

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #29**

**March 6, 2008
6:00 pm to 9:45 pm**

<http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/>

FSJ Cultural Center

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email or Postal Address</u>
<i>Participants</i>			
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	250-787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@Canfor.com
John Rowe	Canfor	250-787-3680	John.Rowe@Canfor.com
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	250-787-3651	Darrell.Regimbald@Canfor.com
Dave Menzies	Canfor	250-787-3613	Dave.Menzies@Canfor.com
Walter Fister	BCTS	250-262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	250-262-3209	Mark.Vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Doug Braybrook	Tembec		Doug.Baybrook@tembec.com
Wes Neumeier	Canfor	250-787-3645	Wes.Neumeier@Canfor.com
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	250-789-3621	Andrew@taylordunnage.ca
Brian Farwell	BCTS	250-262-3337	Brian.Farwell@gov.bc.ca

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Oliver Mott	Environment	250-785-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com
Chad Dalke	Oil and Gas		Chad.d.dalke@conocophillips.com
Budd Phillips	Non-commercial recreation/hunting/fishing	250-785-1283	Budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com
Dale Johnson	Range	250-262-3260	Fax: 262-3260
Stanley Gladysz	Recreation	250-785-2596	sgladysz@pris.ca
Roy Lube	Recreation	250-787-7619	Rlube@telus.net
Duane Salmond	Trapping	250-785-2571	none
Vicki Allen	Trapping	250-785-5597	none
Ron Wagner	Labour	250-787-0172	roiwagner@telus.net

Advisors

Elizabeth Hunt	Ministry of Forests and Range	250-784-1242	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	Ministry of Environment	250-787-3393	Joelle.scheck@gov.bc.ca

Observers

Teena Demeulemeester	West Moberly First Nations	250-788-3676	forestry@westmo.org
Gord Haines	Public Observer		outdoorgord@hotmail.com
Norma Pyle	Blueberry River First Nation		npyle@blueberryfn.ca
Anita Messier	BCTS		Anita.Messier@gov.bc.ca

Facilitator

Gail Wallin	Facilitator	250-305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com
-------------	-------------	--------------	--

1. Review of Meeting Agenda

- Draft agenda was reviewed, no new items to add, agenda was accepted.

2. Welcome and Introductions

- Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, and observers

3. Review of Outstanding Action Items and Last Meeting Summary (Oct 11, 2007)

- **Action #4** – *PAG requested to have a presentation from Ministry of Tourism, Sports, and the Arts about Heritage Trail designations.* A presentation was lined up for this meeting, but presenter had to postpone due to a personal issue.
- **Action #11** – *PAG requested participants to ask KPMG for a definition of “significant non-compliance” and “minor non-compliance” in the next audit summary.* Dave Menzies emailed KMPG VP, response was:

“A significant compliance issue would be:

- Appreciable environmental damage
- Material deviation from the regulated landscape level strategies.”

- **Action #13** – *PAG requested details in meeting minutes regarding non-conformity #NC-2007-01 found during the CSA Audit.* Details were added to the meeting summary from last meeting (Oct. 11, 2007) which was sent out to PAG and is available on the FSJ pilot project website.
- **Action #14** – *PAG requested a list of common forestry acronyms.* A link to a list of acronyms from the Ministry of Forests and Range was emailed to PAG and was added to the meeting summary from the Oct. 11, 2007 meeting.
- **Action #15** – *PAG requested a link to the SFMP in the meeting summary as a source for common forestry terms and definitions.* The link to the draft SFMP was added to the minutes and can be found on the FSJ pilot project website.
 - There was a request from the PAG to discuss the current state and the future of the pilot project at the next meeting. The question was posed to Dale Morgan (District Manger of the Peace Forest District) in December 2007, with the response that government would have an ongoing pilot project review process at meetings with the Forest Practices Branch. The preliminary suggestion was that the pilot project would continue, with possible title changes to make it adaptable to other regions across BC.
- **Action #18** – *Follow-up with Wayne Sawchuck to see if he still wants to participate in the PAG.* Jen Nickel emailed Wayne after the October meeting, Wayne agreed to be an alternate instead of a representative.
- **Action #19** – *Request to send out the 2007/2008 matrix prior to the next PAG meeting.* The matrix was distributed via email, though an incorrect version was mistakenly sent out. A hard copy of the current version of the matrix was distributed to the PAG at the start of this meeting.
- **Action #20** – *Contact Oliver Mott to see if he is willing to be a representative for environment and conservation instead of an alternate.* Jen contacted Oliver by email, and Oliver accepted. **Note – this action was not added to the Oct 2007 meeting summary.**
- Facilitator asked if any corrections needed to be made to the Oct 2007 meeting summary.

ACTION 1: Add Action #20 from Oct 2007 meeting to the corresponding meeting summary.

- No other changes or corrections were made to the meeting summary.

4. Presentation on Mountain Pine Beetle Updates

- Aerial surveys were completed in fall of 2007, approximately 50% of the TSA was flown, resulting in approximately 11,300 potentially infested sites.

Question from the PAG: What is the significance of the yellow areas on the map?

Response from Participant: The yellow areas are private land, mostly agricultural. These areas aren't flown during the aerial surveys, only Crown land is surveyed.

- Beetle probing – crews went to 2,196 of the potentially infested sites to provide more detailed information on which sites were hit and the severity of attack. The estimated number of hit trees was 96,500.
- Treatment plans were produced from November 2007 to February 2008 to decide what activities could be done to minimize the impact of MPB populations. Areas were identified and prioritized according to variables such as beetle populations, rate of spread, probability of a stand getting hit, etc. The result was categorizing operating areas into the Beetle Management Unit Strategy. 3 of these strategies are used locally:
 - Suppression (Fall and burn, harvesting) – The most aggressive strategy, most of the TSA falls into this Unit. Luckily infestations in our area aren't anywhere near as bad as most of BC, so suppression strategies can be a successful treatment.
 - Holding Stage 1 and 2 – Used in areas of chronic beetle infestations
 - Salvage – Used in areas where management efforts won't help, as most of the pine is already dead. The objective is to remove as much as possible before it becomes completely unmerchantable.
- Fall and burn activities are being done between January 1 and March 31, 2008.
- Harvesting in MPB-infested stands started in October 2007, with 210,000m³ of beetle wood harvested in 07/08 and 360,000m³ scheduled for 08/09
 - There have been some amendments to the Forest Operations Schedule because these areas weren't planned at the FOS stage. With the influx of MPB, harvesting as a proactive attempt to decrease beetle populations has resulted in a shift areas where MPB is concentrated.

Question from the PAG: How does the volume of wood harvested in 07/08 and 08/09 compare to a "normal" year, i.e.: pre-MPB?

Response: Volume is approximately 700,000m³/year, with 250,000m³ coming from incidental coniferous volume harvested from aspen stands. A lot of volume is purchased from private landowners and woodlot owners, and those blocks with more homogenous pine stands and infected trees will be at a higher priority to purchase over other sales.

Question from the PAG: How many healthy trees are there?

Response: There are estimated to be more than a billion trees in the TSA. Timber cruise data from MPB-infested blocks shows a 1-14% incidence of MPB attack, which is relatively quite low.

Question from the PAG: So is the MPB problem now endemic to our area?

Response: The MPB was likely always here in very low numbers, but there have been recent very large population increases due to warmer temperatures and an influx of beetles from west of the Rockies. Winters in the FSJ area are still considered to be "too cold" to sustain high beetle populations, though this was a similar comment made in other areas in BC.

- Upcoming activities include mortality surveys, pheromone baiting (successful results have been seen last year by concentrating beetles in blocks scheduled for harvest), aerial surveys (pending federal funding), and harvesting.

Question from the PAG: Are you reforesting the logged areas?

Response: Yes, it's a legal requirement to reforest all harvested areas.

Question from PAG: What species do you plant?

Response: The intent is to mimic the pre-harvest stand, so where mixed stands (Pine/Spruce) are harvested, these species are planted.

Question from PAG: How are the MPB areas accessed? Are new permanent access structures (roads, bridges, etc) being created?

Response: No new roads are being constructed right now, as most of the activities are on/near pre-existing roads.

Question from PAG: Is there a chemical spray/pesticide that can be used?

Response: Not at this time.

Question from PAG: Is the increase in decking area in Wonowon due to increase in MPB harvesting?

Response: No, peelers (for plywood) are being decked here temporarily before being sent up to Fort Nelson.

Question from PAG: Aren't there some individual trees that have a natural immunity to MPB?

Response: No, but some trees are less susceptible because they are able to produce more pitch in response to a beetle attack. Younger trees tend to be less susceptible because of this.

5. Presentation of Long-Time Attendance Award

- Ron Wagner was presented with a book of Peace Area photography for attending 29 of 29 PAG meetings. Everyone was invited to sign the book and give comments about Ron's involvement.

6. Biennial Review of Terms of Reference

- Facilitator handed out the current Terms of Reference for review and asked if any of the PAG members wanted to make any changes or comments, none were brought up at this time.
- The working group highlighted its proposed changes to the Terms of Reference and were presented and discussed with the PAG. Each of the sections were discussed as follows:
 - A) Changes proposed to make the TOR more current, in regards to the wording around an SFM Plan. Proposed including "The participants received SFM certification under the CSA standard Z809-02 for the pilot project area in 2003.
 - B) No changes proposed
 - C) No changes proposed
 - D) Proposed change to the timeline to have the TOR reviewing period in the winter instead of the fall, because the fall is when the annual report is being drafted, and it is usually a busy time of year. Reviewing the TOR during the winter will allow for a more thorough review process.
 - E) No changes proposed
 - F) No changes proposed
 - G) Proposed removing empty spaces from the list of participants
 - H) No changes proposed
 - I) No changes proposed
 - J) Proposed changing the next revision date from April 2008 to March, 2010.

ACTION 2: Change section 7 in the Terms of Reference to include a tentative date for the next Terms of Reference revision.

- The PAG and participants accepted the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference.

7. Changes to Membership

- Facilitator asked if there were any changes to the PAG membership
- No inactive members identified, no changes needed

8. Proposed Updates to CSA Matrix

- Facilitator re-iterated that the correct version of the CSA Matrix was handed out and that changes were highlighted.
- Facilitator asked if there were any items that the PAG or observers wanted to discuss, these issues would be discussed after the proposed changes by the working group
 - #61 – drop or update according to target
 - This was brought up because the incorrect version was sent out electronically; this change was done on the corrected hardcopy version given out at this meeting.
 - Proposal to add an objective around safety
- Working group proposals were to the following indicators:
 - Indicator # 21:** Proposal to change the target from "A minimum of 1 drainage plan submitted no later than October 2007" to "A minimum of 1 drainage plan submitted no later than October 2009." The participants' rationale for this change is that the target may not be achieved within the 1-year variance attached to it. There is a lower urgency on the MKMA, due to the shift toward activities in areas affected by the mountain pine beetle.

Question from PAG: Since #21 is a legal indicator, why hasn't it been done by Oct 2007?

Response: There is a one-year variance attached to the target, so there is no issue currently about non-compliance. Because it is a legal indicator, any changes still need government approval, so even if the PAG agrees to this change, it may not get government OK. The government needs to approve a landscape unit objective, and then the drainage plan can be submitted.

Question from PAG: How long does it take to develop a drainage plan?

Response: 8 months to 1 year

Comment/Suggestion from PAG: Why not change the wording to remove any reference to a specific date, so that this does not come up in 2009 if the issue hasn't been addressed by then? If it can be tied to the approval of the landscape unit objective it may work better.

- The suggested wording change to "A minimum of 1 drainage plan submitted within 1 year following approval of a landscape unit objective" was accepted by the PAG.

ACTION 3: Participants to amend the target for indicator 21 as suggested by PAG, subject to government approval.

UPDATE: March 14 – PAG Proposed Matrix amendment to Indicator # 21 confirmed by Participants, and will be submitted for government approval.

Indicator # 25: Proposal to split this forest health target from "100% of sites with significant detected forest health damaging agents will have treatment plans developed for them, and initiated within one year of initial detection" into two separate targets as follows:

- "100% of sites infected with Mountain Pine Beetle, and identified within Beetle Management Units with a "Suppression" classification, will have treatment plans developed for them, and initiated within one year of detection."
- "100% of sites with significant forest health damaging agents (excluding Mountain Pine Beetle) will have treatment plans developed for them, and initiated within one year of detection."

The participants' rationale is that MPB management has become extensive enough to warrant its separation from the management of other forest health damaging agents.

- No questions from PAG, proposal approved.

ACTION 4: Participants to proceed with proposed changes to Indicator #25, subject to government approval.

UPDATE: March 14 – matrix amendment completed for Indicator # 25, and will be submitted for government approval.

Indicator # 35:

a) Proposal to change the water quality target to read "Less than 30% of the total number of surveyed stream crossings on roads for which the participants have stewardship, will have "high" WQCR, based on a three year rolling average."

b) Proposal to add, "based on a three year rolling average" to the variance statement for this target.

The participants' rationale is that currently there are essentially two targets – one for active roads and one for inactive roads, but since the objective is maintenance of water quality it shouldn't matter if the road is active or inactive. The Water Quality Concern Rating is an assessment of the hazard of accelerated erosion and sediment delivery to streams, associated with road crossings. It is not based on the size of the road or stream, only the crossing itself. Also, the original targets were based on limited information (one year's worth of data-82 samples), and now there are 977 samples. More data collection has allowed for a more accurate representation of the proportion of "high" Water Quality Concern Ratings, and the new proposed indicator reflects the better accuracy of the data.

Question from PAG: What are you finding on inactive roads in regards to water quality?

Response: Surveyors have noted that there can be a fair amount of ruts from quad use on some deactivated roads, which can lead to increased sedimentation. Theoretically, if the deactivation is

well done, it should reduce this problem. When deactivated roads are grass-seeded, there is a lower risk of erosion and sediment delivery, even with increased use by quads.

Question from PAG: Is the WQCR done only on a 4-point scale?

Response: The 4-point scale is a qualitative rating based on a computed infinite index. The surveyor does not assign a subjective rating in the field. Since inactive roads make up the majority of the roads, they are subsequently sampled more heavily (75% of samples were on inactive roads).

Comment from PAG: It would be interesting to see the statistical outputs of these surveys, especially the mean and standard deviation for active and inactive roads. That way the PAG may get a better idea of how many crossings have been designated as “high” and what the spread is.

Response: The rating system is very reliable, and is being adapted to other parts of BC, to ensure that the ratings are consistent throughout the province. It may be of interest to show where the crossings are that have “high” ratings.

Comment from Facilitator: Maybe instead of giving the PAG the WQCR results, a presentation could be done on this process at a later meeting.

Question from PAG: Why have you defaulted to 30% (the inactive road target) instead of 25% (the active road target)?

Response: Since the vast majority of samples are done on inactive roads, the target was weighted accordingly. The original indicator was based on data from only one year, but now that there are multiple years’ data we have a better idea of the percent of crossings with different ratings.

Question from PAG: What does “stewardship” mean? Does it only apply to permitted roads, or for every road on the TSA?

Response: The indicator only applies on roads under the tenure of Participants. For example, oil and gas roads are used by forestry workers, but they are not under our tenure, and so they are not included in the WQCR surveys.

Question from PAG: What is the long-term impact of roads on the environment? Even though the majority of roads are deactivated, they are still used by hunters, 4X4, etc, so how clean is the water after deactivation?

Response: 75% of the surveys are done on deactivated roads, so we have reliable data on the WQCR on these crossings.

Question from PAG: What is done with the “high” rated crossings?

Response: The SFMP outlines a procedure to assess the results of WQCR sampling including ‘High’ crossings. In many cases the risk of erosion and sediment delivery is alleviated by additional grass seeding. An example is the Colt Creek area. The 2006 sampling population included a number of crossings originally surveyed in 2003. Many of the crossings in that area received a “high” WQCR. Remediation work was prescribed and completed. The follow-up surveying (2006) showed that all the problems areas were fixed, and no crossings in the project area have a “high” rating any more.

Comment from PAG: The SFMP should state that every failed deactivation will be fixed.

Question from PAG: Does a deactivated road ever become a non-road?

Response: Yes, the tenure can be surrendered to the government.

Question from PAG: Are the 977 samples done on roads throughout the TSA?

Response: Yes, on participants’ tenured roads.

Facilitator: Group would like to get more information on the WQCR to better understand it, but are the PAG ok with the proposed targets as presented?

PAG: Yes, but we would like to understand the process better.

ACTION 5: Participants to proceed with changes to indicator 35, and will prepare a presentation for the next meeting to review the survey results and subsequent actions.

ACTION 6: Re-visit the change to indicator 35 next spring, along with other CSA matrix changes.

Comment from PAG: The wording of the target for indicator 35 is incorrect, it should read “Fewer than...” rather than “Less than...”

- Revised statement accepted by PAG and participants.

ACTION 7: Participants to change the wording of the target for indicator 35 as suggested by PAG.

Indicator # 49-Proposal to include a reporting timeline, with the resulting target statement “95% of the coniferous harvested area will utilize conventional ground based harvesting equipment, during the term of the SFM Plan.” The rationale is to make this indicator more on-par with the timber supply review, and that annually isn’t appropriate because there are some years where no cable logging is done, and so this target would be unachievable during those years.

Question from PAG: Why was this indicator added to the matrix in the first place?

Response: There are objectives regarding maintaining viable harvest levels, and cable logging does have to be done sometimes (at least 1% of the harvested area) to maintain the AAC. On most sites, however, there is no need to use cable systems over ground-based.

Comment from PAG: Not all members of the PAG may know what the difference is between cable, conventional, and heli logging and what the decision-making process is to choose which system to use.

Response: The systems and their parameters are defined in the SFMP, and are generally chosen based on the ground to be harvested (slope, soils, etc). Conventional logging is ground-based, using feller-bunchers and skidders. Cable logging uses a cable and pulley system to pull logs (like a “giant clothesline”), and heli logging uses a helicopter to fly trees from where they were felled and processed to where they will be trucked away.

Question from PAG: Will updated VRI data change the TSR process?

Response: Yes, and this will be discussed later on in the meeting.

- Proposal accepted by PAG

ACTION 8: Participants to proceed with changes to indicator 49 of the SFM matrix

Indicator # 52: Proposal to drop this indicator because of the overriding priority to harvest in MPB suppression areas, where there are no merchantable height class 2 pine types.

- Identification of height class 2 pine types as potentially merchantable was mainly a result of poor historic inventory data. Newer VRI inventory data has dramatically improved type identification, and will likely show that there aren’t many merchantable HC 2 pine types anyways.
- There is no risk to the long-term harvest level as a result of removing this indicator.

Question from PAG: Why was this indicator in the matrix in the first place?

Response: There was an assumption in the timber supply review (TSR) that ~8% of HC2 pine types were potentially merchantable, although this is proving to be overly optimistic. Also, this indicator was included before MPB was an issue in the FSJ area, but after 2006 there has been a shift to harvest exclusively in areas affected by MPB and fire.

Question from PAG: Why can’t this indicator be deferred instead of removed?

Response: The concern is that the target likely won’t be achieved anytime soon due to this shift to MPB suppression, which is clearly a much higher priority from a timber supply viewpoint.

Question from PAG: Can you clarify the comment about HC2 pine – is there 8% or not?

Response: Yes, there is ~8% merchantable HC2 pine, but none of it is in the MPB management areas where our activities have been focused.

Comment from Facilitator: The choice is to remove or defer this indicator.

Comment from Participants: This indicator is a legal indicator, so any changes to it still need government approval even if the PAG approves the changes.

- PAG proposed to defer this indicator for 5 years because although MPB is a high priority, indicator 52 may still be relevant in the long run. The indicator should be reviewed in 5 years because at that time the next TSR should be available, there will be more reliable VRI data, and there should hopefully be less of a focus on MPB.

ACTION 9: Participants to change the variance for Indicator # 52 to 0 during the 2007-2011 period, in order to defer the indicator, but maintain reporting objectives. Any change is subject to government approval.

- Public observer suggested adding an indicator on safety to the SFM matrix, for example a commitment to no LTA, which is already done by licensee woodlands. There should be criteria and indicators to ensure that the forest is a safe place to work.

Comment from PAG: Good idea, because it not only affects workers, but also the public (increased use of roads by logging trucks, etc). If it was to be included as an indicator, it should probably go in Criterion 6, Accepting Society’s Responsibility for Sustainable Development.

Comment from Participant: Licensees and contractors are in the process of becoming SAFE Certified by the BC Forest Safety Council.

Comment from Facilitator: Suggestion on wording of an indicator to include “maintaining SAFE Certification and reporting safety incidents,” and perhaps a review by an external auditor on any unsafe activities or incidents.

Comment from PAG: If the participants brought info on SAFE certification it could help with this discussion.

Comment from PAG: Any safety indicator has to reflect the interests of all participants, not just Canfor and BCTS.

ACTION 10: Participants to draft a presentation on safety and safety certification.

9. Review of Audit Results

- Andrew Tyrrell reviewed the results from the 2007 compliance audit (audit results handed out to PAG)
 - The audit is required to occur on a biennial basis by the FSJ pilot project, and is a synthesis of all audits in the 2-year period regarding FSJ pilot project compliance.
 - The auditor found a high level of compliance, with no significant non-compliances found and no compliance and enforcement requirements
 - The auditor identified 6 minor areas for improvement, outlined in the audit results.
- Brian Farwell reviewed BCTS ISO 14001 recertification audit
 - No official results have been issued yet
 - 6 minor non-conformances identified, none in FSJ
 - 2 opportunities for improvement identified, regarding fuel management and improving trucker awareness regarding on-site spill kits, emergency plans, etc.
- Wes Neumeier reviewed Canfor’s internal FMS audit
 - No non-conformances or non-compliances identified
 - Auditor was impressed with the indicators from the PAG
 - Opportunities for improvement were identified, mainly regarding updating external website and minor changes to Annual Report.

10. Presentation – Updates on Participants’ Activities with First Nations

- Memorandum of Agreement in place between Canfor-LP OSB joint venture and parent companies and 6 local Treaty 8 First Nations
 - The goal is to create economic opportunities for First Nations by improving awareness on education funding, career and job requirements, and career development plans
- The Joint Management Advisory Committee (JMAC) gives input on management plans and training development
- There has been information sharing with First Nations regarding amendments to the Forest Operations Schedule regarding MPB activities
 - Fall and burn contracts have been awarded to Blueberry River and Saulteau First Nations
- ~320,000m³ of aspen was harvested through the 2006/07 season by First Nations contractors, with a target of 390,000m³ for 07/08
 - 2007/08 conifer volume targeted at 79,000m³ harvested by BRFN, with logging and hauling subcontracted to Doig River Timber
- Contract in place with Six Nations Ventures for weigh scale and partial log yard management
 - SNV is owned by all 6 Memo of Agreement First Nations partners
- There are many opportunities for First Nations involvement, including education and job training, employment, contracting, forest management planning, and info sharing.

Question from PAG: Only 7 students given scholarships for education and training, is this enough?

Response: Unfortunately the JMAC does not have a large fund to draw from for scholarships, and there is also dropping enrollment in forestry-related programs. It may be a reflection on the general trend of less people choosing forestry as a career option.

11. Presentation – Vegetation Resource Inventory (VRI)

- VRI monitors the landbase and provides info on timber and non-timber resources used for:
 - Sustainable Forest Management indicators on forest types, seral stages, forest health, and height-class 2 pine
 - Timber supply review and analysis
 - Annual allowable cuts (from TSR)
 - Mapping and management plans for strategic timber supply
 - Delivered wood cost estimates
- The old inventory is outdated (1980's), and is therefore somewhat unreliable
- Brief explanation of VRI process:
 - 2 phase estimate on timber features (age, species composition, crown closure, height) and non-timber features (rocks, water, roads, shrubs, slope)
 - Phase 1: Photo interpretation from air photos
 - Phase 2: Ground sampling of the polygons identified from photo interpretation
 - Net Volume Adjustment Factors: Determines the net merch volume of a unit
- Current VRI process: Phase 1 is to be completed by March 2008
 - Very expensive, has cost \$3.5million since 2001, funded by government (FIA)
 - Phase 2 is expected to be done by August 2009 and expected to cost \$600,000

Question from PAG: How many people does VRI employ?

Response: Currently, there are approximately 22 people working for contractors on VRI process, though they don't work exclusively on FSJ project.

Question from PAG: Who owns the data, and will it be available to the public?

Response: Government owns the data, but it is public. Air photos and VRI data can be viewed online. Currently, only air photos on the eastern areas of the TSA are available.

Question from PAG: Can the inventory be done using satellite imagery?

Response: Satellites can be an alternative, though it is quite expensive and is often used on private lands. Other alternatives are also being looked at.

12. Suggestion for topics for 2008 Summer Field Trip

- Facilitator asked for suggestions from PAG and participants on what they would like to see on the summer field trip, as there is a high interest in going on a trip:
 - Mixedwood management
 - Silviculture activities
 - Coarse woody debris management
 - Motorized recreation opportunities/trail maintenance
 - Sharptail grouse sites
 - Enhancements to ungulate winter range
- Proposed dates for summer field trip: Tuesday/Wednesday/Thursday during the first or second week of June, tentatively 12th or 19th
 - June 12th provides a better opportunity to see active silviculture activities

ACTION 11: Working group to email PAG with a list of proposed field trip topics and dates, and ask members to rank them in order of preference.

13. Proposed Focus for Next Meeting

- Potential topics for the next PAG meeting:
 - Water Quality Concern Rating discussion/presentation
 - Safety discussion/presentation
 - Other topics identified at field trip
 - Review external audit results
 - Review and input for Draft 2008/09 Annual Report