Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan

Facilitator Report

March 31, 2011
March 15, 2011

Dan Szekely, RPF
Planning Forestry Supervisor
Canadian Forest Products Ltd.
Admin Building - Mill Road
Box 310
Mackenzie, BC V0J 2C0

Dear Dan,


This report contains the following:

1. Terms of Reference for the PAG
2. PAG Meetings (schedule of meetings, agendas, sign-in sheets, minutes)
3. Evaluations (sample of evaluation forms, feedback chart, feedback comments
4. Letters of Invitation
5. Mailing List and Meeting Attendance
6. First Nations Correspondence
7. Public Correspondence
8. Continuous Improvement Issues Matrix and SFM Indicator Matrix
9. Multi Criteria Scoring (not available)
10. Meeting Handouts

Please note that some of the documents in this Facilitator’s Report are not available digitally. The hard copy Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group Records binder should be considered as the complete reference.

Sincerely,

[Dwight Scott Wolfe's signature]

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager
Tesera Systems Inc.
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Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan

Public Advisory Group

Terms Of Reference

February 23, 2011
1. Background

1.1 Purpose of Sustainable Forest Management Plan

As society has been increasingly affirming a wider set of values that forests can provide, the forest industry has witnessed a distinct change in the philosophy of forest management. Though timber may still be the primary economic value from the forests, a wider range of economic, environmental and social values is being demanded.

Forest management now involves the sustainable management of a much larger spectrum of values and at the same time ensuring that the benefits we enjoy from the forests today do not impact on the ability of subsequent generations to enjoy benefits from the forests in the future. This concept is commonly referred to as “Sustainable Forest Management” (SFM). Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) refers to being economically sustainable on public land, respecting the social needs of the public, and sustaining viable ecosystems. The objective of SFM is to concurrently balance the sustainability of forestry-related ecological, social and economic values for a defined area.

SFM has gained acceptance at the international, national, and local levels. Furthermore, SFM has attracted the attention of buyers of forest products who are increasingly demanding that the industry demonstrate that products are derived from forests managed on a sustainable basis. As a result, forest certification has emerged as a dominant factor in the forest industry in order to provide assurances to buyers of wood products that the management of forests meets identified standards that are considered critical for SFM. As British Columbia forest companies have evolved and have become dependent on the global marketplace for the export of forest products, the issues of sustainable forest management and forest certification have become paramount.

Canadian Forest Products Ltd., in partnership with other licensees, academics, resource specialists, government agency staff, interested parties, and other related organizations has designed an integrated framework for sustainable forest management across its divisions. This Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Framework has become a credible alternative to current forest management planning in the interior of British Columbia.

The primary purposes of Canadian Forest Products Ltd. and BC Timber Sales Prince George Business Area are to:

a. Rely on the SFM Framework as the conceptual forest management strategy for the certification effort in Mackenzie;

b. Jointly develop an Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) within the geographic area of the Mackenzie Forest District to meet the SFM standard requirements (Z809-08) developed by the Canadian Standards Association (CSA);

c. Support a public advisory process to:

- Identify and select indicators, and targets, based on the SFM framework and any other criteria relevant to the DFA;
- Develop, assess, and select from alternative strategies;
- Review the SFMP;
- Design monitoring programs, evaluate results and recommend improvement; and
- Discuss and resolve any issues relevant to SFM in the DFA;

d. Work together to fulfill the SFMP commitments including data collection and monitoring, participating in public processes, producing public reports, and continuous improvement.

The SFMP may be used by Canadian Forest Products Ltd. and BC Timber Sales Prince George Business Area to prepare for eventual certification under the Canadian Standards Association’s (CSA) SFM Standard (Z809-08).
This SFMP is intended to be consistent with all existing legislation and other strategic plans.

1.2 Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee
The current Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee for the Mackenzie SFMP consists of representatives from BC Timber Sales Prince George Business Area (BCTS) and Canadian Forest Products Ltd. (Canfor).

1.3 Defined Forest Area
The SFMP applies to only the Defined Forest Area (DFA). A DFA is a specified area of forest, including land and water. The DFA for this SFMP is within the Mackenzie Forest District, excluding areas such as private lands, woodlots, Williston Reservoir, Indian reserves, Large Parks and Treaty 8 Lands\(^1\). The DFA boundaries are shown on the map provided in Appendix A.

1.4 Public Advisory Group
The Public Advisory Group (PAG) for the Mackenzie SFMP is comprised of individuals representing the interests listed in section 6.1.1. who voluntarily participate in the PAG process. As outlined in these terms of reference, the PAG will specifically work under the Defined Goals (section 2) as an open, transparent and accountable process. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee and the PAG recognize and agree that Aboriginal participation in the public participation process will not prejudice Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

1.5 Legislation
The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee and the PAG shall ensure that the indicators, and targets are consistent with current relevant government legislation, regulations and policies. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee and the PAG must also respect the findings of any formal public participation processes that have developed values, objectives, indicators, or targets relating to the CSA SFM elements at a landscape or regional level in the area in which the DFA is situated.

2. Defined Goal
The goal of the Mackenzie SFMP is to demonstrate commitment to sustainable forest management for the DFA. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee, with input from the PAG, will be responsible for developing and implementing the SFMP.

The PAG will have the opportunity to work with the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee to:

- a. Identify and select indicators, and targets, based on the SFM framework and any other criteria relevant to the DFA;
- b. Develop, assess, and select from alternative strategies;
- c. Review the SFMP;
- d. Design monitoring programs, evaluate results and recommend improvement; and
- e. Discuss and resolve any issues relevant to SFM in the DFA.

\(^1\) Refers to fee simple and reserve lands
3. **Timelines**

Key dates for developing the SFMP:

- **To be completed by:** January 15, 2006
- **Completed on:** Letters - January 10, 2006

- **To be completed by:** Ads - January 17 & 24, 2006
- **Completed on:**

- **To be completed by:** January 21, 2006
- **Completed on:** January 23, 2006

- **To be completed by:** January 28, 2006
- **Completed on:** January 31, 2006

- **To be completed by:** June 2006
- **Completed on:** May 9, 2006

- **To be completed by:** September 2006
- **Completed on:** October 17, 2006

- **To be completed by:** October 2006
- **Completed on:** October 2006

- **To be completed by:** November 2006
- **Completed on:** November 2006 – February 2007

- **To be completed by:** April 29, 2008
- **Completed on:** April 29, 2008

- **To be completed by:**
- **Completed on:**

Following the completion of the SFMP, it is estimated that the PAG meeting schedule would include 3–4 meetings per year (as required) beginning in 2007.

4. **Communication**

4.1 **Between the PAG and Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee**

- **To be completed by:**
- **Completed on:**

4.2 **With the Public**

- **To be completed by:**
- **Completed on:**
5. **Resources**

5.1 **Travel Expenses**

a. Air travel from Tsay Keh and Fort Ware will be reimbursed for PAG representatives (or in their absence, their alternates). When necessary, mileage between these villages to catch flights to attend Mackenzie PAG meetings will be reimbursed.

b. Mileage to and from PAG meetings for those PAG representatives (or in their absence, their alternates) traveling more than 25 kilometers each way to the meeting site will be reimbursed per kilometer at the provincial government rate. Mileage for those PAG representatives (or in their absence, their alternates) traveling between Tsay Keh or Kwadacha to/from Mackenzie will be reimbursed at the discretion of the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee. PAG representatives (or in their absence, their alternates) traveling from outside the Mackenzie Forest District must obtain approval for travel expenses from the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee before the meeting.

c. Overnight accommodation for PAG representatives and alternates traveling to PAG meetings will be reimbursed if pre-approved by the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee. As a general principle, accommodation should be economical.

d. Expense forms with copies of receipts for the above must be submitted to Canfor-Mackenzie within two weeks following the PAG meeting.

5.2 **Meeting Expenses**

a. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will provide meeting rooms, meals, refreshments, a facilitator, and a scribe.

b. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will provide adequate material and other resources to assist the PAG in understanding the relevant concepts.

6. **Responsibilities**

6.1 **Public Advisory Group**

6.1.1 **Membership Structure**

The PAG reflects a range of interests in the DFA. Members of each identified sector will select one representative and one alternate to participate in the PAG. Each representative and alternate will be allowed to represent only one of the sectors listed in Appendix B.

In addition to members of the public participating in the PAG, Aboriginal peoples have a unique legal status and may possess special knowledge concerning Sustainable Forest Management based on their traditional practices and experience. Each of the local First Nations listed below will be encouraged to invite their members to participate in the Mackenzie SFMP PAG. Members of each of the local First Nations attending PAG meetings will be invited to select a representative and alternate to participate in the PAG:
6.1.2 Selection of the PAG
   a. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will recruit potential local PAG representatives and alternates through mailed invitations to individuals, an open house, posters, and advertisements through local media.
   b. Interested parties and the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will review the potential membership at the initial PAG meeting. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will compile all names of potential representatives. Potential representatives for each interest area will discuss and agree as to who will stand as representative(s) and alternate(s). If they are unable to select a representative or alternate for the interest area, then the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will recommend a solution.
   c. Once the PAG is established, the PAG and the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee can recommend changes in PAG structure, list of interests, and potential members.
   d. The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee, in consultation with the PAG, approves appointments and replacement of PAG representatives and alternates.

6.1.3 Responsibilities of PAG Representatives
   PAG representatives are responsible for:
   a. Providing input related to the Defined Goals (defined in Section 2);
   b. Being prepared, informed and ready for meetings;
   c. Requesting of the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee an advisor to provide information when the PAG considers this necessary;
   d. Acting as a liaison between the PAG and others from the interest area they are representing;
   e. Assuming responsibility towards reaching consensus on recommendations to the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee;
   f. Attending meetings. It is recognized that PAG representatives may miss some meetings due to the nature of their work or other activities;
   g. Informing their alternate and the facilitator if unable to attend a PAG meeting. If a PAG representative misses more than two consecutive meetings without a valid reason and without notifying his/her alternate and the facilitator, the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee may, based on consultation with the PAG, replace or remove that representative;
   h. Ensuring that the alternate is informed, up-to-date and prepared prior to the alternate participating in a PAG meeting. This includes providing the alternate with a past meeting summary in a timely, effective fashion; and
   i. Providing their input on upcoming agenda items when they are aware that they will be absent from a PAG meeting. They may provide their information to another PAG member or the Mackenzie PAG Steering
Committee to present at the PAG meeting or forward it in writing to the facilitator who will then provide to the Mackenzie PAG Steering Committee or a specified PAG member to present at the meeting.

6.1.4 Responsibilities of PAG Alternates
An alternate may be appointed for each PAG representative. The PAG alternate is responsible for:
   a. Attending PAG meetings on behalf of the representative. When doing so, the alternate agrees to work according to the Terms of Reference; and
   b. Coming informed, up-to-date, and prepared for discussions and decision-making based on briefings by the representative when attending on behalf of the representative.

6.2 Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee
The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee is responsible for:
   a. Providing and clarifying information to the PAG as related to the Defined Goals. Where possible, this material will be provided in advance of the meeting;
   b. Providing the PAG with necessary and reasonable human, physical, financial, information and technological resources;
   c. Where possible, informing the PAG (via the agenda) of any advisor attending a meeting;
   d. Not participating in reaching consensus on recommendations by the PAG;
   e. Considering and responding to the recommendations of the PAG;
   f. Making decisions regarding sustainable forest management and certification; and
   g. Preparing the PAG meeting agendas and summaries.

6.3 Advisors
The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will invite advisors, as required, to provide technical information and advice to the PAG. These advisors could be from government agencies, professional organizations, academia, consulting firms, or other sources. Advisors are responsible for:
   a. Providing and/or clarifying technical or legal information as requested; and
   b. Not participating in reaching consensus on recommendations by the PAG.

6.4 Observers
The public is welcome to participate in discussions at PAG meetings. They may not participate in reaching consensus on recommendations by the PAG.

6.5 Facilitator
The PAG facilitator is responsible for:
   a. Ensuring that PAG meetings address the agreed-upon agenda items;
   b. Starting and ending meetings at the times stated in the agenda;
   c. Managing and implementing the Terms of Reference, including the appropriate participation of the PAG, the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee, advisors, and observers;
d. Enabling equitable opportunity by all PAG representatives (or in their absence, their alternates) to participate in the meetings;

e. Working to clarify interests and issues, and help the PAG build recommendations;

f. Not participating in reaching consensus on recommendations by the PAG;

g. Distributing the agenda prior to each PAG meeting; and

h. Distributing the PAG meeting summaries following each PAG meeting.

7. **Conflict of Interest**

The PAG recognizes that a conflict of interest could occur if there is a potential for a representative (or his or her alternate) to personally and directly benefit from specific recommendations from the PAG. Therefore, if a PAG representative or alternate has a perceived or real conflict of interest that could result in a potential exclusive personal economic benefit in relation to his or her input to the Defined Goals, that representative or alternate, other PAG representatives and alternates, or a member of the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee must state the potential conflict. The PAG and the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will then decide on what actions are needed.

Potential actions could include asking the representative or alternate to:

a. Serve as an observer for the relevant specific issue(s) and recommendation(s);

b. Take a leave from the PAG (length of term to be defined); or

c. Carry on with normal participation.

8. **Operating Guidelines**

8.1 **Meetings Guidelines**

All participants in this process agree to:

a. Arrive on time;

b. Be prepared for each meeting;

c. Follow the speakers list;

d. Be respectful;

e. Be concise; and

f. Stay on topic.

8.2 **Meeting Agenda and Schedule**

The meeting agenda and schedule may change if agreed to by the PAG and Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee.

8.2.1 **Meeting Agenda**

a. Meeting agendas will address the needs of the SFMP and CSA requirements.

b. The PAG may provide input to meeting agendas during each meeting.

c. The agenda will include proposed objectives for the meeting.
8.2.2 Meeting Schedule
   a. The PAG and Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will agree upon meeting dates.
   b. Meetings will be held as needed to monitor and review the SFMP.

9. Decision Making and Methodology
   a. Anyone attending PAG meetings may participate in the discussions. However, only representatives will
      participate in making decisions, that is, recommendations to the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee.
   b. The PAG agrees to work by consensus. Consensus is defined as no PAG representative substantially
      disagreeing on an issue and being willing to proceed to the next step. The PAG will work to identify the
      underlying issues, seek compromise, identify alternatives, and clarify information. The PAG shall make
      every effort to achieve consensus in a positive and respectful manner, and commits to arriving at the best
      solution possible.
   c. The PAG will not revisit past decisions unless the PAG representatives agree to do so.
   d. A quorum for any meeting of the PAG shall be greater than 50% of the average number of PAG
      representatives attending the past five (5) meetings.

10. Dispute Resolution Mechanism

10.1 Process Issues
    The facilitator will resolve process issues.

10.2 Technical Issues
    a. Where an impasse is reached, the representation(s) with the outstanding issue shall offer solutions or
       options for resolution.
    b. If the impasse remains, the generally agreed-upon decision, along with the dissenting view(s), will be
       forwarded to the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee.

11. Review and Revisions
    The PAG and Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will review and agree upon the Terms of Reference at least
    annually.

Approved:
   Public Advisory Group          Date: January 31, 2006
   Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee Date: January 31, 2006

Revised:
   Public Advisory Group          Date: February 23, 2011
   Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee Date: February 23, 2011
Appendix A

Map of the Defined Forest Area (DFA)
Appendix B
Public Advisory Group Sectors

Academia
Agriculture/Ranching
Contractors – Forestry
Environment/Conservation
First Nations
General Public
Germansen Landing
Labour – CEP
Labour – PPWC
Local Government
McLeod Lake Indian Band
Mining/Oil & Gas
Noostel Keyoh
Public Health & Safety
Recreation – Commercial
Recreation – Non-commercial
Recreation – Non-commercial (motorized)
Saulteau First Nations
Small Business – Germansen Landing
Small Business – Mackenzie
Small Community
Trapping
West Moberly First Nations
Woodlot

Approved:
Public Advisory Group Date: January 31, 2006
Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee Date: January 31, 2006

Revised:
Public Advisory Group Date: February 23, 2011
Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee Date: February 23, 2011

2 This sector is open to allow participation of any First Nations person wishing to contribute
A quorum for any meeting of the PAG shall be greater than 50% of the average number of PAG members attending the past five (5) meetings. (Mackenzie PAG TOR wording February 10, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PAG members present</th>
<th>Quorum required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28, 2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28, 2006</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28, 2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13, 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Completed PAG Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 2010</td>
<td>PAG Meeting #22 Review Annual Report Indicator Refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2010</td>
<td>PAG Meeting #23 Indicator Refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 2011</td>
<td>PAG Meeting #24 Review Terms of Reference Canfor Biodiversity Strategy Presentation Indicator Refinement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Review Agenda
3. Evaluation Results (February 10, 2010)
4. Approve Minutes (February 10, 2010)
   - - - 12:00 Lunch - - - -
6. Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08)
   - - - - 2:30 Break - - - -
7. Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08) (continued)
8. Other
   a.
9. Update on Actions
10. Expense Forms
11. Meeting Evaluation
12. Next Meeting

Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010 if you plan on attending this meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PAG Rep / Alt Observer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Scott Wolfe</td>
<td>Dwight Scott Wolfe</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Kollbrand</td>
<td>Kollbrand</td>
<td>Trap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Szikely</td>
<td>Szikely</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwen Koch</td>
<td>Ko</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Lambie</td>
<td>Yi Lambie</td>
<td>Fdg rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Briggs</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>P.D.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm Spivey</td>
<td>Spivey</td>
<td>PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td>Crosby</td>
<td>PAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Neumann</td>
<td>Neumann</td>
<td>canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Kallam</td>
<td>Kallam</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Beshears</td>
<td>Beshears</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Beshears</td>
<td>Beshears</td>
<td>Noted Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenah Demourenis</td>
<td>Demourenis</td>
<td>WMFNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Desjardains</td>
<td>Desjardains</td>
<td>WMFNV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Summary

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Advisory Group:</th>
<th>Steering Committee &amp; Advisors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Briggs</td>
<td>Stephanie Killam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Beshere</td>
<td>Josef Kollbrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Beshere</td>
<td>Vi Lambie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td>Aaron Snively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teena Demeulemeester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator &amp; Scribe:</th>
<th>Observers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.)</td>
<td>George Desjarlais - West Moberly First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Neumeyer - Canfor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome & Introductions

1. Members signed in.

2. Welcome by the Chair of the Steering Committee [Dan Szekely]. Dan has taken over Chair of the Steering Committee as of April 1, 2010.

3. George Desjarlais - West Moberly First Nation is attending as an observer. He will discuss with tribal council the opportunity if replacing his father, Max, as the Alternate for West Moberly First Nation.

4. Final versions of the Mackenzie SFM Plan (January 2010) were distributed to PAG representatives in attendance. Copies will be mailed to the other PAG members.

2. Confirmed agenda

1. Add “Core Indicators Presentation (Jason Neumeyer)” after Agenda Item #4 Approve Summary (February 10, 2010).

2. Agenda accepted as revised.


   a. Evaluation results for February 10, 2010 were reviewed.

   b. All results from the February 10, 2010 meeting met or exceeded the target.

   c. Meeting comments were as follows:

   Your Suggestions

   • Communications – discussed during meeting and will be followed up.

1. PAG comment regarding the last BCTS External Audit.
   a. PAG member concerned that the BCTS audits only occur in the winter and miss the opportunity for field audits of summer operations.
   b. It was noted by BCTS that there is a summer audit that looks at other aspects of SFM.

2. Summary of the February 10, 2010 meeting accepted as written.

5. Core Indicators

1. Jason Neumeyer gave a presentation to the PAG on the new Core Indicators that are a requirement of the revised CSA SFM standard (Z809-2008). Jason is the Coordinator of all SFM Plans for Canfor and is based in Quesnel.
   a. Currently there are 14 different SFM Plans within Canfor that are based on several different frameworks. These plans contain hundreds of different indicators.
   b. Since 2007 Canfor has been working with the different PAGs to streamline and standardize the indicators across Canfor’s operations. Canfor intends to incorporate the new Core Indicators where possible into the SFM plans while the plans are being re-written to the new CSA standard. Most of the Core Indicators align with the current SFM plan indicators. There is “room” for Defined Forest Area (DFA)-specific indicators.
   c. Canfor will continue to maintain different SFM plans.

2. Discussion:
   a. PAG members were encouraged to see that corporately, Canfor is recognizing that there are differences in each DFA and community.


Darwyn Koch and Dan Szekely provided a review of the draft 2009-2010 Annual Report. This is the first Annual Report based on the consolidated suite of SFM indicators approved by the PAG last fiscal year.

1. The Draft Annual Report was distributed and will soon be available on the BCTS Website:
   http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/ftp/TPG/external/?publish/SFMS/Mackenzie_SFMP/Annual%20Report/

2. Executive Summary (pg 7):
   a. 40 indicators were met; 5 indicators not met.
3. Indicators not met included:
   a. Indicator 12 - Road re-vegetation (pg 14)
      i. Canfor met the target.
      ii. BCTCS has not met this indicator for the past 3 years. This is primarily due to incorrect wording in their Forest Stewardship Plan which states that BCTCS will grass seed (re-vegetate) all disturbance areas, regardless of risk. The Forest Stewardship Plan was amended in February of 2009 to remove this onerous requirement to re-vegetate. Unfortunately this amendment to the FSP has not been approved as of April 2010. Once the amendment is approved BCTCS will be meeting this indicator.
      iii. PAG noted that invasive plants are present in the DFA and could be managed with grass seeding.
   b. Indicator 19 - Site Index (pg 17)
      i. This indicator measures a predicted Site Index (SI) by subzone and leading species based on the forest inventory, and compares the site index at free growing, which is based off SIBEC estimates. SIBEC is an acronym for site index estimates for tree species according to site units of the Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification system of British Columbia.
      ii. The LSC questions the validity of this indicator in terms of measuring SI performance. There are few ground samples in the Mackenzie District to support these statistics. This makes it very hard to reconcile with the SI. The LSC is not able to fine-tune the data to include more samples from the Mackenzie District.
      iii. In 2010, the LSC will propose to the PAG to either amend the variance downward for this indicator, or propose to remove this indicator from the SFMP since it is not a core indicator under the new standard.
   c. Indicator 22 - Communication of planned Deactivation Projects (pg 19)
      i. Canfor met this indicator.
      ii. BCTCS did not meet this indicator. The details around this new indicator did not materialize through the PAG process until late fall or early winter of 2009. By this time all of BCTCS’ 4 deactivation projects were completed. For the 2010 deactivation projects, BCTCS sent out referral letters to First nations and overlapping stakeholders in February of 2010. Systems have been put into place to ensure that future deactivation projects are referred to First Nations and Stakeholders.
   d. Indicator 26 – Harvest Volumes (pg 21)
      i. BCTCS Mackenzie failed to meet this indicator due to the local processing facilities being closed for the past 2 years. This has had a huge impact on BCTCS' ability to sell wood
in Mackenzie. With the local forest industry starting to get back on track, BCTS expects their ability to sell wood in Mackenzie will increase slightly for the 2010-2011 reporting year. Until the sawmills are on 2 or 3 shifts, BCTS will not likely be able to meet this indicator since the volume requirements can be satisfied with the Licensee quota volumes. The success of BCTS meeting this target is, in part, largely dependent on the increase in local and regional sawmill production.

ii. Canfor failed to meet this indicator due to the recent curtailments and the re-configuration of the sawmill operations. The Canfor Mackenzie operation has been reduced to one sawmill with a projected annual consumption of approximately 750,000m³. Under this scenario, it will not be possible for Canfor to meet this indicator as currently presented.

iii. A proposal will be made to the PAG to increase the variance in order to make this indicator achievable under current conditions.

e. Indicator 33 - Representation (PAG) (pg 25)

i. The LSC has not been able to meet this indicator for the past 3 reporting years. This is due largely in part to high number of sectors in the PAG Terms of Reference that are duplicate or irrelevant.

ii. At the February 10th, 2010 PAG meeting, the LSC proposed to the PAG to revise the indicator by either changing the variance, by reducing the number of sectors to a realistic and representative list, or by changing the PAG representation from sector based to interest based (a number of interests represented by each PAG member). All of these ideas were not fully accepted by the PAG, and the LSC was tasked with providing rationale why certain sectors should be removed from the list and provide this at a later meeting in the 2010 reporting year.

4. Some highlights from measures met included:

   a. This report was easier to prepare due to the downsizing of the SFM Plan.
   b. There are no longer any Pending Indicators.
   c. Auditors are pleased with the direction of the SFM Plan.

**Action Item #1:** PAG members to provide comments on the draft Annual Report to the Facilitator by July 2, 2010.

7. **Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08)**

   Dan informed the PAG that the goal is to have a new SFM plan completed to the new standard by the end of 2011.

   1. Specific Changes to Indicators
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a. Indicator 46 (new) - Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broad leaf, treed mixed) >20 years old across DFA. Target: Maintain the baseline ranges and distribution into the future. Variance: to be determined.

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion

• LSC Comments: This is a core indicator under the new standard. Groups are defined as treed conifer = >75% conifer leading; treed broadleaf = >75% broadleaf leading; treed mixed = neither species leading but still treed.
• PAG members have concerns about the amount of dead pine and the presence/absence of a treed understory.
• PAG concern about the deciduous partition in the allowable annual cut (AAC). BCTS has a deciduous partition and are only targeting stands with low coniferous content.
• PAG concern about logging in birch-leading stands. Licensees should not be targeting birch stands. There has been a limited amount of birch planting in the past.
• PAG members wondered if the deciduous licensees are part of the SFM Plan. Currently, they are not as the SFM Plan is specific to Canfor and BCTS Defined Forest Areas. PAG concern that we are now facing multiple licensees in the District that are not part of the DFA. Many licensees do not have SFM Plans.
• PAG requested that a MoFR representative attend a future PAG meeting and explain the overlapping tenures and the potential impact to the SFM Plan.
• The Community Forest can become signatory to the SFM Plan if they wish.

iii. General Agreement on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the SFM Plan with one abstention.

• Reason for abstention: did not participate in the discussion.

b. Indicator 47 (new) - Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use. Annually, 100% conformance with the standards. Variance: 0%

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion

• LSC Comments: This indicator was in the original Mackenzie SFMP and was removed, however, the new standard speaks to a core indicator which would be satisfied by this statement. Chief Foresters Standards for Seed Use
• Canfor and BCTS have a legally binding commitment to meet provincial regulations. The indicator will now meet the CSA Standard’s requirement for an indicator of Genetic Diversity.

iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the SFM Plan.

c. Indicator 48 (new) - Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans. Target: No non-compliances for site level plans. Variance: 0

i. LSC Recommendation: Combine 3 indicators into one for all non-timber objectives.

• Indicator 31 - The percentage of forest operations consistent with range requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans. Target: 100%. Variance: 0.

• Indicator 41 - The percentage of harvesting and road building operations consistent with visual quality requirements as identified in operational, tactical, and/or site plans. Target: 100%. Variance: 0.

• Indicator 42 – Percentage of blocks and roads harvested that coincide with identified resource features that are managed or protected. Target: 100%. Variance: -10%.

ii. Discussion

• LSC Comments: Mackenzie SFMP currently contains 3 indicators (#31 - range, #41 - visuals, #42 – resource features) which fall under this category. All are being monitored in a similar fashion.

• PAG concern that some non-timber benefits will get lost in the roll-up. Berry picking will be covered under a Core Indicator that will be presented to the PAG at a future PAG meeting.

• The LSC assured the PAG that all range requirements, visual quality requirements and resource features currently identified in the SFM Plan will be transferred into this new indicator. There is also flexibility to add additional non-timber benefits as they are identified.

iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to remove indicators #31, #41 and #42 from the SFM Plan and add Indicator #48 to the SFM Plan.

d. Indicator 26 Harvest Volumes

i. Existing Indicator Statement: Actual harvest volume compared to the apportionment across the DFA over each 5-year cut control period. Target: ≤100%. Variance: +/-10%.
ii. LSC Recommendation: Increase the variance to 50%. If the proposed variance is not realized, then BCTS would change how we are measuring this indicator.

iii. Discussion

- LSC Comments: Under the current circumstances and with the Canfor mill configuration in its present form, this indicator is unachievable for Canfor. Canfor’s AAC is 1,082,000 m³. The mill is capable of consuming approximately 750,000 m³ which is sourced from it’s own forest licence as well as BC timber sales, woodlots and other private sales. Intent of the indicator is achieved (ecological and social) wherever fibre is sourced. For BCTS, our ability to meet this target is currently based on the viability of the local sawmills. A more appropriate way to measure this for BCTS is to measure what we offer for sale as opposed to what is actually sold.
- PAG concern that setting target to -50% will allow Canfor to continue to undercut.

iv. PAG could not reach agreement on the LSC recommendation to increase the variance to -50% or any other combination. The LSC agreed to keep the indicator target and variance as currently written in the SFM Plan.

- Only three PAG representatives were comfortable with the LSC recommendation.
- On PAG member abstained stating that this was the wrong type of issue to cause a company to lose their certification.
- Four PAG members did not agree with changing the variance, stating the following reasons for not agreeing:
  - Canfor doesn’t have the processing facilities to meet the existing Apportionment so an increase in the variance could continue indefinitely
  - Don’t like the way this issue have been brought forward by the auditors. There are too many circumstances beyond the control of the licensee regarding their ability to meet this indicator.
  - This is (hopefully) the result of a temporary economic situation and it will turn around.

e. Indicator 27 Waste and Residue

i. Existing Indicator Statement: Percentage of blocks and roads harvested where estimated waste and residue is below allowable levels. Target: ≤100%. Variance: -20%

ii. LSC Recommendation: Remove this indicator from the SFM Plan.

iii. Discussion
• LSC Comments: This indicator is based on legislation created to encourage licensees to optimize the use of the fibre on a block through the potential imposition of penalties if certain benchmark levels of waste and residue are exceeded. The direction of government moving towards “cruised-based” sales will create more of an incentive to utilize the fibre since it’s being paid for up front. This indicator is also contradictory to the intent of Indicator #6 (Coarse woody debris).

• PAG concern that setting target to -50% will allow Canfor to continue to undercut.

iv. General Agreement with one dissention on the LSC recommendation to remove this indicator from the SFM Plan.
   ♦ Reason for dissention: Wants to see how close CWD and Waste & Residue are defined in the new legislation.

f. Indicator 19 Site Index
   
i. Existing Indicator Statement: *The percentage of standards units declared free growing that have measured site index values at or greater than pre-harvest site index. Target: 100%. Variance: -5%.*

ii. LSC Recommendation: Remove this indicator from the SFM Plan.

iii. Discussion
   
   • LSC Comments: The intent of this indicator is to ensure that site productivity is maintained over time. Unfortunately, the data that is available and that is being utilized to measure this indicator is not dependable and is not site-specific.

   • PAG concern that setting target to -50% will allow Canfor to continue to undercut.

iv. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to remove this indicator from the SFM Plan.

g. Indicator 33 Representation (PAG)
   
i. Existing Indicator Statement: *Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the TOR invited to participate in the PAG process. Target: 100%. Variance:0%.*

ii. LSC Recommendation: Update the TOR to remove sectors where representation has been unachievable or representation is covered by another similar sector. Increase variance to 20%?

iii. Discussion
   
   • PAG members questioned the value of having this indicator in the plan as the LSC is unable to achieve the target each year due to lapsed PAG members not attending meetings.
• PAG representatives suggested removing this indicator from the SFM Plan as it is not a Core Indicator in the new CSA Standard and there are other indicators to track public satisfaction with the process.

iv. PAG consensus on the recommendation to remove this indicator from the SFM Plan.

8. Other

No additional agenda topics.

9. Actions updated

See Action Table (below)


Action Item #2: Facilitator to contact Todd Walter at Green Energy to discuss their interest in participating in the Mackenzie SFM Process. Due: Next Meeting.


4. Action ID – Feb 10-01: Facilitator to modify future correspondence with PAG members to include the following: In the body of the email/letter, highlight key issues to be discussed at the meeting, also, make follow-up phone calls to PAG members to inform them directly about the issues being discussed at the meeting. Completed with recent round of phone calls reminding PAG representatives of the June 2 meeting. This action will now be a standard operating procedure for the Facilitator when organizing the meetings.

5. Action ID – Feb 10-01: Facilitator to contact lapsed PAG members by letter to inform them of their status, explain the process of replacement and ask if they can recommend new representatives for their interest area. Completed with letters to lapsed PAG representatives following the February 10, 2010 meeting. Letters were sent to the following individuals:

   a. Mary Anne Arcand (Public Health & Safety) – no response, therefore removed from the mailing list
   b. Bruce Bennett (Small Business – Mackenzie) – requested to remain on the PAG citing personal reasons for missing meetings.
   c. Jim Besheres (Noostel Keyoh) - requested to remain on the PAG citing personal reasons for missing meetings.
   d. Janet Besheres (Small Business – Germansen Landing) - requested to remain on the PAG citing personal reasons for missing meetings.
   e. Mike Broadbent (Recreation – Non-commercial (motorized)) - no response, therefore removed from the mailing list.
f. Tom Michael (Mining/Oil & Gas) - no response, therefore removed from the mailing list. Dave Forshaw has been approached about being the new representative to the PAG for this sector.

g. Nancy Perrault (Germansen Landing) – responded with a request to remain on the mailing list.

h. Ken Reierson (Agriculture/Ranching) - no response, therefore removed from the mailing list

i. Mary Reierson (Small Community) - no response, therefore removed from the mailing list

j. Vida Tattrie (Recreation – Non-commercial) - no response, therefore removed from the mailing list

10. **PAG Meeting Feedback (PAG questionnaire):** Mackenzie SFMP PAG questionnaire distributed, completed, and collected.

11. **Next meeting:**

    Tentatively scheduled for October 20, 2010

    10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

    Mackenzie Recreation Centre – Conference Room (2nd Floor)

    Agenda: Updating the Mackenzie SFM Plan
### 12. Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 29-03</td>
<td>Work with PAG representatives and others in the community to find new/replacement PAG representatives.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29-04</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of Green Energy participating in the Mackenzie SFM process.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27-03</td>
<td>Add a non-timber benefits issue to the Continuous Improvement Matrix.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>March 31, 2011.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10-01</td>
<td>Modify future correspondence with PAG members to include the following: In the body of the email/letter, highlight key issues to be discussed at the meeting, also, make follow-up phone calls to PAG members to inform them directly about the issues being discussed at the meeting.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>March 31, 2010.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10-02</td>
<td>Contact lapsed PAG members by letter to inform them of their status, explain the process of replacement and ask if they can recommend new representatives for their interest area.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>March 31, 2010.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10-03</td>
<td>Add clarification to Table 3 in the SFM Plan regarding the LRMP Resource Management Zone designations.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>March 31, 2010.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2-01</td>
<td>Provide comments on the draft Annual Report to the Facilitator.</td>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>July 2, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2-02</td>
<td>Contact Todd Walter at Green Energy to discuss their interest in participating in the Mackenzie SFM Process.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Review Agenda
3) Evaluation Results (June 2, 2010)
4) Approve Meeting Summary (June 2, 2010)
5) Audit Updates:
   a) Canfor Internal and External Forest Management System Audit Results
   b) BCTS Internal Audit Results
6) Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08)
    - - - 12:00 Lunch - - - -
7) Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08) (continued)
    - - - - 2:30 Break - - - -
8) Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08) (continued)
9) Other
   i)
10) Update on Actions
11) Expense Forms
12) Meeting Evaluation
13) Next Meeting

Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010 if you plan on attending this meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PAG Rep / Alt Observer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Wolfe</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Webb</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwyn Koch</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Publicover</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Saulteau First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Baigis</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>P.A.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi Lambie</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>PAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick McCardic</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Forsland</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Woodlot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Szely</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Summary

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Advisory Group:</th>
<th>Steering Committee &amp; Advisors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Briggs</td>
<td>Darwyn Koch - BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi Lambie</td>
<td>Dan Szekely - Canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Publicover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitator & Scribe:
Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.)

Observers:
Steve Webb – BCTS
Rick McCordic – BCTS
Dave Forshaw

1. **Welcome & Introductions**

1. Members signed in.
2. Welcome by the Chair of the Steering Committee [Dan Szekely].
3. Rick Publicover – is replacing Monica Rice as the Alternate for the Saulteau First Nation. Rick is the new Lands Manager.
4. Dave Forshaw is attending as an observer and is interested in being the new representative for the Mining/Oil & Gas sector. Dave has many years of local experience as a prospector in the Mackenzie area.
5. Steve Webb is attending as an observer. Steve is the Acting Timber Sale Manager for BC Timber Sales - Prince George Business Area
6. Rick McCordic is attending as an observer. Rick is a Practices Forester for BC Timber Sales - Prince George Business Area and is based out of Mackenzie.

2. **Confirmed agenda**

1. Add “PAG Membership Update” after Agenda Item #4 Approve Summary (June 2, 2010).
2. Add “Steve Webb Presentation” after Agenda Item #4 Approve Summary (June 2, 2010).
3. Agenda accepted as revised.

3. **Evaluation results for June 2, 2010.**

1. Evaluation results for June 2, 2010 were reviewed.
   a. All results from the June 2, 2010 meeting met or exceeded the target.
4. **Summary of the June 2, 2010 Meeting.**

Summary of the June 2, 2010 meeting accepted as written.

5. **PAG Membership Update**

Dave Forshaw was recognised by the PAG as the new Representative for the Mining/Oil & Gas sector.

6. **Steve Webb Presentation.**

Steve Webb provided a brief “state of the union” speech from his perspective as a BCTS Timber Sales Manager.

1. Not much has changed with the lumber markets in recent months. Markets are still slow in the United States. China markets have improved.

2. Steve is excited about prospects in Mackenzie with the recent mill start-ups. The new Mackenzie Fibre is looking to BCTS for their fibre requirements.

3. The BCTS mandate is for deliver the “right wood, to the right place, at the right time for the right price. Even so, profit margins are very slim on delivered logs.

4. BCTS has the same pressures as the rest of the industry but has a legislative mandate to be a net generator of revenue for the crown on an annual basis.

5. BCTS is responsible for silviculture activities once the block development and harvesting obligations are fulfilled by the Timber Sale License holder.

6. BCTS is committed to CSA SFM Certification in Mackenzie, Prince George and the Robson Valley. Currently, 2.2 million of 2.4 million cubic metres of BCTS apportionment in these three Timber Supply Areas is CSA Certified.

7. **Audit Updates**

1. Canfor Internal and External Forest Management System Audit
   a. Dan Szekely gave an update on recent internal and external audits. (Environmental Management System (EMS) – ISO 14001; Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) – CSA Z809-02; Chain of Custody (CoC) – PEFC)
   b. Internal Audit (conducted June 2010) findings related to the SFM Plan included:
      i. One Non-Compliance – Transportation of Dangerous Goods (Fuel). An uncertified fuel tank was identified.
      ii. One Minor Non-Conformity - All training required by contractor / sub-contractor staff could not be verified.
iii. One Opportunity for Improvement - Mackenzie Operations staff may wish to consider comments on several SFMP indicators contained in the report body.

iv. Best Practices - The Jan 2010 SFMP has several meaningful, descriptive and useful indicators/ targets that meet the intent of the Z809-08 standard.

c. External Audit: (conducted on July 30, 2010) findings related to the SFM Plan included:

i. Progress towards addressing previous OFI’s:
   • 2008-OFI-05 (overly-complex nature of the current Mackenzie SFM plan) - the Mackenzie SFM plan has now been revised to address this finding. The current SFM plan (dated January 2010) now contains 45 indicators (compared to more than 100 in the previous version), is easier to understand and employs the VOIT approach outlined in the CSA Z809 standard. OFI closed.

ii. No new non-conformities were identified.

d. Canfor recommended for re-registration to CSA Z809-02 (SFM), ISO 14001 (EMS) and PEFC Annex 4 Chain of Custody.

2. BCTS Internal Audit Results

a. Darwyn Koch gave an update on a recent internal audit (Environmental Management System (EMS) – ISO 14001; as well as the January 2010 version of the SFMP) that was conducted September 21-23, 2010.

b. Minor Non-Conformance:

i. Monitoring and Measurement: The audit found that two large logs (40 cm x 6 m) and smaller pieces of woody debris were found in a S4 stream at the wooden bridge deactivation site. The planting contractor failed to inspect their operations fully to address the crossing put in to allow ease of access for tree transfer and did not remove the crossing as required.

c. Opportunities for Improvement:


d. Good Practices:

i. Good work towards developing and implementing action plans.

ii. The development of the Licensee TOR.

iii. Rehab of block roads as a standard practice.
iv. The cedar tree, rare in the Mackenzie area, was noticed by a feller buncher operator and protected from damage.

v. The watershed Peak Flow calculator that Canfor and BCTS are using. And the use of the Sharepoint site for updating the depletions.

vi. BCTS Operational Requirements Spreadsheet used in Mackenzie for the 2009-2010 reporting period.

8. Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08)

1. Specific Changes to Indicators

a. Indicator 48 (new) - Percent of blocks meeting dispersed retention levels as prescribed in the site plan/logging plans. Target: 100%. Variance: 0.

   i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

   ii. Discussion

   • LSC Comments: This indicator is an important piece of the puzzle for implementation of the “biodiversity strategy”. Dispersed retention has been identified as one of the critical habitat elements for a particular suite of species. This indicator will provide a means of measuring the licensees’ performance as it relates to prescribed dispersed retention where applicable.

   iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the SFM Plan.

b. Indicator 49 (new) - Training in environmental and safety procedures in compliance with company training plans. Target: 100% of company employees and contractors will have both environmental and safety training. Variance: -5%

   i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

   ii. Discussion

   • LSC Comments: Sustainable forest management provides training and awareness opportunities for forest workers as organizations seek continual improvement in their practices. Investments in training and skill development generally pay dividends to forest organizations by way of a safer and more environmentally conscious work environment. Assessing whether forest contractors have received both safety and environmental training is a direct way of measuring this investment. Additionally, training plans should be in place for employees of the forest organizations who work in the forest. Measuring whether the training occurred in accordance with these plans will confirm an organizations commitment to training and skills development. This is a core indicator under the new standard. Company employees refers to members of the woodlands staff.
• PAG Member asked about third party employees associated with Log Purchase Agreements (eg. Community Forests) The LSC stated that third party employees associated with Log Purchase Agreements were not included.

• PAG asked why the variance was set at -5% given that the indicator related to training in environmental and safety procedures. The LSC stated that the variance is required to account for new hires that may not receive training during the reporting period. Especially with contractors there may be a lag with EMS training. Training is mandatory and employees cannot opt out.

• PAG would prefer to see the variance apply to new hires only. The LSC noted that the annual report would capture the detail of what happened if target is not met. LSC would like to have a variance in place while this indicator is implemented and monitored over the next few years. PAG would like to see the reporting detail if the annual result is less than 100% but still within the variance.

• PAG suggested edits to the wording of the Indicator and Target to include “licensee”

iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the SFM Plan as revised: Training in environmental and safety procedures in compliance with company / licensee training plans. Target: 100% of company / licensee employees and contractors will have both environmental and safety training. Variance: -5%

c. Indicator 50 (new) - Maintain the level of direct and indirect employment. Target: Employment multiplier? Current levels? Variance: -5%

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion

• LSC Comments: The LSC propose that current employment levels be determined and that this figure be utilized as a baseline with an appropriate variance. This is a core indicator under the new standard.

• PAG is interested in knowing how the local economy is doing.

• The LSC looked at the 2006 Census but the information was compiled prior to the economic downturn.

• BCTS estimates of local direct / indirect employment levels

  ♦ Four Logging contractors with approximately 15 people each is 60 full time equivalents (FTE’s). Planting contractors add approximately 12.5 FTE’s (1 contractor with 100 employees working 1.5 months). A total of 117 FTE’s

• Canfor estimates of local direct / indirect employment levels
♦ 265 FTE’s on 1.1 million m³ apportionment is approximately 0.2FTE per 1000 m³.

• Canfor and BCTS will have separate targets and reporting will be based on a 5-yr rolling average. The variance will be shown as a percentage.

• The LSC is aware of the potential for double-accounting if Canfor buys logs from BCTS.

iii. PAG could not reach agreement on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the plan until such time as Canfor and BCTS have prepared targets and variances that reflect the current economic situation in Mackenzie

Action Item #1: LSC to revisit Indicator 50 with PAG with recommended targets and variances. Due: Next Meeting.

d. Indicator 51 (new) - The number of stakeholders and members of the public who took part in an educational opportunity. Target: 50. Variance: -10

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion

• LSC Comments: The participating licensees are committed to working with directly affected stakeholders and members of the public on forest management issues and have a well-established history of participation in community meetings, including local planning processes. The sharing of knowledge and contributes to informed, balanced decisions and plans acceptable to the majority of public. When informed and engaged, members of the public can provide local knowledge and support that contributes to socially and environmentally responsible forest management. This is a core indicator under the new standard.

• LSC plans to estimate participation at School Tours, Open Houses and Trade Shows.

• PAG suggested changing the target to >50

iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the SFM Plan as revised: The number of stakeholders and members of the public who took part in an educational opportunity. Target: >50. Variance: -10

e. Indicator 52 (new) - % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes. Target: 100%. Variance: 0

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion
• Due to only one First Nation’s representative being in attendance, the PAG agreed to defer discussion of this indicator to the next meeting and circulate the draft indicator to First Nations representatives in advance.

f. Indicator 53 (new) - *Employees will receive First Nations awareness training. Target: 100%. Variance: -5%.*
   i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.
   ii. Discussion
       • Due to only one First Nation’s representative being in attendance, the PAG agreed to defer discussion of this indicator to the next meeting and circulate the draft indicator to First Nations representatives in advance.

**Action Item #2:** Facilitator to distribute Indicators 52 and 53 to PAG prior to next meeting, solicit comment and encourage attendance. Due: Next Meeting.

9. **Other**
   No additional agenda topics.

10. **Actions updated**
    See Action Table (below)
       Action ID – June2-02: Ongoing.

11. **PAG Meeting Feedback (PAG questionnaire):** Mackenzie SFMP PAG questionnaire distributed, completed, and collected.

12. **Next meeting:**
    Scheduled for February 23, 2011
    10:00 AM – 4:00 PM
    Mackenzie Recreation Centre – Conference Room (2nd Floor)
    Agenda: Updating the Mackenzie SFM Plan
**13. Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 29-03</td>
<td>Work with PAG representatives and others in the community to find new/replacement PAG representatives.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29-04</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of Green Energy participating in the Mackenzie SFM process.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27-03</td>
<td>Add a non-timber benefits issue to the Continuous Improvement Matrix.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>March 31, 2011.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2-01</td>
<td>Provide comments on the draft Annual Report to the Facilitator.</td>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>July 2, 2010</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2-02</td>
<td>Contact Todd Walter at Green Energy to discuss their interest in participating in the Mackenzie SFM Process.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20-01</td>
<td>Revisit Indicator 50 with PAG with recommended targets and variances.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20-02</td>
<td>Distribute Indicators 52 and 53 to PAG prior to next meeting, solicit comment and encourage attendance.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Review Agenda
3) Evaluation Results (October 20, 2010)
4) Approve Meeting Summary (October 20, 2010)
5) Audit Updates:
   a) BCTS External Audit Results
6) Terms of Reference Review
7) Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08)
   a) Proposed targets for Indicator 46 (percent distribution of forest type)
   b) Proposed targets for Indicator 50 (maintain the level of direct and indirect employment).
- - - 12:00 Lunch - - - -
8) Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08) (continued)
   a) Criterion 6 – Society’s Responsibility
- - - - 2:30 Break - - - -
9) Presentation on Canfor’s Biodiversity Strategy by Jim McCormack (SFM Coordinator, Canfor Houston).
10) Other
   i)
11) Update on Actions
12) Expense Forms
13) Meeting Evaluation
14) Next Meeting

Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011 if you plan on attending this meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PAG Rep / Alt Observer / SC / Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Scott Wolfe</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Pucihar</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryn Kich</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Suckel</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McCormack</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Forshaw</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Napier</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Klemm</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Bever</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Memmott</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>WMFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Gautreau Steele</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>SFU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Summary

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Advisory Group:</th>
<th>Steering Committee &amp; Advisors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Briggs</td>
<td>Darwyn Koch - BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td>Dan Szekely – Canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teena Demeulemeester</td>
<td>Jim McCormack - Canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Forshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator &amp; Scribe:</th>
<th>Observers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.)</td>
<td>Stella Gauthier – West Moberly First Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome & Introductions

1. Members signed in.

2. Welcome by the Chair of the Steering Committee [Dan Szekely].

3. Jim McCormack is attending as an advisor. Jim is the SFMP Coordinator, Planning coordinator- South, CanFor - Forest Management Group.

4. Stella Gauthier is attending as an observer. Stella is a member of the West Moberly First Nations.

2. Confirmed agenda

1. Move Agenda Item #9 “Presentation on Canfor’s Biodiversity Strategy” to after Agenda Item #6 “Terms of Reference Review”.

2. Agenda accepted as revised.


1. Evaluation results for October 20, 2010 were reviewed.

   a. All results from the October 20, 2010 meeting met or exceeded the target.


   Summary of the October 20, 2010 meeting accepted as written.

5. BCTS External Audit Results, January 2011

1. Darwyn Koch gave a verbal update on the results of the recent BCTS External SFM Audit.

2. The Mackenzie DFA portion of the Audit found no issues. The Auditor noted that the current state of the SFM Plan was a highlight of the audit.
6. Terms of Reference Review.

1. PAG members reached consensus on the following changes to the Terms of Reference (changes and additions italicised):
   a. Date of Terms of Reference changed to “February 23, 2011”
   b. Deleted the word “measure” throughout the document.
   c. Updated the reference to the CSA Standard to “Z809-08” throughout the document.
   d. Section 3 Timelines: Words and dates added as follows:
      i. Plan updated and endorsed by the PAG January, 2010
      ii. Plan updated to the Z809-08 Standard and endorsed by the PAG December 31, 2011
      iii. estimated that the PAG meeting schedule would include 3–4 meetings per year
   e. Section 4.1.a Communication between the PAG and the Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee
      i. Revised the following sentence: “The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will ensure that the PAG meeting summaries are distributed to the PAG within one week.” New sentence reads: “The Mackenzie SFMP Steering Committee will ensure that the PAG meeting summaries are distributed to the PAG with the meeting notice.”
   f. Section 11 Revised:
      i. Dates changed to “February 23, 2011”.
   g. Appendix B Public Advisory Group Sectors
      i. Added “Recreation – Non-commercial (motorized)”
      ii. Deleted “Saulteau First Nation”
      iii. Added “Saulteau First Nations”
      iv. Deleted “West Moberly First Nation”
      v. Added “West Moberly First Nations”
      vi. Dates changed to “February 23, 2011”.

7. Presentation on Canfor’s Biodiversity Strategy by Jim McCormack (SFM Coordinator, Canfor Houston)

   a. Highlights:
      i. Canfor’s Vision for their Biodiversity Strategy is Ensuring a Consistent Supply of Fibre to our Highly Valued Customers through Cost Effective, Scientifically Credible Sustainable Forest Practices.
ii. Canfor has three (3) goals for their Biodiversity Strategy

- **Ecosystem Diversity** - Conserve ecosystem diversity at the stand and landscape level by maintaining the variety of communities and ecosystems that naturally occur in the DFA.

- **Genetic Diversity** - Conserve genetic diversity by maintaining the variation of genes within species and ensuring that reforestation programs are free of genetically modified organisms.

- **Species Diversity** - Conserve species diversity by ensuring that habitats for the native species found in the DFA are maintained through time, including habitats for known occurrences of species at risk.

iii. Jim McCormack described a variety of biodiversity strategies that go from coarse filter (landscape) scale to fine filter (stand) scale:

- **Ecosystem Representation**
- **Conservation of Protected Areas and Sites of Special Biological and Cultural Significance**
- **Landscape Structure**
- **Stand Structural Habitat Elements**
- **Species Accounting**

iv. Jim McCormack elaborated on the Species Accounting System (Generalist, Dependent, etc.) and the monitoring requirements.

v. Intent of the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy

- Maintain productive, well distributed populations of species in a defined management area.

- This will maintain the variation among individuals and species so that species will be able to persist in changing environments.

- The major strategies and indicators interact and encompass the complexity of the broad goal.

b. Discussion:

i. “Species” refers to both flora and fauna

ii. Species Accounting is based on Fred Bunnell’s research work at UBC.

iii. Baseline #’s will be developed through a series of species accounting projects.
iv. PAG member asked about culturally significant sites – who determines buffers on these sites? The LSC stated that site-specific features are managed based on detailed site-level plans. (eg. Trails – avoid or rehab post-harvest; or a spiritual site with a suggested 400 m buffer). The LSC is open to discussion with First Nations and working toward developing solutions.

v. PAG member asked about salmon populations and Sensitive Watershed Best Management Practices? Are species at risk tracked? The LSC stated that currently, the species accounting doesn’t include fish populations.

vi. PAG member feels that healthy fish populations need to be protected. The LSC noted that riparian management practices addresses fish habitat.

vii. PAG member asked about Bull Trout. Where do Bull Trout habitat areas come into play? The LSC noted that the government (MoE) are identifying Wildlife Habitat Areas (WHA’s) for species at risk (including Bull Trout) and developing management strategies.

viii. PAG member asked if songbird surveys been done in Mackenzie? The LSC noted that a project was implemented a few years ago.

ix. PAG wants to discuss fish populations and management strategies at a future meeting.

x. PAG member asked how do you know if the populations are there? The LSC stated that they rely on MoE species counts. The LSC would support future population survey work.

xi. The LSC stated that their Management Practices will be modified to assist species to recover. The key is to pick representative species for ecosystem groups and monitor over time.

xii. The LSC is open to input from public and FN on sensitive species and local changes in populations.

xiii. In the Mackenzie DFA, the LSC is starting to work on tying the species account to local management practices. In 2011 (subject to funding) the LSC will begin setting priorities and developing management strategies for species accounts in specific Ecosystem Groups.

xiv. PAG member asked how are you protecting pine for marten? Licensees and BCTS are not salvage logging all dead pine. It is important to understand the requirements of marten in the forest. Over time, population datasets will be completed to monitor effectiveness for key species.

xv. PAG requests an update on the roll-out of the Biodiversity Strategy.
**Mackenzie SFMP PAG Meeting Summary – February 23, 2011**

**Action Item 1:** LSC to provide an update on the roll-out of the Biodiversity Strategy. Due: June 2011.

**Action Item 2:** LSC to provide information on Species Accounting related to fish populations. Due: June 2011.

8. **Transitioning to the new CSA Standard (Z809-08)**

1. The new version of the CSA SFM Standard can be found at this link:
   
   [http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf](http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf)

2. Specific Changes to Indicators
   
   a. Indicator #48 – *Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans.*
      
      i. There were two indicators with #48 in the plan. This indicator is now Indicator 42.

   b. Indicator 52 (new) - *% of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes. Target: 100%. Variance: 0*
      
      i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.
      
      ii. Discussion:
         
         • PAG member asked what is the process if an issue is not done as per the First Nation request. What are the instances and the results? LSC stated that all interactions are tracked and recorded.
         
         • PAG member asked do Auditors ever go to the Stakeholders and ask for input? LSC stated that the Auditors do and the LSC will also request First Nations consultation during the Annual Plan review.
         
         • PAG member concerned that consultation does not happen with mineral claims.
         
         • PAG member requested that LSC be more proactive with mining stakeholders now that mining opportunities are increasing. LSC noted that new blocks and roads go out for public comment and that there is an issue with overlapping mineral claims.
         
         • PAG member noted that the West Moberly First Nations is in the process of developing their own suite of indicators based surveys within their communities.
         
         • PAG suggested revising the indicator to replace the word “considered” with “accommodated”. LSC was fine with this suggestion.

3. **Action Item #3:** LSC to look at including active mineral claim stakeholders to the list of affected stakeholders in relation to Indicators 34 and 35. Due: Next Meeting.
iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to add the revised Indicator # 52 (% of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses accommodated in forestry planning processes. Target: 100%. Variance: 0) to the SFM Plan.

c. Indicator 53 (new) - Employees will receive First Nations awareness training. Target: 100%. Variance: -10%.

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion:

• Canfor has an awareness program in place with a series of modules. Currently the training is a 1 or 2 day workshop. Canfor is looking at developing an on-line version.

• LSC to share information with WMFN and Sauteau through the planners at the Canfor operations. There is the potential for First Nations to access the training program and improve the content.

• PAG member asked a question regarding the -10% variance. Canfor and BCTS share a number of SFM Plans across the central interior and the variance relates to new employees being trained. Training will be mandatory for Forest Operations staff. Getting the program set up this summer for training in the fall of 2011. Training will be updated at least annually.

• PAG requested that the LSC provide a better definition of “employee” in the indicator detail sheet.

iii. PAG consensus on the LSC recommendation to add this indicator to the SFM Plan.

d. Indicator 46 (review) - Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broad leaf, treed mixed) >20 years old across DFA. Target: Maintain the baseline ranges and distribution into the future. Variance: to be determined.

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion

• LSC Comments: This indicator was endorsed by the PAG at the October 2010 meeting and the LSC was required to provide the baseline ranges and variances for PAG review at this meeting. Forest Types are defined as treed conifer = >75% conifer leading; treed broadleaf = >75% broadleaf leading; treed mixed = neither species leading but still treed.

• Recommended Targets and Variances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Type</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treed Conifer</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mackenzie SFMP PAG Meeting Summary – February 23, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Type</th>
<th>Percentage 1</th>
<th>Percentage 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treed Mixed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treed Broadleaf</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- LSC stated that the forest types are consistent with the natural forest types found in the area prior to industry development.

- This indicator will be on a 5-year reporting frequency. The current status table will be updated in 5 years with current area by Landscape Unit and 5-year status by Landscape Unit.

iii. PAG consensus on the recommended targets and variances for this indicator.

e. Indicator 50 (new) - *Maintain the level of direct and indirect employment. Target: Employment multiplier? Current levels? Variance: -5%*

i. LSC Recommendation: Add indicator to plan.

ii. Discussion

- LSC Comments: This indicator was endorsed by the PAG at the October 2010 meeting and the LSC was required to provide an appropriate target and variances for PAG review at this meeting.

- BCTS targets and variances
  - 95.5 Full – time Equivalent (FTE) jobs created annually
  - Indirect: Multiplier of 0.22 for each Direct FTE (based on Mackenzie Timber Supply Review 2000).

- Canfor targets
  - Direct: 278 FTE jobs created annually on 1.1 million m3 apportionment.
  - Indirect: Multiplier of 0.22 for each direct FTE (based on Mackenzie Timber Supply Review 2000)

- Both BCTS and Canfor will have a variance of -5% on each Direct and Indirect employment target.

- Reporting will be based on a 5-yr rolling average. The variance will be shown as a percentage.

iii. PAG consensus on the recommended targets and variances for this indicator.

9. Other

No additional agenda topics.
10. **Actions updated**

See Action Table (below)

5. Action ID – Oct 20-01: Indicator 50 reviewed and endorsed at this meeting. Action completed.
6. Action ID – Oct 20-02: Indicators 52 and 53 reviewed and endorsed at this meeting. Action completed.

11. **PAG Meeting Feedback (PAG questionnaire):** Mackenzie SFMP PAG questionnaire distributed, completed, and collected.

12. **Next meeting:**

Scheduled for June 8, 2011

10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Mackenzie Recreation Centre – Conference Room (2nd Floor)

Agenda: Annual Report review
### 13. Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 29-03</td>
<td>Work with PAG representatives and others in the community to find new/replacement PAG representatives.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29-04</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of Green Energy participating in the Mackenzie SFM process.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27-03</td>
<td>Add a non-timber benefits issue to the Continuous Improvement Matrix.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>March 31, 2011.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2-02</td>
<td>Contact Todd Walter at Green Energy to discuss their interest in participating in the Mackenzie SFM Process.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20-01</td>
<td>Revisit Indicator 50 with PAG with recommended targets and variances.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20-02</td>
<td>Distribute Indicators 52 and 53 to PAG prior to next meeting, solicit comment and encourage attendance.</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 23 - 01</td>
<td>Provide an update on the roll-out of the Biodiversity Strategy</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 23 - 02</td>
<td>Provide information on Species Accounting related to fish populations</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 23 - 03</td>
<td>Look at including active mineral claim stakeholders to the list of affected stakeholders in relation to Indicators 34 and 35.</td>
<td>Licensee Steering Committee</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Advisory Group
Summary of Comments from June 2, 2010 PAG meeting

Meetings
- None

Facilitator
- Very good

Meeting Logistics
- Kind of cold in the room
- Room was a little too cool.

Suggestions
- Ground level meeting place.
- Blankets?
- Everything good.
Public Advisory Group
Summary of Comments from October 20, 2010 PAG meeting

Meetings
• None

Facilitator
• None

Meeting Logistics
• None

Suggestions
• More of the members present
• Develop interest from all aboriginal groups
• Moderate heat
Public Advisory Group
Summary of Comments from February 23, 2011 PAG meeting

Meetings
• None

Facilitator
• Double side all papers...
• Some minor issues with the print materials

Meeting Logistics
• None

Suggestions
• Ensure that all stakeholders are given the information of work plans
• Move the meetings to Thursdays
• Working well
• Need better projector to help us old people see the screen
Using the following scale of 1-5, please evaluate the Mackenzie SFMP Public Advisory Group process.  

1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=average, 4=good, 5=very good

Meetings
Meetings had:
1. an agenda pre-published? _____
2. most members involved? _____
3. Steering Committee advisors prepared?  _____
4. followed the PAG Terms of Reference? _____
5. actions updated?  _____
6. time allocated wisely?  _____
7. decisions summarized?  _____
8. focus on consensus decision making?  _____
9. a positive atmosphere?  _____

Your overall satisfaction with the
10. amount & timing of information presented? _____
11. meetings _____
12. PAG process _____

Comments:____________________________________
_____________________________________________
_______________________________________

Facilitator
The facilitator:
1. strived for consensus decision-making? _____
2. kept the meeting focused? _____
3. kept the meeting moving?  _____
4. remained neutral on content issues?    _____
5. encouraged open communication?  _____
6. tolerated and addressed conflict?  _____
7. obtained technical expertise (when needed)?   _____
8. kept meeting records? _____
9. actively listened?  _____
10. came prepared and organized?  _____

Comments:____________________________________
_____________________________________________
_______________________________________

Meetings Logistics
1. Was the meeting location convenient? _____
2. Was the timing of the meeting convenient? _____
3. Was the meeting room adequate?  _____
4. Was the food and beverage good? _____

Comments:____________________________________
_____________________________________________
_______________________________________

Your Suggestions
Please list three things that the Steering Committee can improve upon for subsequent PAG meetings:
1. _______________________________________
2. _______________________________________
3. _______________________________________

General Comments (please write on back)
Please indicate who you are:
☐ Public  ☐ First Nation  ☐ Advisor  ☐ Observer  ☐ Other

□ Public  □ First Nation  □ Advisor  □ Observer  □ Other

Letters of Invitation

During the 2010-11 Fiscal Year there were no:

- Letters of Invitation
- Advertisements and Articles
# Mackenzie SFMP Public Advisory Group

(as of March 31, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector:</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Ranching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors – Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Conservation</td>
<td>Vi Lambie</td>
<td>Ryan Bichon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Tom Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germansen Landing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour – CEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour – PPWC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Stephanie Killam</td>
<td>Warren Waycheshen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Lake Indian Band</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lionel Chingee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining/Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td>Dave Forshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noostel Keyoh</td>
<td>Jim Besherse</td>
<td>Sadie Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation – Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation – Non-commercial</td>
<td>Aaron Snively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation – Non-commercial (motorized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulteau First Nations</td>
<td>Chief Harley Davis</td>
<td>Rick Publicover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business – Germansen Landing</td>
<td>Janet Besherse</td>
<td>Don Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business – Mackenzie</td>
<td>Bruce Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping</td>
<td>Lawrence Napier</td>
<td>Josef Kollbrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Moberly First Nations</td>
<td>Teena Demeulemeester</td>
<td>George Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlot</td>
<td>Ron Crosby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Chief Dolly</td>
<td>Takla Landing, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Chief Rena</td>
<td>Kitwanga, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beshersse</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Germansen Landing, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beshersse</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Germansen Landing, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bichon</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>McLeod Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botrakoff</td>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Prince George, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingee</td>
<td>Lionel</td>
<td>McLeod Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Chief Harley</td>
<td>Moberly Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeulemeester</td>
<td>Teena</td>
<td>Moberly Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Moberly Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forshaw</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Moberly Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izony</td>
<td>Chief Dennis</td>
<td>Prince George, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Prince George, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td>Sadie</td>
<td>Prince George, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killam</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch</td>
<td>Darwyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollbrand</td>
<td>Josef</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuzio, R.P.F.</td>
<td>Shaun</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mclean</td>
<td>Chief Rick</td>
<td>Telegraph Creek, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orr</td>
<td>Chief Derek</td>
<td>McLeod Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perreauilt</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Germansen Landing, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPWC (Local 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicover</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Chetwynd, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Chief Fred</td>
<td>Fort St James, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snively</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szekely</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vander Maaten</td>
<td>Judi</td>
<td>Mackenzie, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanSomer</td>
<td>Chief Donny</td>
<td>Prince George, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitford</td>
<td>Chief Ed</td>
<td>Wonowon, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willson</td>
<td>Chief Roland</td>
<td>Moberly Lake, BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 11, 2011

Chief Dolly Abraham
Takla Lake First Nation
General Delivery
Takla Landing, BC V0J 1T0

Dear Chief Abraham;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.

Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations’ focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Dennis Izony
Tsay Keh Dene Band
Apt. 11 - 1839 1st Ave.
Prince George BC V2L 2Y8

Dear Chief Izony;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.

Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Derek Orr
McLeod Lake First Nation
General Delivery
McLeod Lake, BC, V0J 2G0

Dear Chief Orr;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

- 5.2 Communities and Sustainability
- 6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested**: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Donny VanSomer
Kwadacha Band Office
#207 513 Aubau St.
Prince George, BC  V2M 3R8

Dear Chief VanSomer;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Ed Whitford
Halfway River First Nation
PO Box 59
Wonowon, BC V0C 2N0

Dear Chief Whitford;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Fred Sam  
Nak'azdli First Nation  
P.O. Box 1329  
Ft. St. James, BC  V0J 1P0  

Dear Chief Sam:

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.  
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie  

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability  
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

• Indicaor 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
• Indicaor 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:

http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.  

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Harley Davis
Saulteau First Nations
PO Box 330
Moherly Lake, BC V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Davis;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

- 5.2 Communities and Sustainability
- 6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Rena Benson  
Gitxsan Nation (Nii Kyap)  
PO Box 128  
Kitwanga, BC  V0J 2A0

Dear Chief Benson;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011. 
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability  
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.  
Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Richard Mclean  
Tahltan First Nation  
Box 46  
Telegraph Creek, BC  V0J 2W0

Dear Chief Mclean;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.  
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie  

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability  
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:

http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.  

**Action Requested**: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Chief Roland Willson
West Moberly First Nation
PO Box 90
Moberly Lake, BC V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Willson;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Dolly Abraham
Takla Lake First Nation
General Delivery
Takla Landing, BC  V0J 1T0

Dear Chief Abraham;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Dennis Izony
Tsay Keh Dene Band
Apt. 11 - 1839 1st Ave.
Prince George BC  V2L 2Y8

Dear Chief Izony;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Derek Orr
McLeod Lake First Nation
General Delivery
McLeod Lake, BC, V0J 2G0

Dear Chief Orr;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Donny VanSomer
Kwadacha Band Office
#207 513 Aubau St.
Prince George, BC  V2M 3R8

Dear Chief VanSomer;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Ed Whitford
Halfway River First Nation
PO Box 59
Wonowon, BC  V0C 2N0

Dear Chief Whitford;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Fred Sam  
Nak’azdli First Nation  
P.O. Box 1329  
Ft. St. James, BC  V0J 1P0

Dear Chief Sam;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.  
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

1.1 Ecosystem Diversity  
5.2 Communities and Sustainability  
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Harley Davis  
Saulteau First Nations  
PO Box 330  
Moberly Lake, BC  V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Davis;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.  
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

1.1 Ecosystem Diversity  
5.2 Communities and Sustainability  
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Rena Benson
Gitxsan Nation (Nii Kyap)
PO Box 128
Kitwanga, BC V0J 2A0

Dear Chief Benson;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/5Crepository5Cgroup5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Richard Mclean
Tahltan First Nation
Box 46
Telegraph Creek, BC   V0J 2W0

Dear Chief Mclean;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Chief Roland Willson  
West Moberly First Nation  
PO Box 90  
Moberly Lake, BC  V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Willson;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.  
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity  
5.2 Communities and Sustainability  
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Dolly Abraham
Takla Lake First Nation
General Delivery
Takla Landing, BC V0J 1T0

Dear Chief Abraham;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Dennis Izony  
Tsay Keh Dene Band  
Apt. 11 - 1839 1st Ave.  
Prince George BC  V2L 2Y8

Dear Chief Izony;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.  
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Derek Orr
McLeod Lake First Nation
General Delivery
McLeod Lake, BC, V0J 2G0

Dear Chief Orr;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Donny VanSomer
Kwadacha Band Office
#207 513 Aubau St.
Prince George, BC V2M 3R8

Dear Chief VanSomer;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Ed Whitford
Halfway River First Nation
PO Box 59
Wonowon, BC V0C 2N0

Dear Chief Whitford;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Fred Sam
Nak’azdli First Nation
P.O. Box 1329
Ft. St. James, BC V0J 1P0

Dear Chief Sam;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Harley Davis
Saulteau First Nations
PO Box 330
Moherly Lake, BC V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Davis;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Jerry Asp
Tahltan First Nation
Box 46
 Telegraph Creek, BC   V0J 2W0

Dear Chief Asp;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Rena Benson  
Gitxsan Nation (Nii Kyap)  
PO Box 128  
Kitwanga, BC  V0J 2A0

Dear Chief Benson;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.  
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Roland Willson  
West Moberly First Nation  
PO Box 90  
Moberly Lake, BC  V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Willson;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.  
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
August 23, 2010

Chief Fred Sam  
Nak'azdli Band Council  
PO Box 1329  
Fort St. James, BC  
V0J 1P0

Dear Chief Fred Sam,

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010  
Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

Chief Donny Van Somer
Kwadacha Band Council
#207 Ahbau Street
Prince George, BC
V2M 3R8

Dear Chief Donny Van Somer,

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
     Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

Chief Dennis Izony
Tsay Keh Dene Band Council
#11 – 1839 1st Avenue
Prince George, BC
V2L 4Y8

Dear Chief Dennis Izony,

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
     Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

Chief Dolly Abraham
Takla Lake Band Council
General Delivery
Takla Landing, BC
V0J 2T0

Dear Chief Dolly Abraham,

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
     Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

Halfway River First Nation
PO Box 59
Wonowon, BC
V0C 2N0

Dear Chief Ed Whitford;

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

McLeod Lake Indian Band
General Delivery
McLeod Lake, BC
V0J 2C0

Dear Chief Derek Orr;

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
     Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

West Moberly First Nation
PO Box 90
Moberly Lake, BC
V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Roland Wilson;

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
  Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
August 23, 2010

Saulteau First Nation
PO Box 1020
Chetwynd, BC
V0C 1J0

Dear Chief Harley Davis;

Attached are the approved copies of the newly revised Canfor/BCTS Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and 2009/2010 Annual Report. Based on the hard work completed by the Public Advisory Group (PAG) in 2009, a large number of revisions have been made to the SFMP both in format and content. The intent of this work was to develop a plan that was more comprehensible and manageable. We believe that we have achieved those objectives. The 2009/2010 reporting period is the first to be analyzed using the new plan indicators.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Darwyn Koch (BCTS) at 250-614-7416 or Dan Szekely (Canfor) at 250-997-2641.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

On behalf of the Mackenzie Licensee Steering Committee.

Encl: Mackenzie SFMP Version 10.1 - January 2010
      Mackenzie SFMP Annual Report 2009/2010
May 19, 2010

Chief Dolly Abraham
Takla Lake First Nation
General Delivery
Takla Landing, BC  V0J 1T0

Dear Chief Abraham;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Dennis Izony
Tsay Keh Dene Band
Apt. 11 - 1839 1st Ave.
Prince George BC  V2L 2Y8

Dear Chief Izony;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Derek Orr
McLeod Lake First Nation
General Delivery
McLeod Lake, BC, V0J 2G0

Dear Chief Orr;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
March 19, 2010

Chief Donny VanSomer  
Kwadacha Band Office  
#207 513 Aubau St.  
Prince George, BC V2M 3R8  

Dear Chief VanSomer;  

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.  

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie  

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:  
- A draft Agenda,  
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting  

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.  

Sincerely,  

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Ed Whitford
Halfway River First Nation
PO Box 59
Wonowon, BC V0C 2N0

Dear Chief Whitford;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:

- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Fred Sam  
Nak’azdli First Nation  
P.O. Box 1329  
Ft. St. James, BC  V0J 1P0

Dear Chief Sam;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:

- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.  
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.  
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Harley Davis
Saulteau First Nations
PO Box 330
Moberly Lake, BC V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Davis;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Jerry Asp
Tahltan First Nation
Box 46
Telegraph Creek, BC  V0J 2W0

Dear Chief Asp;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.  

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM  
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Rena Benson
Gitxsan Nation (Nii Kyap)
PO Box 128
Kitwanga, BC  V0J 2A0

Dear Chief Benson;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Chief Roland Willson
West Moberly First Nation
PO Box 90
Moberly Lake, BC V0C 1X0

Dear Chief Willson;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
MacPAG: The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011 (First Nation's-related Indicators)

Hi Folks,

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.

Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM

Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

- 5.2 Communities and Sustainability
- 6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new) % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new) Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report and pictures of the Cedar tree mentioned in the report.

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.
The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.

Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM

Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, February 18, 2011, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
February 11, 2011

Nancy Perreault
Bag 24
Germansen Landing, BC V0J 1T0

Dear Nancy:

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, February 23, 2011.
Time: 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the October 20 Mackenzie PAG meeting is also attached. At this meeting, we will continue transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

Two of the indicators to be reviewed have a First Nations' focus:

- Indicator 52 (new): % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes
- Indicator 53 (new): Employees will receive First Nations awareness training

Details on these indicators can be found in the attached document "Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators Feb 2011". For additional reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

For general interest, I am also attaching the recent BCTS Internal SFM Audit report.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Bruce Bennett
Box 955
Mackenzie, BC
V0J 2C0

Dear Bruce;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

**Action Requested:** Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
October 8, 2010

Nancy Perreault
Bag 24
Germansen Landing, BC
V0J 1T0

Dear Nancy;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:
1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard: http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
Hi Folks,

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, October 20, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM

Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Centre, Mackenzie

A draft agenda is attached. The draft summary of the June 2 Mackenzie PAG meeting has previously been distributed.

At this meeting, we will begin transitioning to the new CSA SFM Standard with a review of indicators for the following SFM elements:

1.1 Ecosystem Diversity
5.2 Communities and Sustainability
6.5 Information for Decision-Making

For reference, please refer to Section 6 - SFM Performance Requirements using the following link to the new version of the CSA SFM Standard:
http://www.csagroup.org/%5Crepository%5Cgroup%5CZ809-08.pdf

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, October 15, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

DSW

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager
Tesera Systems Inc. | Prince George, BC
T: 403.932.0445 Ext 5 | C: 250.614.3122
TFN: 1.866.698.8789 | F: 250.564.0393
Hi Folks,

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM

Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

DSW

--

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager
Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel
866.698.8789 toll free
250.564.0393 fax
www.tesera.com

Cochrane
403.932.0445 tel
403.932.9395 fax
Box 1078, Cochrane, AB, T4C 1B1

Prince George
250.614.3122 tel
250.564.0393 fax
Box 2130, Prince George, BC, V2N 2J6

This e-mail message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and is confidential, subject to
August 23, 2010

Bruce Bennett
Box 955
Mackenzie, BC
V0J 2C0

Dear Bruce;

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

A reminder that the next Mackenzie PAG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.
Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

Please mark this date in your calendar. An agenda will be sent out closer to the meeting date.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

[Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com]
August 23, 2010

Nancy Perreault
Bag 24
Germansen Landing, BC
V0J 1T0

Dear Nancy,

Here is the draft meeting summary from the June 2, 2010 Mackenzie PAG meeting.

Hope you are having a good summer.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
May 19, 2010

Bruce Bennett
Box 955
Mackenzie, BC
V0J 2C0

Dear Bruce;

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM
Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard. The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

Dwight Scott Wolfe
RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager, Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel, 866-698-8789 toll free, 250. 564.0393 fax, macpag@tesera.com
Hi Folks,

The next meeting of the Mackenzie PAG is Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Time: 10:00AM - 4:00PM

Location: Conference Room (2nd floor), Recreation Center, Mackenzie

At this meeting we will review the Mackenzie SFMP 2009/2010 Draft Annual Report and discuss transitioning to the new CSA Standard.

The following documents are attached:
- A draft Agenda,
- Draft Minutes from the February 10th Mackenzie PAG meeting

Action Requested: Please contact the facilitator, Dwight Scott Wolfe, (phone: 250-614-3122 or MacPAG@tesera.com) by noon on Friday, May 28, 2010, if you plan on attending this meeting.

Sincerely,

DSW

Dwight Scott Wolfe, RPF, Cert. ConRes.
Operations Manager
Tesera Systems Inc.
250.614.3122 tel
866.698.8789 toll free
250.564.0393 fax
www.tesera.com
Dear Dwight,

Thank you for your letter dated March 10/10. Yes I would like to receive the info from the PAG meetings so I can keep my binder up to date. I have not attended meetings as I have written before, because I don’t have the transportation. Also the last meetings were short notice to me. Not a complaint just a fact. I couldn’t have gone anyway.

I sure hope any representative for Germans live in Germany. They should also make it common knowledge that they have the PAG info available for viewing and any discussion or local input. Nobody has asked to see the PAG info I have, except when the meetings started. I still let all know it was available.

Lack of attendance has not been lack of interest. We are very interested in what happens around our areas. At least BCTS and Contra included us in the PAG. That is more than Abitibi did. I cannot see getting to the meetings. I would still like to receive all mail from at least the info that concerns here. I have received the IEP R pkg. It is in my binder. No I will not need to call. Any this will get to you late, but I got it on another mail to get this to you.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
PS. Let Germans know who the rep. will be.
The purpose of this matrix is to capture issues presented by PAG members that can contribute to the continuous improvement of sustainable forest management but are either outside the scope of the PAG process or cannot be addressed by Canfor (Mackenzie) and BCTS (Prince George Forest District) at the present time. These issues are to be reviewed at PAG meetings for further discussion and prioritization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Perf. Matrix Ref.</th>
<th>Description of Issue</th>
<th>Suggested Strategies</th>
<th>Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2-1.1</td>
<td>Develop baseline data for course woody debris.</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Recognize advances in carbon accounting and incorporate that information on course woody debris.</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-going – June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Examine possibility for measures associated with shrubs, snags, and large live trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consider opportunity for adding an indicator on forest product carbon pools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consider a new measure with carbon associated with slash burning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1-3.1</td>
<td>Consider a measure for management strategies from the Northern Caribou Recovery Action Plan as it is finalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Develop a measure to deal with pesticide use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9-2</td>
<td>Consider a measure for the management of visual quality areas recommended within the Mackenzie LRMP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9-1.2</td>
<td>Consider a measure for Canfor and BCTS to sponsor and maintain new recreation sites and rest areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>9-3 &amp; 1-4</td>
<td>BCTS and Canfor to solicit public for input on additional resource features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Develop a measure around road maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Develop a smoke management strategy in consultation with the local communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Develop a measure on dust control for road safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Develop a measure to protect domestic water intake and/or supply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>5-1 &amp; 9-1</td>
<td>An opportunity to incorporate marketed and non-marketed, non-timber values into one measure</td>
<td>Revisit Measures 5-1.1 and 9-1.1 and look at incorporating marketed and non-marketed, non-timber values into one Measure. September 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CANFOR - MACKENZIE/BCTS DEFINED FOREST AREA
### SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN
### SUSTAINABLE FOREST CRITERIA AND INDICATOR MATRIX

**A Framework for Sustainable Forest Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Version</th>
<th>Amended Version</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>PAG Approval Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2.11 Percent compliance with Chief Forester’s Standards for Seed Use.</td>
<td>Remove measure</td>
<td>Redundant – declaring a block stocked (2-3.1) means it must also be compliant with the Chief Forests’ Standard. Updates to SFMP text to refer to Chief Forester’s Standards for seed use.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.1 Percent of harvested blocks declared Stocked prior to the regeneration date.</td>
<td>Percent of harvested blocks declared Stocked prior to the regeneration date consistent with operational plans.</td>
<td>PAG request to maintain consistent wording.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5.1 Measured annually. Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis (Sept. 2006). Target combined between Canfor and BCTS.</td>
<td>Measured annually. Only fires &gt; 1ha recorded. Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis (Sept. 2006). Target combined between Canfor and BCTS.</td>
<td>Revised comment to reflect MoFR protection branch process for tracking hectares burned.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5.3 Percent compliance with Chief Forester’s Standards for Seed Use.</td>
<td>Remove measure</td>
<td>Redundant – declaring a block stocked (2-3.1) means it must also be compliant with the Chief Foresters’ Standard. Updates to SFMP text to refer to Chief Forester’s Standards for seed use.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.1 Taxes paid to governments.</td>
<td>Municipal taxes paid to government. GST and corporate tax tracked by head office, not by division. Not possible to assign taxes to division.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2.2 Website containing SFM information relevant to the Mackenzie SFMP is developed and updated.</td>
<td>Remove measure</td>
<td>PAG satisfied with material presented on Canfor and BCTS websites if invitation to join PAG included on site.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2.4 Measured annually. Will also post on public website.</td>
<td>Canfor and BCTS to update annually their respective webpages with current documents.</td>
<td>PAG amended comment to clarify intent to make documentation available to the public at least once per year.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Percentage of forest operations consistent with mutually agreed upon strategies developed with First Nations.</td>
<td>4-4.2 Percentage of forest operations consistent with mutually agreed upon strategies developed with First Nations.</td>
<td>Measure needed to be specific to strategies developed with First Nations as originally intended by PAG.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1.1 The percentage of harvest operations consistent with results or strategies as identified in operational plans, tactical plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>The percentage of harvest operations consistent with results or strategies for recreation values as identified in operational plans, tactical plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>Clarify that the measure is explicit to recreation values.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2.1 The percentage of forest operations consistent with visual quality requirements as identified in operational plans, tactical plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>The percentage of harvesting and road building operations consistent with visual quality requirements as identified in operational, tactical and/or site plans.</td>
<td>To be consistent with other measures.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2.2 Percentage of operations consistent with visually effective green-up buffer along roads as identified in the Mackenzie LRMP.</td>
<td>Percentage of harvest operations consistent with visually effective green-up buffer along roads as identified in the Mackenzie LRMP.</td>
<td>Specifying harvest operations limits harvesting without unduly isolating timber by restricting road ingress and silviculture activities are moot after harvesting.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3.1 Percent of identified resource features that are managed or protected.</td>
<td>Percent of identified unique and/or significant places and features of social, cultural or spiritual importance that are managed or protected.</td>
<td>Clarify that the measure is specific to the indicator.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3.2 Report out – dependent on list developed in 5-1.1 and report out by June 30, 2007.</td>
<td>Report out – dependent on list developed in 5-1.1 and report out by or before March 31, 2008.</td>
<td>Revised comment to reflect that report is to be completed in Fiscal 07/08.</td>
<td>28-Mar-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1.1 Percent area of old and mature-age forest by landscape unit group and BEC variant for CFLB within the DFA.</td>
<td>5-1.1 Percent area of old-age forest by landscape unit group and BEC variant for CFLB within the DFA.</td>
<td>Update the measure statement and the comments to reflect the requirements of the approved old growth order.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1.2 Percent of interior old forest by landscape unit group and BEC variant for CFLB within the DFA.</td>
<td>5-1.2 Percent of Interior old forest by landscape unit group and NT for CFLB within the DFA.</td>
<td>Update the measure statement and the comments to reflect the requirements of the approved old growth order.</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.5 Percent productive forest by BEC variant represented within the Non-harvestable land base.</td>
<td>Delete this measure because BEC variant is too coarse of a scale to be an effective measure of Biodiversity. PEM is a more appropriate tool to use, when it becomes available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2.5 Trend toward unmanaged species composition on managed stands by BEC zone on the THLB.</td>
<td>Delete this measure because the numbers indicate that managed stands at free growing have more species diversity than unmanaged stands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1.5 Variance between average preharvest and post harvest Site Index (at Free Growing) by inventory type group for cutblocks.</td>
<td>Delete this measure because stands at free growing are generally too short to use growth intercept as a measure of site index. For this reason, we rely on SI-BEC as the tool to use to estimate site index at free growing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.5 Trend toward unmanaged species composition on managed stands by BEC zone on the THLB.</td>
<td>Delete this measure because the numbers indicate that managed stands at free growing have more species diversity than unmanaged stands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5.2 Comments: Catastrophic change associated with forest health, global climate change, etc. Initial completion March 31, 2007.</td>
<td>2-5.2 Comments. This measure will concentrate on the ranked forest health factors identified in the the annual strategic forest health plan.</td>
<td>Refine the measure to concentrate efforts on the ranked forest health factors only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCFM Criterion</th>
<th>CSA SFM Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>FW Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>PAG Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

October 28, 2008

Version 2008.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCFM Criterion</th>
<th>CSA SFM Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>FW Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>PAG Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1. Ecologically distinct habitat types are represented in an unmanaged state in the DFA to sustain lesser known species and ecological function.</td>
<td>1-1.1 Percent area of old seral stage by landscape unit group and BEC group for CFLB within the DFA.</td>
<td>Targets as per the Mackenzie TSA Biodiversity Order.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canfor and BCTS to monitor BEC groups for recruitment areas when within 10% or within 1000 ha of target (whichever is less). Excludes parks which encompass whole Landscape Units.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar. 28, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1. Ecologically distinct habitat types are represented in an unmanaged state in the DFA to sustain lesser known species and ecological function.</td>
<td>1-1.2 Percent of interior old forest by landscape unit group and BEC group for CFLB within the DFA.</td>
<td>Targets as per the Mackenzie TSA Biodiversity Order.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excludes parks which encompass whole Landscape Units.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar. 28, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1. Ecologically distinct habitat types are represented in an unmanaged state in the DFA to sustain lesser known species and ecological function.</td>
<td>1-1.3 The amount of established landscape-level biodiversity reserves within the DFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, Protected Areas, Wildland RMZs, OGMAs, WHAs, UWR (List to be included in the SFMP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1. Ecologically distinct habitat types are represented in an unmanaged state in the DFA to sustain lesser known species and ecological function.</td>
<td>1-1.4 Hectares of unauthorized forestry-related harvesting or road construction within protected areas or established old growth management areas (OGMA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 ha</td>
<td></td>
<td>OGMAs to be established in Mackenzie TSA. Draft OGMAs are to be managed as if established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-1.5 Percent productive forest by BEC variant represented within the Non-harvestable land base.</td>
<td>Target to be established following analysis (Sept. 2006).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus - May 9, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.1 Percent area by patch size class by landscape unit group and Natural Disturbance Types.</td>
<td>Trend towards targets in LRMP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patch is combined areas of harvesting within 20 years of age that are generally within 400 metres of each other including unharvested areas in-between. Measured biannually.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar. 28, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.2 Percentage of cutblocks that exceed coarse woody debris requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal or requirements specified in operational plan. Measured annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.3 Percentage of cutblocks that meet or exceed wildlife tree patch requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal or requirements specified in operational and/or site plan. Measured annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.4 The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian management area requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2.5 Trend toward unmanaged species composition on managed stands by BEC zone on the THLB.</td>
<td>Target to be established following analysis (Sept. 2006).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area weighted percent species composition at free growing measured by inventory label for all stands declared FG within the reporting period. Measured annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.6 The percentage of forest operations consistent with approved provincial Caribou Ungulate Winter Range requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measured annually. Subject to adaptive management requirements of CSA and effectiveness monitoring (PAG comment request).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.7 The percentage of identified unnatural sediment occurrences where mitigating actions were taken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigating actions may include referral to appropriate party. Measured annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.8 Percentage of stream crossings appropriately designed and properly installed and/or removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.9 Percent of watersheds containing approved or proposed development with Peak Flow Index calculations completed</td>
<td>100% by Sept 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRMP 6.6</td>
<td>Consensus - Apr. 11, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>CI. Biological richness and its associated values are sustained in the defined forest area (DFA)</td>
<td>1-1.2 The amount, distribution, and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types, structure and elements important to biological richness are sustained.</td>
<td>1-2.10 Percentage of road construction or deactivation projects where prescribed revegetation occurs within 12 months of disturbance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>This will meet the LRMP requirement for reduction of noxious weeds. Revegetation may include grass seeding, willow cuttings, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFM Criterion</td>
<td>CSA SFM Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>FW Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator Measure</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 12 Percentage of planned roads that have an environmental risk assessment completed.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤10%</td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3.2 Percent of appropriate personnel trained to identify Species at Risk in the DFA.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤10%</td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3.3 Percent of Species at Risk in the DFA that have management strategies developed by April 2007.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Subject to adaptive management requirements of CSA and effectiveness monitoring (PAG comment request).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3.4 Percent LRMP Resource Management Zone (RMZ) specific wildlife species with management strategies by April 2007.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>The RMZ strategy is only applicable to the RMZs in which these species have been identified. Measured annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3.5 Percentage of forest operations consistent with Species at Risk in the DFA management strategies as identified in operational plans, tactical plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Commencing after April 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3.6 Percentage of forest operations consistent with LRMP Resource Management Zone (RMZ) specific wildlife species management strategies as identified in operational plans, tactical plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Commencing after April 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.2 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3.7 Report out on the annual results from the Mugaha Marsh bird banding station.</td>
<td>Report out on</td>
<td>Annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.4 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4.1 The amount of established landscape-level biodiversity reserves within the DFA.</td>
<td>≥ area set aside across the DFA.</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>Parks, Protected Areas, Wildland Resource Management Zones, OGMAs, WHAs, UWR (List to be included in the SFMP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.4 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4.2 Hectares of unauthorized forestry-related harvesting or road construction within protected areas or established old growth management areas (OGMA).</td>
<td>0 ha</td>
<td>0 ha</td>
<td>OGMAs to be established in Mackenzie TSA. Draft OGMAs are to be managed as if established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.4 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4.3 Percent of appropriate personnel trained to identify sites of biological significance in the DFA.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤10%</td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.4 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4.4 Percent of sites of biological significance that have management strategies developed by April 2007.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually. “Sites” refers to features that can be found in the field. Management strategies address types of sites, not necessarily specific sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.4 Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4.5 Percentage of forest operations consistent with sites of biological significance management strategies as identified in operational plans, tactical plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>Measured annually commencing after April 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 3 3.1 Environmental 2 2-1. The productive capability of forest ecosystems within the Timber Harvesting Landbase (THLB) is sustained. 2-1.1 Percentage of cutblocks that exceed coarse woody debris requirements. 100% 0% Legal or requirements specified in operation plan. Measured annually. Consensus - Feb. 28, 06

2-1.2 The percentage of forest operations consistent with soil conservation standards as identified in operational plans and/or site plans. 100% 0% Measured annually. Operational plan requirements are specific to each block based on soil hazard assessment. Consensus - Feb. 28, 06
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>PAG Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1.3</td>
<td>The percentage of forest operations consistent with terrain management requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Operational plan requirements are specific to each block based on terrain stability indicators.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb. 28, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1.4</td>
<td>The number of EMS reportable spills.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Measured annually. Report on spills and actions taken. EMS as per Canfor and BCTS (and listed in SFMP). Add definition of running water and applicability to standing water. Variance is combined between Canfor and BCTS.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar. 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1.5</td>
<td>Variance between average preharvest and post harvest Site Index (at Free Growing) by inventory type group for cutblocks.</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Interim measure - Measured annually, includes blocks at late free growing date within reporting period.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb. 28, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.1</td>
<td>Area of THLB converted to non-forest land use through forest management activities.</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb. 28, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.2</td>
<td>The percentage of gross cutblock area occupied by total permanent access structures.</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Averaged annually.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb. 28, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.3</td>
<td>Inclusion of access management in communication strategies with stakeholders.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Intent is to coordinate access to minimize area of roads.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb. 28, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.1</td>
<td>Percent of harvested blocks declared Stocked prior to the regeneration date consistent with operational plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Query blocks where RD is in this reporting period.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb 20, 07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.2</td>
<td>Percent of harvested blocks declared Free Growing prior to the late free growing assessment date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Query blocks where LFG is in this reporting period.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.3</td>
<td>Percent compliance with stocking levels and species composition requirements contained in operational plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.4</td>
<td>Trend toward unmanaged species composition on managed stands by BEC zone on the THLB.</td>
<td>Target to be established following analysis (Sept. 2006).</td>
<td>Area weighted percent species composition at free growing measured by inventory label for all stands declared FG within the reporting period. Measured annually.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4.1</td>
<td>The percentage of forest operations consistent with terrain management requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Operational plan requirements are specific to each block based on terrain stability indicators.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5.1</td>
<td>Number of hectares (area) damaged by accidental forestry-related industrial fires.</td>
<td>&lt;100ha</td>
<td>+5ha</td>
<td>Measured annually. Only fires &gt;1ha recorded. Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis (Sept. 2006). Target combined between Canfor and BCTS.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb 20, 07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5.2</td>
<td>Percentage of identified risk factors with updated management strategies.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Catastrophic change associated with forest health, global climate change, etc. Initial completion March 31, 2007.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.1</td>
<td>Area of THLB converted to non-forest land use through forest management activities.</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.2</td>
<td>Percentage of cutblocks that exceed coarse woody debris requirements.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Legal or requirements specified in operation plan. Measured annually.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.3</td>
<td>Percent of harvested blocks declared Stocked prior to the regeneration date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Query blocks where RD is in this reporting period.</td>
<td>Consensus with one abstention - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFM Criterion</td>
<td>CSA SFM Element</td>
<td>Value FW Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-1.4 Percent of harvested blocks declared Free Growing prior to the late free growing assessment date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-1.5 Percent compliance with stocking levels and species composition requirements contained in operational plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-1.6 The percentage of forest operations consistent with soil conservation standards as identified in operational plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3. The processes that take carbon from the atmosphere and store it in forest ecosystems are sustained.</td>
<td>3-3.1 Area of THLB converted to non-forest land use through forest management activities.</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-3.2 Percent compliance with stocking levels and species composition requirements contained in operational plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-3.3 Percent of harvested blocks declared Stocked prior to the regeneration date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-3.4 Percent of harvested blocks declared Free Growing prior to the late free growing assessment date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1.1 Area of THLB converted to non-forest land use through forest management activities.</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Refinement of the target will be done pending analysis.</td>
<td>Consensus - Mar 14, 06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 4 C IV. The flow of economic benefits from forests through the forest industry is sustained.</td>
<td>4-1. Timber harvesting continues to contribute to economic well-being.</td>
<td>100% +/- 10%</td>
<td>Measured annually. Reported on anniversary of cut control period.</td>
<td>Consensus - May 9, 06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1.1 Actual harvest volume compared to the apportionment across the DFA over each 5 year cut control period.</td>
<td>Report out on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-1.2 Percent compliance with waste and residue standards.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2. The public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) continues to receive a portion of the benefits.</td>
<td>4-2.1 Canfor to provide opportunities to purchase wood from private enterprises.</td>
<td>Opportunity exists</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Private enterprises include any legal source such as woodlot owners, mining claims, private land, non-replaceable forest licenses, etc.</td>
<td>Consensus - Apr 25, 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-2.2 The number of first order wood products produced from trees harvested from the DFA.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-2.3 The percent of money spent on forest operations and management on the NCI suppliers (Stumpage not included).</td>
<td>Report out on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-2.4 The number of support opportunities provided to the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties).</td>
<td>Report out on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-2.5 Report out on the amount of money directed towards environmental projects.</td>
<td>Report out on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3. Governments continue to receive a portion of the benefits.</td>
<td>4-3.1 Municipal taxes paid to governments.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Measured annually.</td>
<td>Consensus - Feb 20, 07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-3.2 Stumpage paid to government.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4. Opportunities to receive a portion of the benefits exist for First Nations.</td>
<td>4-4.1 The number of support opportunities provided to First Nations with Treaty area and/or asserted traditional territory within the DFA.</td>
<td>Report out on</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support opportunities include community support services, pro bono work, training opportunities, etc. (Canfor only). Report out the number of opportunities provided and the number of First Nations provided with opportunities.</td>
<td>Apr 25, 06 Indicator accepted - with 1 dissension; measure accepted - with 1 dissension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFM Criterion</td>
<td>CSA SFM Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>FW Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-4.2</td>
<td>The number of contract opportunities provided to First Nations with Treaty area and/or asserted traditional territory within the DFA.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-4.3</td>
<td>The total value of transactions undertaken with First Nations with Treaty area and/or asserted traditional territory within the DFA.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5.</td>
<td>A competitive, diversified forestry sector exists.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5.1</td>
<td>The percentage of DFA volume advertised for sale through open competitive bid.</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5.2</td>
<td>A competitive primary milling facility is sustained.</td>
<td>≥2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6.</td>
<td>Levels of forest damaging events or agents are managed such that their economic impact is minimized.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6.1</td>
<td>Percentage of identified risk factors with updated management strategies.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6.2</td>
<td>Areas with stand damaging agents will be prioritized for treatment.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6.3</td>
<td>Number of hectares (area) damaged by accidental forestry-related industrial fires.</td>
<td>&lt;100 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>C V.</td>
<td>The flow of marketed non-timber economic benefits from forests is sustained.</td>
<td>5-1.</td>
<td>Amount and quality of marketed non-timber forest resources does not decline over the long-term.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-1.1</td>
<td>List of existing and documented potential for marketed non-timber benefits.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-1.2</td>
<td>Description of potential implications of SFM practices on the amount and quality of marketed non-timber values.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-1.3</td>
<td>The percentage of forest operations consistent with range requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C VI.</td>
<td>Forest management contributes to a diversified local economy.</td>
<td>6-1.</td>
<td>Employment and income sources and their contribution to the local economy continue to be diversified.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1.1</td>
<td>Employment supported by each sector of the local economy (actual and percentage of total employment).</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1.2</td>
<td>Contribution of income sources from each sector of the local economy (actual and percentage of total income).</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1.3</td>
<td>The number of opportunities given to businesses within, or immediately adjacent to the TSA to provide non-tendered services to forest management activities.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1.4</td>
<td>The number of first order wood products produced from trees harvested from the DFA.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1.5</td>
<td>The number of support opportunities provided within, or immediately adjacent to, the TSA.</td>
<td>Report out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFM Criterion</td>
<td>CSA SFM Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>FW Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.1 Implement and update a comprehensive list of stakeholders and affected or interested parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.2 The number of opportunities for PAG to review and provide comment on the SFMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.3 Number of Public Advisory Group meetings per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.4 The level of satisfaction of the PAG members with the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.5 Maintain and review at least annually and as required the Mackenzie SFMP PAG TOR, to ensure a credible and transparent process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.6 Survey residents, stakeholders and First Nations regarding their satisfaction with forest management (process and outcomes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.7 Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the ToR invited to participate in the PAG process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.8 Percentage of PAG satisfaction with amount and timing of information presented for informed decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C VIII.</td>
<td>Decisions guiding forest management on the DFA are informed by and respond to a wide range of social and cultural values.</td>
<td>7-1. Forest management planning adequately reflects the interests and issues raised by the public (stakeholders, residents and interested parties) in the DFA through an effective and meaningful (to the participants) public participation process.</td>
<td>7-1.9 Report out on consistency of indicators or measures with LRMP objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.1 The number of opportunities given to the public and stakeholders to express forestry-related concerns and be involved in our planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.2 The percent of timely responses to written and documented concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.3 Distribution/access to SFM Plan, annual reports and audit results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.4 The number of SFM educational opportunities and interactions provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.5 Percentage of mutually agreed upon communication strategies met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.6 Adaptive Management strategy is developed, documented, acted upon and reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Social</td>
<td>7 Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clause 4.1</td>
<td>Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2. Information is effectively exchanged between DFA forest resource managers and the public through a varied and collaborative planning approach to facilitate mutual understanding and recognition.</td>
<td>7-2.7 Monitoring plan for indicators is developed, documented, acted upon and reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSM Criteria</td>
<td>CSA SFM Element</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>FW Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C VIII. Forest management sustains or enhances the cultural (material and economic), health (physical and spiritual) and capacity benefits that First Nations derive from forest resources.</td>
<td>8-1. Forest management recognizes and respects First Nations rights and Treaty rights.</td>
<td>7-3.3 Reports and analysis of monitoring information – Annual Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>C IX. Forest management sustains ongoing opportunities for a range of quality of life benefits.</td>
<td>9-1. Resources and opportunities for recreation (including quality of experience) are maintained or enhanced.</td>
<td>9-1.1 Percentage of harvest operations consistent with the Heritage Conservation Act.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consensus - Feb 20, 07
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCFM Criterion</th>
<th>CSA SFM Element</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>FW Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-4. Worker safety is maintained.</td>
<td>9-4.1 Written safety policies in place and full implementation is documented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Measured annually. One per organization. Consensus - May 9, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-4.2 Number of lost time accidents in woodlands operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Measured annually. Includes Canfor and BCTS staff. Consensus - May 9, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-5. Forest management considers public health and safety implications.</td>
<td>9-5.1 Signage on FSRs and main haul roads to be kept current.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Measured annually for current operations. Consensus - May 9, 06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators
## June 2nd, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 46 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broad leaf, treed mixed) &gt;20 years old across DFA</th>
<th>Target: Maintain the baseline ranges and distribution into the future.</th>
<th>Variance: to be determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> This is a core indicator under the new standard. Groups are defined as treed conifer = &gt;75% conifer leading; treed broadleaf = &gt;75% broadleaf leading; treed mixed = neither species leading but still treed.</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong> Add indicator to plan. <strong>Agreed</strong></td>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 47 (new)</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use.</th>
<th>Target: Annually, 100% conformance with the standards</th>
<th>Variance: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> This indicator was in the original Mackenzie SFMP and was removed, however, the new standard speaks to a core indicator which would be satisfied by this statement. Chief Foresters Standards for Seed Use</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong> Add indicator to plan. <strong>Agreed</strong></td>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 48 (new)</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans.</th>
<th>Target: No non-compliances for site level plans</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> Mackenzie SFMP currently contains 3 indicators (#31 - range, #41 - visuals, #42 – resource features) which fall under this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category. All are being monitored in a similar fashion.

**LSC Recommendations:** Combine 3 indicators into one for all non-timber objectives.  **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #26</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Actual harvest volume compared to the apportionment across the DFA over each 5-year cut control period.</th>
<th>Target: ≤100%.</th>
<th>Variance: +/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** Under the current circumstances and with the Canfor mill configuration in its present form, this indicator is unachievable for Canfor. Canfor’s AAC is 1,082,000 m³. The mill is capable of consuming approximately 750,000m³ which is sourced from its own forest licence as well as BC timber sales, woodlots and other private sales. Intent of the indicator is achieved (ecological and social) wherever fibre is sourced.

For BCTS, our ability to meet this target is currently based on the viability of the local sawmills. A more appropriate way to measure this for BCTS is to measure what we offer for sale as opposed to what is actually sold.

**LSC Recommendations:** Increase the variance to 50%. If the proposed variance is not realized, then BCTS would change how we are measuring this indicator.  **No agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #27</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Percentage of blocks and roads harvested where estimated waste and residue is below allowable levels.</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: -20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** This indicator is based on legislation created to encourage licensees to optimize the use of the fibre on a block through the potential imposition of penalties if certain benchmark levels of waste and residue are exceeded. The direction of government moving towards “cruised-based” sales will create more of an incentive to utilize the fibre since it’s being paid for up front. This indicator is also contradictory to the intent of Indicator #6 (Coarse woody debris).

**LSC Recommendations:** Remove this indicator.  **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #19</th>
<th>Existing Measure Statement: The percentage of standards units declared free growing that have measured site index values at or greater than pre-harvest site index.</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: -5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** The intent of this indicator is to ensure that site productivity is maintained over time. Unfortunately, the data that is available and that is being utilized to measure this indicator is not dependable and is not site specific.

**LSC Recommendations:** Remove this measure from the plan.  **Agreed**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #33</th>
<th>Existing Measure Statement: Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the TOR invited to participate in the PAG process.</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSC Comments:</td>
<td>Update the TOR to remove sectors where representation has been unachievable or representation is covered by another similar sector. Increase variance to 20%? PAG representatives suggested removing this indicator from the SFM Plan as it is not a Core Indicator in the new CSA Standard and there are other indicators to track public satisfaction with the process. Agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 48 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Percent of blocks meeting dispersed retention levels as prescribed in the site plan/logging plans</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSC Comments:</td>
<td>This indicator is an important piece of the puzzle for implementation of the “biodiversity strategy”. Dispersed retention has been identified as one of the critical habitat elements for a particular suite of species. This indicator will provide a means of measuring the licensees’ performance as it relates to prescribed dispersed retention where applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC Recommendations:</td>
<td>Add indicator to plan. Agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 49 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Training in environmental and safety procedures in compliance with company training plans</th>
<th>Target: 100% of company employees and contractors will have both environmental and safety training</th>
<th>Variance: -5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSC Comments:</td>
<td>Sustainable forest management provides training and awareness opportunities for forest workers as organizations seek continual improvement in their practices. Investments in training and skill development generally pay dividends to forest organizations by way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of a safer and more environmentally conscious work environment. Assessing whether forest contractors have received both safety and environmental training is a direct way of measuring this investment. Additionally, training plans should be in place for employees of the forest organizations who work in the forest. Measuring whether the training occurred in accordance with these plans will confirm an organizations commitment to training and skills development. This is a core indicator under the new standard. Company employees refers to members of the woodlands staff.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan. **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 50 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Maintain the level of direct and indirect employment</th>
<th>Target: Employment multiplier? Current levels?</th>
<th>Variance: -5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** The LSC propose that current employment levels be determined and that this figure be utilized as a baseline with an appropriate variance. This is a core indicator under the new standard.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan. **Agreed** – Target to proposed at next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 51 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: The number of stakeholders and members of the public who took part in an educational opportunity.</th>
<th>Target: 50</th>
<th>Variance: -10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** The participating licencees are committed to working with directly affected stakeholders and members of the public on forest management issues and have a well-established history of participation in community meetings, including local planning processes. The sharing of knowledge and contributes to informed, balanced decisions and plans acceptable to the majority of public. When informed and engaged, members of the public can provide local knowledge and support that contributes to socially and environmentally responsible forest management.
This is a core indicator under the new standard.
**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan. **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 52 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** Meaningful relationships and open communication with local Aboriginal communities help ensure that areas of cultural importance are managed in a way that retains their traditions and values. This indicator recognizes the importance of managing and protecting culturally important practices and activities during forestry operations. First Nations, with the benefit of local and traditional knowledge may provide valuable information concerning the specific location and use of these sites as well as the specific forest characteristics requiring protection or management. The outcome of these discussions and the means to manage/protect values and uses are included in operational plans. The intent of the indicator statements are to manage and/or protect those truly important sites, thus there is a degree of reasonableness in identifying the sites. The targets verify that consideration was given in plans, then follows through with assessing plan execution. This is a core indicator under the new standard.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 53 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Employees will receive First Nations awareness training</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: -10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** Section 35 of the Constitution Act states “The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of Aboriginal Peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed”. Some examples of the rights that Section 35 has been found to protect include hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, sacred and spiritual practices, and title. SFM requirements are not in any way intended to define, limit, interpret, or prejudice ongoing or future discussions and negotiations regarding these legal rights and do not stipulate how to deal with Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights.

The first step toward respecting Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights is compliance with the law. Section 7.3.3 of the CSA Z809 Standard
reinforces legal requirements for many reasons, including the reality that demonstrating respect for Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights can be challenging in Canada’s fluid legislative landscape and therefore it is important to identify these legal requirements as a starting point. It is important for companies to have an understanding of applicable Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights, as well as the Aboriginal interests that relate to the DFA.

Both the desire of licencees to comply with laws and open communication with local First Nations requires that company staff members have a good understanding of Aboriginal title and rights and treaty rights.

This is a core indicator under the new standard.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conifer Leading</th>
<th>Decid Leading</th>
<th>Mixed Species</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akie</td>
<td>68,492</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>7,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akie River</td>
<td>30,011</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijoux Falls</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater</td>
<td>125,109</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>23,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalohead</td>
<td>45,974</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>7,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>94,013</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins - Davis</td>
<td>131,887</td>
<td>11,070</td>
<td>19,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaghan Creek</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklund</td>
<td>20,126</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffney</td>
<td>122,923</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>3,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germansen Mountain</td>
<td>9,013</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillis</td>
<td>31,056</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackfish</td>
<td>11,140</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>20,659</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klawli</td>
<td>66,513</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Akie</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>4,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ospika</td>
<td>82,759</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>10,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Pesika</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manson River</td>
<td>19,797</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCusker</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misinchinka</td>
<td>65,345</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>6,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morfee</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscovite</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabesche</td>
<td>112,408</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>8,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omineca</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsnip</td>
<td>46,247</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>8,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesika</td>
<td>41,840</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>127,623</td>
<td>7,589</td>
<td>14,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Lake</td>
<td>9,935</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Pass</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooler</td>
<td>55,028</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>3,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>33,676</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>8,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Germansen - U</td>
<td>13,461</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudyah A</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudyah B</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudyah Lake</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Mille</td>
<td>16,857</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Ospika</td>
<td>35,385</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicked River</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,467,104 88.2%  52,127 3.1%  144,189 8.7%  1,663,420
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Canfor Biodiversity Vision

- Ensuring a Consistent Supply of Fibre to our Highly Valued Customers through Cost Effective, Scientifically Credible Sustainable Forest Practices
  - Protection/conservation of biodiversity is a public concern and a management priority for Canfor
  - The maintenance of biodiversity and timber extraction can be competing goals (Bunnell 1997)
  - Canfor Biodiversity Strategy is built around the concept of managing for “species richness” a credible surrogate to biological diversity.
  - Includes 3 component goals, with associated strategies and monitoring indicators intended to create a hierarchical, cost effective & scientifically credible approach to manage for biodiversity while extracting timber.
Biodiversity Strategy Function

1. The philosophy to sustaining biological richness uses a coarse to fine filter approach in which the distribution of ecologically distinct habitat types within the DFA is assessed so that the amount of each habitat type in the THLB and NHLB can be determined and the kinds of habitat provisions required in harvested areas to maintain the full range of viable habitats can be estimated.

2. The strategies and indicators define how ecosystems, habitat elements and species are sustained.

3. The strategies and indicators also measure the biological components required to sustain species richness in managed and unmanaged landscapes.

Goals of Canfor Biodiversity Strategy

1. Ecosystem Diversity
   - Conserve ecosystem diversity at the stand and landscape level by maintaining the variety of communities and ecosystems that naturally occur in the DFA.

2. Genetic Diversity
   - Conserve genetic diversity by maintaining the variation of genes within species and ensuring that reforestation programs are free of genetically modified organisms.
**Goals of Canfor Biodiversity Strategy**

### Species Diversity
- Conserve species diversity by ensuring that habitats for the native species found in the DFA are maintained through time, including habitats for known occurrences of species at risk.

### Strategies
- **Ecosystem Representation**
  - Coarse filter approach to sustain biological richness (surrogate for biodiversity) in forested landscapes.
  - Maintain species, including poorly understood species and ecosystem functions by ensuring that all distinct habitat types are represented in the unmanaged landbase.
  - Provides a safeguard against uncertainty in managing the entire landbase and provides benchmarks against which we can compare the effects of management in the managed landbase.
  - Provides for a diversity of habitats
Strategies

1. Conservation of Protected Areas and Sites of Special Biological and Cultural Significance
   - Respect protected areas identified by Government.
   - Cooperate in broader landscape management related to protected areas and sites of special biological and cultural significance.
   - Identify sites of special geological, biological or cultural significance within the DFA and implement strategies appropriate to their long term maintenance.

2. Landscape Structure
   - Maintenance of landscape level attributes such as seral distribution, is a coarse to medium filter approach to managing for forest structures that are considered as important habitat and are impacted by forestry practices.

   - These attributes are impacted by the tactical level of planning - the arrangement of harvesting in both time and space.

   - Maintains a diversity of habitat structures to accommodate a wide range of species, including those that are poorly known.
Strategies

Stand Structural Habitat Elements

- Medium filter approach that complements the landscape level coarse filter by focusing on key stand level terrestrial and aquatic habitat elements that can be manipulated or impacted by forest management and with which a large portion of vertebrates are associated.

- Habitat elements important for terrestrial vertebrates include dead and dying trees, coarse woody debris, riparian habitat, hardwoods and shrubs.

- Operational strategies are developed to maintain stand structural habitat elements in managed stands and across the landscape.

Species Accounting

- A fine filter approach that monitors the response of species to changes in habitat structure and pattern.

- Monitoring the population trends of certain species (songbirds) is a means of assessing the effectiveness of the strategies of providing habitat and structure across the landbase, which should result in persistent populations of species.

- In addition to maintaining habitat through the previous strategies, specific habitat requirements may be managed to maintain productive populations of species of special management concern.
**Strategies**

**Species Accounting System**

- Uses knowledge of species' natural history to assign species to most cost effective form of monitoring while highlighting habitat features that are likely to be limiting.
- Assigns species to groups determined by their response to forest practices and their accessibility to monitoring.

**Species Accounting System**

The 6 groups are:

1. Generalists, species that inhabit many habitat types.
2. Species that can be statistically assigned to broad habitat types as defined in VRI (e.g. young hardwoods, older coniferous stands).
3. Species with strong dependencies on specific habitat elements (e.g. snags or understory).
4. Species restricted to specialized and highly localized habitats.
5. Species for which patch size and connectivity are considered important.
6. Species known to occur in the area, but that are not dependent upon forested environments are not monitored.
Species Accounting System

The maintenance of productive populations is based on the following assumptions:
- species are affected by habitat availability and quality,
- species will be maintained if their habitat requirements are maintained, and
- many vertebrate species can be maintained by managing the key structural components with which they are likely associated.

Monitoring

Why do we monitor performance?
1. To ensure that the adaptive capacity of the forest is maintained (Bunnell 2003). Variability among individuals, populations species and ecosystems allows for adaptation to change, which makes possible the generation of new biodiversity!

1. Helps to evaluate the habitat benchmarks used and to verify the assumptions on which the maintenance of productive species is based.

1. The public views sustenance of species as the ultimate measure of success or failure
Thresholds or Performance Criteria

- There are no unequivocal thresholds for representation and the development of credible thresholds will be an ongoing process.
- The sensitivity of ecosystem types to disturbance varies; therefore no universal target is likely to be developed.
- Rather the choice of thresholds must be specific to the local context, including type and intensity of management in the harvested land base.

Monitoring - Canfor Indicators

- Designed to inform on relative success of forest practices at conserving biodiversity.
- Tie in well with CSA Elements & core indicators

Ecosystem Diversity - Coarse filter Strategic Planning level Indicators
- Percent representation of ecosystem groups in the across the DFA
- Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broadleaf, treed mixed) >20 years old across the DFA
- Percent late seral distribution by ecological unit across the DFA
- Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies for protected areas and sites of biological significance.
Monitoring - Canfor Indicators

Species Diversity - Coarse to medium filter, operational planning
- Percent of stand structure retained across the DFA in harvested areas.
- Percent of blocks meeting dispersed retention levels as prescribed in the site plan/logging plan.
- Percent of audited cutblocks where post harvest CWD levels are within the targets contained in Plans.
- Number of non conformance where forest operations are not consistent with riparian management requirements as identified in operational plans.
- Percent of forest management activities consistent with management strategies for species of management concern

Genetic Diversity - Fine filter, operational planning
- Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use.
Final Thoughts

- Intent of the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy
  - Maintain productive, well distributed populations of species in a defined management area.
  - This will maintain the variation among individuals and species so that species will be able to persist in changing environments.
  - The major strategies and indicators interact and encompass the complexity of the broad goal.
  - E.g. - the distribution of ecologically distinct habitat types within a DFA determines how much of each habitat type is in the NHLB and this informs the amount and kinds of habitat that will be required for retention in the THLB to achieve success.

- The approach to sustaining biological richness uses a coarse to fine filter philosophy in which the distribution of ecologically distinct habitat types within the DFA is assessed so that the amount of each habitat type in the NHLB can be determined and the kinds of habitat provisions required in harvested areas to maintain the full range of viable habitats can be estimated.
- The strategies and indicators define how ecosystems, habitat elements and species are sustained.
- The strategies and indicators also measure the biological components required to sustain species richness in managed and unmanaged landscapes.
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Group 1 - Generalists, species that inhabit many habitat types (examples)

**Birds**
- American Crow
- American Robin
- American Tree Sparrow
- Blue Grouse
- Common Raven
- Cooper's Hawk
- Golden Eagle
- Great Horned Owl
- House Finch
- Mourning Dove
- Olive-sided Flycatcher
- Orange-crowned Warbler
- Pine Siskin
- Rufous Hummingbird

**Mammals**
- Black Bear
- Bobcat
- Canada Lynx
- Common (Masked) Shrew
- Cougar
- Deer Mouse
- Gray Wolf
- Grizzly Bear
- Hoary Bat
- Least Weasel
- Long-tailed Vole
- Mink
- Mule Deer
- Porcupine
- Red Fox
- Snowshoe Hare
- Wolverine
- Yellow-pine Chipmunk
### Group 1 (con’t)

#### Mammals
- Big Brown Bat
- Black Bear
- Bobcat
- Bushy-tailed Woodrat
- Canada Lynx
- Common (Masked) Shrew
- Cougar
- Deer Mouse
- Dusky Shrew
- Ermine
- Golden-mantled Ground Squirrel
- Gray Wolf
- Grizzly Bear
- Hoary Bat
- Least Weasel
- Little Brown Myotis
- Long-legged Myotis
- Long-tailed Vole
- Long-tailed Weasel
- Meadow Vole
- Mink
- Mule Deer
- Northern Bog Lemming
- Porcupine
- Pygmy Shrew
- Red Fox
- Silver-haired Bat
- Snowshoe Hare
- Western Jumping Mouse
- Western Long-eared Myotis
- White-tailed Deer
- Wolverine
- Yellow-pine Chipmunk

### Group 2 - Species that can be statistically assigned to broad habitat types as defined in VRI

#### Birds
- Boreal Owl
- Evening Grosbeak
- Gray Jay
- Great Gray Owl
- House Wren
- Least Flycatcher
- MacGillivray’s Warbler
- Pine Grosbeak
- Red Crossbill
- Red-Eyed Vireo
- Red-tailed Hawk
- Ruffed Grouse
- Steller’s Jay
- Townsend’s Warbler
- Varied Thrush
- Warbling Vireo
- Western Tanager

#### Mammals
- Northern Flying Squirrel
- Red Squirrel
### Group 3 - Species with strong dependencies on specific habitat elements (e.g. snags or understory).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RIPARIAN</strong> (including wetlands)</th>
<th><strong>Amphibians</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reptiles</strong></th>
<th><strong>Birds</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mammals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Long-toed Salamander</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Pacific Tree Frog</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Common Garter Snake</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>American Dipper</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Beaver</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Amphibians**
  - **Pacific Tree Frog**

- **Reptiles**
  - **Common Garter Snake**

- **Birds**
  - **American Dipper**
  - **American Bittern**
  - **Belted Kingfisher**
  - **Bufflehead**
  - **Canada Goose**
  - **Canvasback**
  - **Cinnamon Teal**
  - **Common Loon**
  - **Common Merganser**
  - **Hooded Merganser**
  - **Lesser Scaup**
  - **Mallard**
  - **Northern Oriole**
  - **Northern Pintail**
  - **Osprey**
  - **Pied-billed Grebe**
  - **Red-necked Grebe**
  - **Red-winged Blackbird**
  - **Ring-necked Pheasant**
  - **Ruddy Duck**
  - **Sora**

- **Mammals**
  - **Beaver**
  - **Northern River Otter**
  - **Water Shrew**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HARDWOODS</strong></th>
<th><strong>SHRUBS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cavity Sites</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Black-headed Grosbeak</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Cedar Waxwing</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Black-capped Chickadee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clay-colored Sparrow</strong></td>
<td><strong>Downy Woodpecker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gray Catbird</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hairy Woodpecker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Harris's Sparrow</strong></td>
<td><strong>Northern Flicker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lazuli Bunting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Northern Hawk Owl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Magnolia Warbler</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pileated Woodpecker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nashville Warbler</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pygmy Nuthatch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Swainson's Thrush</strong></td>
<td><strong>Red-breasted Nuthatch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tennessee Warbler</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree Swallow</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Veery</strong></td>
<td><strong>Violet-green Swallow</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Willow Flycatcher</strong></td>
<td><strong>White-breasted Nuthatch</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **HARDWOODS**
  - **Black-headed Grosbeak**

- **SHRUBS**
  - **Cedar Waxwing**

- **Cavity Sites**
  - **Black-capped Chickadee**
  - **Downy Woodpecker**
  - **Hairy Woodpecker**
  - **Northern Flicker**
  - **Northern Hawk Owl**
  - **Pileated Woodpecker**
  - **Pygmy Nuthatch**
  - **Red-breasted Nuthatch**
  - **Tree Swallow**
  - **Violet-green Swallow**
  - **White-breasted Nuthatch**

- **LARGE LIVE TREES**

- **Birds**
  - **Bald Eagle**
  - **Great Blue Heron**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LARGE LIVE TREES</strong></th>
<th><strong>Birds</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bald Eagle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Great Blue Heron</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 4 Species restricted to specialized and highly localized habitats.

**Amphibians**
- Wood Frog
- Western Toad

**Birds**
- Great Blue Heron
- Lewis’s Woodpecker
- Sandhill Crane
- Williamson’s Sapsucker
- Three-toed Woodpecker

Group 5 Species for which patch size and connectivity are considered important

**Birds**
- Golden-crowned Kinglet
- Northern Goshawk
- Spruce Grouse

**Mammals**
- Marten
- Southern Red-backed
- Vole
- Fisher
- caribou
Group B: Species known to occur in the area, but that are not dependent upon forested environments are not monitored

- Largely restricted to areas above treeline
  - American Pipit
  - Golden-Crowned Sparrow
  - White-tailed Ptarmigan
  - Bighorn Sheep (also grassland)
  - Hoary Marmot
  - Least Chipmunk
  - Water Vole

- Rely primarily on habitats created or modified by human activities
  - American Goldfinch
  - Barn Swallow
  - Blue Jay
  - Bobolink
  - Brewer’s Blackbird
  - Killdeer
  - Long-billed Curlew
  - Northern Pocket Gopher
  - Snow Bunting (winter)
  - Western Kingbird
  - Western Meadowlark

- Breeds primarily in cliff-like habitat
  - Bank Swallow
  - Black Swift
  - Cliff Swallow
# Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators
## June 2nd, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 46 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broad leaf, treed mixed) &gt;20 years old across DFA</th>
<th>Target: Maintain the baseline ranges and distribution into the future.</th>
<th>Variance: to be determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** This is a core indicator under the new standard. Groups are defined as treed conifer = >75% conifer leading; treed broadleaf = >75% broadleaf leading; treed mixed = neither species leading but still treed.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan. **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 47 (new)</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use.</th>
<th>Target: Annually, 100% conformance with the standards</th>
<th>Variance: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** This indicator was in the original Mackenzie SFMP and was removed, however, the new standard speaks to a core indicator which would be satisfied by this statement. Chief Foresters Standards for Seed Use

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan. **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 48 (new)</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans.</th>
<th>Target: No non-compliances for site level plans</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** Mackenzie SFMP currently contains 3 indicators (#31 - range, #41 - visuals, #42 – resource features) which fall under this
category. All are being monitored in a similar fashion.

**LSC Recommendations:** Combine 3 indicators into one for all non-timber objectives. **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #26</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Actual harvest volume compared to the apportionment across the DFA over each 5-year cut control period.</th>
<th>Target: ≤100%.</th>
<th>Variance: +/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** Under the current circumstances and with the Canfor mill configuration in its present form, this indicator is unachievable for Canfor. Canfor’s AAC is 1,082,000 m³. The mill is capable of consuming approximately 750,000 m³ which is sourced from its own forest licence as well as BC timber sales, woodlots and other private sales. Intent of the indicator is achieved (ecological and social) wherever fibre is sourced.

For BCTS, our ability to meet this target is currently based on the viability of the local sawmills. A more appropriate way to measure this for BCTS is to measure what we offer for sale as opposed to what is actually sold.

**LSC Recommendations:** Increase the variance to 50%. If the proposed variance is not realized, then BCTS would change how we are measuring this indicator. **No agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #27</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Percentage of blocks and roads harvested where estimated waste and residue is below allowable levels.</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: -20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** This indicator is based on legislation created to encourage licensees to optimize the use of the fibre on a block through the potential imposition of penalties if certain benchmark levels of waste and residue are exceeded. The direction of government moving towards “cruised-based” sales will create more of an incentive to utilize the fibre since it’s being paid for up front. This indicator is also contradictory to the intent of Indicator #6 (Coarse woody debris).

**LSC Recommendations:** Remove this indicator. **Agreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #19</th>
<th>Existing Measure Statement: The percentage of standards units declared free growing that have measured site index values at or greater than pre-harvest site index.</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: -5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** The intent of this indicator is to ensure that site productivity is maintained over time. Unfortunately, the data that is available and that is being utilized to measure this indicator is not dependable and is not site specific.

**LSC Recommendations:** Remove this measure from the plan. **Agreed**
### Indicator #33

**Existing Measure Statement:** Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the TOR invited to participate in the PAG process.  

**Target:** 100%  

**Variance:** 0

**LSC Comments:**  

**LSC Recommendations:** Update the TOR to remove sectors where representation has been unachievable or representation is covered by another similar sector. Increase variance to 20%? PAG representatives suggested removing this indicator from the SFM Plan as it is not a Core Indicator in the new CSA Standard and there are other indicators to track public satisfaction with the process.  

**Agreed**

### Indicator 48 (new)

**New Indicator Statement:** Percent of blocks meeting dispersed retention levels as prescribed in the site plan/logging plans  

**Target:** 100%  

**Variance:** 0

**LSC Comments:** This indicator is an important piece of the puzzle for implementation of the “biodiversity strategy”. Dispersed retention has been identified as one of the critical habitat elements for a particular suite of species. This indicator will provide a means of measuring the licensees’ performance as it relates to prescribed dispersed retention where applicable.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan.

### Indicator 49 (new)

**New Indicator Statement:** Training in environmental and safety procedures in compliance with company training plans  

**Target:** 100% of company employees and contractors will have both environmental and safety training  

**Variance:** -5%

**LSC Comments:** Sustainable forest management provides training and awareness opportunities for forest workers as organizations seek continual improvement in their practices. Investments in training and skill development generally pay dividends to forest organizations by way of a safer and more environmentally conscious work environment. Assessing whether forest contractors have received both safety and
environmental training is a direct way of measuring this investment. Additionally, training plans should be in place for employees of the forest organizations who work in the forest. Measuring whether the training occurred in accordance with these plans will confirm an organization's commitment to training and skills development. This is a core indicator under the new standard. Company employees refers to members of the woodlands staff.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 50 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Maintain the level of direct and indirect employment</th>
<th>Target: Employment multiplier? Current levels?</th>
<th>Variance: -5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** The LSC propose that current employment levels be determined and that this figure be utilized as a baseline with an appropriate variance. This is a core indicator under the new standard.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 51 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: The number of stakeholders and members of the public who took part in an educational opportunity.</th>
<th>Target: 50</th>
<th>Variance: -10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LSC Comments:** The participating licencees are committed to working with directly affected stakeholders and members of the public on forest management issues and have a well-established history of participation in community meetings, including local planning processes. The sharing of knowledge and contributes to informed, balanced decisions and plans acceptable to the majority of public. When informed and engaged, members of the public can provide local knowledge and support that contributes to socially and environmentally responsible forest management. This is a core indicator under the new standard.

**LSC Recommendations:** Add indicator to plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 52 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: % of identified Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses considered in forestry planning processes</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> Meaningful relationships and open communication with local Aboriginal communities help ensure that areas of cultural importance are managed in a way that retains their traditions and values. This indicator recognizes the importance of managing and protecting culturally important practices and activities during forestry operations. First Nations, with the benefit of local and traditional knowledge may provide valuable information concerning the specific location and use of these sites as well as the specific forest characteristics requiring protection or management. The outcome of these discussions and the means to manage/protect values and uses are included in operational plans. The intent of the indicator statements are to manage and/or protect those truly important sites, thus there is a degree of reasonableness in identifying the sites. The targets verify that consideration was given in plans, then follows through with assessing plan execution. This is a core indicator under the new standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong> Add indicator to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 53 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Employees will receive First Nations awareness training</th>
<th>Target: 100%</th>
<th>Variance: -10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> Section 35 of the Constitution Act states “The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of Aboriginal Peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed”. Some examples of the rights that Section 35 has been found to protect include hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, sacred and spiritual practices, and title. SFM requirements are not in any way intended to define, limit, interpret, or prejudice ongoing or future discussions and negotiations regarding these legal rights and do not stipulate how to deal with Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights. The first step toward respecting Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights is compliance with the law. Section 7.3.3 of the CSA Z809 Standard reinforces legal requirements for many reasons, including the reality that demonstrating respect for Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights can be challenging in Canada’s fluid legislative landscape and therefore it is important to identify these legal requirements as a starting point. It is important for companies to have an understanding of applicable Aboriginal title and rights, and treaty rights, as well as the Aboriginal interests that relate to the DFA. Both the desire of licencees to comply with laws and open communication with local First Nations requires that company staff members have a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
good understanding of Aboriginal title and rights and treaty rights.

This is a core indicator under the new standard.

LSC Recommendations: Add indicator to plan.
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

- Objectives
- Findings
- Conclusions
Objectives

- Second surveillance audit of the corporate ISO 14001 certification.
- Re-registration audit of the corporate CSA Z809 certification.
- First surveillance audit of the corporate PEFC CoC certification.
- Follow-up on the status on open findings from previous external audits.
Findings

- **Operational Strengths**
- **Status of Previous Non-conformities**
- **New Findings**
Operational Strengths

- Laminated copies of new SWPs issued to contractors and available in all machines.
- The recently revised (January 2010) Mackenzie SFM plan represents a significant improvement over the previous version.
Status of Previous Non-conformities

- There were a total of 5 NCs identified during the 2008 Mackenzie ISO 14001/CSA Z809 audit. The Operation’s progress towards addressing these findings was assessed during the 2009 audit, with the result that they were all closed at that time. No additional ISO 14001/CSA Z809 NCs were identified in 2009 that would have required a follow-up assessment during the 2010 audit.

- 1480.11-NC-2009 Mackenzie PEFC Scope Extension-01 (FMS manual assigned a number of key CoC responsibilities to the Woodlands Manager, a position which no longer exists) – The FMS manual and new CoC SWP have now been aligned with the new organizational structure. NC closed.

- 1480.11-NC-RR-2009 Mackenzie PEFC Scope Extension-02 (lack of an internal CoC audit since 2008) – An internal PEFC CoC audit was completed in June 2010. One NC was identified in relation to the CoC system. However, the report remains in draft form, a corrective action plan has yet to be developed and the results have yet to be reviewed in an Operations-level management review. NC remains open pending completion of remaining action plan items.
Progress towards Addressing Previous OFIs

Follow-up comments regarding previous OFIs:

- **2008-OFI-05** (overly-complex nature of the current Mackenzie SFM plan) – the Mackenzie SFM plan has now been revised to address this finding. The current SFM plan (dated January 2010) now contains 45 indicators (compared to more than 100 in the previous version), is easier to understand and employs the VOIT approach outlined in the CSA Z809 standard. OFI closed.

- **2009-OFI-02** (lack of an FMG East environmental management program for 2009/10) – An EMP for 2009/10 for FMG East was prepared after the external audit took place. In addition, an EMP for 2010/11 has also been developed. OFI closed.

- **1480.11-OFI-2009 Mackenzie Scope Ext-01** (lack of clear CoC-specific training requirements in the FMS manual, uncertainty regarding the existence of staff CoC training records in Mackenzie) – unable to verify that this finding had been adequately addressed during the Mackenzie visit as some key staff not available for interview at the time the visit took place. Further follow-up required.
New Findings

Non-conformities

- No new non-conformities were identified during the 2010 ISO 14001/CSA Z809/PEFC CoC audit.
New Findings

Opportunities for improvement

- ISO 14001 4.4.6/CSA Z809 7.4.6 - Isolated weaknesses in the implementation of fuel storage and handling and equipment maintenance procedures were observed in relation to one contractor (Bid Right Contracting – blocks 1245 and 1248). The audit noted examples of poorly maintained equipment that had slow fuel/hydraulic oil leaks, including active leaks from equipment (loader and two slip tanks), or staining on the ground on the in-block road and around the shop truck. Also, there were 10-15 buckets of waste oil at the roadside near the shop truck that had no crash protection.

- ISO 14001 4.4.6/CSA Z809 7.4.6 - On one block (1248), the skidder operator had completed the prework, and was knowledgeable of the site-specific block issues. However, he did not have his map with him on the machine while skidding, and had not had it with him for most of the time on the block (he was audited on his third day of skidding).

- ISO 14001 4.4.7/CSA Z809 7.4.7 - Inspection of a sample of 12 fire extinguishers (blocks 1245, 4685, 1248 and Rd 32519) noted 4 which did not bear the required tag to demonstrate that they had been inspected within the previous 12 months, and 1 had been discharged. In addition, on one buncher that had on-board fire suppression, the system was undercharged (the buncher did however have the hand fire extinguisher to meet the minimum CFP requirements).
## Field Sample Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of field samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silviculture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Conclusions

- Except where noted otherwise in this report, the FMS, SFM system and CoC system continue to:
  - Be effectively implemented at the operation, and;
  - Conform with the requirements of the ISO 14001, CSA Z809 and PEFC CoC standards.

- NB: The PEFC CoC portion of the 2010 Mackenzie remains incomplete at this time, as some of the Canfor staff members responsible for implementing the system were not available at the time the audit team was on-site. As a result, further PEFC audit work will be required during the next few weeks, which could result in findings in addition to those reported here.
Reporting

- Our findings will be summarized in a corporate summary report in August 2010.
- A corporate public summary report will be made available for review and comment once all action plans have been approved.
- NB: Unless identified at other operations, isolated opportunities for improvement identified at the divisional level will not be brought forward to the corporate audit report.
Focus Areas for the Next Assessment

- Implementation of action plans to address open findings from the 2010 and previous audits.
- Completion and implementation of the Canfor biodiversity strategy.
- Revision of SFM plans to: (1) incorporate Canfor core indicators, and (2) address the incremental requirements of CSA Z809-08.
- Progress by the Licensee Team in working with the other licensees operating within the DFA (e.g., Conifex) to develop a cooperative approach to landscape level planning which facilitates the achievement of the targets included in the SFM plan.
### 5.0 Summary of Internal Audit Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-compliance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One instance of non-compliance related to the TDG regulation (uncertified large means of containment) and measures required by the TDG regulations and the BC fire Code (tagged and current fire extinguishers) was identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FMS/SFM/PEFC Findings - Major Non-Conformity**

No instances of major non-conformity were identified.

**FMS/SFM/PEFC Findings - Minor Non-Conformity**

- **NC\_MINOR \#1**: The aspect ranking worksheet does not identify legal requirements that apply to each aspect as required by the standard and the FMS Manual.
- **NC\_MINOR \#2**: One instance of non-compliance related to the TDG regulation (uncertified large means of containment) and measures required by the TDG regulations and the BC fire Code (tagged and current fire extinguishers) was identified.
- **NC\_MINOR \#3**: All training required by contractor/sub-contractor staff could not be verified.
- **NC\_MINOR \#4**: One instance of an incomplete ITS report and actions/documentation required by the 2009 EPRP related to a fuel spill could not be verified.
- **NC\_MINOR \#5**: Month end certification calculation spreadsheets were not signed off in 2010 as required by the revised FMC CoC SWP.

**FMS/SFM/PEFC Findings - Opportunities for Improvement**

- **OFI \#1**: The Mackenzie Operations may wish to consider updating their RAM/RACI matrix to match table 7 in the SFMP.
- **OFI \#2**: The Mackenzie Operations is encouraged to update the temporary training matrix and use it as the medium to transfer training records to Prince George for population in the database of choice.
- **OFI \#3**: Pre-work forms should always be complete and include documentation of the site hazards using the check list for that purpose.
- **OFI \#4**: FMG-East may wish to better communicate the change to 50l as the minimum fuel/oil licensee spill reporting level for spills to land.
- **OFI \#5**: FMG-East may wish to consider using the Bid Right Contracting fire incident as a test/drill considering how serious the incident could have been.
- **OFI \#6**: Mackenzie Operations FMG staff may wish to consider comments on several SFMP indicators contained in the report body.
- **OFI \#7**: LPA’s should contain an explicit identification of the percentage of the purchase that is certified rather than an implied percentage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMP #1</th>
<th>The consistency and quality of MBL's staff training records shows attention to detail and is reflective of the high level of organization demonstrated on the worksite.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMP #2</td>
<td>Contractor staff have a high level of awareness of SAR/special sites and what actions are required should they encounter one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP #3</td>
<td>The Jan 2010 SFMP has several meaningful, descriptive and useful indicators/targets that meet the intent of the Z809-08 standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP #4</td>
<td>The Sales &amp; Production Coordinator has a strong understanding of the CoC process from the stump through sales and can demonstrate how the manufacturing systems will be used to track lumber sold as PEFC certified when a request is made by CWPM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BCTS – Prince George Business Unit
2010 Internal ISO 14000 / Z809 Conformance and Compliance Audit

Audit Dates: September 21-23, 2010

Mackenzie DFA – BC Timber Sales Environmental Management System as well as the January 2010 version of the SFMP

Field Portion:

The auditor examined 5 Timber Sale Licences (1 active and 4 recent harvest operations), and 1 active road construction project and bridge installation. The auditor also examined 10 SFMP indicators in the field.

Office Portion:

The auditor also took a comprehensive look at the following components of the plan:

- **SFM Requirements**: General requirements of the plan
- **PAG Requirements**: Interested parties, Process, and Communications
- **SFM Performance Requirements**: All indicators relative to criterion 1, 2, 3, and 6
- **SFM System Requirements**: DFA, Shared Responsibilities, Rights and Regulations, SFM Plan, Structure and Responsibility, Communication, Monitoring and Measurement, and Internal audits to the SFMP.

**Good Practices**:

- Good work towards developing and implementing action plans
- The action planning and route cause description for the indicators is an excellent practice
- The development of the Licensee TOR
- Rehab of block roads as a standard practice
- The cedar tree, rare in the Mackenzie area, was noticed by a feller buncher operator and protected from damage
- The watershed Peak Flow calculator that Canfor and BCTS are using. And the use of the Sharepoint site for updating the depletions.
- **BCTS Operational Requirements Spreadsheet used in Mackenzie for the 2009-2010 reporting period.**

**Minor Non-conformances**:

Monitoring and Measurement: The audit found that two large logs (40 cm x 6 m) and smaller pieces of woody debris were found in a S4 stream at the wooden bridge deactivation site. The planting contractor failed to inspect their operations fully to address the crossing put in to allow ease of access for tree transfer and did not remove the crossing as required.

**Opportunities for Improvement**:

# Mackenzie SFMP Summary of Proposed Changes to Indicators

**June 2nd, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 46 (new)</th>
<th>New Indicator Statement: Percent distribution of forest type (treed conifer, treed broad leaf, treed mixed) &gt;20 years old across DFA</th>
<th>Target: Maintain the baseline ranges and distribution into the future.</th>
<th>Variance: to be determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong></td>
<td>This is a core indicator under the new standard. Groups are defined as treed conifer = &gt;75% conifer leading; treed broadleaf = &gt;75% broadleaf leading; treed mixed = neither species leading but still treed.</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td>Add indicator to plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 47 (new)</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Regeneration will be consistent with provincial regulations and standards for seed and vegetative material use.</th>
<th>Target: Annually, 100% conformance with the standards</th>
<th>Variance: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong></td>
<td>This indicator was in the original Mackenzie SFMP and was removed, however, the new standard speaks to a core indicator which would be satisfied by this statement. Chief Foresters Standards for Seed Use</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td>Add indicator to plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 48 (new)</th>
<th>Existing Indicator Statement: Conformance with strategies for non-timber benefits identified in plans.</th>
<th>Target: No non-compliances for site level plans</th>
<th>Variance: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong></td>
<td>Mackenzie SFMP currently contains 3 indicators (#31 - range, #41 - visuals, #42 – resource features) which fall under this category. All are being monitored in a similar fashion.</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LSC Recommendations:** Combine 3 indicators into one for all non-timber objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #26</th>
<th><strong>Existing Indicator Statement:</strong> Actual harvest volume compared to the apportionment across the DFA over each 5-year cut control period.</th>
<th><strong>Target:</strong> ≤100%</th>
<th><strong>Variance:</strong> +/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> Under the current circumstances and with the Canfor mill configuration in its present form, this indicator is unachievable for Canfor. Canfor’s AAC is 1,082,000 m³. The mill is capable of consuming approximately 750,000m³ which is sourced from it’s own forest licence as well as BC timber sales, woodlots and other private sales. Intent of the indicator is achieved (ecological and social) wherever fibre is sourced. For BCTS, our ability to meet this target is currently based on the viability of the local sawmills. A more appropriate way to measure this for BCTS is to measure what we offer for sale as opposed to what is actually sold.</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong> Increase the variance to 50%. If the proposed variance is not realized, then BCTS would change how we are measuring this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #27</th>
<th><strong>Existing Indicator Statement:</strong> Percentage of blocks and roads harvested where estimated waste and residue is below allowable levels.</th>
<th><strong>Target:</strong> 100%</th>
<th><strong>Variance:</strong> -20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> This indicator is based on legislation created to encourage licensees to optimize the use of the fibre on a block through the potential imposition of penalties if certain benchmark levels of waste and residue are exceeded. The direction of government moving towards “cruised-based” sales will create more of an incentive to utilize the fibre since it’s being paid for up front. This indicator is also contradictory to the intent of Indicator #6 (Coarse woody debris).</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong> Remove this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #19</th>
<th><strong>Existing Measure Statement:</strong> The percentage of standards units declared free growing that have measured site index values at or greater than pre-harvest site index.</th>
<th><strong>Target:</strong> 100%</th>
<th><strong>Variance:</strong> -5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSC Comments:</strong> The intent of this indicator is to ensure that site productivity is maintained over time. Unfortunately, the data that is available and that is being utilized to measure this indicator is not dependable and is not site specific.</td>
<td><strong>LSC Recommendations:</strong> Remove this measure from the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator #33</td>
<td>Existing Measure Statement: Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the TOR invited to participate in the PAG process.</td>
<td>Target: 100%</td>
<td>Variance: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC Comments:</td>
<td>LSC Recommendations: Update the TOR to remove sectors where representation has been unachievable or representation is covered by another similar sector. Increase variance to 20%?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current State

1. Canfor currently is involved with 14 SFM Plans in British Columbia and Alberta.
2. All 14 plans have been developed independent of each other.
3. Several SFM frameworks have been used to develop the plans.
4. Resulted in indicators and measures that don’t mesh between plans.
5. Inefficient and costly to manage multiple plans based on different
### Current State

1. Hundreds of Indicators to manage
   - Indicators # range from 36 to 96
2. Multiple methods used to manage same/similar indicators
   - In-house vs contract
   - Different Data management tools (Genus vs spreadsheets)

### Streamlining and Standardization

1. In 2007 started the process of identifying common indicators that we could use while re-writing the SFM plans to meet the new CSA standard using a draft copy of the standard.
2. Not a lot done in 2008 and 09 until after the standard was finished.
3. To date, two plans have been re-written, with PAG input and approval:
   - Kamloops TSA (Vavenby Operation)
   - Fort St John Pilot Project
4. In early 2010, opportunities were identified to streamline and standardize indicators while transitioning the remaining SFM plans to the QA standard.
Benefits of Streamlining and Standardization

1. Standardize and Streamline Indicators
   - Reduce the overall # of indicators in the plans
   - Incorporate efficient indicators (things we already do)
2. Standardize indicator statements and targets will:
   - Introduce efficiencies as the same indicators will be measured the same way,
   - Enable better identification of trends across the Defined Forest Areas (DFA’s)
   - Support the development and implementation of broader strategies.

Canfor Common Indicators

1. With input from independent consultants, SFM experts, and Canfor staff, a list of indicators was developed to satisfy the CSA Z809-08 required core indicators.
2. Goal is to incorporate these indicators where possible into our SFM plans while the plans are being re-written to the new CSA standard.
3. Most of the common indicators align with many of the current SFM plan indicators.
Implementation Plan

Proposed Time Line
- Meet with licensee partners by April 30, 2010
- Meet with PAG’s in May and June 2010 to introduce the process
- Start PAG review of indicators in fall of 2010
- Complete PAG meetings by June 2011
- Complete plan re-writes by end of 2011
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1.0 Introduction
This is the third Annual Report of the Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan. It covers the reporting period of April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010. The Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) is a result of the combined efforts of Canfor 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, Mackenzie Business Area – Mackenzie Operations
2. Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Mackenzie Operations

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 Mackenzie SFMP. Canfor and BCTS have 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. Canfor and BCTS established a PAG to assist with the development of the SFMP. A wide range of public sector interest groups from within the Mackenzie Forest District were invited to participate in the SFM process through the PAG. After completing the Terms of Reference in January 2006, the PAG established the SFMP Criteria and Elements Performance Matrix with the SFMP being completed in June of 2006. It is important to note, the Mackenzie 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 indicators the signatory’s performance in meeting the indicator targets outlined in the SFMP over the Mackenzie Defined Forest Area (DFA). The DFA is the Crown Forest land base within the Mackenzie Forest District and the traditional operating areas of Canfor and BCTS, 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 Mackenzie 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, indicators, objectives or the management practices involved, the reader should refer to the Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan Document.

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 Mackenzie Sustainable Forest Management Plan.

AAC – Annual Allowable Cut
BCTS – BC Timber Sales
BEC – Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification
BEO – Biodiversity Emphasis Option
BWBS – Black and White Boreal Spruce
CSA – Canadian Standards Association
CWD – Coarse Woody Debris
DFA – Defined Forest Area
ESSF – Engellman Spruce Sub-alpine Fir
FRPA – Forest and Range Practices Act
FSR – Forest Service Road
GIS – Geographic Information System
LOWG – Landscape Objective Working Group
LRMP – Land and Resource Management Plan
LU – Landscape Unit
MoFR – Ministry of Forest and Range
1.2 Executive Summary

Of the 45 indicators listed in Table 1, 40 indicators were met within the prescribed variances, and 5 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 indicators Status, April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Target Met</th>
<th>Pending</th>
<th>Target Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old forest</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interior forest</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Biodiversity reserve effectiveness</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Productive forest representation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patch size</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coarse Woody Debris</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wildlife Trees</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riparian Management area effectiveness</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sedimentation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stream Crossings</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Peak Flow Index</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Road re-vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Road environmental risk assessments</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Species within the DFA</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sites of Biological Significance</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Soil conservation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Terrain Management</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reportable Spills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Site Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Site Conversion</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Permanent Access Structures</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Communication of planned Deactivation Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Regeneration Delay</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Free Growing</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Prioritizing harvest of damaged stands</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Harvest Volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Waste and Residue</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>First-order Wood Products</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Local Investment</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Contract Opportunities for First Nations</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Range Management Effectiveness</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number</td>
<td>Indicator Description</td>
<td>Target Met</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Target Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Satisfaction (PAG)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Representation (PAG)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Input into Forest Planning</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Public and Stakeholder Concerns</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Access to SFM Information</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SFM Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>First Nations Input into Forest Planning</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>First Nations Concerns</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Visual Quality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Resource Features</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Safety Policies</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals           | 40  | 0  | 5  |

1.3 SFM Performance Reporting

This annual report will describe the success of Canfor and BCTS in meeting the indicator targets over the DFA. The report will be available to the public and will allow for full disclosure of forest management activities, successes, and failures. Canfor and BCTS have reported individual performance within their traditional operating areas as well as the performance which contributes to shared indicators and targets across the plan area. Both Canfor and BCTS are committed to work together to fulfill the Mackenzie SFMP commitments including data collection and monitoring, participation in public processes, producing public reports, and continuous improvement.
2.0 SFM Indicators, Targets and Variances

Indicator 1  Old forest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percent of blocks and roads harvested that meet the prescribed old growth targets. | Target: 100%  
Variance: 0% |

This indicator was chosen to monitor the amount of old forest within each Landscape Unit (LU) group. It is assumed that maintenance of all seral stages across the landscape will contribute to sustainability because doing so is more likely to provide habitat for multiple species as opposed to creating landscapes of uniform seral stage. Emphasis is placed on old forest because many species use older forests and the structural elements found therein (e.g. large snags, coarse woody debris, and multilayer canopies). These structural elements are difficult to recreate in younger forests. The targets for old forest are taken from the approved Mackenzie TSA Biodiversity Order.

### Old Forest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Blocks and roads harvested</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads harvested that meet the old growth targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: April 2010 Analysis Results – See Appendix 1 for analysis tables.

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 2  Interior Forest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percent of blocks and roads harvested that meet the prescribed interior old targets. | Target: 100%  
Variance: 0% |

Interior forest conditions refer to a situation where climatic and biotic characteristics are not significantly affected by adjacent and different environmental conditions (e.g., other seral stages, other forest or non-forest types, etc.). This indicator is important because provision of habitat for old-forest dependent species (see Indicator #1) can only occur if old forests are not significantly affected by adjacent environmental conditions. Historically, natural disturbance events such as fire, insects, and wind led to diverse landscapes characterized by forests having these interior old forest conditions. Thoughtful planning of harvesting patterns can minimize "fragmentation" of the forested landscape and help create interior old forest conditions. Furthermore, the intent of this indicator is to have interior old forest conditions represented within all ecosystem types to further enhance ecosystem resilience. The targets for interior old are taken from the approved Mackenzie TSA Biodiversity Order.

### Interior Old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Blocks and roads harvested</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads harvested that meet the interior old targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: April 2010 Analysis Results – See Appendix 1 for analysis tables.

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 3  Biodiversity Reserve Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percentage of blocks and roads harvested that are not within legally established protected areas, ecological reserves, or OGMA’s. | Target: 100%  
Variance: 0% |

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 legally established Old Growth Management Areas (OGMAs), parks, ecological reserves, 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.

### Biodiversity Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Blocks and roads harvested</th>
<th>Blocks and roads harvested that are not within protected areas, ecological reserves, or OGMAs</th>
<th>%in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GIS query

**Indicator Discussion:**

#### Indicator 4  Productive Forest Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent productive forest by BEC variant represented within the non-harvestable land base.</td>
<td>Target: As per the table below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintaining representation of a full range of ecosystem types is a widely accepted strategy to conserve biodiversity in protected areas and is suggested for landscapes managed for forestry. Most species, especially those for which knowledge is sparse or absent, are best sustained by ensuring that some portion of each distinct ecosystem type is represented in a relatively unmanaged state. Unmanaged stands act as a precautionary buffer against errors in efforts intended to sustain species in the managed forest. Unmanaged areas also help to sustain poorly understood ecosystem functions and provide an ecological baseline against which the effects of human activities can be compared based on the approach developed by, ecosystem representation is determined by evaluating the proportion of productive crown forest found in the non-harvested land base (NHLB), including parks and protected areas, but also including areas excluded from harvest for other reasons such as operability constraints.

An evaluation of ecological representation allows managers to identify the ‘management footprint’ on ecological units within a forest management unit. This in turn allows managers to prioritize management objectives (such as which units to emphasize OGMA placement, Wildlife Tree Patch targets and riparian reserves) and where to focus monitoring efforts.

### Productive Forest Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEC Variant</th>
<th>DFA Area (ha)</th>
<th>THLB Area (ha)</th>
<th>THLB Percent of DFA (%)</th>
<th>NHLB Area (ha)</th>
<th>NHLB Percent of DFA (%)</th>
<th>Approved Target (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>137,420</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWBS dk1</td>
<td>129,526</td>
<td>76,054</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>46,110</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWBS mw1</td>
<td>10,247</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>5,953</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWBS wk2</td>
<td>21,097</td>
<td>12,442</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>7,641</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF mv2</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>6,205</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF mv3</td>
<td>314,568</td>
<td>200,277</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>92,126</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF mv4</td>
<td>330,448</td>
<td>113,448</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>152,437</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF mvp</td>
<td>92,940</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>18,608</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF wc3</td>
<td>174,961</td>
<td>46,040</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>68,444</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF wcw</td>
<td>58,320</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSF wk2</td>
<td>111,798</td>
<td>62,900</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>39,488</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS mk1</td>
<td>257,289</td>
<td>189,083</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>41,785</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS mk2</td>
<td>175,296</td>
<td>115,469</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>37,831</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS wk1</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>7,201</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GIS

**Indicator Discussion:**
**Indicator 5  Patch Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of blocks and roads harvested that meet the prescribed patch size target ranges or are trending towards the target range.</td>
<td>Target: 100%  \n Variance: -30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patches often consist of even aged forests because most are the result of either a natural disturbance such as fire, wind or pest outbreaks, or from harvesting timber in a cutblock. Patches may be created through single disturbance events or through a series of events (i.e. a combination of natural disturbance and harvesting). Mature forests and younger forest patches represent a land base created from a history of disturbances, natural and otherwise. As such, forest stands and patches are often composed of a variety of species, stocking levels and ages. Currently, forest management practices have reduced the occurrence of many natural disturbance events, such as wildfire. In the absence of natural disturbance, timber harvesting is employed as a disturbance mechanism and thus influences the distribution and size ranges of forest patches in the same fashion as historical natural disturbance events. Harvesting activities serve to mimic natural disturbance events characteristic within the Mackenzie DFA. Past social constraints associated with harvesting and resulting patch size have lead to fragmentation of the landscape beyond the natural ranges of variability, which has developed over centuries from larger scale natural disturbance. In order to remain within the natural range of variability of the landscape and move toward sustainable management of the forest resource, it is important to develop and maintain patch size targets based on historical natural patterns. This indicator will monitor the consistency of harvesting patterns compared to the landscape unit group and the natural patterns of the landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patch Size</th>
<th>Number of Blocks and roads harvested</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads harvested that meet or are trending towards the patch size target ranges</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signatory</td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: April 2010 Analysis Results – See Appendix 1 for analysis tables.

**Indicator Discussion:**

**Indicator 6  Coarse Woody Debris**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The percent of cutblocks and roads harvested that exceed coarse woody debris requirements.</td>
<td>Target: 100%  \n Variance: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coarse woody debris (CWD) as a habitat element provides: 1) nutrients for soil development, 2) structure in streams to maintain channel stability, 3) food and shelter for animals and invertebrates, and 4) growing sites for plants and fungi,. Past forestry practices have encouraged the removal of CWD from sites for a number of economic and/or safety reasons, presumably to the detriment of biological diversity. We use this indicator following harvesting to quantify CWD retained in blocks, wildlife tree patches, riparian areas, and in areas of un-salvaged timber. Within the NHLB we assume that natural processes will result in the maintenance of appropriate levels of CWD.

Post-harvest CWD levels will be measured as a standard component of either the silviculture survey or residue and waste survey. The interim target for CWD was taken from the FRPA Forest Planning and Practices Regulation, Sec. 68 default requirements (BC. Reg 14/2004). Although the PAG members felt that this number was inadequate to protect this element of biodiversity, they recognized that insufficient information exists to determine either the amount of CWD left behind after harvesting or the amount of CWD that occurs in natural pre-harvest stands. Even so, we expect significantly more CWD than the target is retained after harvest and have committed to developing a more comprehensive CWD strategy pending availability of more data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coarse Woody Debris</th>
<th>Number of Blocks and roads harvested</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads harvested that exceed CWD requirements</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signatory</td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GIS.

**Indicator Discussion:**
Indicator 7  Wildlife Trees

Indicator Statement

Percentage of cutblocks that meet or exceed wildlife tree patch requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Cutblocks Harvested</th>
<th>Number of Cutblocks Harvested exceeding WTP requirements</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Site Plans

Indicator Discussion:

Stand level retention, including wildlife tree patches, is managed by each signatory in the DFA on a site-specific basis. During the development of a cut block, retention areas are delineated based on a variety of factors. Stand level retention generally occurs along riparian features and will include non-harvestable and sensitive sites if they are present in the planning area. Stand level retention also aims to capture a representative portion of the existing stand type to contribute to ecological cycles on the land base. Retention level in each block is documented in the associated Site Plan, recorded in the signatories’ respective database systems and reported out in RESULTS on an annual basis.

Indicator 8  Riparian Management Area Effectiveness

Indicator Statement

The percentage of forest operations consistent with riparian management area requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans.

Riparian Management are assessed during the block lay-out stage to determine its riparian class and associated RRZ/RMZ. Appropriate buffers are then applied, considering other factors such as operability and windfirmness. Prescribed measures, if any, to protect the integrity of the RMA are then written into the Operational Plan. The target is a legal requirement. The target value of 100% has been established to reflect this and to ensure that all riparian management practices, specifically RRZ designation and management, continue to remain consistent with the pre-harvest operational plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Forest Operations with Riparian Management Strategies identified in Operational Plans</th>
<th>Forest Operations Completed in Accordance with riparian management requirements</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>Silviculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Operational Plans

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 9  Sedimentation

Indicator Statement

The percentage of identified unnatural sediment occurrences where mitigating actions were taken.

Sedimentation occurrences are detected by forestry personnel during stream crossing inspections, road inspections, silviculture activities, and other general activities. In addition, Canfor supervisors routinely fly their operating areas annually following spring freshet to look for any such occurrences. While in some situations the sites may have stabilized so that further sedimentation does not occur, in other cases mitigating actions may have to be conducted. This may involve re-contouring slopes, installing siltation fences, re-directing ditch lines, grass seeding, or deactivating roads.

Sedimentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of identified unnatural sediment occurrences</th>
<th>Number of identified unnatural sediment occurrences with mitigating actions taken</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Indicator 10 Stream Crossings

Indicator Statement
Percentage of stream crossings appropriately designed and properly installed and/or removed.
Target and Variance
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. Sediment is a natural part of streams and lakes as water must pass over soil in order to enter a water body, but stream crossings can dramatically increase sedimentation above normal levels. Increased sedimentation can damage spawning beds, increase turbidity, and effect downstream water users. When stream crossings are installed and removed properly, additional sedimentation may be minimized to be within the natural range of variation. Erosion control plans and procedures are used to ensure installations and removals are done properly. To calculate 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.

Stream Crossings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Stream Crossings</th>
<th>Number of Stream Crossings</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installed</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inspection monitoring reports

Indicator 11 Peak Flow Index

Indicator Statement
Percent of watersheds containing approved or proposed development with Peak Flow Index calculations completed.
Target and Variance
Target: 100%
Variance: 0%

The peak flow index is an indicator that indicates the potential effect of harvested areas on water flow in a particular watershed. The H60 is the elevation for which 60% of the watershed area is above. The ECA or "Equivalent Clearcut Area" is calculated from the area affected by logging and the hydrologic recovery of that area due to forest re-growth. After an area has been harvested, both winter snow accumulation and spring melt rates increase. This effect is less important at low elevations, since the snow disappears before peak flow. Harvesting at high elevations will have the greatest impact and is, therefore, of most concern. As a result, areas harvested at different elevations are weighted differently in the calculation of peak flow index. Most hydrologic impacts occur during periods of the peak stream flow in a watershed. In the interior of British Columbia, peak flows occur as the snowpack melts in the spring.

With PFI calculations now complete, the watersheds will next be evaluated to establish the watershed sensitivity and thereby the PFI risk (low to high). With the PFI risk ratings established, harvesting plans will have to consider the impact harvesting will have on the watershed in which it occurs. The goal, in watersheds with a high PFI risk rating, is to either postpone harvesting, or refer to a qualified registered professional for a detailed review.

Peak Flow Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of watersheds with harvest activities in the DFA</th>
<th>Number of those watersheds with Peak Flow Index calculations</th>
<th>Total % DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GIS analysis – See Appendix 1 for a table with the current Peak Flow Index status of all Watersheds within the DFA.

Indicator Discussion:
Indicator 12  Road Re-vegetation

**Indicator Statement**
Percentage of road construction or deactivation projects where prescribed re-vegetation occurs within 12 months of disturbance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance:</strong> -10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator was chosen as a way to assess our ability to minimize or at least reduce the anthropogenic effect of forest roads on adjacent ecosystems. In keeping with the common assumption of coarse-and medium-resolution biodiversity, our underlying assumption with this indicator was – re-vegetating roads will reduce the potential anthropogenic effects that roads have on adjacent ecosystems by minimizing potential for silt runoff or slumps, the amount of exposed soil, the potential for invasive plants to become established, and returning at least a portion of forage and other vegetation to conditions closer to those existing prior to management.

### Road Re-vegetation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Total Number of Projects Where Re-vegetation is Prescribed</th>
<th>Number of Prescribed Re-vegetation Projects Completed within 12 months of disturbance</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Licensee tracking systems

**Indicator Discussion:** BCTS has not met this indicator for the past 3 years. This is primarily due to incorrect wording in our Forest Stewardship Plan which states that BCTS will grass seed (re-vegetate) all disturbance areas, regardless of risk. The Forest Stewardship Plan was amended in February of 2009 to remove this onerous requirement to re-vegetate. Unfortunately this amendment to the FSP has not been approved as of April 2010. Once the amendment is approved BCTS will be meeting this indicator.

Indicator 13  Road Environmental Risk Assessment

**Indicator Statement**
Percentage of planned roads that have an environmental risk assessment completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance:</strong> -10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental risk assessments provide a indicator of “due diligence” in avoiding accidental environmental damage that has potential to occur from forest development in conditions of relatively unstable soil. Through the implementation of risk assessments, we expect to maintain soil erosion within the range that would normally occur from natural disturbance events under unmanaged conditions. Our assumption was – the more we can resemble patterns of soil erosion existing under unmanaged conditions, the more likely it will be that we do not introduce undue anthropogenic effects, from road construction, on adjacent ecosystems. The completion of environmental risk assessments on roads is completed by field staff during road layout and is inputted into the signatories' respective databases. The assessments provide the basis for future road inspection requirements and highlight areas of special concern that may require professional geotechnical or design work. All assessments are completed in accordance to documented procedures.

### Road Environmental Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Total Number of roads constructed</th>
<th>Number of constructed roads with environmental risk assessments completed</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Genus

**Indicator Discussion:**

Indicator 14  Species within the DFA

**Indicator Statement**
Percentage of blocks and roads harvested that adhere to management strategies for Species at Risk, Ungulate winter ranges, and other local species of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance:</strong> -10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fundamental to the correct identification of species and habitats is the incorporation of appropriate management strategies where forest activities have the potential to impact species and habitats. Identification of those animals, invertebrates, bird species, vascular plants, 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 within the DFA 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.

There are various sources to draw upon when developing the comprehensive list of species that are legally protected or species of importance within the DFA. The list of species in Appendix C includes species from the following sources:

1. Species at Risk Act
2. Legally established Ungulate Winter Ranges
3. Local species of importance.

Incorporation of local species of importance recognizes potential species that are not legally protected. Local species of importance can be proposed by First Nations, PAG members, the licensees, or by members of the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species within the DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Forest Operations that coincide with Species at Risk, Ungulate Winter Ranges, or other local species of importance as identified in Operational Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Operational Plans

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 15 Sites of Biological Significance

Indicator Statement:
Percentage of blocks and roads harvested that adhere to management strategies for sites of biological significance.

Target and Variance:
- Target: 100%
- Variance: 110%

Sites of biological significance include areas that are critical for wildlife habitat, sensitive sites, and unusual or rare forest conditions or communities. Specific management strategies may be required to ensure that these sites are maintained within the DFA. This indicator will ensure that specific management (fine filter) strategies are developed to conserve and manage sites of biological significance. Many types of sites of biological significance are sufficiently known to allow the development of special management areas, or prescribe activities that will appropriately manage these areas. The management strategies will be based on information already in place (e.g., National Recovery Teams of Environment Canada, IWMS Management Strategy), legislation (provincial and national parks), Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs), and recent scientific literature. Management strategies will be implemented in operational plans such as site plans to ensure the protection of these sites. Training of appropriate personnel in the identification of these sites of biological importance is critical to the management and protection of these sites. Appropriate personnel include key signatory staff and consultants that are directly involved in operational forest management activities. Having appropriate personnel trained to identify sites of biological significance will reduce the risks of forestry activities damaging these sites.

This indicator evaluates the success of implementing specific management strategies for sites of biological significance as prescribed in operational, tactical and/or site plans. Operational plans such as site plans describe the actions needed to achieve these strategies on a site specific basis. Once harvesting and other forest operations are complete, an evaluation is needed to determine how well these strategies were implemented. Developing strategies and including them in operational, tactical and/or site plans are of little use if the actions on the ground are not consistent with them. Tracking this consistency will ensure problems in implementation are identified and corrected in a timely manner.
Sites of Biological Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Harvesting</th>
<th>Silviculture</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Forest Operations Completed in Accordance with Identified Strategies</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Operational Plans

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 16 Soil Conservation

Indicator Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Forest Operations with Sites of Biological Significance Management Strategies Identified in Operational Plans</th>
<th>Forest Operations Completed in Accordance with Identified Strategies</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>Silviculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Operational Plans

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 17 Terrain Management

Indicator Statement

The percentage of forest operations consistent with terrain management requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site 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.

Terrain Management
### Indicator 18  Reportable Spills

**Indicator Statement**
The number of EMS reportable spills

**Target and Variance**
- Target: 0
- Variance: < 5

All signatories currently have procedures in place for reducing and reporting spills. EMS checklists and monitoring procedures require the proper storage, handling, and labeling of controlled products. Such indicators include proper storage tank construction, the use of shut off valves, availability of spill kits, and the construction of berms where required. EMS plans also include the indicators to be taken in the event of a spill.

**Reportable Spills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Petroleum Products</th>
<th>Pesticides</th>
<th>Antifreeze</th>
<th>Battery Acid</th>
<th>Grease</th>
<th>Paints and Solvents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Signatory Incident Tracking System

### Indicator 19  Site Index

**Indicator Statement**
The percentage of standards units declared free growing that have measured site index values at or greater than pre-harvest site index.

**Target and Variance**
- Target: 100%
- Variance: -5%

Site index is an expression of the forest site quality of a stand, defined as the height of the dominant or co-dominant trees in a stand at a specified age. Site index equations are calculated for individual species using mensuration data. It is commonly used as an indicator of site productivity as it infers that trees or stands with greater growth at a given age have access to more key resources required for biomass production. The higher the site index for a given species in a given region, the higher the productivity or the quality of the site. Site index is sensitive to changes in ecological variables including soil nutrients, soil moisture, and others.

This indicator provides a relative comparison of a post-harvest average site index (at free growing) compared to the pre-harvest site index (as represented by inventory estimates) in the THLB. Current condition for this indicator is not known on a block-by-block basis as pre-harvest site index data is not readily available for blocks that are currently becoming free growing. The signatories are taking steps to remedy this and pre-harvest site index data now being tracked.
**Source:** N/A

**Indicator Discussion: BCTS:** This indicator measures a predicted SI by subzone and leading species based on the forest inventory, and compares the site index at free growing…which is based off of SIBEC estimates. The LSC question the validity of this indicator in terms of measuring SI performance. In 2010, the LSC will propose to the PAG to either amend the variance downward for this indicator, or propose to remove this indicator from the SFMP since it is not a core indicator under the new standard.

**Indicator 20 Site conversion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of THLB converted to non-forest land used through forest management activities.</td>
<td>Target: &lt;5% Variance: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to maintaining the resources necessary for sustaining the resiliency of forest ecosystems, a stable land base within which productive capability is assessed is also required. In order to assess the maintenance of the productive capability of the land base, this indicator specifically tracks the amount of productive land base loss due to various non-forest uses. Removal of the productive land base occurs as a result of permanent access structures, including roads, landings and gravel pits, as well as converting forested areas to non-forest land use, such as range, seismic lines and other mineral exploration.

Conversion of the THLB to non-forest land also has implications for carbon sequestration. A permanent reduction in the forest means that the removal of carbon from the atmosphere and carbon storage will be correspondingly reduced. The data that is required for monitoring is the number of hectares of productive forest area lost due to conversion to a non-forest use. This data collection and analysis is essentially a GIS exercise that can be completed at 5 year intervals concurrently with the Timber Supply Review process.

**Site Conversion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Total THLB</th>
<th>Area Converted to Non-forest Land</th>
<th>Percent of THLB Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>624,762</td>
<td>20,444</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>411,007</td>
<td>19,346</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,035,770</td>
<td>39,790</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** GIS analysis

**Indicator Discussion:**

**Indicator 21 Permanent Access Structures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The percentage of gross cutblock area occupied by total permanent access structures.</td>
<td>Target: &lt;5% Variance: +1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This indicator indicates the amount of area developed as permanent access structures (PAS) within cutblocks, in relation to the area harvested during the same period. Limits are described in legislation in the Forest Planning and Practices Regulation, section 36. 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. Roads and stream crossings may also increase risk to water resources through erosion and sedimentation. As such, minimizing the amount of land converted to roads and other structures protects the forest ecosystem as a whole.

### Permanent Access Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Total Cutblock Area Harvested</th>
<th>Total Cutblock Area in Permanent Access Structures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1094.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1980.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3075.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Operational Plans

### Indicator Discussion:

#### Indicator 22 Communication of planned Deactivation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of off-block road deactivation projects that are communicated with applicable First Nations and Stakeholders.</td>
<td>Target: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance: -10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forest is utilized by a variety of users. Access to the forest resource is important to First Nations, stakeholders, and the general public. Deactivation of off-block access roads can limit or remove access to the forest for other users. Where the signatories need to deactivate off-block roads, communication of their intention is required. Our assumption with this indicator is simply that – by increasing communication regarding signatory deactivation plans among stakeholders, we can increase the efficiency of access to resources. For the purpose of this indicator, stakeholders include trappers, guides, private land owners, and woodlots. First Nations will also be communicated with where their consultative boundary overlaps the planned deactivation projects.

### Communication of Planned Deactivation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of deactivation projects communicated to First Nations and Stakeholders</th>
<th>Total number of deactivation projects completed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory communication records

**Indicator Discussion:** BCTS: BCTS did not meet this indicator due to the details around this new indicator did not materialize through the PAG process until late in the fall or early winter of 2009. By this time all of the 4 deactivation projects were completed. For the 2010 deactivation projects, BCTS has sent out referral letters to First nations and overlapping stakeholders in February of 2010. Systems have been put into place to ensure that future deactivation projects are referred out to First Nations and Stakeholders.

#### Indicator 23 Regeneration Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of standards units declared stocked prior to the regeneration date consistent with operational plans</td>
<td>Target: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance: &lt;5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regeneration delay is defined in this SFM plan as the time allowed in a prescription between the start of harvesting in the area and the earliest date by which the prescription requires a minimum number of acceptable, well-spaced trees per hectare to be growing in that area. There is a maximum permissible time allowed and comes from standards developed and/or approved by government. The regeneration delay period is usually within two years, where planting is prescribed and five years where the stand is expected to reforest naturally. Ensuring that all harvested stands meet the prescribed regeneration delay date within the specified time frame is an indication that the harvested area has maintained the ability to recover from a disturbance, thereby maintaining its resiliency and productive capacity. It also helps to ensure that a productive stand of trees is
beginning to grow for use in future rotations. A regeneration survey is completed after planting to ensure adequate stocking of harvested blocks. The current status of this indicator was derived from a review of signatories' records for the reporting period.

### Regeneration Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of standards units required to meet Regeneration Date During Period</th>
<th>Number of standards units that Meet the Regeneration Date</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory silviculture records and/or RESULTS

**Indicator Discussion:**

**Indicator 24 Free Growing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percent of standards units declared free growing prior to the late free growing date consistent with operational plans. | Target: 100%  
Variance: <5% |

A free growing stand is defined in this SFM plan as 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. The free growing status is somewhat dependent on the regeneration delay date of a forest stand and could be considered the next reporting phase. A free growing assessment is conducted on stands based on a time frame indicated in operational plans. The late free growing dates are established based on the biogeoclimatic classification of the site and the tree species prescribed for planting after harvest.

In order to fulfill mandates outlines in legislation, standards are set for establishing a crop of trees that will encourage maximum productivity of the forest resource (BC MOF 1995b). The free growing survey assesses the fulfillment of a Licensee's obligations to the Crown for reforestation and helps to ensure that the productive capacity of the forest land base to grow trees is maintained. Continued ecosystem productivity is ensured through the principle of free growing. This indicator illustrates the percentage of harvested blocks that meet free growing obligations across the DFA.

### Free Growing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Standards Units Required to Meet Free Growing During Period</th>
<th>Number of Standards Units declared Free Growing</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory silviculture records and/or RESULTS

**Indicator Discussion:**

**Indicator 25 Prioritizing harvest of damaged stands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percentage of area (ha) harvested that are damaged or considered a high risk to stand damaging agents. | Target: 100%  
Variance: -20% |

Damaging agents are considered to be biotic and abiotic factors (fire, wind, insects etc.) that reduce the net value of commercial timber. To reduce losses to timber value it is necessary to ensure that if commercially viable timber is affected by damaging agents, that the timber is recovered before its value deteriorates. At the time of this SFMP's preparation, the most serious stand damaging agent in the Mackenzie 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 un-infested 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.

Treating areas with stand damaging agents will provide other societal benefits. Burned and diseased killed stands may be aesthetically unpleasing, and their harvesting and reforestation will create a more pleasing landscape. Windthrown stands restrict recreational use and can foster the growth of insect pests such as the spruce bark beetle. Thus, prioritizing areas with stand damaging agents for treatment will help to maintain a
more stable forest economy and achieve social benefits through enhanced aesthetics and recreational opportunities.

### Prioritizing Harvest of Damaged stands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of hectares harvested in the stands considered a high risk to stand damaging agents</th>
<th>total number of hectares harvested during the reporting period</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1094.8</td>
<td>1094.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1585.8</td>
<td>1676.9</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2680.6</td>
<td>2771.7</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatories Operational Plans

### Indicator Discussion:

**Indicator 26  Harvest volumes**

**Indicator Statement**

Actual harvest volume compared to the apportionment across the DFA over each 5-year cut control period.

**Target and Variance**

Target: ≤100%.  Variance: +/- 10%.

To be considered sustainable, harvesting a renewable resource such as timber cannot deteriorate the resource on an ecological, economic or social basis. It is expected that certain resource values and uses will be incompatible; however, a natural resource is considered sustainable when there is a balance between the various components of sustainability. During 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 a number of 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 Mackenzie DFA is part of the larger Mackenzie TSA, comprising about 42% of the TSA area.

The harvest level for a TSA must be met within thresholds that are established by the Crown. By following the AAC determination, the rate of harvest is consistent with what is considered by the province to be sustainable ecologically, economically and socially within the DFA. As stated above, the Chief Forester makes a determination of the rate of harvest for a particular TSA. The licensee then by law must achieve the AAC within the specified thresholds. In the case of BC Timber Sales, they are mandated to offer timber sale licenses matching the allocated AAC. Each truckload of wood is assessed and accounted for at an approved Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR) scale site. The MOFR uses this information to apply a stumpage rate to the wood, and monitors the volume of wood harvested and compares it to the AAC thresholds. BC Timber Sales tracks volume for timber sale licenses issued based on volume cruised, and compares this to its AAC allocation. Canfor tracks the scaled volume of wood harvested.

The volume of timber actually harvested within the DFA will be determined annually by a review of MOFR timber scale billing summaries for the period of January 1st to December 31st each year, on an annual basis. BC Timber Sales will track the volume sold annually relative to their apportionment. The signatories will report out on the volume harvested (Canfor) or sold (BCTS) over the previous 5 year period. With each annual report, the actual reported years within the 5 year period will change as the first year drops off and the current year is added on.

### Harvest Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>5 year Apportionment</th>
<th>Percent of 5 year cut in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1,237,619</td>
<td>1,034,139</td>
<td>491,314</td>
<td>105,011</td>
<td>335,424</td>
<td>3,203,507</td>
<td>5,414,520</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>590,202</td>
<td>801,475</td>
<td>787,404</td>
<td>377,673</td>
<td>170,630</td>
<td>2,727,384</td>
<td>3,594,430</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,827,821</td>
<td>1,835,614</td>
<td>1,278,718</td>
<td>482,684</td>
<td>506,054</td>
<td>5,930,891</td>
<td>9,008,950</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Signatory harvest records, HBS, and/or Sales Schedules

**Indicator Discussion:** For the 09-10 SFMP annual report, BCTS Mackenzie failed to meet this indicator. This is due to the fact that the local processing facilities have been closed for the past 2 years, which has had a huge
impact on our ability to sell wood in Mackenzie. Now that the local forest industry is starting to get back on track, our ability to sell wood in Mackenzie will increase slightly for the 2010-2011 reporting year. Until the sawmills are on 2 or 3 shifts, BCTS will not likely be able to meet this indicator since the volume requirements can be satisfied with the Licensee quota volumes. The success of BCTS meeting this target is, in part, largely dependent on the increase in local and regional sawmill production. Canfor also failed to meet this indicator due to the recent curtailments and the re-configuration of the sawmill operations. The Canfor Mackenzie operation has been reduced to one sawmill with a projected annual consumption of approximately 750,000m³. Under this scenario, it will not be possible for Canfor to meet this indicator as currently presented. A proposal will be made to the PAG to increase the variance in order to make this indicator achievable under current conditions.

Indicator 27 Waste and Residue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of blocks and roads harvested where estimated waste and residue is below allowable levels.</td>
<td>Target: 100%. Variance: -5%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of this indicator is to ensure that the use of wood fiber is maximized given reasonable consideration of fiber quality and milling efficiency. Government has set targets on allowable waste and residue for forest harvesting operations. This indicator simply allows us to monitor compliance with already established standard targets under the assumption that these targets adequately minimize any loss of economic potential from undue waste and residue of wood fiber.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads meeting waste and residue standards</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads harvested</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Waste and residue surveys

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 28 First-Order Wood Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of first-order wood products produced from trees harvested from the DFA.</td>
<td>Target: 5 Variance: -2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator helps to show how forest management activities can contribute to a diversified local economy based on the range of products produced at the local level. Forest management’s contribution to multiple benefits to society is evident through this indicator, as well as an indication of the level of diversification in the local economy. First order wood products are often used to supply value-added manufacturers with raw materials for production, such as pre-fabricated houses components. These provisions help to maintain the stability and sustainability of socio-economic factors within the DFA. By ensuring a large portion of the volume of timber harvested in the DFA is processed into a variety of products at local facilities, the local economy will remain stable, diverse, and resilient.

First-Order Wood Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Sawlogs</th>
<th>Pulp Logs</th>
<th>House logs</th>
<th>Lumber</th>
<th>Custom cut lumber</th>
<th>Trim Blocks</th>
<th>Pulp chips</th>
<th>OSB strands</th>
<th>Hog</th>
<th>Wood shavings</th>
<th>Plywood</th>
<th>Veneer</th>
<th>Pole Logs</th>
<th>Railway tie logs</th>
<th>Sawdust</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Finger joint</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 29  Local Investment

Indicator Statement
The percent of money spent on forest operations and management on the DFA provided from local suppliers.

Target and Variance
Target: 30%
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.

Local is defined in this SFMP as the communities of Mackenzie, McLeod Lake, Germanson Landing, Manson Creek, Tsay Keh Dene, and Fort Ware. The total dollar value of goods and services purchased within the local communities 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 local suppliers. Woodlands employee salaries are considered goods purchased where the employee lives within the local area and therefore contribute to community stability.

Forest Operations and Management consider all money spent within the signatory’s woodlands departments, excluding stumpage. Harvesting and road building costs, where applicable, will be included in the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Money spent in local area on Forest operations and management</th>
<th>Total money spent on forest operations and management</th>
<th>% in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>$6,287,059.24</td>
<td>$2,161,308.34</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>$4,278,519.83</td>
<td>$2,472,796.75</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10,565,579.07</td>
<td>$4,634,105.09</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatories accounting records

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 30  Contract Opportunities to First Nations

Indicator Statement
The number of contract opportunities with First nations within the DFA.

Target and Variance
Target: >5
Variance: -2

This indicator is intended to monitor the impacts of forest industry and government activities on the ability of First Nations to access forestry related economic opportunities. At present, this indicator is not intended to assess how successful First Nations are at taking advantage of the opportunities. BCTS provides opportunities for all eligible bidders including First Nations. Canfor has explored forestry related opportunities with First Nations in the past. Capacity amongst the First Nations to take advantage of opportunities will likely have to be addressed in order for available opportunities to be acted upon. This indicator tracks the existence of opportunities available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Road Building &amp; Deactivation</th>
<th>Other Volume Purchased</th>
<th>Logging</th>
<th>Silviculture Forestry</th>
<th>Other Contracts</th>
<th>Management Services</th>
<th>Total for DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: Signatories accounting records
Indicator 31  Range Management Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The percentage of forest operations consistent with range requirements as identified in operational plans and/or site plans. | Target: 100%  
Variance: 0% |

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. The indicator is designed to ensure that operational plans with identified range requirements have those requirements implemented on the ground. Maintenance of range resources is an important aspect of sustainable forest management because it contributes to the social and economic needs of people who traditionally and currently use the DFA for purposes other than forestry. This indicator will help to ensure that various range values are conserved for current and future generations.

### Range Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Total Number of Forest Operations with Range Requirements</th>
<th>Number of Forest Operations Consistent With Requirements</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>Silviculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory operational plans

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 32  Satisfaction (PAG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average overall percent of the PAG’s satisfaction with PAG meeting process. | Target: 100%  
Variance: -20% |

The PAG is one of the key elements of public involvement in the SFM process. The Mackenzie PAG provides 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 signatories have a positive and meaningful working relationship with the PAG, where the signatories are able to respond to all issues and concerns the PAG may have during the process. This indicator will use an average of the PAG meeting evaluation forms to determine the level of satisfaction of the PAG with the public participation process.

Following all PAG meetings to date, PAG participants completed meeting evaluations. One question is in the PAG meeting evaluation form to address this indicator which asked participants “Your overall satisfaction with PAG process?” This indicator is specific to responses to questions M10, M11, and M12 combined.

### PAG Satisfaction

| Mackenzie DFA SFM Plan Public Advisory Group Meeting Evaluation Question |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Question MQ10 | Question MQ11 | Question MQ12 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percent (score / 5)</th>
<th>Variance (from 100%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percent (score / 5)</th>
<th>Variance (from 100%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percent (score / 5)</th>
<th>Variance (from 100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-05-26</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 33  Representation (PAG)

Indicator Statement
Percentage of the public sectors as defined in the TOR invited to participate in the PAG process.

Target and Variance
Target: 100%
Variance: 0%

The Mackenzie 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 representatives from the various public sectors as defined in the Terms of Reference. Their involvement in the PAG process is crucial for 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 the signatories can draw on in achieving the SFMP objectives. Their participation will enhance the co-operation between the forest industry and other parties interested in the management of public lands in the DFA to meet the social, economic, and ecological goals of sustainable forest management.

PAG Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of sectors with a representative identified</th>
<th>Number of Sectors with no Representative</th>
<th>Total Number of sectors with no representative Invited</th>
<th>Number of Public Sectors in Terms of Reference</th>
<th>Percent in DFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAG meeting summaries

Indicator Discussion: The LSC has not been able to meet this indicator for the past 3 reporting years. This is due largely in part to high number of sectors in the PAG Terms of Reference that are duplicate or irrelevant. At the February 10th, 2010 PAG meeting, the LSC proposed to the PAG to revise the indicator by either changing the variance, by reducing the number of sectors to a realistic and representative list, or by changing the PAG representation from sector based to interest based (a number of interested represented by each PAG member). All of these ideas were not fully accepted by the PAG, and the LSC was tasked with providing rationale why certain sectors should be removed from the list and provide this at a later meeting in the 2010 reporting year.

Indicator 34  Input into Forest Planning

Indicator Statement
The number of opportunities for the public and/or stakeholders to provide meaningful input into forest planning.

Target and Variance
Target: 6
Variance: -2

Forestry activities can impact a wide section of the public and individual stakeholders within the DFA. This indicator was designed to monitor the signatory’s success at providing effective opportunities to residents and stakeholders to express concerns and be proactively involved in the planning process. This involvement may include the identification of areas of interest, definition of the nature of their interest in the land base, and any specific forestry activity that may impact their specific interests. 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 signatories planning framework.

Stakeholders include the following forest sectors; trappers, guide outfitters, water licence holders, range tenure holders, woodlot owners, private land owners, other licensees, and specific government agencies. Opportunities for input into forest planning will be offered to stakeholders where their tenured area coincides with the signatories planned activities.

Input into Forest Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>The Number of Opportunities For Public And Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Indicator 35 Public and Stakeholder Concerns

**Indicator Statement**

The number of operational concerns raised by the public and/or stakeholders that are considered and incorporated into operational and/or tactical plans.

**Target and Variance**

Target: 100%
Variance: -10%

All signatories solicit feedback for their public forest management plans in the DFA. As mentioned in previous indicators, public involvement is an important aspect of SFM as it promotes inclusiveness in how Crown forests are managed. Considering a diverse range of opinions and concerns will result in operational forest management decisions that consider views other than those of the forest industry. A forest industry that respects public and stakeholder input will maintain the support of the public, creating a more economically stable and open forest economy. Operational concerns from the public may be provided in many ways, including written letters, e-mails, or faxes to the signatories. There may also be written comments made during an in-person or telephone meeting between a staff member and the person providing comment. This indicator will compare the number of operational concerns that have been acted on relative to the total number of operational concerns raised. Operational plans are generally FSPs. Tactical plans can include AIs, operating plans, and cutblock and road referrals.

#### Public and Stakeholder Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of concerns brought forward that have been considered and incorporated into operational plans</th>
<th>Number of operational concerns brought forward</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
Indicator Discussion:

### Indicator 36 Access to SFM information

**Indicator Statement**

The number of opportunities provided annually for access to SFM related documents.

**Target and Variance**

Target: 3
Variance: 0
With this indicator we intend to monitor our effort to ensure effective and comprehensive distribution of the SFMP, annual reports, and audit results for the Mackenzie DFA. In order to gain trust and confidence in the SFMP process, it must be an open and transparent process. By ensuring access to the Plan, annual reports, and audit results, the results of our efforts in achieving sustainable forestry and continuous improvement can be clearly seen and monitored by the public, stakeholders, and First Nations. In this manner, the public, stakeholders and First Nations can hold the signatories accountable for achieving the desired results and have confidence that forest resources are being managed sustainably.

### Access to SFM Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Canfor</th>
<th>BCTS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open houses/Trade Shows</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFM/PAG Meetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of SFM Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indicator Discussion:

#### Indicator 37 SFM Educational Opportunities

**Indicator Statement**
The number of SFM educational opportunities and interactions provided.

**Target and Variance**
Target: 2
Variance: 0

This indicator was designed to monitor the signatories’ success at providing training and educational opportunities in sustainable forest management. SFM relies on residents and stakeholders making informed decisions on forest management. To achieve this, it is incumbent on the signatories to ensure the public are sufficiently informed about SFM to make the choices we request of them. The indicator is intended to ensure that the signatories provide the required opportunities for residents and stakeholders to learn about SFM. It is anticipated that educational opportunities will come in the form of open houses, public presentations, PAG meetings, the Mackenzie Trade Fair, and field tours of the signatory’s operations.

### SFM Educational Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Canfor</th>
<th>BCTS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field tours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open houses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG Meetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Shows, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indicator Discussion:

#### Indicator 38 Heritage Conservation

**Indicator Statement**
Percentage of forest operations consistent with the Heritage Conservation Act.

**Target and Variance**
Target: 100%
Variance: 0%

The protection of cultural heritage values assures they will be identified, assessed and their record 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.

The indicator is designed to ensure that operational plans with identified strategies to conserve cultural heritage values have those strategies implemented on the ground. Tracking the level of implementation will allow the signatories to evaluate how successful this implementation is and improve procedures if required.

### Heritage Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Total Number of Forest Operations that have associated sites protected under the Heritage Conservation Act (pre 1846)</th>
<th>Number of Forest Operations Completed in Accordance with the Heritage Conservation Act</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>Silviculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory operational plans

**Indicator Discussion:**

#### Indicator 39 First Nations Input into Forest Planning

**Indicator Statement**

The number of opportunities for First Nations to provide meaningful input into our planning processes where active operations are within their respective traditional territories.

**Target and Variance**

Target: \( \geq 2 \) per First Nation

Variance: 0

This indicator was designed to list and report out on all documented opportunities provided to First Nations people to be involved in forest management planning processes. Incorporation of First Nations people 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. The Mackenzie SFM PAG is a process designed to identify public values and objectives within the DFA. Within the PAG process, First Nations has been identified as an important sector for representation.

### First Nations Input into Forest Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Opportunity</th>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Tsay Keh</th>
<th>Kwadacha</th>
<th>Takla Lake</th>
<th>Nak'azdli</th>
<th>McLeod Lake</th>
<th>West Moberly</th>
<th>Saulteau</th>
<th>Halfway River</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Planning Referrals</td>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House Style Meetings</td>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Shows</td>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Operational Meetings</td>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Management Prescriptions</td>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP referrals / Consultation</td>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory communication records.
Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 40  First Nations Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percentage of operational concerns raised by First Nations that are considered and incorporated into operational and/or tactical plans. | Target: 100%  
Variance: -10% |

Incorporating management strategies into the planning process in order to resolve issues raised by First Nations leadership is a key aspect to sustainable forest management. This indicator contributes to respecting the social, cultural heritage and spiritual needs of people who traditionally and currently use the DFA for the maintenance of traditional aspects of their lifestyle.

Forest planning can include information sharing for both operational and tactical plans. Operational plans that are currently referred to First Nations as in the FSP process. Tactical plans that may be referred to First Nations include AIAs, operating plans, cutblock and road referrals, and annual operating maps. Active forest operations are considered to be current harvesting, road construction, and mainline deactivation projects, planned vegetation management projects, as well as forest planning of new cutblocks and roads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Nations Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signatory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Signatory communication records and operational, tactical, or site plans.

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 41  Visual Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The percentage of harvesting and road building operations consistent with visual quality requirements as identified in operational, tactical, and/or site plans. | Target: 100%  
Variance: 0% |

The indicator is designed to ensure that those operational plans with identified strategies to conserve visual quality have those strategies implemented on the ground. The maintenance of visual quality in scenic areas is an important aspect of sustainable forest management because this indicator contributes to overall landscape condition and social acceptance of industrial forestry. Monitoring the success of the requirements of the operational, tactical and/or site plans to meet VQOs will help to ensure that visual quality is conserved for future generations.

Visually sensitive areas are defined as viewscapes that have been identified through a previous planning process. During Forest Stewardship Plan preparation, scenic areas are identified on a map and if harvesting operations are planned for an area that contains VQOs, information will be further identified in a Site Plan. Visual Impact Assessments (VIAs) help determine block shape, location and internal retention options. At the site level, strategies are included in the Site Plan to minimize visual impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signatory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Signatory operational plans

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 42 Resource Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Percentage of blocks and roads harvested that coincide with identified resource features that are managed or protected. | Target: 100%  
Variance: -10% |

Resource features are site-specific elements that have a unique importance because specific ecological factors exist in combination at one place and don’t often occur similarly elsewhere. Examples are caves, Karst, or culturally modified trees but in general can be declared through regulation as any of the following:

- Karst;
- A range development;
- Crown land used for research;
- Permanent sample sites;
- A cultural heritage resource;
- An interpretive forest site or trail;
- A recreational site or trail; or
- A recreational feature.

These features are generally considered to have value to society so we assume that through conservation of these features we are contributing to social value. Our intent with this indicator is to monitor our commitment to manage and protect regulated resource features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of blocks and roads harvested with identified resource features</th>
<th>Total number of blocks and roads harvested where identified resource features are managed or protected</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 43 Safety Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Written safety policies in place and full implementation are documented. | Target: 2  
Variance: 0 |

Each signatory has a written safety policy in place which is reviewed by the safety committee at least once every year and revised as necessary and approved by management. If an incident occurs the cause of the incident is determined and recommendations are put forward. These recommendations may result in a change to a specific policy. Annual audits will be conducted and Action Plans developed for any item that requires attention detailing the person responsible for the item and the deadline for completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Written Safety Policies in Place and Implementation Documented? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory safety certification records

Indicator Discussion:

Indicator 44 Accidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Statement</th>
<th>Target and Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Written Safety Policies in Place and Implementation Documented? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and safety of forest workers and members of the public is an important quality of life objective that is essential to SFM. All signatories consider employee and public safety as a primary focus of all forestry related operations. Evidence of this high priority can be seen in various company mission statements and individual EMS policies. This indicator was developed to track and report out on the number of lost time workplace accidents that occur within Canfor’s woodlands division and the field operations of BCTS. Operations conducted outside the woodlands division and field operations have been excluded from this indicator; however the signatories currently promote safety in all aspects of forest management operations. Two types of workplace accidents are the most common within the forest industry including lost time accidents (LTA) or incidents where medical aid or treatment was necessary but no loss of work time was experienced by the employee. Through this indicator, only LTA will be tracked and monitored.

### Accidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory</th>
<th>Number of Lost Time Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Signatory safety records

**Indicator Discussion:**

### Indicator 45  Signage

**Indicator Statement**
The percentage of operational activities in place that have the appropriate signage in place during the activity, and removed following the completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Completed operational Activities requiring signage Number of completed operational projects requiring signage where the signs were posted during the activity and removed following completion</th>
<th>Number of Completed operational Activities requiring signage</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTS</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People value being informed of most activities that take place on public lands including those associated with industrial forestry. Signage establishes a standard for safety and otherwise helps inform public about the nature and extent of industrial activity. Conversely, if signage is not kept current, credibility of the signs declines resulting in a potential safety hazard. With this indicator we will monitor our commitment to making information about our activities current and available to those traveling the roads and trails of the Mackenzie DFA.

**Source:**

**Indicator Discussion:**
## Appendix 1

Old, Old/Mature, and Old Interior Forest Retention on the Mackenzie Defined Forest Area

### Mackenzie Old Growth and Old Interior Summary Table

**Defined Forest Area**

**Assessment Date – March 2010**

Targets based off of the Ministerial Order for Non-spatial Landscape Biodiversity Objectives in the Mackenzie Forest District.

Current reflects all known harvest blocks completed within the DFA as of March 31, 2010 (BCTS, Canfor, and Abitibi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Unit Group within the DFA</th>
<th>B.E.O.</th>
<th>B.E.C. Group</th>
<th>CFLB (ha)</th>
<th>Target Minimum %</th>
<th>Target Area (ha)</th>
<th>Current Area (ha)</th>
<th>Current %</th>
<th>Target Minimum % of Old Interior</th>
<th>Target Area (ha)</th>
<th>Current Area (ha)</th>
<th>Current %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater (includes Muscovite Lakes Park)</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>20980</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1888.2</td>
<td>11374</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>3302</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 4,7</td>
<td>94754</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10422.9</td>
<td>19971</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1042.3</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 5</td>
<td>61071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12519</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1251.9</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akie River</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>2544</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>58076</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5226.8</td>
<td>36687</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>522.7</td>
<td>13225</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 7</td>
<td>29555</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3251.1</td>
<td>15515</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>325.1</td>
<td>6271</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>3723</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>484.0</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalohead (includes Ed Bird Estella Park)</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>75223</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6770.1</td>
<td>46961</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>677.0</td>
<td>18095</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 7</td>
<td>89326</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9825.9</td>
<td>37964</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>982.6</td>
<td>7657</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>10140</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1318.2</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Davis</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49794</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4481.5</td>
<td>21619</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>448.1</td>
<td>5739</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34226</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6502.9</td>
<td>18889</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1625.7</td>
<td>5068</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22032</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2423.5</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32183</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2896.5</td>
<td>7103</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>289.6</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9751</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1072.6</td>
<td>4318</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4461</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>579.9</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germansen Mtn.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7909</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>711.8</td>
<td>3238</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>79868</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7188.1</td>
<td>43364</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>718.8</td>
<td>14454</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 5</td>
<td>5712</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>514.1</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 4</td>
<td>76031</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8363.4</td>
<td>17892</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>836.3</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffney, Manson River</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43778</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8317.8</td>
<td>27556</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4158.9</td>
<td>8838</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>10025</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>902.3</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>225.6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 5</td>
<td>22024</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1982.2</td>
<td>17892</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 4</td>
<td>6532</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>718.5</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 5</td>
<td>4465</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>401.9</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 2</td>
<td>36975</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3327.8</td>
<td>11387</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>831.9</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 4</td>
<td>13397</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1473.7</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>368.4</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 8</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>270.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morfee</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>161.6</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 2</td>
<td>24256</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2183.0</td>
<td>8405</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>545.8</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 7</td>
<td>6974</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>767.1</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>191.8</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 8</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 1</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 2</td>
<td>35906</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3231.5</td>
<td>12023</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>807.9</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 3</td>
<td>14021</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2664.0</td>
<td>7883</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1332.0</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 4</td>
<td>20763</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2283.9</td>
<td>5466</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>571.0</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 5</td>
<td>6141</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>552.7</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 1</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 2</td>
<td>80054</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7204.9</td>
<td>38267</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1801.2</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 4</td>
<td>13894</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1528.3</td>
<td>4638</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>382.1</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 7</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>586.3</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 8</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabesche</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  2</td>
<td>24427</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2198.4</td>
<td>12958</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>549.6</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  3</td>
<td>43191</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8206.3</td>
<td>20612</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4103.1</td>
<td>6790</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  4</td>
<td>4325</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>475.8</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  5</td>
<td>12926</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1163.3</td>
<td>4136</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>290.8</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  6</td>
<td>9417</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1035.9</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  8</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsnip (includes Heather Dina Lake Park)</td>
<td>I  1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  3</td>
<td>48335</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9183.7</td>
<td>39417</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4591.8</td>
<td>18606</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  5</td>
<td>25695</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2312.6</td>
<td>11718</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>578.1</td>
<td>4987</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  1</td>
<td>22869</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2515.6</td>
<td>4198</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>628.9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Mile</td>
<td>I  1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  2</td>
<td>12457</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1121.1</td>
<td>7855</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>280.3</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  7</td>
<td>3113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>342.4</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misinchinka, Tudyah B</td>
<td>L/I  5</td>
<td>34893</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3140.4</td>
<td>15855</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>785.1</td>
<td>4697</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L/I  4</td>
<td>19127</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2104.0</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>526.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L/I  3</td>
<td>31283</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5943.8</td>
<td>26957</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2971.9</td>
<td>12897</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip, Philip Lake, Tudyah A</td>
<td>L/I  2</td>
<td>62801</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5652.1</td>
<td>28289</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1413.0</td>
<td>6739</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L/I  5</td>
<td>4868</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>438.1</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misinchinka, Tudyah B</td>
<td>L/I  4</td>
<td>118828</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13071.1</td>
<td>19251</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3267.8</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaghan Creek, Eklund, Jackfish, South Germansen - Upper Manson</td>
<td>H  1</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  2</td>
<td>33438</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4346.9</td>
<td>15723</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1086.7</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  7</td>
<td>15031</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2405.0</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>601.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  4</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>816.8</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>204.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  8</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>276.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>H  3</td>
<td>13037</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3650.4</td>
<td>11472</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1825.2</td>
<td>5633</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  5</td>
<td>5793</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>756.5</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>187.6</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Akie, Lower Pesika</td>
<td>H  1</td>
<td>4451</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>578.6</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>144.7</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  7</td>
<td>13128</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2100.5</td>
<td>5760</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>525.1</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  8</td>
<td>3370</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>640.3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>160.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Osipka</td>
<td>H  1</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  2</td>
<td>18570</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2414.1</td>
<td>14137</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1207.1</td>
<td>4727</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  4</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>425.6</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>H  4</td>
<td>12243</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1958.9</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>489.7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>H  1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  3</td>
<td>13276</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3717.3</td>
<td>8087</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1858.6</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H  5</td>
<td>18230</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2369.9</td>
<td>4175</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>592.5</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>432.0</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU’s Enhanced</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>535.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading BWBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU’s General</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading BWBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU’s Special</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading BWBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### April 2010 Patch size Analysis

**Current State of depletions as of March 31, 2010**

Future state projected to 2015 with all planned blocks from BCTS, Canfor, and Abitibi

### Enhanced Management Strategy Resource Management Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Unit Group within the DFA</th>
<th>NDT 1, 2, and 3 &lt;=40</th>
<th>NDT 1 and 2 = 40-80, NDT 3 = 40-250</th>
<th>NDT 1 and 2 = 80-250, NDT 3 = 250-5000</th>
<th>over maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5810.0</td>
<td>9334.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10021.0</td>
<td>12746.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germansen Mt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip, Philip Lake, Tuudyah A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7260.0</td>
<td>9474.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>103.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15703.0</td>
<td>21708.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>463.0</td>
<td>467.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1332.0</td>
<td>1461.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>328.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2589.0</td>
<td>463.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalohead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5320.0</td>
<td>2474.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19463.0</td>
<td>13293.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>788.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4943.0</td>
<td>5977.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3370.0</td>
<td>4328.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** NDT refers to the National Development Tool, which is a measure of the size and condition of forest patches. The table details the current and future state of depletions in various landscapes, with target ranges and future projections for patch size analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Unit Group within the DFA</th>
<th>NDT 1, 2, and 3 &lt;=&lt;40</th>
<th>NDT 1 and 2 = 40-80, NDT 3 = 40-250</th>
<th>NDT 1 and 2 = 80-250, NDT 3 = 250-1000</th>
<th>over maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Total Area of patches (ha)</td>
<td>Future Total Area of patches (ha)</td>
<td>Target Range %</td>
<td>Current Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>702.0 1854.0</td>
<td>30-40 37.0 5% 149.0 8%</td>
<td>30-40 232.0 33% 404.0 22%</td>
<td>20-40 320.0 46% 610.0 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Akie</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>10-20 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>10-20 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>60-80 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peskia</td>
<td>1696.0 1362.0</td>
<td>10-20 30.0 2% 53.0 4%</td>
<td>10-20 279.0 16% 374.0 27%</td>
<td>60-80 1291.0 76% 883.0 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>20-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsnip</td>
<td>3858.0 5844.0</td>
<td>10-20 51.0 1% 57.0 1%</td>
<td>10-20 982.0 25% 1375.0 24%</td>
<td>60-80 1296.0 34% 707.0 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>427.0 1448.0</td>
<td>30-40 64.0 15% 66.0 5%</td>
<td>30-40 36.0 8% 154.0 11%</td>
<td>20-40 119.0 28% 208.0 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ospika</td>
<td>714.0 621.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 22.0 4%</td>
<td>30-40 30.0 4% 98.0 16%</td>
<td>20-40 0.0 0% 283.0 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabishe</td>
<td>279.0 481.0</td>
<td>30-40 117.0 42% 157.0 33%</td>
<td>30-40 605.0 29% 909.0 28%</td>
<td>60-80 495.0 24% 773.0 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Nabishe</td>
<td>1124.0 1450.0</td>
<td>30-40 124.0 11% 187.0 13%</td>
<td>30-40 129.0 11% 501.0 35%</td>
<td>20-40 275.0 24% 587.0 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>1326.0 1021.0</td>
<td>30-40 38.0 3% 33.0 3%</td>
<td>30-40 671.0 51% 587.0 57%</td>
<td>60-80 260.0 20% 43.0 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ospika</td>
<td>194.0 92.0</td>
<td>10-20 9.0 5% 9.0 10%</td>
<td>10-20 185.0 95% 83.0 90%</td>
<td>60-80 0.0 0% 0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peskia</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>20-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooer</td>
<td>1717.0 252.0</td>
<td>30-40 4.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 97.0 6% 65.0 26%</td>
<td>20-40 352.0 21% 136.0 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Ospika - no blocks</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>60-80 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooler</td>
<td>561.0 119.0</td>
<td>10-20 46.0 8% 20.0 17%</td>
<td>10-20 114.0 20% 71.0 60%</td>
<td>60-80 0.0 0% 24.0 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ospika</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>30-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
<td>20-40 0.0 0% 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Unit Group within the DFA</td>
<td>ND T</td>
<td>Current Total Area of patches (ha)</td>
<td>Future Total Area of patches (ha)</td>
<td>40-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>40-250</td>
<td>250-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Area (ha)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Current Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaghan Creek, Eklund, Jackfish, S. Germansen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1333.0</td>
<td>1227.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>714.0</td>
<td>1164.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffney - Manson River</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7525.0</td>
<td>7788.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11614.0</td>
<td>17030.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillis - Klawli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3741.0</td>
<td>8910.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1318.0</td>
<td>3137.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>882.0</td>
<td>981.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misinchinka TudyahB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>442.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5064.0</td>
<td>7636.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2759.0</td>
<td>3679.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1021.0</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>575.0</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Watershed Summary

Sensitivity Rating: Based on the terrain data under the first tab of this spreadsheet. Enter the rating in manually since the PFI calculation cannot distinguish linked cells.

PFI calculation: The PFI is calculated based on the watershed sensitivity rating and the ECA for the current condition and the future condition. The formula is the (% ECA below H60) + (% H60 above*1.5). If the PFI indicates a HIGH rating, then consult a qualified professional Hydrologist prior to future harvesting in the watershed, unless at such time the hydrological recovery of the existing openings allows for future harvest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Sensitivity Risk</th>
<th>PFI %</th>
<th>Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Sensitivity Risk = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;62.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.5-74.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;74.5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Sensitivity Risk = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;47.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5-62.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;62.5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Sensitivity Risk = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5-47.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;47.5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydrological Risk Rating: This calculation considers the ECA above the H60 line relative to the area above the H60 line. If the ECA above H60 is < 30.5% then the rating is low, between 30.5-49.5% then the rating is moderate, and above 49.5% then it is high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Name</th>
<th>Assessment Year</th>
<th>Watershed Sensitivity Rating</th>
<th>Current ECA (ha)</th>
<th>Current ECA (%)</th>
<th>PFI (%)</th>
<th>PFI Risk Rating</th>
<th>Hydrological Risk Rating</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7717.9</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dastagia Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>619.0</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1077.2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro Lake</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3554.6</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9617.1</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation River</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4627.0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATRWS000024</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1040.3</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAWSD00006</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>286.8</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Williston</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70498.5</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13887.0</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5336.6</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scovil Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1590.6</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvestor Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4080.5</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsedeka Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1251.2</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>