic cycle. Water tables may rise, water temperatures may increase, and stream levels may become more erratic as the mitigating influence of the forest is absent. One of the objectives to regenerating harvested areas quickly and efficiently is to restore the balance to the hydrology in the area. Tracking the area regenerated in comparison to the area harvested on a landscape level will ensure that harvesting does not outpace the ability of the DFA to adjust to changes in its hydrology. In addition to hydrological and ecological benefits, prompt reforestation benefits society in the short and long term. Regenerated cutblocks also improve aesthetics, provide recreational opportunities, and are the economic future of the forest industry.

Site plans define the standards to which regenerated blocks will be held to, and the timeframe to which they must reach Free to Grow status. The prescribed legal date for regenerating a cutblock is the "regen" date, and varies depending on the ecosystem association being reforested. This indicator measures harvesting and reforestation on a landscape level which provides a different perspective than traditional reforestation goals set at the individual cutblock level.

**Table 43: Net Area Regenerated vs. Net Area Harvested**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET 100% (variance -2.0%)	
Licensee	Net Area Harvested (ha)	Net Area Regenerated of those Harvested*	% in DFA**
Canfor	7,675.3	7,568.3	
Winton Global	1,259.5	1,259.5	
Lakeland Mills	556.9	556.9	
BCTS	2,525.8	889.1	
Carrier	236.8	236.8	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,254.3</b>	<b>10,510.6</b>	

\* Area qualified as regenerated as soon as planting takes place

\*\* % = (Total area regenerated/ total area harvested) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** BC Timber Sales' ability to accurately report on silviculture accomplishments has been impaired by database issues largely as a result of converting to a new data storage structure. The effort required to get this system fully operational is detailed in an action plan being monitored by the BCTS management.

**5.1.A.a.iii Stand Damaging Agents**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Areas with stand damaging agents will be prioritised for treatment	Target: 100% Variance: -10%

Damaging agents are considered to be biotic and abiotic factors (fire, wind, insects etc.) which reduce the net value of commercial timber. At present, the most serious stand-damaging agent in the Prince George DFA is the Mountain Pine Bark Beetle, which has killed millions of mature, commercially viable Lodgepole pine. Prioritizing infested stands for treatment can contribute to sustainable forest management in several ways. Removing infested trees can slow the spread of beetles to adjacent healthy stands and allow Licensees to utilize trees before they deteriorate. Also, once harvesting is complete the area can be replanted, turning an area that would have released carbon through the decomposition of dead trees into the carbon sink of a young plantation.

All Licensees and BCTS target damaged stands in a similar manner. Each year the volume of damaged timber is assessed within the DFA. Of this volume, licensees prioritize planning and harvesting activities based on levels of attack, stage of attack, wood quality and milling capacity/needs. This indicator measures the success in ensuring areas with stand damaging agents have been assessed and have been prioritized for treatment, if required and thereby minimizing value losses within the DFA.

Table 44 shows the areas with stand damaging agents that were prioritized for treatment, between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 44: Areas with Stand Damaging Agents Prioritized for Treatment**

**April 1/05 to March/06 TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

<b>Licensee</b>	<b>Total Area with Stand Damaging Agents Identified</b>	<b>Area with Stand Damaging Agents Prioritized for Treatment (ha)</b>	<b>% for DFA*</b>
Canfor	1,268,696	1,268,696	100.0%
Winton Global	264,603	264,603	100.0%
Lakeland Mills	85,277	85,277	100.0%
BCTS	555,699	555,699	100.0%
Carrier	189,109	189,109	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,363,384</b>	<b>2,363,384</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* % = (Area with damaging agents prioritized for treatment / total area with stand damaging agents identified) X 100

**5.1.A.a.iv Forestry Related Industrial Fires**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Number of hectares (area) damaged by accidental forestry related industrial fires	Target: <100 ha annually Variance: 5.0 ha

This indicator measures the number of hectares affected by industrial forest fires. As forest fires can result in catastrophic losses to timber supply, wildlife habitat, and private property, a high value has been placed on reducing the impact of these fires within the DFA. Accidental industrial fires can be caused by various sources, including escapes from the use of prescribed fire (e.g. burning slash piles) or from human induced error (e.g. machinery, cigarette smoking, etc.).

Industrial fires are usually brought under control quickly due to the availability of fire fighting equipment and Licensee/ BCTS Fire Preparedness Plans. In contrast, naturally caused fires have the potential to quickly grow in size before fire control efforts can be undertaken. However the area and extent of accidental industrial fires must be minimized throughout the DFA in order to contribute to the overall health of the forest and long-term sustainability of the resource.

**Table 45: Accidental Forestry Related Industrial Fires**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 TARGET <100ha (variance 5ha)**

<b>Licensee</b>	<b>Number of Accidental Forestry Related Industrial Fires</b>	<b>Total Area Damaged (ha)</b>
Canfor	0	0
Winton Global	0	0



Licensee	Number of Accidental Forestry Related Industrial Fires	Total Area Damaged (ha)
Lakeland Mills	0	0
BCTS	0	0
Carrier	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**5.1.A.b.i Visual Quality Requirements**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with visual quality requirements as identified in operational plans.	Target: 100% Annually Variance: 0%

Forests can provide intangible benefits in addition to their economic and ecological values. The perceived visual quality of certain areas is one of these benefits and must be considered in forest management. Protection and maintenance of visual quality helps ensure that these values will be available for current and future generations. A Visual Quality Objective (VQO) is a resource management objective established by the MoFR District Manager, or contained in a higher level plan that reflects the desired level of visual quality. It is based on the physical characteristics and social concern for the area.

The indicator is designed to ensure that those operational plans with identified strategies to conserve visual quality have those strategies implemented on the ground. Visual Impact Assessments (VIA) are conducted on all identified visual quality areas, which help determine block shape, location and internal retention options. At the site level these strategies are included within the Site Plan to minimize visual impacts.

Table 46 indicates forest operations on cut blocks with visual quality requirements that were harvested between April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 46: Forest Operations Consistent with Visual Quality Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006				TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)	
Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Visual Quality Requirements (VQR)			Forest Operations in Adhered to VQR	% in DFA*
	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	6	2	8	8	
Winton Global	11	0	11	11	
Lakeland Mills	0	2	2	2	
BCTS	11	0	11	11	
Carrier	4	0	4	4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with visual quality requirements / total operation completed) X 100

**5.1.A.b.ii Cultural Heritage Requirements**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with cultural heritage requirements as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% annually Variance: 0%

The protection of cultural heritage values assures they will be identified, assessed and available to future generations. A cultural heritage value is a unique or significant place or feature of social, cultural or spiritual importance. It may be an archaeological site, recreation site or trail, cultural heritage site or trail, historic site or a protected area. Cultural heritage values often incorporate First Nation's heritage and spiritual sites, but they can also involve features protected and valued by non-aboriginal people. Maintenance of cultural heritage values is an important aspect to sustainable forest management because it contributes to respecting the social and cultural needs of people who traditionally and currently use the DFA for a variety of reasons.

Forest plans have used an Archaeological Predictive Model to assess the potential presence of archaeological resources within proposed harvest areas or road access corridors. Where activities are proposed within zones of high archaeological potential, Licensees and BCTS conduct site level Archaeological Evaluations (AE) to identify, assess and record any archaeological resources that may be present. Once a strategy to conserve cultural heritage values is included within an operational plan, there is a legal obligation for the licensee to implement and adhere to the strategy. Harvest and subsequent silviculture inspections ensure that these strategies are implemented as stated in the operational plan.

**Table 47: Forest Operations Consistent with the Cultural Heritage Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Cultural Heritage Requirements				Total with Cultural Heritage Requirements Met	% for DFA *
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	59	0	59	59	
Winton Global	0	12	2	14	14	
Lakeland Mills	0	10	0	10	10	
BCTS	0	21	0	21	21	
Carrier	0	4	0	4	4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with cultural heritage requirements / total operations completed) X 100

**5.1.A.b.iii Range Requirements**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with range requirements as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

The livestock industry has been an important part of British Columbia's economy for over a century. Historically, ranchers have used Crown range resources as a source of feed for their animals. Conservation of identified range resources will help to assure their availability for future generations. Range resources can include grazing or hay cutting permits or areas with potential for these ventures. Range managers and forest managers share the forest for their particular purposes, and must work cooperatively in order to achieve sustainable development and management of its resources. This indicator will help to ensure that various range values are conserved for current and future generations

Table 48 shows forest operations on blocks with range management requirements that were harvested during the reporting period within the DFA.

**Table 48: Forest Operations Consistent with Range Requirements**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operation with Range Requirements				Total Number with Range Requirements Met	% for DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	2	0	2	2	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	1	5	0	6	6	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* %= (Operations completed in accordance with range requirements / total operations completed) X 100

**5.1.A.b.iv Riparian Area Management**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian management requirements as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Riparian areas occur adjacent to streams, lakes and wetlands. They include both the area dominated by continuous high moisture content and the adjacent upland vegetation that exerts an influence on it. Riparian habitat can be critical for providing wildlife cover, fish food organisms, stream nutrients, large organic debris, stream bank stability and maintenance of water quality and quantity. Riparian features are also well appreciated by humans for recreation, aesthetics, and sustaining water quality.

This indicator is intended to ensure that the strategies identified in operational plans (such as Site Plans) to conserve riparian values actually have those strategies implemented on the ground. Once a strategy to conserve riparian values is included in a Forest Stewardship Plan, there is a legal obligation for the licensee to implement and adhere to the strategy. Harvest, road and silviculture inspections ensure that strategies are implemented as stated in the Site Plan document.

**Table 49: Forest Operations Consistent with Riparian Management**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations with Riparian Management Requirements			Number of Forest Operations with Requirements Met	% in DFA*
	Harvesting/Roads	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	103	15	118	117	98.7%
Winton Global	41	25	66	65	
Lakeland Mills	14	5	19	19	
BCTS	12	4	16	16	
Carrier	6	0	6	5	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>222</b>	

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with riparian management requirements / total operations completed) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** Winton Global had one incident where a feller buncher lost control on a steep slope and rolled down a gully into a S4 machine free zone. No one was injured and there was no damage to the stream or stream bank. Standard Operating Procedures were reviewed with the operator to avoid a reoccurrence of this accident. Carrier Lumber Ltd. had one incident where timber was decked in a riparian management area contrary to company standard operating procedures regarding harvest operations. The incident was reviewed and company standard operating procedures were revised to prevent future occurrences.

**5.1.A.b.v Recreation Requirements**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of forest operations consistent with recreation requirements as identified in operational plans	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

The consideration of non-timber values such as recreation is important to sustainable forest management as it recognizes the multiple benefits forests can provide to society. Licensees and BCTS currently solicit public and stakeholder input during Forest Development Plan/ Forest Stewardship Plan development. Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP) can also provide direction for planning for recreational interests. The site plan for a cutblock provides the site-specific requirements that operations have to achieve to meet the needs of recreational users. Once a recreation strategy is included within an operational plan document, there is a legal obligation for the Licensee or BCTS to implement and adhere to the strategy. Harvest and silviculture inspections ensure that these strategies are implemented as stated in the operational plan.

Table 50 shows forest operations within areas with recreation management requirements between April 1 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 50: Forest Operations Consistent with Recreation Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations with Recreation Requirements				Number of Forest Operations Meeting Recreation Requirements	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	3	2	0	5	5	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with recreation requirements/total operations completed) X 100

**5.1.A.b.vi Lakeshore Requirements**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with lakeshore requirements as identified in operational plans.	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Lakeshores are a type of riparian habitat that may be critical for providing wildlife cover, fish food organisms, and supporting unique vegetation communities. They are also highly valued for their recreational and aesthetic properties. The protection and maintenance of lakeshores will ensure that these values will be conserved for current and future generations.

Lakeshore values are generally identified through the planning process and then verified on the ground during field exercises. Lakeshore management areas are initially identified on a map during the preparation of the Forest Stewardship Plan. If harvesting operations are planned for an area that may contain lakeshore values, additional information is identified in a site plan. The site plan also prescribes any management activities that are to be undertaken to conserve the lakeshore riparian values. Once lakeshore requirements are identified in operational plans, there is a legal obligation for the Licensee or BCTS to implement and adhere to those requirements.

**Table 51: Forest Operations Consistent with Lakeshore Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Lakeshore Requirements				Number with Requirements Met	% for DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	16	3	19	19	
Winton Global	0	11	6	17	17	
Lakeland Mills	0	5	0	5	5	
BCTS	0	6	0	6	6	
Carrier	0	1	0	1	1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with lakeshore requirements / total operations completed) X 100

**5.1.A.b.vii First Order Wood Products**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The number of first order wood products produced from trees harvested from the DFA	Target: ≥ 12 types of products annually Variance: -3

This indicator monitors the number of first order wood products that are produced within the DFA. First order wood products are items directly produced from trees. This indicator demonstrates how forest management activities contribute to a diversified local economy based on the range of products produced at the local level. By ensuring a large portion of the volume of timber harvested within the DFA is processed into a variety of products at local facilities, the local economy will remain stable, diverse, and resilient.

Each Licensee currently produces a variety of forest products with different grades and sizes of dimensional lumber being the primary products (Table 52). BCTS is limited to providing raw logs for sale through an open competitive bid process. Licensees also produce specialty wood products such as Japanese select lumber, Machine Stress Rated lumber, and a variety of special order lumber products.

**Table 52: First Order Wood Products Produced from Trees Harvested from the DFA**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**Target >12 (variance - 3)**

Licensee	Canfor	Winton Global	Lakeland Lumber	BCTS	Carrier	Total	Products Produced
Raw Logs	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
House Logs	1	1	0	0	1	3	1
Lumber	1	1	1	0	1	4	1
Custom Cut Lumber	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
Reman Lumber*	0	1	0	0	1	2	1
Pulp Chips	1	1	1	0	1	4	1
OSB Stands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hog Fuel	1	1	1	0	1	4	1
Wood Shavings	1	1	1	0	1	4	1
Plywood	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Veneer	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Pole Logs	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Railway Ties	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sawdust	0	1	0	0	1	2	1
Instuments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finger Joint	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
							<b>14</b>

\* Remanufactured lumber - trim blocks

**5.1.A.b.viii Volume Advertised through Competitive Bid**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of DFA volume advertised for sale through open competitive bid	Target: ≥ 20% Annually Variance: -5%

Most of the timber harvested in the DFA is collectively cut under major licenses held by Forest Licensees. However, a percentage of the annual volume cut is advertised for sale through an open competitive bid process. The Crown through BC Timber Sales (BCTS) sells this volume of timber. BCTS develops and sells publicly owned timber to establish market prices and optimize net revenue to the Crown. Reliant on the highest bid, BCTS sells units of timber across the DFA to a variety of customers, including sawmill operators, small-scale loggers, and timber processors.

In addition to helping establish market prices and providing revenue to the Crown, BCTS provides the opportunity for customers to purchase timber in a competitive and open market. In this way people who might not have access to Crown timber have an opportunity to purchase it in an equitable manner.

This indicator evaluates the volume of timber advertised for sale through open competitive bid. The process contributes to the social and economic aspects of SFM by creating opportunities for forest sector employment, and by providing revenue to the Crown that reinvests the money back into the DFA through government programs and institutions. Tracking the indicator will ensure that the volume of timber offered for sale in this manner is sufficient to meet the goals of sustainable forest management.

Table 53 reports on the percentage of volume advertised through an open competitive bid in the Prince George Forest District:

**Table 53: Volume Advertised for Sale through Open Competitive Bid**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET  $\geq$  20% (variance - 5%)**

Licensee	Total Annual Volume in the Prince George Forest District ( m3)*	Volume Advertised for Open Competitive Bid (m3)**	% in DFA***
Canfor	2,355,000	0	
Winton Global	505,541	0	
Lakeland Mills	203,080	0	
BCTS	1,159,310	859,310	
Carrier	253,027	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,475,958</b>	<b>859,310</b>	

\* Volume is cut control volume billed in that calendar year from the PG District.

\*\* Volume for BCTS is the apportioned volume for each fiscal year

\*\*\* % For DFA = (volume advertised for sale through open competitive bid / total annual volume) X 100

**5.1.A.b.ix Public and Stakeholder Input**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The number of opportunities given to the public and stakeholders to express forestry related concerns and be involved in planning processes	<u>Target:</u> $\geq$ 15 Annually  <u>Variance:</u> -3

Forestry activities can impact a wide sector of the general public and individual stakeholders within the DFA. This indicator was designed to monitor the success of the Licensees and BCTS at providing effective opportunities to residents and stakeholders to express concerns and proactively be involved in the planning process. This process ensures that when forestry activities are planned, information is exchanged in an effective and timely manner, so as to resolve potential conflicts before they occur. This process will help to identify the public values, interests and uses of the forest that will be considered within the Prince George Licensees and BCTS planning framework.

There are many opportunities for the public and stakeholders to express forestry-related concerns and to be involved in the planning process. These include Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) public reviews, FSP amendments, letters to stakeholders soliciting input, Pesticide Management Plan reviews, field tours, newsletters, and a website.

Table 54 shows the number of opportunities provided to the public and stakeholders to express forestry related concerns and be involved in our planning process by the signatories of the PG SFMP.

**Table 54: Opportunities for Public and Stakeholders to be involved in Planning Processes**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

Opportunity	Number of Opportunities for Public and Stakeholders Input						
	Canfor	Winton Global	Lakeland Mills	BCTS	Carrier	Joint SFMP	TOTAL
FSP Original Ads	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
FSP Amendment Ads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FSP Stakeholder Letters	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
PMP Original Ads	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
PMP Stakeholder letters	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
PMP Signage	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
FDP Original Ads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FDP Amendment Ads	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
FDP Stakeholder Letters	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
Field Tours	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
CNRC Meetings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newsletters	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Open Houses	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
PAG Meetings	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
LRMP Meetings	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

Opportunity	Number of Opportunities for Public and Stakeholders Input						
	Canfor	Winton Global	Lakeland Mills	BCTS	Carrier	Joint SFMP	TOTAL
Documented Phone Calls	1	1	1	1	1	0	5
Documented Personal Meetings	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
<b>Total for DFA*</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>39</b>

\* This indicator tracks the number of different types of opportunities that the public has to provide input into the planning process, not the total number of opportunities.

**5.1.A.b.x Viewing of Access Plans**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Annually, provide a viewing of BCTS and Licensee current access plans of the DFA	Target: On or before October 1 <sup>st</sup> of each year Variance: +1 month

Forestry roads provide access for industry and the public to large portions of the DFA. Constructing, maintaining, deactivating, and closing these roads is an ongoing process that requires careful planning. Because many non-forestry users of these roads have an interest in their management it is important to provide a viewing of the current access plans of BCTS and Licensees. The input received from such open houses can be used to plan future access management activities.

The Licensees and BCTS held an Open House Oct. 2005, jointly displaying their road access information, which meets the target, established for this measure.



Open House held at the Prince George Library

**5.1.A.b.xi Responses to Written Public Inquiries**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percentage of timely responses to written public inquiries	Target: 100% Annually Variance: -5%

All Licensees and BCTS solicit feedback for their public forest management plans within the DFA. They also receive ongoing general comments and inquiries regarding forestry activities. These inquiries represent a public concern for how forest resources are managed, and as such should receive a timely response by all Licensees. This indicator has defined a timely response as one that is made within 30 days of written inquiry.

Comments from the public may be provided in many ways, including written letters, e-mails, or faxes to Licensees and BCTS. There may also be written comment made during an in-person meeting between a Licensee or BCTS staff member and the person providing comment, or a comment written by a Licensee staff member dictated by a member of the public over the phone or in person.

**Table 55: Timely Responses to Written Public Inquiries**

April 1/05 to March 31/06

**TARGET 100% (variance - 5%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Written Public Inquiries Made	Total Number of Responses Made within 30 days	% for DFA*
Canfor	16	15	
Winton Global	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	
BCTS	5	5	
Carrier	2	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>22</b>	

\* % = (Number of responses made within 30 days of receipt / total number of public inquiries made) X 100

**Indicator Discussion:** Although some licensees reported that no written public inquiries were made to licensees by the public, stakeholders and the public were communicated with a number of times.

**5.1.A.b.xii Communication Strategies**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percentage of communication strategy requirements met	Target: 100% Annually Variance: -5%

Licensees and BCTS maintain a list of interested parties that they notify when forestry operations/developments are to occur. These interested parties may be private landowners, lodge operators, trappers, or hunting guides. Communication strategies are in place to ensure that information is provided to these interested parties in a timely and efficient manner. As sustainable forest management includes non-timber values, it is important that the forest industry works with these individuals to minimize the impact of forest operations and consider their concerns. This indicator is intended to measure the success of meeting communication strategy requirements that are designed to achieve these goals.

**Table 56: Communication Strategy Requirements Met**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance - 5%)**

Licensee	Number of Communication Strategies Required	Number of Communication Strategies Completed	% for DFA*
Canfor	20	20	
Winton Global	13	13	
Lakeland Mills	40	38	
BCTS	326	324	
Carrier	9	9	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>404</b>	

\* % = (Number of communication strategies completed / total number of communication strategies required) X 100

**5.2.A.a.i Support of North Central Interior Suppliers and Contractors**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of money spent on forest operations and management in the DFA provided from North Central Interior Suppliers and Contractors	Target: 75% Variance: -5%

Forests provide many ecological benefits but they also provide substantial socio-economic benefits. In order to have sustainable socio-economic conditions for local communities associated with the DFA, local forest related businesses should be able to benefit from the work that is required in the management of the DFA. Furthermore, for small forestry companies to contribute to and invest in the local economy there must be assurances that there will be a consistent flow of work. In the same way that larger licensees depend on a secure flow of resources to justify investment in an area, small businesses depend on a sustained flow of opportunities to develop and invest in the local community.

The North Central Interior is defined in this SFMP as the region that includes communities from 100 Mile House to McKenzie (south to north) and from Smithers to McBride (west to east). The total dollar value of goods and services considered to be local will be calculated relative to the total dollar value of all goods



and services used. This calculation will be used to derive the percentage of money spent on forest operations and management of the DFA from suppliers in north central BC.

**Table 57: Forest Operations and Management Provided by NCI Suppliers/Contractors**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 75% (variance - 5%)**

Licensee	% Money Spent in NCI***	Volume Billed (sold BCTS)	Weighted Average Volume*	% in DFA**
Canfor	84.7%	2,355,000	1,994,685	
Winton Global	93.7%	472,761.0	442,977.05	
Lakeland Mills	96.8%	203,080.0	196,581.44	
BCTS	75.0%	859,310.0	644,482.5	
Carrier	98.5%	244,157.0	240,494.6	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4,134,308</b>	<b>3,519,220.59</b>	

\* Weighted Average Volume = (individual cut volume X individual % money spent in NCI) / 100

\*\* Weighted Average % = (total weighted average volume / total cut volume) X 100

\*\*\* % Money spent in NCI does not include taxes

**5.2.A.a.ii Volume Advertised through Competitive Bid**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of DFA volume advertised for sale through open competitive bid	Target: ≥ 20% Annually Variance: -5%

Most of the timber harvested in the DFA is collectively cut under major licenses held by Forest Licensees. However, a percentage of the annual volume cut is advertised for sale through an open competitive bid process. The Crown through BC Timber Sales (BCTS) sells this volume of timber. BCTS develops and sells publicly owned timber to establish market prices and optimize net revenue to the Crown. Reliant on the highest bid, BCTS sells units of timber across the DFA to a variety of customers, including sawmill operators, small-scale loggers, and timber processors.

In addition to helping establish market prices and providing revenue to the Crown, BCTS provides the opportunity for customers to purchase timber in a competitive and open market. In this way people who might not have access to Crown timber have an opportunity to purchase it in an equitable manner.

This indicator evaluates the volume of timber advertised for sale through open competitive bid. The process contributes to the social and economic aspects of SFM by creating opportunities for forest sector employment, and by providing revenue to the Crown that reinvests the money back into the DFA through government programs and institutions. Tracking the indicator will ensure that the volume of timber offered for sale in this manner is sufficient to meet the goals of sustainable forest management.

Table 58 reports on the percentage of volume advertised through open competitive bid in the Prince George Forest District:

**Table 58: Volume Advertised for Sale through Open Competitive Bid**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET > 20% (variance - 5%)**

Licensee	Total Annual Volume in the PG Forest District ( m3)*	Volume Advertised for Open Competitive Bid (m3)**	% in DFA***
Canfor	2,355,000	0	
Winton Global	505,541	0	
Lakeland Mills	203,080	0	
BCTS	1,159,310	859,310	
Carrier	253,027	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,475,958</b>	<b>859,310</b>	

\* Volume is cut control volume billed in that calendar year from the PG District.

\*\* Volume for BCTS is the apportioned volume for each fiscal year

\*\*\* % for DFA = (volume advertised for sale through open competitive bid / total annual volume) X 100

### 5.3.A.a.i Payment of Taxes

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percentage of taxes paid on time to the Government	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

Payment of taxes (including Federal, Provincial, and local government taxes) by Licensees and BCTS is a quantifiable indicator of how the public is receiving a portion of the economic benefits derived from forests. It is important to note that Licensees/ BCTS does not control how municipal and other taxes are spent, or whether the public within the DFA receives benefits. However, it should be assumed that a portion of the monies received from taxes would be returned to communities within the DFA.

A query of the financial data stored within the Licensees accounting systems reported that all taxes were paid on time for the reporting period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006. This includes GST, property tax and corporate taxes only and is based on a weighed average by AAC.

**Table 59: Taxes and Stumpage Paid on Time to Governments**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006** **TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

<b>Licensee</b>	<b>% Taxes Paid on Time*</b>	<b>% Stumpage Paid on Time**</b>	<b>AAC</b>	<b>(% on time) X AAC</b>
Canfor	100.0%	100.0%	2,355,000	2,355,000
Winton Global	100.0%	100.0%	505,541	505,541
Lakeland Mills	100.0%	100.0%	254,102	254,102
BCTS		100.0%		
Carrier	100.0%	100.0%	253,027	253,027
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,367,670</b>	<b>3,367,670</b>

\* This includes GST, property tax and corporate tax only

\*\* % = (Weighted by AAC)

**Indicator Discussion:** Government organizations such as BCTS, do not pay taxes to government.

### 5.3.A.a.ii Stumpage Paid to Government

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percent of stumpage paid on time to Government	Target: 100% Variance: 0%

The payment of stumpage owing on the timber harvested by Licensees is a quantifiable indicator of how the public in the Prince George DFA is receiving a portion of the economic benefits derived from the forest. Forests provide many ecological benefits to areas that surround them and also generate significant socio-economic benefits. In order to ensure continual sustainable socio-economic conditions for local DFA communities, all stumpage billings are to be paid on time.

Each month, the provincial government invoices the Licensees for stumpage. This invoice is directed to the accounting and payroll departments for immediate processing. During the reporting period of April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006, 100% of stumpage fees were paid on time.

**Indicator Discussion:** Refer to Table 59.

### 5.3.A.a.iii Loss Time Accidents

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Number of loss time accidents (days) in Woodland Operations	Target: 0 Variance: 0

The health and safety of forest workers and members of the public is an important objective that is essential to SFM. All Licensees and BCTS consider employee and public safety as a primary focus for all forestry-related operations. Evidence of this high priority can be seen in various company mission or policy statements. This indicator was developed to track and report out on the number of loss time workplace accidents that occur within the woodlands division of each Licensee and the field operations of BCTS. Activities conducted outside of woodlands operations have been excluded from this indicator; however Licensees and BCTS currently promote safety in all aspects of forest management operations.

Monitoring and reporting the number of workplace loss time accidents will help Licensees identify problems with procedures and increase overall awareness in order to prevent future injuries and accidents. The current status for this measure is derived through an analysis of safety reports and a tally of all loss time accidents.

Table 60 show the number of lost time accidents reported between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 in the Woodland Operations of the signatory licensees.

**Table 60: Number of Loss Time Accidents in Woodlands Operations**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 Target 0 (variance 0)**

Licensee	Number of Loss Time Accidents
Canfor	0
Winton Global	0
Lakeland Mills	0
BCTS	0
Carrier	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

**6.1.A.a.i Legally Recognized Treaty Areas**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
No unauthorised forestry activities within legally recognized (Province and Federal) treaty areas.	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

A treaty is a negotiated agreement that spells out the rights, responsibilities and relationships of First Nation peoples and the Federal and Provincial governments (Government of BC, 2005). Depending on the nature of the treaty, specific First Nation people will exercise a variety of rights over the area outlined by the treaty. Any forestry activities that occur in these areas without the permission of the appropriate First Nation peoples could have serious legal, economic, and social repercussions. Respecting Aboriginal treaty rights is part of sustainable forest management as it protects social and economic values. The following First Nation peoples are within the DFA:

- Lheidli T'enneh (Lheit-Lit'en) First Nation
- Lhoosk'uz Dene Nation (Kluskus First Nation)
- McLeod Lake Band
- Nak'azdli Band
- Nazko First Nation
- Simpcw First Nation (North Thompson Indian Band)
- Red Bluff First Nation
- Saik'uz First Nation

Table 61 shows the harvesting completed during this reporting period within the DFA that was completed in authorized areas outside of legally recognized treaty areas.

**Table 61: Forest Activities within Legally Recognized Treaty Areas**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Total Number of Forest Operations within Treaty Areas				Number of Authorized Forest Activities	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Winton Global	0	0	0	0	0	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	0	0	0	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

\* % = (Number of authorized activities inside legally recognized treaty areas/ total number of activities in treaty areas) X 100

**6.1.A.a.ii Forest Stewardship Plan Referral to First Nations**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
All Forest Stewardship Plans (FSP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal bands	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

This indicator is designed to evaluate the success of providing opportunities to Aboriginal peoples to be involved in the forest management planning processes. Specifically, all Forest Stewardship Plans and associated major amendments are to be referred to affected Aboriginal bands for their input. Incorporation of First Nation peoples and their unique perspective into the forest planning process is an important aspect of SFM. This indicator will contribute to respecting the social, cultural and spiritual needs of the people who traditionally and currently use the DFA for the maintenance of traditional aspects of their lifestyle.

Licensees and BCTS currently have individual working relationships with local First Nation communities within the DFA. All of these First Nation communities have had the opportunity for participation and input into the SFM planning process. In order to maintain a high level of participation and response, Licensees/ BCTS have also engaged First Nation people within their communities as they have requested, in order to provide greater opportunity for involvement in the Prince George SFMP process.

**Table 62: FSP and Associated Major Amendments Referred to Affected Aboriginal Bands**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

<b>Licensee</b>	<b>Number of FSP and Associated Major Amendments Completed</b>	<b>Number Referred to Affected Aboriginal Bands</b>	<b>% for DFA*</b>
Canfor / Carrier	0	0	
Sinclar**	1	1	
BCTS	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

\* % = (Number of FSP and major amendments referred / total number of FSP and major amendments completed) X 100

\*\*Sinclar includes Winton Global Lumber Ltd. and Lakeland Mills Ltd.

**6.1.A.a.iii Pesticide Management Plan Referrals to First Nations**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The percentage of Pest Management Plans (PMP) and associated major amendments are referred to affected Aboriginal bands	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

This indicator will measure the success of Licensees/ BCTS to have all Pesticide Management Plans and associated major amendments referred to affected Aboriginal bands. Licensees/ BCTS use a variety of pesticides during the forest management process. The primary objective has been to control competing vegetation on regenerating cutblocks. Industrial users of non-high risk class pesticides are required to prepare a Pest Management Plan (PMP) which requires public consultation as part of the PMP preparation process. Including Aboriginal communities in the planning and communication process is fundamental to recognizing their unique interests in the forest and an integral part of sustainable forest management. As pesticides may have to be used within the DFA to meet certain forestry objectives, Pest Management Plans will be prepared to outline their use. This use may include areas of interest to various First Nation groups within the DFA and the plans need to be referred to them for input. The location and type of pesticide use may change as a result of their consultation.

Table 63 shows the Pesticide Management Plans and associated major amendments completed between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2006 within the DFA.

**Table 63: All PMP and Associated Major Amendments referred to Affected Aboriginal Bands**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

Licensee	PMP and Associated Major Amendments Completed	PMP and Amendments Referred to Affected Aboriginal Bands	% for DFA*
Canfor	2	2	
Winton Global	1	1	
Lakeland Mills	0	0	
BCTS	1	1	
Carrier	1	1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	

\* % = (Number of FSP and major amendments referred / total number of FSP and major amendments completed) X 100

### 6.2.A.a.i Cultural Heritage Requirements

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
The percentage of forest operations consistent with cultural heritage requirements as identified in operational plans	<u>Target:</u> 100% annually <u>Variance:</u> 0%

The protection of cultural heritage values assures they will be identified, assessed and available to future generations. A cultural heritage value is a unique or significant place or feature of social, cultural or spiritual importance. It may be an archaeological site, recreation site or trail, cultural heritage site or trail, historic site or a protected area. Cultural heritage values often incorporate First Nation's heritage and spiritual sites, but they can also involve features protected and valued by non-aboriginal people. Maintenance of cultural heritage values is an important aspect to sustainable forest management because it contributes to respecting the social and cultural needs of people who traditionally and currently use the DFA for a variety of reasons.

Forest plans have used an Archaeological Predictive Model to assess the potential presence of archaeological resources within proposed harvest areas or road access corridors. Where activities are proposed within zones of high archaeological potential, Licensees and BCTS conduct site level Archaeological Evaluations (AE) to identify, assess and record any archaeological resources that may be present. Once a strategy to conserve cultural heritage values is included within an operational plan, there is a legal obligation for the licensee to implement and adhere to the strategy. Post harvest and subsequent silviculture inspections ensure that these strategies are implemented as stated in the operational plan.

**Table 64: Forest Operations Consistent with the Cultural Heritage Requirements**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006

**TARGET 100% (variance 0.0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations with Cultural Heritage Requirements				Total with Cultural Heritage Requirements Met	% for DFA *
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	59	0	59	59	
Winton Global	0	12	2	14	14	
Lakeland Mills	0	10	0	10	10	
BCTS	0	9	0	9	9	
Carrier	0	4	0	4	4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with cultural heritage requirements / total operations completed) X 100

### 6.2.A.a.ii Heritage Conservation Act

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percent of forest operations consistent with the Heritage Conservation Act	<u>Target:</u> 100% <u>Variance:</u> 0%

The *Heritage Conservation Act's* stated purpose is "to encourage and facilitate the protection and conservation of heritage property in British Columbia". The act prohibits activities that will damage specific heritage resources. There are many heritage resources in the DFA that are protected by the Act.

Some of the more common features that are of concern to forestry operations are culturally modified trees, cache pits and pit house sites. Measures must be taken to ensure forest operations are consistent with the Heritage Conservation Act to preserve and manage these features to meet social and cultural needs of First Nation people and the broader community within the DFA.

Known features protected under the Act are relatively easy to plan forest operations around. Forest Development Plans also use an Archaeological Predictive Model to assess the potential for archaeological resources within proposed harvest areas or road access corridors. Where activities are proposed within zones of high archaeological potential, Licensees/ BCTS conduct site level Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIA) to identify, assess and record any archaeological resources that may be present. Trained archaeologists identify resources that are to be protected under the Heritage Conservation Act.

**Table 65: Forest Operations Consistent with the Heritage Conservation Act**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance 0%)**

Licensee	Number of Forest Operations within Sites Protected under the Heritage Conservation Act (pre1846)				Activities in Compliance with the Act	% in DFA*
	Roads	Harvesting	Silviculture	Total		
Canfor	0	2	0	2	2	100%
Winton Global	0	2	1	3	3	
Lakeland Mills	0	1	0	1	1	
BCTS	0	0	0	0	0	
Carrier	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	

\* % = (Operations completed in accordance with the Heritage Conservation Act/ total operations completed) X100

**6.3.A.a.i PAG Satisfaction with Public Participation**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percentage of PAG (Public Advisory Group) satisfaction with public participation process	Target: 100%-a rank of 5 (very good) for all meetings Variance: -20% (a rank of 3.6)

The PAG is one of the key elements of public involvement in the SFM process. The Prince George PAG provided guidance, input and evaluation during development of the SFMP. It is also instrumental in maintaining links to current local values and forest resource uses within the DFA. Therefore, it is important that the Licensees and BCTS have a positive and meaningful working relationship with the PAG, where the Licensees/ BCTS is able to respond to all issues and concerns the PAG may have during this process. This indicator will use an average from the PAG meeting evaluation forms to determine the level of PAG satisfaction with the public participation process.

During the 6 PAG meetings, PAG participants completed formal meeting evaluations. A number of questions were asked under three general headings:

- 1) Meeting and PAG Progress
- 2) Facilitator
- 3) Meeting Logistics

In addition to the questions, the participants were asked to provide suggestions and comments. The meeting evaluations included the question "Are you satisfied with the PAG process?" The answers to the question showed a general improving trend. The overall average was 4.25 (85%). This translates as a "good" ranking, with 5 being very good, the highest possible rating.

**Table 66: PAG Satisfaction with the Public Participation Process**

**April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006**

**TARGET 100% (variance -30%)**

Prince George Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group	Score	% ( score/5)
Question MQ 11 - Are you satisfied with the PAG process?	4.25	85%

**6.3.A.a.ii PAG Terms of Reference**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
PAG (Public Advisory Group) Terms of Reference reviewed per year	Target: ≥1 Variance: 0

The Terms of Reference document is an important part of the public participation component as it lays out the mutually agreed upon procedures, participants, communication strategies, responsibilities and conduct of the PAG members. The document is intended to provide the necessary framework and proper protocol to ensure the existence of a relevant and functioning PAG. SFM requires public participation and the PAG Terms of Reference ensures these requirements are met in a credible and transparent fashion.

The initial Terms of Reference document was developed by the PAG and accepted as part of the SFMP process on December 9th, 2004. The PAG Terms of Reference is to be reviewed annually to ensure it is up to date with the present day context of SFM. The Licensees and BCTS are responsible for ensuring that PAG members are given adequate notice as to when the Terms of Reference document will be reviewed. This review is part of a scheduled PAG meeting so that all participants are aware of review timelines. The Licensees/ BCTS maintains the Terms of Reference document so that any revisions resulting from an annual review will be made and the new document will be distributed to PAG members.

The Public Advisory Group reviewed the terms of reference once during this reporting period on November 24, 2005, which meets the established target for this indicator.

**6.3.A.a.iii Number of PAG Meetings**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
The number of Public Advisory Group (PAG) meetings per year	Target: ≥1 Variance: 0

The Prince George PAG is made up of a diverse set of representatives that have various defined interests, values or specific uses of the forest resource within the DFA. The PAG provided valuable input with the initial development of values, indicators, measures and targets for the SFMP. PAG members helped to identify local issues and values for the Prince George DFA for forestry managers to consider during the management and planning processes. The PAG will continue to provide guidance, input and evaluation throughout the SFMP process, including all aspects of implementation and continual improvement of the plan over time. PAG participation with the SFMP will also help to demonstrate the achievement of the public participation requirements, which are part of the CSA performance audit requirements.

**Table 67: Number of Public Advisory Group Meetings per Year**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 **TARGET ≥1/year (variance 0)**

<b>Meeting Dates</b>	<b>Total Number of PAG Meetings</b>
April 9, 2005	<b>6</b>
April 23, 2005	
September 15, 2005	
September 24, 2005	
November 24, 2005	
February 9, 2006	

**6.3.A.a.iv Public Sector Participation in the PAG**

<b>Indicator Statement</b>	<b>Target and Variance</b>
Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the Terms of Reference invited to participate in the Public Advisory Group (PAG) process	Target: 100% Annually Variance: 0%

The Prince George PAG is comprised of a variety of representatives that have various defined interests, values or specific uses of the forest resource within the DFA. An important component of the PAG is the representation from the various public sectors as defined in the Terms of Reference.

Their involvement in the PAG process is crucial to the success of the SFMP as they represent a broad range of interests, both commercial and non-commercial, within the DFA. They also possess experience and expertise that Licensees/ BCTS can draw from to achieve sustainable forest management objectives. Their participation will enhance the co-operation between the forest industry and other parties interested in the management of public lands within the DFA to meet the social, economic, and ecological goals of sustainable forest management.

This indicator is designed to monitor the efforts made to encourage public sector participation by tracking the percentage of public sectors, as defined in the Terms of Reference, that were invited to participate in the PAG process. The PAG provides the opportunity for participation through such invitations.

As of April 1, 2005, the PAG included at least one representative from 18 of the 20 Terms of Reference listed sectors. Some of the people attending the PAG meetings were affiliated with some of the six First Nation groups listed in the Terms of Reference, but they were not their official representatives.

**Table 68: Public Sectors Invited to Participate in the PAG Process**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET 100% (variance 0%)
Number of Sectors with a Representative Identified	18	
Number of Sectors with No Representative, with invitations on file	2	
Total number invited	20	
Number of Public Sectors in Terms of Reference(ToR)	20	
<b>% of Public Sectors Invited*</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

\*% = (Number of sectors with representation or invitations on file / number of sectors in ToR) X 100

**6.4.A.a.i PAG Satisfaction with Information Presented for Decision Making**

Indicator Statement	Target and Variance
Percentage of PAG satisfaction with amount and timing of information presented for informed decision making	Target: 100% Variance: -20%

The PAG is one of the key elements of public involvement in the SFM process. The Prince George PAG provided guidance, input and evaluation during the SFMP development. It is also instrumental in maintaining links to current local values and forest resource uses within the DFA. In order for the PAG to make informed decisions with regard to the SFMP, such as indicators, targets, and levels of responsibility, they must have the background information to support those decisions. This information must be sufficient in quantity, quality and delivered in a timely manner to the PAG to facilitate sound decision making as part of the SFMP process.

This indicator is intended to measure and report the level of satisfaction the PAG members have with the amount and timing of information presented for informed decision making. While it is hoped that there will be high satisfaction with the provision of background information, it is also acknowledged that with any group of diverse backgrounds and opinions it is difficult to achieve unanimous satisfaction. However, if the SFMP is to succeed, the people who are involved must have a certain level of satisfaction with the information they are using to direct the SFMP development.

Two questions were added to the PAG meeting evaluation forms to address this indicator. The March 31/05 and April 9/06 PAG meetings asked the questions listed in the following table. A score of 88% for both questions is within the target set for this indicator.

**Table 69: PAG Satisfaction with the Information Presented for Informed Decision-Making**

April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006		TARGET 100% (variance -30%)	
Prince George SFMP PAG	Score (of 5)	% *	
Question MQ 12 - How timely was the information?	4.42	88.4%	
Question MQ 13- How satisfied were you with the information?	4.4	88.0%	

\*% = Score / # of meeting evaluations