

Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project

Public Advisory Group Meeting # 48

Thursday, October 23, 2014 from 5:30 to 9:30

Fort St. John Quality Inn, Northern Grand Meeting Room

A) Meeting Attendance:

Participants

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Walter Fister	BC Timber Sales	(250) 262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	(250) 787-3651	darrell.regimbald@canfor.com
Dawn Griffin	Canfor	(250) 787-3607	dawn.griffin@canfor.com
Larry McFadden	BC Timber Sales	(250) 262-3324	Lawrence.McFadden@gov.bc.ca
Jennifer McCracken	Canfor	(250) 787-3641	Jennifer.McCracken@canfor.com
Sara Hyslop	Canfor	(250) 787-3696	sara.hyslop@canfor.com
Evan Hauk	Canfor	(250) 787-3693	evan.hauk@canfor.com
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	(250) 789-3621	admoore@cameronriver.ca

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Lyle Mortenson	Halfway River First Nation/ Prophet River First Nation	(250) 782-2227	lyle@lrm.ca
Fred Jarvis	Rural Communities	(250) 262-2913	fredjarvis@shaw.ca
Jim McKnight	Environment	(250) 262-1673	jimk01@telus.net
George Desjarlais	West Moberly First Nations	(250) 788-3676	forestry@westmo.org
Walter Allison	West Moberly First Nations	(250) 788-3663	
Dave Harris	Range-alternate	(250) 827-3503	dharris@pris.ca

Advisors Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Brian Farwell	F.L.N.R.O.	(250) 787-3455	brian.farwell@gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	F.L.N.R.O.	(250) 787-3393	Joelle.Scheck@gov.bc.ca
Norah White	F.L.N.R.O.- presenter	(250) 387-8013	Norah.White@gov.bc.ca

Other

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	(250) 305-9161	gwallin@wlake.com
Dave Menzies	Observer	(250) 787-7877	dmenzies@pris.ca
Ashley Bunker	Canfor-observer	(250) 782-1919	Ashley.Bunker@canfor.com
Tabatha Nedokus	Canfor-observer	(250) 787-3621	tabatha.nedokus@canfor.com
Gord Haines	Observer		outdoorgord@hotmail.com

B) Meeting Summary

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions - Gail Wallin
2. Review of Meeting Agenda - Gail Wallin
3. Review of Meeting #47 draft summary – Gail Wallin
4. Review of Outstanding Actions – Darrell Regimbald
5. Update from Participants – Dawn Griffin/Stephanie Smith/Andrew Moore
 - Canfor, BCTS, Cameron River Logging
6. Review of 2014 Audit Results-Evan Hauk, Walter Fister
7. Review of 2013 SFM Annual Report-Darrell Regimbald, Stephanie Smith
8. FSJPP transition process-Norah White, Walter Fister
 - Feedback from PAG
9. Survey Results/Improvement Opportunities-Jennifer McCracken
 - Review of annual PAG Public Process Satisfaction Survey Results
 - Feedback from PAG
10. Other information updates:
 - 2014 Brushing Summary-Sara Hyslop
 - Forest Health (Fires, Mountain Pine Beetle)- Jennifer McCracken
 - Timber Supply Review-Darrell Regimbald, Elizabeth Hunt
11. Summary of Field Trip Preparations-Walter Fister
12. Review of PAG Membership and Notice-Darrell Regimbald
13. Overview of 2015 Meeting Schedule - Darrell Regimbald
14. Feedback on Meeting, Survey

1) Welcome and Introductions

- Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, members, and observers.
- Participation in the meeting was extended to all present.

2) Review of Meeting Agenda

- Agenda was accepted. No changes were made.

3) Review of Meeting # 47 draft Summary

Meeting #47 summary was accepted as circulated by PAG. No changes were made.

4) Review of Outstanding Actions – Darrell Regimbald

PAG Meeting #47 Action Item #1: Prior to PAG Meeting #48, participants are to review Indicator 6.67, Rare Ecosystems, and send the background information written to PAG members.

Completed-Done

PAG Meeting #47 Action Item #2: Add George Desjarlais to the distribution list.

Completed- Done, but email address to be checked for accuracy.

PAG Meeting #47 Action Item #3: Indicator Matrix- correct spelling error on page 19, of Indicator Statement; “Indvator” should read “Indicator”.

The spelling was corrected.

PAG Meeting #47 Action Item #4: Attach the BC Professional magazine letter that was submitted by Walter Fister to meeting summary or otherwise distribute a copy of the letter to the PAG.

Completed

No further questions from PAG members.

5) Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, members, and observers.

6) Update from Participants-Dawn Griffin(Canfor)/Walter Fister (BCTS)/Andrew Moore (CRL)

Cameron River Logging:

- Currently in the fourth month of trans-loading logs to be sent by rail to Dunkley Lumber outside of Hixon.
- Have started trans-loading fracking sand.
- 23 acres of manufacturing and storage area in Taylor operations.

Canfor:

- Lumber markets are strong with the China market stronger than the United States.
- Lumber prices have increased and the FSJ mill is profitable at this time.
- Third shift is in place. Sixty people hired, still trying to hire 25 more workers.
- Canfor engaged with a joint venture with Pacifica Bioenergy Corporation recently announced a 58 million dollar investment in the construction of a pellet plant in Chetwynd and Fort St. John. Will employ 15 to 17 people at each plant, late 2015 for start-up.
- Very hot summer with forest fires has impacted deliveries. Peace Valley OSB is 60% below their target deliveries. Canfor sawmill is 20% below their target deliveries.
- Higher level management at Canfor has changed.

BC Timber Sales:

- Todd Bondaroff is the new Peace Natural Resources District Manager.
- Ralph Barkhouse is the new BC Timber Sales, Peace-Liard Woodlands Manager.
- Darral Alexander has retired from the Fort St. John Field Team.
- There will not be any lumber recovery/salvage from the local fires in the Fort St. John Timber Supply Area.
- Fort St. John Field Team planted over 1 million trees in 2014.
- No site prep was completed in 2014 due to the lack of bidders.
- completed both manual brushing and herbicide application contracts in 2014.
- Have sold two of the two that have been offered for sale. Two more are currently advertised with another ten to be offered in the coming months.
- Most upcoming timber sales to be advertised have been developed this year. Very little will be left in “ Standing Timber Inventory” (STI).
- Have been mandated to offer all our apportionment.

Question from PAG member: My alternate member is concerned with the herbicide spraying of saskatoons.

Answer: Without getting into specifics, we always ask the public and First Nations, if there are berry patches to be protected to let us know and we will do whatever we can to protect them. And experience indicates the berry bushes that have been treated with herbicide will return in future years.

6) Review of Audits- Evan Hauk/Walter Fister

Internal Audit- Canfor

Canadian Standards Association Internal Audit (June 17th to 20th)

Summary of Findings:

- No major non-conformances
- 2 minor non-conformances
- 3 opportunities for improvements
- 3 best practices

Minor non-conformances:

#1: incident tracking system (ITS) didn't have enough detailed information

#2: Harvesting/Road pre-work documents were not always signed off.

Opportunities for Improvements:

#1: Some documentation has not been updated with "Paper Excellence" replacing "Tembec"

#2: Some employee didn't receive the required training in areas where courses were not available.

#3: Wrong standards were shown on a certain template. This has been revised.

Best Management Practices:

#1: Site Level Plans have a strong link to the Landscape Level Strategies.

#2: Harvesting contractors training documentation is very thorough.

External Audit-Canfor

Canadian Standards Association Internal Audit July 28 to 31st

Canfor:

No major or minor non-conformities, one opportunity for improvement, six best practices.

OFI #1: A propane tank didn't have impact protection.

Best Management Practices:

#1: PAG membership has good representation (both Canfor and BCTS) and process

#2: Migratory Bird Act-Canfor's process for ranking the presence of active bird nests by stand attributes and timing logging activities accordingly.

#3: Implementing practices that minimize soil disturbance.

#4: Continued reduction of herbicide use

#5: Well organized work site (Zapper Contracting)

#6: Action plans closed off.

Recommendation from auditor is for recertification, both Canfor and BCTS.

Focus for 2015:

1. Consideration of First Nations topics for PAG field tour.

2. Status of Halfway River First Nations/Canfor herbicide use agreement.

No questions were asked regarding the Canfor audit presentation.

Internal Audit- BCTS (June 24-26)

Summary of Findings (all specific to Fort St. John Field Team):

- No major non-conformances
- 1 minor non-conformance
- 2 opportunities for improvement
- 4 good management practices

Minor non-conformance:

#1: Auditor determined that the Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) requirement as stated in the Site Level Plan had not been met on a harvested block.

Details of the four good management practices or opportunities for improvement were not provided.

Question from advisor: Regarding the CWD requirement, was that a pilot project requirement or a provincial directive?

Answer: Generally we have tried to provide some CWD through critter piles; the block that was audited was within the Wonowon Fire Zone, which we had committed to not leaving debris piles. I had found a document from the Chief Forester that provided a strategy to follow. I asked the prescribing forester to implement the Chief Forester's directive however we found it to be too onerous to be practicable.

There was no interest in hearing the auditor's findings around the good practices.

External Audit-BCTS

July 28 to 31st

Summary of Findings (all specific to Fort St. John Field Team):

- No major non-conformances
- No minor non-conformance
- 1 opportunities for improvement

Opportunity for Improvement:

OFI#1: Auditor felt on one block, the herbicide application layout should not have included a riparian area. We disagreed with the auditor and will not change our practice. Participants aren't required to follow OFIs.

A statement from the auditor regarding the good practice of record keeping BCTS has developed around the consultation with First Nations herbicide application program was read out to the PAG.

No questions from the PAG.

6) Review of 2013 Annual Report-Darrell Regimbald

More pictures were included in this year's annual report as a response to input from the PAG.

i) Major Achievements:

- Third full year of operation under SFMP #2
- Consistent with the targets of 64 out of 66 indicators in SFMP #2.
- Consistent in 27 out of 28 indicators related to the landscape level strategies.

Indicator targets not met:

-Canfor didn't meet the Establishment Delay target for mixedwood timber types.

Slides were shown to the PAG and discussion followed. Canfor want to consider two years of survey data before developing an action for the blocks in question.

-Canfor didn't achieve the Worker Training requirements. 1 out of 37 employees didn't meet training requirements. A mandatory course was not offered during the reporting year, as a result 1 employee could not complete all mandatory training.

ii) **Highlights of 2013/14**

Timber Harvesting

Slide was shown that indicated the harvest area amounts between the participants. The level of harvest has been increasing slightly between both Canfor and BCTS.

Reforestation

BCTS has planted 645 ha with 868,905 trees,

Canfor (acting on behalf of all the licenses managed) has planted 5,850 ha with 3,615,130 trees.

Overall the amount of trees planted has been increasing since 2009, with a sharp increase during the past three years. This reflects the increase in area harvested over the last 4 years.

Reforestation Assessment

Canfor has far exceeded the target (minimum predicted volume value) over the past three years. BCTS has exceeded the target over the past two years after not meeting the target in 2011.

Brushing Programs

Slides showed area in hectares that were proposed for treatment and actual area treated after consultation with First Nations. Overall trend shown is a reduction in the area treated with herbicide.

Wildlife Tree Patch Retention Targets

Slide showed the targets by Landscape Unit and the actual achieved percentages. We have exceeded the targets in all instances.

Question: What is the time frame?

Answer: This is a continuous time frame, since the first SFMP was instigated.

Visual Quality Objectives

Last year the target was not achieved. This year it has been achieved. All eleven assessments were consistent with the established VQOs.

A photo showing pre-harvest and post-harvest conditions was shown.

Contracts Awarded to First Nations

Eight contracts were awarded to First Nations including 121,000m³ of timber purchased, 401,000 m³ timber harvested/hailed and the management of the Peace Valley log yard which totaled a value of 1.8 million dollars in 2013/14.

Dollars Spent Locally on Each Woodlands Phase

In the past, we have had difficulty meeting the silviculture target, primarily because of very few silviculture contractors in the Peace area. We came to the PAG to have this target reduced. This year we have achieved this target in all phases. The total amount spent locally was 83.8% of the total amount spent by the participants.

iii) **Summary of Contraventions**

a) Harvesting equipment trespass (Canfor). Photo showed tracks in a Machine Free Zone of a small stream (possible non-classified drainage, but was assessed as an S6 stream); due to operator error. This incident was reported to Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations but no action was taken. A photo that showed the tracks was put on the projector screen.

b) Herbicide Application outside the planned treatment area (Canfor) occurred on two blocks but totaled less than 0.2 hectares out of 1,209 hectares treated. This was reported to the Ministry of Environment, but no action was taken.

Question: What is the time line for the government to respond?

Answer: Advisor was unable to answer question. Think there is a statute of limitations.

Action Item #1: Participants to investigate if there is a statute of limitations for these types of contraventions.

c) Debris piles not disposed of (BCTS). Fire hazard was not abated within 12 months after harvesting completed. BCTS reported to FLNRO and developed an action plan to burn the piles by December 31, 2014. No further action has been taken by FLNRO.

d) Unconfirmed Alleged Excess Soil Disturbance (Canfor). A government inspector felt Canfor had exceeded the soil disturbance limits on a cutblock. The MFLNRO inspection report indicates that although Canfor was close to the site disturbance limits, the inspector didn't think they were exceeded. Nevertheless, Compliance and Enforcement (C&E) decided to complete a full survey of the block to confirm if the limits had been exceeded. Canfor hired an independent contractor to conduct a soil disturbance survey on this block. This contractor felt the soil

disturbance limits had not been exceeded. Canfor is not sure of C&E's audit results. They have not shared their results with Canfor as of the date of this PAG meeting.

- e) Potential Impact to Archeological Site (Canfor) was reported last year but has not been completely dealt with. This block was required to have an Archeological Impact Assessment completed, it took some time to acquire the permit, it is in place and the archeological company has completed the field work investigation but as of the date of this PAG meeting have not yet completed their report. Their findings will be reported to FLNRO.

Summary: All issues had action plans created and there were no fines or penalties imposed on the participants. A graph was shown that indicated the number of contraventions per unit of area harvested have decreased over time.

Question: How does the hiring of Quesnel people by Cameron River Logging affect the Local Employment Indicator?

Answer: CRL haven't completed a formal forecast on how that hiring will impact them. These new workers will be moving to the Peace area and therefore will be considered local people.

**7) Fort St. John Pilot Project Transition Status Update- Norah White, RPF
(Sustainable Forest Management Policy Officer)**

Fort St John Pilot Project is a key component of the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA). The FSJ Pilot Project began under the Forest Practices Code, but has not been updated to reflect the provisions included in FRPA. One of the purposes of the FSJPP was to try some different management practices and then incorporate what we have learned to the rest of the province. The pilot is significantly different than the rest of the province. The intent is to integrate the pilot with the rest of the province at some point. However it will require a change to the legislation. The government is satisfied with the pilot and its results, there is no desire to change or remove or wind down the pilot at this time. SFMP #2 expires March 31, 2016.

Options for moving after March 31, 2016:

- 1) Extend for another full six year term plus a two year wind-down period.
Integration into provincial legislation to be completed by 2024.
- 2) Extend with two year increments, earliest to be integrated would be 2020.

- 3) Termination of the FSJPP in 2018 (two year wind down period) which isn't likely.

Next Steps:

1. Moving into a third SFMP, factors to consider:
 - a) What was achieved with SFMP #2;
 - b) New pilot activities in SFMP #3;
 - c) Monitoring successes so will be ready for changes in law. The PP will be 18 years old after the next term.
2. Obtain executive decision involving decision makers in Victoria regarding immediate fate of the FSJPP.
3. Draft SFMP #3 in 2015 for approval Will involve the PAG group.

Question (DR): Can we assume that it is a goal of government to integrate the pilot into FRPA?

Answer: Yes that is a fair assumption but there is no clear timeframe. There is a benefit to the rest of the province to implement many aspects that have been learned from the pilot.

Comment from DR: The best case scenario is there will be another full term, worst case only a two year extension.

Answer: That is a valid observation.

Question (DM): The pilot's advantage is it is a Landscape Level plan, how do you see it fitting with the rest of the province given the rest of the province doesn't manage on a Landscape Level?

Answer: You hit it right on the head! You are right; this type of planning hasn't worked in other areas of the province.

Question (AM): What are the aspects of the pilot that are liked by Victoria?

Answer: This venue (PAG) is huge; it isn't required by law anywhere else (it is a requirement for many certification schemes such as CSA however). The Forest Operations Schedule (FOS) is another positive aspect. The concept of the SFMP as an Operational Plan is very positive as well.

8) Survey Results/Improvements Opportunities – Jennifer McCracken

i) Review of Annual PAG Public Process Satisfaction Survey Results

The survey distributed, is a requirement in the SFMP (Indicator 64), Level of Satisfaction with the PAG. The SFMP requires the level of satisfaction be at least 80%. Twelve PAG members responded. The score is 91.1% level of satisfaction with the PAG process; therefore this indicator has been met. All questions were above 80% except for question 5 (still scored 78.2%).

ii) Feedback from PAG

It was noted that PAG feedback regarding the meeting will be requested at the end of each meeting.

9) Other Information Updates

i) 2014 Brushing Summary – Sara Hyslop

Canfor (including all licenses) applied herbicide on 600 hectares while BCTS on 440 hectares. The slide presented showed the trend for Canfor's herbicide use which is decreasing. Part of the reason for this trend is the participants using a Landscape Level Silviculture Strategy. This strategy allows for certain strata to have lower conifer stocking as a reflection of natural stands. Also the improved implementation of discretionary treatments (selective treatment) rather than broadcast treatments (treating an entire block) are being prescribed more than in the past. There has been a trend towards harvesting drier stands (primarily mountain pine beetle infested stands) therefore less competition resulting in less need to control competing vegetation. General acceptance of higher risk, taking a wait and see approach rather than the low risk approach of the past.

Question: During the last few years, if harvesting has occurred primarily in pine stands (which are drier and less brushy) what challenges do you see will happen as you move back into spruce dominated stands?

Answer: We think with some of the strategies that have been implemented will compensate and we will not return to herbicide application levels of the past.

Question: I would like to complement Canfor on the trend to use less herbicide. First Nations have a difficult time responding to a request to provide information such as berry picking areas that need to be protected.

Would like to see more ground application using the same principle of

“faller selection” of trees. Silviculture Surveyors should put effort into identifying berry picking areas while completing their survey.

Question: Based on an earlier slide showed that the amount of area pre consultation and post consultation with First Nations showed a drop in area to be treated for BCTS but not Canfor, was that because First Nations are not happy with Canfor’s practices or is there a lack of response on their part?

Answer: Canfor drop blocks from the Notice of Intent to treat after consultation with First Nations. The slide shown didn’t reflect this and we will correct that in future presentations.

Question: In regard to the Reforestation assessment results, the results reflects blocks that were harvested 15 years ago when herbicide use was very common, as part of the CSA certification requirements, the participants should be able to forecast results of MSQ results in 12, 15 years based on the change in the treatment regimes, would this be a practical thing to do? Could you present what you are doing to the PAG at a future date?

Answer: Yes we are working on this, we are focusing on more site prep and planting higher densities on the difficult sites and are tracking the costs. As time passes we will be able to determine if these treatments have been successful at reducing vegetative competition.

Question: Why replant mixed wood stands with pine?

Answer: Generally we plant the same species that we harvested.

ii) **Forest Health-Jennifer McCracken**

a) Mountain Pine Beetles:

Reviewed the mountain pine beetle life cycle and the effects on pine trees. Each year, the government completes forest health surveys via flying the entire province and record areas with forest health issues. The infestation continues to expand on the northern and southern edges therefore the center of the province is essentially dead. The beetle’s expansion has slowed due to colder winters and lack of food supply. The infestation peaked in 2011 in the Fort St. John Timber Supply Area.

Question: How much area did you log in beetle infested stands last year?

Answer: I don't have that figure and would need to get back to you.

Action Item #2: Jennifer McCracken will provide this information asked for by PAG meeting participant.

Jennifer answered the PAG member via email on October 27th. Below is her answer:

At the PAG meeting last week you asked a question regarding the amount of pine that we have harvested in the last year. I have done a little searching and found that from May 1 of 2013 to May 1 of 2014 Canfor delivered approximately 356,000 m3. This equates to 35% of the total conifer volume delivered in that period and wouldn't include any oil and gas volume. There are many reasons the pine % seems low despite our focus being on pine stands. Most of which you can probably determine yourself given your intimate knowledge of our business, but here they are:

- Despite our focus being on pine leading stands, there is almost always a component of spruce or aspen in our blocks.*
- When we harvest deciduous stands there is almost always incidental conifer in the stand, which is typically spruce.*
- The mill targets for 2013 were 65% green meaning we have to harvest a certain amount of green while still managing the beetle stands.*

iii) Fires

This year there were 16 fires which impacted approximately 14,043 hectares of timber in the Fort St. John Timber Supply Area. Size of fires range from 2 to 8,500 hectares. Majority were lightning caused. Fires occurred in 16 different Operating Areas. Participants will generally try to salvage fire damaged timber if there is an opportunity to do so. However most of the 2014 fires occurred in non-merchantable timber types or isolated areas without road access.

Several pictures were shown.

iv) Timber Supply Review- Darrell Regimbald

The process has begun, an analyst has been assigned to this project by the MFLNRO.

The Data Package was hoped to be available for public, stakeholder, First Nations review for 60 days sometime prior to November 2014. Comments

may be incorporated into the Data Package and then the analysis will be completed and followed with a public discussion paper for another 60 day review. The Chief Forester will then review the discussion paper and determine the AAC for this Timber Supply Area.

10) Summary of Field Trip Preparations- Walter Fister

The summer field tour that was planned for June was cancelled because we didn't have the minimum number of committed PAG members to attend the tour. We would like to have a field tour next summer. The minimum attendance to hold the tour was set at three PAG members. We will talk about the 2015 summer field tour at the next meeting.

11) Review of PAG Membership and Notice- Darrell Regimbald

The draft Notice of Membership was distributed. Publishing a notice of PAG membership is a requirement of the FSJPP Regulation. It will be published in the *Northeast News*. The PAG members were asked if they did not wish their name to be published. No one objected.

12) Overview of 2015 Meeting Schedule – Darrell Regimbald

It will be important to prepare SFMP #3 in the upcoming year. We are not anticipating any new indicators that will need to be incorporated into the revised SFMP. The spring meeting will include the planning for the summer field trip. The fall 2015 meeting will be similar to this meeting.

13) Feedback on Meeting, Survey

Recommendations: In the presentations, provide both BCTS and Canfor numbers together rather than separately. It helps to show what is happening on the landscape overall.

Comment: I like the pictures and the presentations.

Comment: I like the quality of presentations; it keeps me informed of what is going on in the forest industry.

Recommendation: Would like to hear a presentation from one of the interest groups.

The PAG was asked if they would provide a presentation. Generally there was a willingness to do so.

Comment: Would there be interest in a presentation on the Boreal Caribou Forest Planning?

Generally there was interest from PAG members.

Comment: Great meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:44 pm

Handout from Meeting #48

- 1) FSJ Results Based Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Meeting #47 Summary and actions.
- 2) Meeting #48 agenda.
- 3) Notice of Membership

Summary of Actions from Meeting #48

PAG Meeting #48 Action Item #1: Participants to investigate if there is a statute of limitations for the investigation of contraventions such as trespasses.

Completed - The following response was provided by the MFLNRO:

“According to Section 86 (1) of FRPA, the time limit for laying an information respecting an offence under the Acts is 3 years after the date on which the facts that led to the laying of the information first came to the knowledge of an official. Under FRPA, we have three years from the date that the facts of a contravention become known to us. During those three years, a Delegated Decision Maker may find a contravention and levy an administrative penalty.”

PAG Meeting #48 Action Item #2: Jennifer McCracken will provide the interested PAG member the amount of area harvested due to mountain pine beetle infestation in 2014.

Completed – The requested information was provided to the PAG member and has been included in this meeting summary:

At the PAG meeting last week you asked a question regarding the amount of pine that we have harvested in the last year. I have done a little searching and found that from May 1 of 2013 to May 1 of 2014 Canfor delivered approximately 356,000 m³. This equates to 35% of the total conifer volume delivered in that period and wouldn't include any oil and gas volume. There are many reasons the pine % seems low despite our focus being on pine stands. Most of which you can probably determine yourself given your intimate knowledge of our business, but here they are:

- Despite our focus being on pine leading stands, there is almost always a component of spruce or aspen in our blocks.
- When we harvest deciduous stands there is almost always incidental conifer in the stand, which is typically spruce.
- The mill targets for 2013 were 65% green meaning we have to harvest a certain amount of green while still managing the beetle stands.

The Participants will identify in each SFM annual report the amount of pine volume harvested and the proportion of total conifer harvested.