

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting # 30**

**October 16,2008
1800 to 2100hrs**

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

FSJ Cultural Center

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendance:

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
<i>Participants</i>			
Wes Neumeier	Canfor	787-3645	Wes.Neumeier@Canfor.com
Andrew Tyrell	Canfor	787-3665	Andrew.Tyrell@Canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	787-3613	Dave.Menzies@Canfor.com
John Rowe	Canfor	787-3680	John.Rowe@Canfor.com
Reg Gardner	Canfor	787-3641	Reg.Gardner@Canfor.com
Walter Fister	BCTS	262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	789-3621	Andrew@taylordunnage.ca
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	787-3651	Darrell.regimball@Canfor.com
<i>PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates</i>			
Dale Johnson	Range	262-3260	Fax: 262-3260
Budd Phillips	Non Commercial Rec/ Hunt/ Fish	785-1283	Budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com
Stanley Gladysz	Recreation	785-2596	sgladysz@pris.ca
Oliver Mott	Environment / Public Interest	785-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com
Duane Salmond	FSJ Trappers	785-2571	none
Peter Bueckert	Labour	262-9580	bueckert@bluenova.ca
Vicki Allen	FSJ Trappers	785-5597	none
Fred Klassen	Labour Rep	787-1429	Klassen@intpac.ca
<i>Advisors</i>			
Roger St.Jean	Oil And Gas	787-3234	Roger.StJean@gov.bc.ca

Commission			
Alicia Goddard	Ministry of Environment	787-3369	Alicia.Goddard@gov.bc.ca
Observers			
Teena	West Moberly	788-3676	forestry@westmo.org
Demeulemeester	First Nation		
Jim Vince	FSJ Trappers	783-9168	Jim.Vince@bchydro.bc.ca
Tim Bennett	Ministry of Tourism Culture and the Arts	784-0178	Tim.Bennett@gov.bc.ca
Philip Dyck	public	787-0431	n/a
Gerald Peters	public	785-3557	n/a
Rod March	public	262-3324	Rodney.March@gov.bc.ca
Larry McFadden	public	787-8777	Lawrence.McFadden@gov.bc.ca
Ronald Laurentin	public	261-3202	Ronald.Laurentin2@gov.bc.ca
Facilitator			
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com

1. Welcome and Introductions

- **(GW)** – Review of Terms of Reference focus of meeting is Pilot Reg and CSA Standards, this is the 30th PAG meeting
- Introductions round table
- Sorted out FSJ trappers Association interest, Duane is representative, Vicki is Alternate

2. Review of Meeting Agenda

- Draft agenda reviewed, revised to omit items 11 and 12 in interest of timing, no public presentations were tabled
- Draft annual report discussion – to be made available online when finalized
- **(GW)** – discussion on what we will focus on in Annual report – non target items
- No corrections to last meeting summary other: **Action #1: add Jim Vince and Vicki Allen to attendance for PAG meeting # 29.**
- Action # 6 from previous PAG meeting will carry forward to next spring
- No questions from PAG on Action items

3. Presentation on Water Quality indicator and how the field procedures work – (Andrew Tyrell)

- **Question from PAG**– Are Oil spills or contaminants covered under this monitoring of water quality?
- **Response**– No, that is measured differently from this process.

- **Comment from PAG**– With siltation, it makes sense to build roads across natural courses
- **Question from PAG**– Are you only concerned with areas specific to crossing, what about steep and cut slopes?
- **Response**– We have peak flow index indicators for areas other than crossings and management practices around streams, in this process we are discussing looks at crossing areas only.
- **Comment from facilitator** – We have 61 indicators, we agreed to measure this one at crossings, and there are 59 or 60 others and some look at water quality issues as well.
- **Question from PAG** - Do planning activities take areas with high turbidity into account?
- **Response** - Not high turbidity, it says there is a high potential risk of erosion, this is not a pre harvest accounting procedure, this is monitoring road crossings
- **Question from PAG**– You do not take this into account in planning?
- **Response** – No, we have other / many practices in place designed to minimize sedimentation into streams.
- **Comment from facilitator to paraphrase question** - In examples with high potential for erosion, what do you do?
- **Response** - Remediation of areas, mostly revegetating with grass seed – this, in our experience is the most effective at a reasonable cost. It usually brings the area from high to low.
- **Question from PAG** - You do this procedure after you log, not before?
- **Response** - Yes, that is correct.
- **Question from PAG**– Does weather affect the effectiveness of the remediation procedures?
- **Response** - Yes, it makes it very difficult to establish grass; however assessments are much easier to conduct in the rain.
- **There were no further questions or comments from PAG regarding this presentation**

4. Annual Report Presentation (copies of summary handed out) open for questions

- **Comment from facilitator** The Annual report provides information on indicators measured. Explanation of how indicators are reported back to PAG every year through annual report. Asked for any specific areas of clarification or areas that PAG members wanted to focus on. The three things below (aerial herbicide, road deactivation, and CWD) were discussed prior to review of report
- **Question from PAG**– With respect to silviculture treatments, how much spraying is done?
- **Response**– Total amount of spraying is not an indicator that we report on in this process. Additional comments on this topic later by Wes Neumeier and Walter Fister – see below.
- **Question from PAG**– Table 17. Can we get some clarification on what permanent / semi permanent / temporary mean? At Inga Lake, they went back in post logging, why show permanent status at Inga?

- **Response** - It does not refer to the type of road, but rather refers to the type of road deactivation that is planned. We use temporary deactivation in areas where we plan to go back for silviculture or some other reason.
- **ACTION ITEM # 2 – Participants to revise table in Annual Report to clarify the column refers to the level of deactivation .**
- **Question from PAG** Regarding 3.6 CWD targets. With new gov't regulations on hogfuels, will we loose CWD targets?
- **Response**– The 46 cubic meters comes from a pre harvest survey on a landscape level in which 92 cubic meters was found to be the average although there was a high degree of variation in these amounts (20 to 200 meters) . We are targeting 50% to remain post harvest. These targets are legal indicators and will override any new regulations until such time as the SFMP is reviewed. As it stands now, the SFMP is law and government will have to sort out any new changes.
- **Question from PAG**– What about naturally occurring debris, is this included in the 92 m³
- **Response**) – Yes, this is included in pre logging sampling that looked at 30 or 40 sample sites on landscape level.
- **Comment from facilitator**– These new regulations and the pilot project review are some things we should be aware of as a group. We need to realize that we can only have indicators that we have control over or the responsibility of the participants.
- **Return to question on Herbicide – Response** - With harvesting, green up happens quickly. There is a lot of competition and we have problems with this. We do a lot of site preparation, we plant early with the right stock and brushing is a last resort. We do not spray on areas with deciduous regeneration, and the amount of conifer we are planting is decreasing, therefore, the amount of spray we are using is decreasing overall. We brush approx. 90% to 95% of conifer plantations, and approx 80-85% of the treatments involve spraying using aerial herbicide.
- **Additional Comments from on BCTS Program.** A point on the program. CSA does not track amounts, however, SFI and FSC does track amounts to limit herbicide use. For BCTS, 95% of brushing is aerial herbicide, 5% is manual brushing or ground application. We treat less than 50% of blocks as we do more site prep, have better stock so we expect less herbicide use in future. We also expect to lower amount of brushing as we expect less administrative brushing and relying more on judgements at a landscape level.
- **Question from PAG**– Is there drift outside boundaries and what percentage and is there reporting on this?
- **Response** – will address this later on in the presentation when we review contraventions.
- **Question from PAG**– Are stakeholders contacted with respect to road deactivation activities?
- **Response** - No, this is done at the FOS referral stage, then we notify trappers at logging stage, we can make an action plan based on inputs. We need to be aware of access issues from stakeholders, so that we can modify deactivation measures, otherwise we deactivate road to permanent status.

- **Question from PAG**– There are a lot of companies listed on the paperwork supplied, why is it that only Canfor is answering questions, Tembec does not do same procedures for their roads?
- **Response**– Canfor manages Tembec licences on their behalf in the North Peace. In the South Peace, Louisiana Pacific manages Tembecs holdings.

5. Annual Report Presentation (Dave Menzies)

- Provided a review of annual report, achievements, trends, non conformances, contraventions and other highlights. Noted participants are in conformance with all legal requirements, and in conformance with 59 / 61 indicators of SFMP (Non conformances: #35 Water quality, and #56 Treaty rights)
- **Question from PAG** – Re: Mountain Pine Beetle: Are there areas not affected?
- **Response** – John Rowe will cover MPB later but yes, there are areas not affected and we are focusing on new attack to hold the spread.
- **Comment from PAG** – During the summer field trip, we looked at water quality and stream crossings. It is impressive to see the improvements in the methods used to deal with crossings.
- **No further questions or comments from PAG on this topic**

Break , reconvened at 1945 hrs

6. Recreation presentation (Tim Bennett)

- **Comment from facilitator** – We have had lots of discussions in the past on what is a heritage trail, the RCMP trail, etc, Tim is here to answer these questions.
- **Question from PAG** - What is the significance of 1846?
- **Response** – Not certain on this, think it's related to first European contact, NOTE: Andrew later provided comment that it was related to signing of the Oregon treaty.
- Post Note From Tim Oct 22 email “ [the significance of the year 1846 is that it is the year in which the Oregon Boundary Treaty was signed asserting British sovereignty over the area that later became British Columbia. I think it was also recognized at the time the HCA was being drafted that as most archaeological sites pre-date 1846, they would be "automatically" protected under section 13 of the HCA.](#)”
- **Question from PAG**– Does the RCMP trail cross this area?
- **Response** – Yes, in the Cypress creek Area. , it started in Edmonton and goes to Fort Ware. ILMB collected info on Traditional use site in the area – more info coming in future
- **Question from PAG**– Is the reason the RCMP trail not on the map provided because you don't want it disturbed or explored?
- **Response** – No, this is old map, area is public domain, working on updates
- **Question from PAG**– At what stage is the trail in terms of establishment as heritage trail
- **Response**– This is sitting in Victoria now. It may take 2 years for establishment
- **Question from** what does “sitting in Victoria” mean, what are the next steps?
- **Response** - Need to map it, refer it, address any conflicts, talk to First Nations, once conflicts are addressed, then draft letter to Deputy Minister to establish trail . li is now on Deputy Ministers to do list now.
- **Question from PAG**– Are you talking to Trappers about this?

- **Response**– referrals are gone through – follow the process. It is difficult as much of area is overgrown and not certain as to exact locations to refer to people.
- **Question from PAG**– If area is open to public, what about trap lines. Trappers will be upset with all people on their trap lines.
- **Response** - It is crown land so public has right to access
- **Question from PAG**– Doesn't lands branch have a lot of this information on location form survey of the RCMP?
- **Response**– What info is available is being digitized, however much is missing, for example, Williston reservoir, other over grown areas etc. It is a very long trail; we are focusing on areas of interest or areas at risk of being lost. If there is no industrial activity we do not look at it too closely in those areas.
- **Question from PAG** - Where can we get a copy of maps?
- **Response**.) – all maps will be made available to public. There are several sources of information out there that we are currently trying to get into one map Norata? , back roads bc, etc. We are trying to have one map for all interests.
- **Comment from facilitator** - Alaska Tourism / BC group is source of info for maps.
- **ACTION ITEM # 3: Tim to get web information of the sources of maps for participants.**
- **Question from PAG** - Is the Fort Nelson freight trail included as a heritage trail?
- **Response** - don't know, not certain on all trails.
- **ACTION ITEM # 4: Final note Nov 23rd trails manager coming to FSJ to do presentation. Tim to advise group when dates and location of this presentation is finalized.**

7. Mountain Pine Beetle Presentation (John Rowe)

- Presentation focused on Canfor's efforts to date in combating MPB, achievements, challenges, funding expended over past year and target areas for next season and near future.
- **Question from PAG**– Why is it that trees are wasted/ destroyed, is there a reason for this?
- **Response**– Softwood Lumber Agreement - Americans would consider it a subsidy if we try to utilize this wood – would result in additional tax. Also, the small piece size makes it less economical to bring to mill in some cases.
- **Comment from PAG** - This is why the gov't brought in hog fuel regs, we need more co-gen plants.
- **Question from PAG**– In the Cameron Fall and Burn area, not all the flagged trees are burned, why is this?
- **Response** - The red trees are the ones that beetle have killed and left for new trees. The F&B focuses on trees with beetle in them. Also, we may have run out of time and money to finish all intended work. OR, finally, there may be a risk of fire spread so we stop work when risk is high and we may have left some trees standing.
- **Question from PAG** - What reforestation activities take place in the areas of fall and burn?
- **Response**– None, the areas all under 1 hectare openings, there is no clear cutting and MOFR said it is not necessary to plant the small openings.

- **Question from PAG** - How will / do you determine the efficacy of the fall and burn treatments?
 - **Response** – We try to slow down the spread, we are working an East to West pattern, and we are trying to hold numbers until suitable cold weather helps out. We are also harvesting as well in baited areas and areas of high beetle infestations.
- 8. Pilot Regulation review presentation (Dave Menzies)**
- Provided a summary handout and text of a portion of the report summarizing PAG interviews.
 - The review is being conducted to ensure the FSJ Pilot Project is effective in meeting the intended objectives. This is the first formal review of the pilot. 6 teams established for review.
- **Comment from PAG** - Those of us who were surveyed would likely be more involved if there was feedback offered on comments
 - **Response** - We will advise of this concern
 - **Question from PAG** - Were First Nations asked to be a part of the 6 teams?
 - **Response** No - but they were interviewed, or attempts were made to interview a percentage of First Nations, at this time, not certain of exact number interviewed.
 - **Comment from Participant** - the review is focused on regulatory context only
 - **Question from PAG , paraphrased by facilitator**- We as a group have 30 meetings invested in this, is the draft report going to be shared with PAG? Then a comment by same PAG member - "I was sent seven written questions, followed by a 45 minute telephone interview, I am not sure how or if this information was used.
 - **Response** - Yes, I will take all PAG feedback back to the committee and request a draft be made available to the PAG..
 - **Comment from PAG** - "I only had three days to reply to survey once I received it. - not enough time - there need to be a better way to do this, I did not reply at all
 - **Response** - Appreciate comments and will take back concerns to committee.
 - **Question from PAG** - Please explain for benefit of PAG, what is the worst case scenario of this review.
 - **Response.)** - The Pilot regulation could be cancelled and we could go to the FRPA norm. This is not what we want as we have significant time and resources invested in this over past ~7 years.

- **Comment from BCTS Participant** - Initially there was a fear of Pilot in Victoria, however Gov't now sees benefit and other areas may adopt the model.
- **Facilitator canvassed PAG members to confirm how they would like the participants to proceed . The consensus was that the PAG would like an opportunity to review any draft report before it goes forward through government to a decision. And they may want to either comment on the report, or call a meeting to coordinate a subsequent response, depending on the content.**
- **ACTION ITEM # 5: Participants to forward PAG comments and request circulation of the final draft report to the PAG for comment**

9. Review PAG membership and consent to publish membership names

- **Question From GW to PAG-** Are members OK with names published in paper?
- **Response** - Yes by those in Attendance –
- **ACTION ITEM # 6 - Participants to contact absentees for permission / see if they are OK with names published.**

10. Review Audit Results (W.N.)

- 3 yr re-registration audit. Audit had no non compliances or non conformances, recertified under CSA for another 3 years.
- **Comment from Participants)** - Auditors did mention that there was some difficulty in contacting PAG members – please try to be available for these ~15 minute interviews.
- **Question from PAG** - Will audit results be out on website?
- **Response.)** - They will be, yes. And for those with no internet, will mail hard copy.
- **Question from PAG** Is it possible for the interviewers to identify themselves when they call?
- **Response** - This is something to be aware of and an audit is upcoming so you may be getting phone calls.

11. Removed from Agenda

12. Removed from Agenda

13. No public presentations

14. Next meeting and focus:

- Update matrix and targets for next year.
- 1. Topic of interest from PAG – wind, energy, site C etc. can it affect Pilot project?
- 2. Topic of Interest from PAG - O & G cumulative impacts on Timber Supply and forest land base – would like someone from fish and wildlife to give perspective on impacts of O&G to those resources -
- TD 3. Topic of Interest from PAG - How do the indicators protect species at risk that fall within TSA.
- WF Safety topic reviewed? Any interest? - Not really.

- PAG to receive info on review of Pilot project by email, hard copy? , lets see report and decide if meeting necessary to discuss , in interim, participants to email Dave with any concerns.

Next meeting Feb / March 2009, preferably prior to March 10th