

# UPDATE Forest Certification



## Canadian Forest Products Chetwynd TFL48

January 2006

### Background

Tree Farm Licence (TFL) 48 is located in northeast B.C. around the communities of Chetwynd, Hudson's Hope and Tumbler Ridge. The TFL encompasses just over 643,200 hectares and has an allowable annual harvest of approximately 466,000 cubic meters. As part of Canfor's commitment to sustainable forest management and independent forest certification, an audit team from KPMG Performance Registrar Inc. completed the following assessments of Canfor's Chetwynd operation in October 2005:

- Re-registration assessment of TFL 48 to the Canadian Standards Association's standard for Sustainable Forest Management Systems (CSA-SFM); and
- Field assessment of the Canfor Chetwynd operation as part of a corporate-wide re-registration assessment to the ISO 14001 standard for Environmental Management Systems (EMS).

The re-registration assessment determined that Canfor's Chetwynd operation continues to demonstrate strong performance in relation to EMS requirements and that Canfor's operations on TFL 48 continue to meet SFM requirements. The combination of ISO 14001 and CSA-SFM registration demonstrates a strong commitment to sustainable forest management on the TFL and is a significant achievement for Canfor.

### The Audit

- **Background** – The ISO 14001 and CSA Z809 standards require regular assessments by an accredited Registrar to assess continuing conformance with the standards and the implementation of action plans related to previous assessments.
- **Audit Team** – The audit was conducted by a two person audit team. Both auditors are accredited SFM/EMS auditors and Registered Professional Foresters.
- **Document Review** – An off-site document review was completed prior to the initiation of field work in order to assess the new version of the Sustainable Forest Management Plan, including a comprehensive review of SFM values, objectives, indicators and targets.
- **Field Audit** – The on-site field audit included interviews with a sample of staff, contractors and Public Advisory Committee (PAC) members and examination of EMS and SFM system records, monitoring information and public involvement information. The team also conducted field assessments of over 20 sites to assess the operation's planning, harvesting, silviculture and road construction, maintenance and deactivation practices.





**Good Practices**

- Our re-registration assessment determined that the EMS and SFM systems continue to be effectively implemented. In addition, the operation has effectively addressed all nonconformities identified during the previous assessment.
- The operation continues to demonstrate a proactive and comprehensive response to the recent arrival of the Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) on the TFL through the effective implementation of its MPB strategy (e.g., overview flights and beetle probing to map out attacked stands on the TFL; identification of susceptible stands; directing harvest to attacked/vulnerable stands; etc.).
- Overall, EMS/SFM awareness levels amongst employees (including new staff) were found to be very high.
- The operation demonstrated effective implementation of its silviculture program through the prompt reforestation of ecologically suited species, including the planting of burn piles.
- The field audit observed high-quality harvesting practices overall, with low site disturbance levels and sensible on-block retention practices on the sample of harvest blocks inspected.
- SFM indicators and targets continue to be improved upon, with the new draft of the SFM plan containing more “SMART” targets overall (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-delineated).
- The operation has shown prudence in incorporating realistic measures of biological diversity into its related SFM indicators based upon the best available research information (i.e., to maintain such habitat and landscape elements as coarse woody debris, large live trees, snags, shrubs, broad-leaved trees, riparian areas, late and early seral stands, etc.).

**Key Areas of Nonconformity**

- The field audit identified the following instances where operational controls were not adequately implemented to minimize impacts to water courses and drainage patterns:
  - Log fill culverts had not been removed at time of audit on two blocks completed during the previous winter.
  - Delays in deactivating roads in two blocks resulted in rutting of road surfaces and, in the case of one of these blocks, sediment transport into an S6 stream.
  - A road failure resulted in sediment deposition into an S6 stream.
- The CSA-SFM standard requires that the applicant make publicly available an annual report on its performance in meeting and maintaining SFM requirements. Our audit found that because 2004 reporting data was encompassed in the new SFM plan (as current status information) rather than in a separate monitoring report, there was a lack of information on overall performance against those indicators no longer in use in the current SFM plan.

<b>CSA-SFM and ISO 14001 Re-registration Assessment Findings</b>	
Major nonconformities	0
Minor nonconformities	2
Opportunities for improvement	10

**Types of audit findings**

**Major nonconformities:**  
Are pervasive or critical to the achievement of the SFM Objectives.  
Major nonconformities must be addressed immediately or certification cannot be achieved / maintained.

**Minor nonconformities:**  
Are isolated incidents that are non-critical to the achievement of SFM Objectives.  
All nonconformities require the development of a corrective action plan within 30 days of the audit, which must be fully implemented by the operation within 3 months.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**  
Are not nonconformities but are comments on specific areas of the SFM System where improvements can be made.



## Key Opportunities for Improvement

- Although the SFM Indicator 8 (*The proportion of shrub habitat by Landscape Unit*) is designed to meet the SFM objective to “sustain sufficient and appropriately distributed suitable habitat elements to maintain native species richness”, the baseline target for this indicator is tied to landscape units rather than to geographic units that are more representative of natural conditions.
- SFM Indicator 10 (*Habitat supply for species of public concern*) is designed to meet the SFM objective to “sustain sufficient and appropriately distributed suitable habitat elements to maintain native species richness.” However, the target for this indicator uses as a baseline the year 2005 rather than linking the baseline to the range of variability under natural conditions (i.e., the no harvest, no fire suppression condition).
- SFM Indicator 31 (*DFA average carbon sequestration rate*) is designed to measure the average carbon sequestration rate on the DFA in order to meet the SFM objective to “maintain the processes for carbon uptake and storage within the natural range of variation.” However, the model used to calculate the estimated carbon exchanges between forest ecosystems in the DFA and the environment under natural and managed stand conditions has not incorporated wood products lifecycle into the managed stand calculation.
- Although the ranking of aspects in the operation’s current list of aspects appears reasonable, the list does not address forest health despite the fact that the growing infestation of mountain pine beetle (MPB) is currently driving planning and harvesting operations (However, as indicated under Good Practices above, the operation is being proactive and comprehensive in its response to the problem).
- There is currently no specific EMS objective and target to deal with the growing MPB infestation (However, as indicated under Good Practices above, the operation is being proactive and comprehensive in its response to the problem).
- The current objectives and targets set for the Peace Region contains an action item to provide species at risk training for pertinent contractors by September 30, 2005. Although the plan was changed to focus the training on staff before that date and delay the training of contractors until the start of the next field season once the field identification guide was complete, the environmental management program was not updated to reflect this change.
- The field audit identified a diesel tank at Youngs Mills Lower Burnt Camp that highlighted a gap in the operation’s existing Fuel Management Standard (i.e., the standard provided no clear guidance on whether the large, non-specification, free-standing tank providing diesel via a partially uncontained gravity feed fuel line to a generator met regulatory requirements or not).
- An opportunity exists to improve the “Gas Leaks Response” procedures in the operation’s Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan to detail requirements for the set-up and operation of camps located in the vicinity of well sites and gas plants and to clearly define what “near” means in the context of the check-in procedures for activities near oil and gas facilities.



The operation continues to proactively and comprehensively respond to the recent arrival of the Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) on the TFL.



This is a particularly significant issue with the increase in oil patch activities in the Chetwynd area increasing the likelihood that woodlands activities will occur in the vicinity of sour gas wells and facilities.

- The most recent EMS management review addressed all of the input requirements of the standard. However, discussion of any communication from external interested parties was not explicitly documented in the minutes.
- Although the operation has established SFM Indicator 11 to address species of management concern, the current status, interim strategies and monitoring procedure under the indicator are currently applicable only to wildlife species and do not apply to plant species. The operation has developed a strategy for including rare forest-dependent plants potentially present on the DFA under this indicator, however an implementation schedule is not clearly indicated. An opportunity exists to deliver on the operation's strategies for managing rare forest dependent plants potentially present on the DFA through the development of associated targets and programs.



The field audit observed high quality harvesting and reforestation practices (including low site disturbance levels, prudent on-block retention practices and prompt reforestation, including the planting of burn piles, on harvested blocks).

#### Contacts:

Mike Alexander, RPF, CEA (604) 691-3401  
David Bebb, RPF, CEA (604) 691-3451  
Chris Ridley-Thomas, RPBio, CEA (604) 691-3088

This report may only be reproduced by the intended client, Canadian Forest Products, with the express consent of KPMG. Information in this issue is of a general nature with respect to audit findings and is not intended to be acted upon without appropriate professional advice. © 2006 KPMG. All rights reserved.