

Fort St James

Sustainable Forest Management Plan



Picture: Kotsine Falls

2017/18 Annual Report



Public Advisory Group



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 List of Acronyms	3
1.2 Executive Summary	4
1.3 SFM Performance Reporting	5
2.0 SFM Indicators, Targets and Strategies	6
1 - Retention of rare ecosystem groups across the DFA	6
2 - Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broadleaf, treed mixed) >20 years old across DFA	6
3 - Percent late seral distribution by ecological unit across the DFA	7
4 - Maintain a variety of young patch sizes in an attempt to approximate natural disturbance	7
5 - Percent of stand structure retained across the DFA in harvested areas	9
6 - The number of cut blocks harvested that are not consistent with riparian management commitments	9
7 - Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies (both landscape and stand level) for Species at Risk and/or Species of Management Concern	10
8 - Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use	11
9 - Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies for protected areas and sites of biological significance as contained in operational plans	11
10 - % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes	12
11 - The regeneration delay, by area, for stands established annually	13
12 - Percentage of gross forest land base in the DFA converted to non-forested land use through forest management activities	13
13 - Existing areas of non-forested types artificially converted to forest types	13
14 - Percent of volume harvested compared to allocated harvest level	14
15 - Percent of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans	14
16 - Percent of cut blocks where post harvest CWD levels are within the targets contained in Plans	15
17 - Sensitive watersheds that are above Peak Flow Index targets will have assessment if harvesting planned	16
18 - % of high hazard drainage structures in sensitive watersheds with identified water quality concerns that have mitigation strategies implemented	16
19 - Percent of road related soil erosion events that introduce sediment into a stream identified in annual road inspections that are addressed	16
20 - Percentage of crossing structures planned and installed on fish streams to a reasonable design and sediment control standard (allow for adequate fish passage - dependant on the presence/absence of fish)	17
21 - Percent of standards units declared annually that meet free growing requirements on or before the free growing date	17
22 - Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in Plans	18
23 - Total percentage of forest operations that are consistent with a landscape level strategy for the management of recreational, commercial and cultural trails as identified in the DFA	18
24 - Percentage of roads deactivated that meet the deactivation criteria	19
25 - Investment in local communities	19
26 - Training in environmental & safety procedures in compliance with company training plans	20
27 - Level of Direct & Indirect Employment	20
28 - Number of opportunities for First Nations to participate in the forest economy	21
29 - Employees will receive appropriate First Nations Awareness Training	21
30 - Evidence of best efforts to share interests and plans with Aboriginal communities	22
31 - % of forest operations in conformance with operational/site plans developed to address Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses	22
32 - Effective communication and co-operation with non-timber resources users and interested parties that have expressed interest in forest planning	23
33 - The number of support opportunities provided in the DFA	24
34 - Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program	25
35 - Percent of PAG meeting evaluations completed during the reporting period that obtain a minimum average acceptability score of 3	25
36 - Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG	26
37 - The number of educational opportunities provided	26
38 - SFM Annual report made available to the public	27

1.0 Introduction

This is the Annual Report for the Fort St James Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP), covering the reporting period of April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2018. The SFMP is a result of Canfor's effort to achieve and maintain Canadian Standards Association (CSA) certification to the CSA Z809-08 standard¹.

The SFMP includes a set of values, objectives, indicators and targets that address environmental, economic and social aspects of forest management in the Fort St James Defined Forest Area. An SFMP developed according to the CSA standard sets performance objectives and targets over a defined forest area (DFA) to reflect local and regional interests. The CSA standard requires compliance with existing forest policies, laws and regulations. Changes to this annual report reflect the 2008 (CSA Z809-08) standard requirements as embodied in the Fort St James Defined Forest Area SFMP – December 2014.

It is important to note that the Fort St James 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 signatories' performance in meeting the indicator targets outlined in the SFMP over the Fort St James Defined Forest Area (DFA). The DFA is the Crown Forest land base within the Fort St James Forest District within the traditional operating areas of Canfor, 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 Fort St James 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 Fort St James Sustainable Forest Management Plan document (December 2014).

1.1 List of Acronyms

Below is a list of common acronyms used throughout this annual report. For those wishing a more comprehensive list should consult the Prince George Sustainable Forest Management Plan.

BCTS – BC Timber Sales

BEC – Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification

CSA – Canadian Standards Association

CE & VOIT- Criterion, Element & Value Objective Indicator Target

DFA – Defined Forest Area

FPPR – Forest Planning and Practices Regulation

FSJ – Fort St James

LOWG – Landscape Objectives Working Group

MoFR – Ministry of Forest and Range

NDU – Natural Disturbance Unit

PAG – Public Advisory Group

PG – Prince George

PG TSA – Prince George Timber Supply Area

SAR – Species at Risk

SFM – Sustainable Forest Management

SFMP – Sustainable Forest Management Plan

1.2 Executive Summary

For each off-target indicator, a corrective and preventative action plan is included in the indicator discussion.

Table 1: Summary of Indicator Status

Indicator Number	Indicator Statement	Target Met	Target Not Met
1	1.1.1 Retention of rare ecosystem groups across the DFA	X	
2	1.1.2 Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broadleaf, treed mixed) >20 years old across DFA	X	
3	1.1.3(a) Percent late seral distribution by ecological unit across the DFA	X	
4	1.1.3(b) Maintain a variety of young patch sizes in an attempt to approximate natural disturbance.		X
5	1.1.4(a) Percent of stand structure retained across the DFA in harvested areas	X	
6	1.1.4(b) The number of cut blocks harvested that are not consistent with riparian management commitments.	X	
7	1.2.1 & 1.2.2 Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies (both landscape and stand level) for Species at Risk and/or Species of Management Concern.	X	
8	1.2.3 & 1.3.1 & 1.2.2 Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use.	X	
	1.3.1 See 1.1.2, 1.1.3(a), 1.1.3(b), 1.2.1, 1.2.3, 1.4.1		
9	1.4.1 Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies for protected areas and sites of biological significance.	X	
10	1.4.2 % of identified Aboriginal and non-aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes.	X	
11	2.1.1 Average Regeneration delay for Stands Established Annually	X	
12	2.2.1a Percentage of gross forest landbase in the DFA converted to non-forest land use through forest management activities.	X	
13	2.2.1 b Existing areas of non-forested types artificially converted to forest types.	X	
14	2.2.2 Percent of volume harvested compared to allocated harvest level.	X	
15	3.1.1 Percent of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans.	X	
16	3.1.2 Percent of audited cut blocks where post harvest CWD levels are within the targets contained in Plans.	X	
17	3.2.1(a) Sensitive watersheds that are above Peak Flow Index targets will have further assessment if further harvesting is planned.	X	
18	3.2.1(b) % of high hazard drainage structures in sensitive watersheds with identified water quality concerns that have mitigation strategies implemented	X	
19	3.2.1(c) Percent of road related soil erosion events that introduce sediment into a stream identified in annual road inspections that are addressed.	X	
20	3.2.1 (d) Percentage of crossing structures planned and installed on fish streams to a reasonable design and sediment control standard (allow for adequate fish passage - dependant on the presence/absence of fish).	X	
21	4.1.1 (a) Percent of standards units declared annually that meet free growing requirements on or before the free growing date.	X	
	4.2.1 See 2.2.1(a)		
	5.1.1(a) See 2.2.2, 4.1.1(a)		
22	5.1.1(b) Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans	X	

Indicator Number		Indicator Statement	Target Met	Target Not Met
23	5.1.1(c)	Total percentage of forest operations that are consistent with a landscape level strategy for the management of recreational, commercial and cultural trails as identified in the DFA.	X	
24	5.1.1(d)	Percentage of roads deactivated that meet the deactivation criteria.	X	
25	5.2.1(a)	Investment in local communities		X
26	5.2.2	Training in environmental & safety procedures in compliance with company training plans	X	
27	5.2.3	Level of direct & indirect employment	X	
28	5.2.4	Number of opportunities for First Nations to participate in the forest economy.		X
29	6.1.1	Employees will receive appropriate First Nations Awareness Training	X	
30	6.1.2	Evidence of best efforts to share interests and plans with Aboriginal communities	X	
31	6.1.3	% of forest operations in conformance with operational/site plans developed to address Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses.	X	
	6.2.1	(see 1.4.2)		
32	6.3.1(b)	Effective communication and co-operation with non-timber resources users and interested parties that have expressed interest in forest planning.	X	
33	6.3.1(c)	The number of support opportunities provided in the DFA.	X	
34	6.3.2 & 6.3.3	Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program	X	
35	6.4.1	Percent of PAG meeting evaluations completed during the reporting period that obtain a minimum average acceptability score of 3.	X	
36	6.4.2	Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG	X	
	6.4.3	See 6.1.2		
37	6.5.1	The number of educational opportunities provided	X	
38	6.5.2	SFM Annual report made available to the public.	X	
		Totals	35	3

1.3 SFM Performance Reporting

This annual report will describe the success of the licensee in meeting the indicator targets over the DFA. The report is available to the public and will allow for full disclosure of forest management activities, successes, and failures.

2.0 SFM Indicators, Targets and Strategies

Indicator Statement	1 - Retention of rare ecosystem groups across the DFA
CSA Indicators	1.1.1 Ecosystem area by type
Target and Variance	Target: 0 hectares Variance: Access construction where no other practicable route is feasible.
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT – report created that pulls site series from SP's from blocks that were harvested in the reporting period. These are reviewed to see if any rare sites (pure and mappable) have been harvested
Was the Target Met?	Yes
The are no reported hectares harvested in the reporting year for Canfor.	

Indicator Statement	2 - Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broadleaf, treed mixed) >20 years old across DFA
CSA Indicators	1.1.2 Forest area by type or species composition
Target and Variance	Target: Douglas-fir to 2% within 20 years; Treed Broadleaf: >1%; Treed Mixed: >4% Variance: None below proposed targets
Methodology of Measurement	TSR – This indicator will remain static until the next Timber Supply Review happens (every 5 years). This indicator will be updated with the new information at that time.
Was the Target Met?	Yes. Table below shows the updated 2018 data.

Table 1: Forest area by type or species

Forest Type	Forest Area (ha)	Forest Area (%)
Coniferous	447,614	89.2%
Broadleaf	13,036	3.6%
Mixed	34,659	7.2%
Total	495,309	100

Currently Douglas-fir comprises approximately 1.9% of the Forest Area in the DFA.

Data includes licensee Operating Areas within the DFA, Parks & Protected Areas Apportionment. Based on the Vegetation Resources Inventory, the areas have been reduced for roads, seismic lines, oil & gas tenures, and other non-THLB areas.

Indicator Statement	3 - Percent late seral distribution by ecological unit across the DFA
CSA Indicators	1.1.3(a) Forest area by seral stage or age class (late seral) 4.1.1 Net carbon uptake
Target and Variance	Target: 100% old forest, old forest interior and none pine targets as per Jan. 2012 PG TSA Biodiversity Order Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	LOWG REPORT – The LOWG group produces the official data to analyze performance towards the Old Growth Order for all Districts in the PGTSA. Report on the most current data available.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
Indicator Statement	4 - Maintain a variety of young patch sizes in an attempt to approximate natural disturbance
CSA Indicators	1.1.3(b) Forest area by seral stage or age class (young patch)
Target and Variance	Target: As per the Jan. 2004 PG TSA Landscape Biodiversity Objectives Variance: As per the Jan. 2004 PG TSA Landscape Biodiversity Objectives
Methodology of Measurement	LOWG REPORT – The LOWG group produces the official data to analyze performance towards the Old Growth Order for all Districts in the PGTSA. Report on the most current data available. Patch Size is reported only every 5 years. This data is from the 2015 analysis. This data will remain static until the next analysis in approx. 2020.
Was the Target Met?	No

Table 3: Patch Size Distribution

OLD NON-PINE FOREST RETENTION - CURRENT CONDITION (2017)

Unit Label	CFLB Area (ha)	Targets		Current Status	
		% Target from the Order	Target Area (ha)	Current Area (ha)	Current Percentage (%)
E1	18,669	33%	6,161	8,959	48%
E2	26,367	13%	3,428	9,479	36%
E3	61,243	10%	6,124	19,910	33%
E4	185,071	4%	7,403	31,706	17%
E5	203,057	6%	12,183	51,040	25%
E6	109,700	0%	0		
E7	28,559	0%	0		
E8	35,857	0%	0		
E9	24,921	0%	0		
E10	97,439	0%	0		
E11	368,221	0%	0		
E12	10,840	9%	976	3,976	37%
E13	13,113	0%	0		
E14	65,170	10%	6,517	28,240	43%
E15	105,171	13%	13,672	67,249	64%
E16	265,473	10%	26,547	92,291	35%
E17	358,280	12%	42,994	122,490	34%

		Current Young Forest Patch Size Distribution (ha)					Total Young Forest Area (ha)
Natural Disturbance Unit (NDU)	NDU Units	< 50	50-100	100-500	500-1000	> 1000	
Moist Interior - Mountain	E1	38	59	7	0	65	168
Moist Interior - Plateau	E2, E3, E4, E5	5,121	6,068	11,207	2,739	62,787	87,923
Northern Boreal Mountains	E6, E7, E8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Omineca - Mountain	E9, E10, E11	960	1,509	1,220	186	1,548	5,423
Omineca - Valley	E12, E13, E14, E15, E16, E17	8,610	10,701	21,599	7,266	25,456	73,633

		Current Young Forest Patch Size Distribution (%)			
Natural Disturbance Unit (NDU)	NDU Units	< 50	50-100	100-1000	> 1000
Moist Interior - Mountain	E1	22.7%	35.0%	3.9%	38.4%
Moist Interior - Plateau	E2, E3, E4, E5	5.8%	6.9%	15.9%	71.4%
Northern Boreal Mountains	E6, E7, E8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Omineca - Mountain	E9, E10, E11	17.7%	27.8%	25.9%	28.5%
Omineca - Valley	E12, E13, E14, E15, E16, E17	11.7%	14.5%	39.2%	34.6%

Trending towards target	Trending away from target
-------------------------	---------------------------

		Target Young Forest Patch Size Distribution (%)			
Natural Disturbance Unit (NDU)	NDU Units	< 50	50-100	100-1000	> 1000
Moist Interior - Mountain	E1	20%	10%	30%	40%
Moist Interior - Plateau	E2, E3, E4, E5	5%	5%	20%	70%
Northern Boreal Mountains	E6, E7, E8	5%	5%	30%	60%
Omineca - Mountain	E9, E10, E11	20%	10%	30%	40%
Omineca - Valley	E12, E13, E14, E15, E16, E17	5%	5%	30%	60%

The LOWG analysis indicates that the Moist Interior and Omineca Mountain NDU's are trending towards some targets while trending away from other targets. The focus on salvage harvest of Mountain Pine Beetle killed stands over the last decade has resulted in this distribution pattern. Patch size distributions will require new analyses and targets once the epidemic has run its course.

The Omineca – Valley NDU, however, is trending away from targets with distributions in most patch size categories exceeding targets, and patches larger than 1000ha well under the target of 60% coming in at 34.6%.

This trend can be attributed to several factors:

- 1 – As dead pine continues to be salvage harvested with strictly regulated pine content targets, forest planning focussed on these types resulting in over-achievement of the small to large patch sizes rather than creating extra-large openings that would have required harvesting more living spruce types.
- 2 – In some cases, the intensive harvesting required to create large 1000+ ha openings was not feasible due to other stakeholder concerns about concentrating harvest activity in their interest areas. As other values are balanced and managed, it is at the expense of other objectives.

We can expect these trends to change as we transition from pine salvage to regular green harvest planning in the future, however the current rise in spruce bark beetle populations may influence harvest focus going forward.

Indicator Statement	5 - Percent of stand structure retained across the DFA in harvested areas						
CSA Indicators	1.1.4(a) Degree of within-stand structural retention (stand-level retention)						
Target and Variance	Target: greater than 7% across the DFA Variance: 0%						
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT – report created that pulls retention levels from SP's from blocks harvested within the reporting period						
Was the Target Met?	Yes						
<p>Stand level retention consists of wildlife tree patches (WTP), dispersed retention and riparian management areas. Refer to the chief forester's guidance on landscape and stand level retention. Large retention levels relate to some larger openings.</p> <p>For operations from 1997-2012, FREP has calculated a mean of 13.1%, as identified in the current TSR data package.</p> <p>Table4 : Stand Level Retention in Harvested Areas</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gross Area Harvested (ha)*</th> <th>Associated Total Retention (ha)</th> <th>Average % Retained **</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4,481</td> <td>692</td> <td>15.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Gross Area Harvested (ha)*	Associated Total Retention (ha)	Average % Retained **	4,481	692	15.4%
Gross Area Harvested (ha)*	Associated Total Retention (ha)	Average % Retained **					
4,481	692	15.4%					

Indicator Statement	6 - The number of cut blocks harvested that are not consistent with riparian management commitments.
CSA Indicators	1.1.4(b) Degree of within-stand structural retention (riparian management requirements)
Target and Variance	Target: 0 Variance: 0
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT – report created that pulls the number of riparian features associated with a block for blocks harvested within the reporting period. ITS is reviewed to check for any issues related to Riparian Features
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>Harvesting was completed on 44 blocks during the reporting period, with no incidents relating to riparian requirements occurring.</p>	

Indicator Statement	7 - Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies (both landscape and stand level) for Species at Risk and/or Species of Management Concern.
CSA Indicators	1.2.1 Degree of habitat protection for selected focal species, including species at risk 1.2.2 Degree of suitable habitat in the long term for selected focal species, including species at risk
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT – report created that pulls SAR information from SPs for blocks harvested within the reporting period. ITS – ITS was reviewed to check for any issues related to SAR.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>This indicator evaluates the success of implementing specific management strategies for Species of Management Concern, including Species at Risk, as prescribed in operational plans. Appropriate management of these species and their habitat is crucial in ensuring populations of flora and fauna are sustained in the DFA.</p> <p>Canfor must ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key staff are trained in Species at Risk (SAR) identification; • SAR listings are reviewed and management strategies are updated periodically • Strategies are implemented via operational plans. <p>Canfor currently has systems in place to evaluate the consistency of forest operations with operational plans. Tracking this consistency will ensure problems in implementation are identified and corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>Six blocks with SAR and/or Species of Management Concern strategies identified in SP's: VAL006, VAL022, VAL07A (caribou); OCO319, SQU124, BOO320 (migratory bird rank 4-6 habitat). All were harvest complete during the reporting period. None were identified in ITS as having strategies not met.</p>	

Indicator Statement	8 - Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use
CSA Indicators	1.2.3 Proportion of regeneration comprised of native species 1.3.1 Genetic diversity (not a core indicator)
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	INFOVIEW REPORT – WIM has created a standard work document to outline how to run the infoview report that will pull this information.
Was the Target Met?	Yes

Table 5 details the areas planted within the DFA in accordance with the Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use for this reporting period.

Table 5: Compliance with Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use

Licensee	Total Seedlings Planted	Seedlings Planted in Accordance with Chief Forester's Standards*	Total % DFA**
Canfor – FSJ District	2,402,700	2,399,940	99.9%

* 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 Statement	9 - Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies for protected areas and sites of biological significance as contained in operational plans
CSA Indicators	1.4.1 Proportion of identified sites with implemented management strategies
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT– WIM has created a summary from the task tab where blocks will have any features of biological significance identified. SP REVIEW – For the blocks identified, the SP is reviewed to specify the management strategies implemented. ITS REVIEW – ITS is checked for any issues related to blocks where management strategies were not met.
Was the Target Met?	Yes

There were no incidents related to not following management strategies for protected areas or sites of biological significance.

Indicator Statement	10 - % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
CSA Indicators	1.4.2 Protection of identified sacred and culturally important sites 6.2.1 Evidence of understanding and use of Aboriginal knowledge through the engagement of willing Aboriginal communities, using a process that identifies and manages culturally important resources and values
Target and Variance	Target: 100% of known forest values, knowledge and uses considered Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT– WIM has created a report that summarizes SP Cultural Heritage Comments, Activity Comments for Info Sharing and Arch, and any Task Tab comments. These are all reviewed to identify heritage forest values. ITS REVIEW – review ITS for any incidents where the issue is related to identified when management strategies related to heritage values not being achieved
Was the Target Met?	Yes

Trails were removed from blocks and protected with machine free where they could not be avoided. Trail crossings, where required, were constructed and removed to keep the trail bed intact. CMT's were either reserved where possible, or stubbed above the scar where they could not be reserved. Areas of Potential (AOP) were removed from harvest area.
BOO318 had an identified trail accidentally planted with approximately 200 seedlings before the planters were stopped. The seedlings were then snipped to prevent degradation of the trail bed.

Table 6: Protection of sacred and culturally important sites

	# of Aboriginal forest values, uses & knowledge gathered during planning process	# of Aboriginal forest values, uses & knowledge considered during planning process
Knowledge	0	0
Uses	13	13
Values	0	0
Total	13	13
Total %		100%

Indicator Statement	11 - The regeneration delay, by area, for stands established annually
CSA Indicators	2.1.1 Reforestation success (regeneration delay)
Target and Variance	Target: Regeneration established in 3 years or less Variance: 1
Methodology of Measurement	WIM REPORT– WIM has created a summary for the reporting year that also generates the graph below.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>Table 7: Regeneration Delay</p> <p>Regeneration delay was 1.8 years for 2014 Regeneration delay was 1.72 years for 2015 Regeneration delay was 2 years for 2016 Regeneration delay was 2 years for 2017 Regeneration delay was 1.48 years for 2018</p>	

Indicator Statement	12 - Percentage of gross forest land base in the DFA converted to non-forested land use through forest management activities
CSA Indicators	2.2.1 (a) Additions and deletions to the forest area
Target and Variance	Target: <3% of the gross land base in the DFA Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	TSR – This indicator will remain static until the next Timber Supply Review happens (every 5 years). This indicator will be updated with the new information at that time (2023)
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>The current % of non-forested land in the DFA is 0.81%. Calculated from current 2018 data.</p>	

Indicator Statement	13 - Existing areas of non-forested types artificially converted to forest types.
CSA Indicators	2.2.1 (b) Additions and deletions to the forest area
Target and Variance	Target: 0 hectares Variance: 0 hectares
Methodology of Measurement	TSR – This indicator will remain static until the next Timber Supply Review happens (every 5 years). This indicator will be updated with the new information at that time (2017)
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>No areas have been converted from non-forested to forested.</p>	

Indicator Statement	14 - Percent of volume harvested compared to allocated harvest level
CSA Indicators	2.2.2 Proportion of the calculated long-term sustainable harvest level that is actually harvested
Target and Variance	Target: 100% over 5 years Variance: as per cut control regulations
Methodology of Measurement	CUT CONTROL DOCUMENT – the legal summary provided from the government is the one used to summarize the performance on that license. The target will be considered met until the 5 year cut is exceeded by the variance, or the 5 year period is completed with an undercut.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
Table 8: Cut Control Licence A40873	

Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total CC	Total AAC (5yr)	% CC Period
Harvest volume m ³	2,032,252	0	0	0	0	2,032,252	7,988,855	25.44%

Indicator Statement	15 - Percent of harvested blocks meeting soil disturbance objectives identified in plans
CSA Indicators	3.1.1 Level of soil disturbance
Target and Variance	Target: 100% of blocks meet soil disturbance objectives Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for issues related to site disturbance on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
There were no incidents of exceeding soil disturbance identified.	

Indicator Statement	16 - Percent of cut blocks where post-harvest CWD levels are within the targets contained in Plans
CSA Indicators	3.1.2 Level of downed woody debris
Target and Variance	Target: 100% of blocks harvested annually will meet targets Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for issues related to coarse woody debris on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes

There were no non-conformances/compliances related to CWD levels on 57 harvested blocks.

The following represents a range of Best Management Practices (BMP's) for CWD that will be implemented where these CWD attributes are achievable in harvest openings:

- To retain standing deciduous trees where operationally feasible; otherwise, left where felled;
- Same as above for Douglas-fir, especially veteran trees;
- To leave non-merchantable stems and under-utilization stems on the block;
- To retain clumps of viable natural regeneration;
- To retain existing CWD in wildlife tree patches and reserve areas will also contribute to the target;
- Use of stub trees as anchors to be retained to varying degrees along riparian areas, machine free zones, and other special features;
- Build loosely constructed piles around stubs. Generally, target 1 pile in every 5 ha, in blocks greater than 15 ha, if there are enough features in the harvest area;
- Radiate some longer pieces of CWD out from the pile(s);
- Retain CWD in clumps;
- Keep longer logs intact to the extent possible; and
- Jackstraw – haphazard orientation.

Objectives and targets specific to CWD will be achieved through the possible application of the following procedures and controls:

- Conduct periodic training for key licensee staff and contractors (in conjunction with pre-works) specific to CWD management and best management practices (including silviculture);
- Adhering to legislative requirements specific to CWD;
- Harvesting pre-works and inspections;
- Conducting implementation monitoring to assess success of implementation of controls and possible opportunities for improvement; and
- Conducting effectiveness monitoring to assess if controls are effective at achieving the desired results.

Indicator Statement	17 - Sensitive watersheds that are above Peak Flow Index targets will have assessment if harvesting planned
CSA Indicators	3.2.1(a) Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
No issues with harvesting occurred in a sensitive watershed within the DFA	

Indicator Statement	18 - % of high hazard drainage structures in sensitive watersheds with identified water quality concerns that have mitigation strategies implemented
CSA Indicators	3.2.1(b) Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	DISCUSSION WITH OPERATIONS – For blocks harvested in sensitive watersheds in the reporting period, talk to operations supervisors to determine what major structures were installed, and what mitigative strategies were implemented.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
Canfor had no structures installed in sensitive watersheds in the DFA	

Indicator Statement	19 - Percent of road related soil erosion events that introduce sediment into a stream identified in annual road inspections that are addressed.
CSA Indicators	3.2.1(c) Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
There were no incidents of sediment introduction into streams identified in ITS.	

Indicator Statement	20 - Percentage of crossing structures planned and installed on fish streams to a reasonable design and sediment control standard (allow for adequate fish passage - dependant on the presence/absence of fish).
CSA Indicators	Indicator 3.2.1(d) Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
There were no bridges installed over fish streams in the DFA with issues identified in ITS	

Indicator Statement	21 - Percent of standards units declared annually that meet free growing requirements on or before the free growing date.
CSA Indicators	Indicator 3.2.1(d) Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance 4.1.1 Net carbon uptake
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
All blocks met free growing requirements	

Indicator Statement	22 - Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in Plans.
CSA Indicators	5.1.1 (b) Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services produced in the DFA
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>There were no incidents related to not following strategies for non-timber benefits.</p> <p>Non-timber benefits can be assessed on a harvest unit specific basis by assessing operational plan commitments designed to reduce any potential impact of the operation on other forest users and stakeholders. These plan commitments could include specific actions to assist ranchers, trappers, guides, resort owners, mineral rights holders, etc. To manage their licensed obligations on shared public forest land. Actions within plans could also involve public expectations related to forest access, visual quality or specific recreational or ecotourism opportunities. Plan commitments could also include actions to manage or protect sites that are culturally important, sacred or spiritual to local Aboriginals.</p>	

Indicator Statement	23 - Total percentage of forest operations that are consistent with a landscape level strategy for the management of recreational, commercial and cultural trails as identified in the DFA.
CSA Indicators	5.1.1 (c) Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services produced in the DFA
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>There were no incidents related to not following strategies for trails in the DFA.</p>	

Indicator Statement	24 - Percentage of roads deactivated that meet the deactivation criteria.
CSA Indicators	5.1.1 (d) Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services produced in the DFA
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – ITS was reviewed for related issues on blocks harvested in the reporting year.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
There were no incidents identified related to not meeting deactivation requirements	

Indicator Statement	25 - Investment in local communities					
CSA Indicators	5.2.1 Level of investment in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability 6.3.1 (a) Evidence that the organization has co-operated with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users, and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy					
Target and Variance	Target: 5 year rolling average Variance: -20%					
Methodology of Measurement	Total Canfor Spend on Vendors with a Ft St James Address as a % of total spending by Plateau operation.					
Was the Target Met?	No					
This is the third year reporting for this indicator. Until now, the methodology left us unable to calculate the 5-year rolling average spend. Total spending on Vendors with addresses in Fort St James DFA as well as the total spend for Plateau excluding stumpage per year is found in the table below.						
Year	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	Average
Canfor Spend in FSJ	\$23.5M	\$19.8M	\$22.4M			\$21.9M
Total Plateau Spend	\$139M	\$129.3M	\$164.2M			\$144.2M
%age	17%	15.3%	13.6%			15.2%

Indicator Statement	26 – Training in environmental & safety procedures in compliance with company training plans
CSA Indicators	5.2.2 Level of investment in training and skills development
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -5%
Methodology of Measurement	TRAINING SUMMARY – Normally run by admin staff when scheduling training. Have them run it for staff and note any deficiencies. TRAINING MATRIX – If deficiencies are found, compare against the training matrix found on FMG SharePoint to see if the training is required. AUDIT FINDINGS – training is reviewed annually by the internal and external audits. Any deficiencies would be identified there, and reported here.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>The training requirements for staff were met. The CSC Driver Training Classroom (every 5 years) course was missed by 8 staff. They are all aware and will take the training in 2019.</p> <p>603 modules were completed by 33 FMG staff (full time and seasonal).</p> <p>Result by course: = 603 modules completed/611 modules required = 99% complete (staff only)</p>	

Indicator Statement	27 – Level of Direct & Indirect Employment
CSA Indicators	5.2.3 Level of direct and indirect employment
Target and Variance	Target: cut allocation X 1.72/1000m3 (3994) Variance: as per 2.2.2
Methodology of Measurement	CUT CONTROL DOCUMENT – refer to the annual harvest in the A40873 cut control document
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>Canfor harvested 2,032,252 m3 in 2017</p> <p>Total = 2,032,252 X 1.72/1000 = 3,495 jobs</p>	

Indicator Statement	28 – Number of opportunities for First Nations to participate in the forest economy
CSA Indicators	5.2.4 Level of Aboriginal participation in the forest economy
Target and Variance	Target: 6 on a 5 year rolling average Variance: -1
Methodology of Measurement	DISCUSSION WITH OPERATIONS AND SILVICULTURE – Provide ops and silv supervisors with the list below, as it represents some of the longer term agreements. Ask if there are any others to include, or should not be included. VENDOR LIST REVIEW – Review the list of Vendors for Plateau and note the ones that are First Nations.
Was the Target Met?	No

Table 9: Aboriginal Contracts

2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/2018	Average
6	4	6	5	3	4.8

Nus De (Burning)
Xsu Wii Ax (Brushing)
Tootikoh (Brushing)

Note that brushing contracts have decreased because the Takla and Minaret blocks are nearly all Free Growing.

Indicator Statement	29 – Employees will receive appropriate First Nations Awareness Training
CSA Indicators	6.1.1 Evidence of a good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	TRAINING MATRIX – Check to make sure Canfor staff who are required to take the training has completed it.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
All first nations awareness training needs identified were met.	

Indicator Statement	30 – Evidence of best efforts to share interests and plans with Aboriginal communities
CSA Indicators	6.1.2 Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities having a clear understanding of the plans 6.4.3 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal communities
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – Check ITS to see if any blocks had issues with Information Sharing or were harvested without CP's. Typically there will not be any as CP's are not issued unless information sharing has been completed. Report the number of blocks harvested in the reporting period.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
All blocks harvested (57) were info-shared with first nations.	

Indicator Statement	31 - % of forest operations in conformance with operational/site plans developed to address Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses.
CSA Indicators	6.1.3 Level of management and/or protection of areas where culturally important practices and activities (hunting, fishing, gathering) occur
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	ITS REVIEW – Check ITS to see if any blocks had issues with Information Sharing or were harvested without CP's. Typically there will not be any as CP's are not issued unless information sharing has been completed. Report the number of blocks harvested in the reporting period.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>Table 10: Aboriginal Values</p> <p>Of the 57 blocks harvested in the DFA this reporting year, there were no instances of harvesting without CP's, or issues with Information Sharing.</p> <p>Management strategies that were incorporated into plans and implemented consisted of trails being removed from blocks and protected with machine free where they could not be avoided. CMT's were targeted for WTP's or identified and stubbed were they could not be removed.</p>	

Indicator Statement	32 - Effective communication and co-operation with non-timber resources users and interested parties that have expressed interest in forest planning
CSA Indicators	6.3.1 (b) Evidence that the organization has co-operated with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users, and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	INFOVIEW REPORTS – Run an infoview report to summarize all stakeholder communication for the reporting period. Report the number of communications ITS REVIEW – Review ITS to see if there are any stakeholder interest related issues identified.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
Canfor summarizes / tracks communication by division not by DFA. Both PG and Vanderhoof met this indicator that included communications with FSJ.	

Indicator Statement	33 - The number of support opportunities provided in the DFA.
CSA Indicators	6.3.1 (c) Evidence that the organization has co-operated with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users, and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy
Target and Variance	Target: 6 Variance: -1
Methodology of Measurement	DISCUSSION WITH OPS MANAGER – This will determine the currency of the primary and by-products listed below. Bring the manager the list, to see if anything should be added or removed. NCI SURVEY REPORT – This accounting report will summarize the number of vendors we have paid invoices to, to generate the number of business relations DISCUSSION WITH ADMIN STAFF – To determine the number of community support opportunities. CORPORATE DONATION SUMMARY – This report, obtained from corporate office, will summarize the donations made to the local community.
Was the Target Met?	Yes

Table 11: Donations

Type	#	Details
Cash donation	3	District of Fort St. James – 5 th Annual Night Market Reid Klassen – Local Scholarship. United Way Campaign
Product donation	3	3 Loads of Firewood to Binchi 6 Loads of Firewood to Nak'azdli 2 Laods of Firewood to Tachie
Total	6	

Note the donations summary indicated that no requests from Fort St James were denied. All donations that were requested, were awarded.

Indicator Statement	34 - Implementation and maintenance of a certified safety program.
CSA Indicators	6.3.2 Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities 6.3.3 Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%
Methodology of Measurement	Canfor is SAFE certified. No ongoing verification required. Canfor Contractors are verified prior to preworks. DISCUSSION WITH SAFETY MANAGER – check in with the FMG Safety Manager to ensure the requirements are current.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
Canfor maintained Safe Companies certification.	

Indicator Statement	35 - Percent of PAG meeting evaluations completed during the reporting period that obtain a minimum average acceptability score of 3.												
CSA Indicators	6.4.1 Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process												
Target and Variance	Target: 100% Variance: -10%												
Methodology of Measurement	PAG FACILIATATOR REPORT – This report found on the PGTSA SFMP website will summarize the satisfaction score for PAG meetings. Summarize for the reporting period.												
Was the Target Met?	Yes												
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>PAG Meeting Date</th> <th>Average Meeting Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>May 24, 2017</td> <td>No survey completed. Show of hands.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oct 2, 2017</td> <td>4.1 / 5.0 = 82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dec 12, 2017</td> <td>4.1 / 5.0 = 82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>March 20, 2018</td> <td>3.9 / 5.0 = 78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>12.1 / 15.0 = 80.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		PAG Meeting Date	Average Meeting Score	May 24, 2017	No survey completed. Show of hands.	Oct 2, 2017	4.1 / 5.0 = 82%	Dec 12, 2017	4.1 / 5.0 = 82%	March 20, 2018	3.9 / 5.0 = 78%	Total	12.1 / 15.0 = 80.1%
PAG Meeting Date	Average Meeting Score												
May 24, 2017	No survey completed. Show of hands.												
Oct 2, 2017	4.1 / 5.0 = 82%												
Dec 12, 2017	4.1 / 5.0 = 82%												
March 20, 2018	3.9 / 5.0 = 78%												
Total	12.1 / 15.0 = 80.1%												

Indicator Statement	36 - Number of educational opportunities for information/training that are delivered to the PAG.
CSA Indicators	6.4.2 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general
Target and Variance	Target: =>1 Variance: 0%
Methodology of Measurement	PAG MEETING MINUTES– These documents found on the PGTSA SFMP website will summarize the meeting minutes. Tally the number of training sessions given to the PAG for the reporting period.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
<p>(2) January 30, 2018 infosession;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coarse Woody Debris Presentation by Dexter Hodder • Timber Supply Review Presentation by John Pousette 	

Indicator Statement	37 - The number of educational opportunities provided
CSA Indicators	6.5.1 Number of people reached through educational outreach
Target and Variance	Target: 4 Variance: -1
Methodology of Measurement	DISCUSS WITH PERMITTING COORDINATOR – Verify any staff involvement with community educational initiatives. DISCUSS WITH MILL SUPERINTENDENTS – Summarize any mill tours given to the community.
Was the Target Met?	Yes

Number of Opportunities: 3

While the ‘Vanderhoof Trade Show’ and ‘Echo Lake Guest Presentations’ were not held in Fort St James specifically, the community was invited and some community members did attend.

Table 12: Educational Opportunities

Date	Location	Description	Method Used to Query/Collect Data
May, 2017	Vanderhoof Arena	Trade show booth geared to educate public on our business from forestry management to manufacturing to sales.	Discussion with Canfor Staff
Jan 30, 2018	Echo Lake	Guest presentations from Dexter Hodder and John Pousette. Advertisements in both the Vanderhoof and FSJames Newspapers. Community attendance from Vanderhoof and FSJames.	Discussion with Canfor Staff
April, 2017	Vanderhoof Office	Project Trades: Had 24 students run through 6 stations: electrical, millwright, welding, saw filing, heavy duty mechanic, and optimization.	Discussion with Canfor Staff

Indicator Statement	38 - SFM Annual report made available to the public.
CSA Indicators	6.5.2 SFM Annual report made available to the public
Target and Variance	Target: SFM monitoring report available to public annually via the web. Variance: None
Methodology of Measurement	CANFOR EXTERNAL WEBSITE – Check to ensure reports are posted as required.
Was the Target Met?	Yes
The 2016-2017 annual report is posted on the website. This annual report will be posted once reviewed by the PAG.	