

## 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. 69 indicators were met within the prescribed variances, 9 indicators are pending due to 2006 targets or outstanding licensee information and 11 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>9</b>	<b>11</b>