

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #20**

**September 22, 2003
3:00pm to 9:10pm**

North Peace Cultural Center

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>email</u>
<i>Participants</i>			
Warren Jukes	Canfor	788-4355	Wjukes@mail.canfor.ca
David Menzies	Canfor	787-3613	Dmenzies@mail.canfor.ca
Don Rosen	Canfor		
Greg Taylor	Canfor		
Tony Fazekas	Canfor		
Chris Stagg	TEMBEC	788-4509	Chris.Stagg@tembec.ca
Roger St. Jean	BC Timber Sales Program	787-5645	Roger.stjean@gems8.gov.bc.ca
Brian Farwell	BC Timber Sales Program	262-3337	Brian.farwell@gems2.gov.bc.ca
John Dymond	Slocan LP		
<i>PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates</i>			
Stanley Gladys	Outdoor Recreation	785-2596	
Oliver Mott	Public Interest	785-9508	Ogmott@hotmail.com
Fred Klassen	Forest Workers	785-3901	
Ron Wagner	Labour	787-0172	Rwagner@pris.ca
Roy Lube	Outdoor Recreation	787-7619	Plube@solarwinds.com
Wayne Sawchuk	Environment		
<i>Facilitator</i>			
Gail Wallin		305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com
<i>Advisors</i>			
Bill Adair	MSRM	787-3413	Bill.adair@gems3.gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	MWLAP	787-3393	Joelle.scheck@gems5.gov.bc.ca
Janice Edwards	MOF	784-1241	
Winn Hays-Byl	MOF	784-1203	Winn.haysbyl@gems4.gov.bc.ca
<i>Observers</i>			
David Boyle			
Tanya Yadao		877-762-8522	Tyadao@omnitechenvironmental.ca

1. Welcome and introductions

- Meeting opened at 1512 hr.
- Roundtable introductions were made

2. Review of Meeting Agenda

- Draft Agenda for tonight's meeting was reviewed; no changes were recommended, agenda was accepted.
- Facilitator provided an overview of the purpose of Meeting 20.

3. Review of September 15 2003 Meeting Summary

- A review of the Sept 15 2003 meeting summary was undertaken.
 - Corrections to Sept 15 2003 summary:
 - Observer "Tanya Hadad" should read "Tanya Yadao"
 - Date in Sec. 1, 'Welcome and Introduction' should refer to February 3 2003, not 2002.
 - Typo in Sec. 4 "Overview, Changes to PPR", first indent. "7Scope" should read "Scope"
 - Typo in Sec. 4 "Overview, Changes to PPR", third indent. "Revisons" should read "Revisions".
- With the amendments above, the summary of the Sept 15 2003 meeting was accepted by those present. A distribution of the amended meeting summary was not deemed necessary by the PAG provided the records contain a corrected copy.

4. Revise TOR

- Version Sept 22, 2003 of the Terms of Reference was distributed for review.
- PAG was asked if there were any objections to observers participating in discussion, provided that final consensus would be by the PAG representatives only. No objections to this suggestion were made by the PAG.
- Facilitator led the meeting through the proposed changes in the distributed TOR. All proposed changes were accepted, with the following exceptions or amendments:
 - Section A.2 – last sentence, remove 'which'.
 - Section C Operating Rules – amend point d) to read " Commencing in 2004, meetings will be held....."
 - Section G Roles and Responsibilities –
 - 1b, xi) - delete reference to LUCO, add in "Muskwa Kechika Board".
 - 1b), c) - expand company names to full name (e.g. Canadian Forest Products)
 - Section 2f) - amend to read " should a representative have a perceived....."
 - Section 2f) – delete "Or others as created by PAG or Participant"
 - Section 2f) – define term length of "leave from the PAG"
- Changes as provided in the revised and distributed Sept 22 2003 TOR, with amendments noted above, are accepted by the PAG.
- Participants asked if PAG representatives agreed to have their names and contact numbers published in the local newspaper and web site.
 - PAG members agreed that their names only would be printed in the local newspaper, but both names and contact numbers would appear on the web site along with the meeting summaries.

5. Review outstanding proposed changes to matrix

- Review changes proposed by participants.
- Distributed matrix description; first five columns are from February meeting. Shaded column items were reviewed and accepted (column 6) on Sept 15. White boxes in column 6 are to be reviewed tonight by the PAG. New indicators and targets in distributed matrix originate from the current SFMP.

Indicator 5, snags

- A handout was distributed showing the new indicator and target; the distributed matrix contains the old wording for these.
- PAG asked what the effect of this new change would be on the ground. Explanation that WTP area has been taken out of the 'prescribed area'. That is, area for determining snag numbers does not include WTP area.

- PAG asked when the plan would be implemented. Participants replied that some of the strategies were already being carried out, but that some strategies were waiting for government approval.
- PAG asked how the Participants could implement the plan if the Participants are still waiting for information from UBC. Participants responded that part of the plan is a work in progress and that implementation would be carried out using only the best information available at that time.
- PAG asked to what percentage of the harvested area would the snag strategy apply. There is a need to define the extent or area of application. What is the effect at the landscape level? (THIS IS AN OUTSTANDING ITEM TO BE READDRESSED AT END OF TONIGHTS MEETING)

Indicator 8, shrubs

- Previous indicator was designed to determine and analyse shrub makeup and levels. Current indicator has set levels by landscape unit.
- PAG received clarification of what would be reported.
- PAG accepted new Indicator and Target.

Indicator 11

- Only change is to the date; now refers to 2004
- PAG accepted the new Indicator and Target.

Indicator 12

- PAG concern over the potential to achieve a maximum harvest level of 20%
- Table 21 refers to the Total Forest Area. PAG would like to see Table 21 clarified.
- THIS IS AN OUTSTANDING ITEM TO BE READDRESSED AT END OF TONIGHTS MEETING

Indicator 13 and 14

- PAG accepted these items.

Indicator 15

- PAG asked for clarification as to which areas are being considered, that is, are the areas LRMP, CSA or Provincial Gov't designations?
- Suggest adding "protected areas" to indicator and target for clarification; otherwise the PAG agreed to the Indicator and Target.
- A PAG member suggested that visual quality be added to the indicator, with respect to park areas.
 - A discussion as to the actual LRMP intent and wording regarding park perimeter areas ensued. Participants will check LRMP, and check table 9 to ensure consistency with LRMP.
 - Page 187 of the SFMP is meant to deal with Vis. Quality.
 - Areas outside protected areas have visual quality addressed through Indicator 44.
 - There was no agreement among PAG representatives as to the necessity of adding a visual portion to this indicator, as the LRMP already provides direction and there is no need to repeat what is already approved provincial policy direction.
 - THIS IS AN OUTSTANDING ITEM TO BE READDRESSED AT END OF TONIGHTS MEETING

Indicator 16

- Suggest adding consistency with objectives of the Muskwa – Kechika management area, otherwise the PAG agreed to the Indicator and Target.

Indicator 17

- Wording has changed but intent remains the same as previously agreed to by PAG.
- Revision accepted by PAG.

Indicator 31

- PAG suggested wording change of Target for 31; "we will propose an AAC that maintains the LTHL of the DFA"
- Accepted by PAG.

Indicator 32

- Participants provided an explanation of site index and site productivity.
- PAG accepted indicator and target

Indicator 33

- PAG accepted indicator 33

Indicator 35

- WQCR – new acronym for Water Quality Concern Rating. – refers to and is measured as individual crossings, whereas the previous measure (SCQI) referred to a roll-up of watershed crossings.
- PAG asked how the benchmark numbers were established. Participants responded that the benchmark stems from previous assessments done.
- There is a write up on this on page 171 of the SFMP re: continuous improvement.
- PAG accepted indicator and target.

Indicator 36

- Indicator is expanded (handout) to include riparian vegetation and covers off all measures taken to protect streams
- PAG accepted indicator and target 36.

Indicator 37, spills

- PAG accepted indicator and target 37.

Indicator 38

- No changes, PAG accepted indicator and target 38.

Indicator 39, Growing Stock

- PAG accepted indicator and target 39.

6. Feedback to PAG Suggestions from Sept 15 2003

- Reviewed distributed handout tabulating PAG comments from Sept 15 and Participants responses, regarding strategies, indicators and targets.
- PAG okay with record and responses provided. Information and amendments resulting from this evening's meeting will be added to this record.

Reforestation and Monitoring Presentations

- A PowerPoint presentation was provided of the SFMP Reforestation, Monitoring and Forecasting strategies, and provided table members with accompanying handouts.
- Reforestation
 - Comparison of new strategy for restocking harvested areas with current practices. New strategy provides means of maintaining growing stock with the flexibility to adapt to changing ground conditions.
 - PAG member had a concern that under the new strategy a participant may 'plan for failure' in some areas, thereby realizing a volume benefit with no reforestation to take place. Participants responded that all areas will be reforested, and that poorly responding areas will be compensated for over the landscape through increased density elsewhere. Additionally, under new and old systems, all areas are prestratified according to site and productivity.
 - PAG asked why the baseline for reforestation is set at 85% instead of 100%, when it is apparent that in some areas the participants may reforest to over 100% stocking in order to compensate for other poorly responding areas. Participants responded that the new strategy is designed to provide better results on a landscape basis than current practices, while providing lower cost and working with natural successional pathways.
- Monitoring

- Description of the “11.28 meter plot on a 3 km grid” monitoring system. UTM Grid will be used to establish plot locations. Plots will capture information such as CWD, shrubs, and snags in addition to timber information. All previously harvested stands within the TSA are included in the population available for sampling. These plots will form a statistically valid representative sample of managed stands throughout the TSA.
- PAG was asked for input on this monitoring strategy and the monitoring and implementation schedules within the SFMP. PAG indicated that they are satisfied with monitoring strategies and schedules.

7. Forecasting and alternative strategies

- A handout was distributed to accompany the PowerPoint presentation on Forecasting.
- Participants were provided with an overview of the scenario assumptions and types of constraints that were built into the forecasting analysis. These include elements such as TSR2 data, Natural Disturbance Units, seral stage requirements, watershed information and others.
- Natural Disturbance Units (NDU) and landscape units were described.
- There was discussion as to why the lower end of the age range was used rather than the top end. Participants explained that the first scenario using the lower end of the NroV (Natural Range of Variation) was just a starting point for one scenario. Subsequent scenarios analyzed different targets based on Forest Management Intensity.
- Presentation included an illustration (map) of watershed boundaries, peak flow index, and a series of modeled graphs illustrating long term seral stage forest condition by landscape unit using combinations of constraints.
- A series of similar graphs were presented showing the deciduous component of the land base. (10 to 15 % of the landbase greater than 120 year old).
- PAG commented that they have no way of knowing if the graphs and results represent reality.
- Advisor question as to whether mortality was built in to deciduous model. Yes, mortality at 150 years.
- Graham IRM area constraints and cluster type harvesting pattern were discussed.
- NPSb (Non Productive Black Spruce) was excluded from the forested area contributing to seral stage requirements.
- Highest constraint combination was applied to caribou zones (scenario 4 and 5 in table)
- Question and comment:
 - PAG and participant discussion of the rationale for using the low end of the Natural range of Variation (NRoV) in the High Intensity Zones and using the high end of NRoV in Low Intensity Zones.
 - PAG asked if when modeling the Graham area were other priorities examined. No harvesting any earlier than scheduled in the GRIMP was modeled or planned. The analysis is not being used to set an AAC target.
 - Model only shows the mature seral stage.
 - Was harvesting of the valley bottoms excluded in modeling the Graham? Yes, for those areas outside the identified clusters. Advisor suggested that perhaps these areas should be harvested before they burn or become infested (timber loss). Response from participants was that the GRIMP states ‘no management’ in these areas.
- The presentations are meant to illustrate to the PAG how the modeling is done, and not to say that any one scenario has been selected for implementation. However, the participants are recommending the “Harvest Flow Results” table of the presentation for the Graham.
- PAG commented that they have no real comfort with the results as the process and input are extremely complicated, and no other options have been provided to the PAG for evaluation. Thus, there is no way that the PAG can know that this one is the best option.
- The PAG was asked if there were other constraints they would like to see modeled. An advisor asked if it were possible to model oil and gas activity and effect. This was decided to be too complex and of poor reliability.
- PAG asked how the MK restrictions are reflected in this model. Response – Graham IRMP, setting Low forest management intensity for LU’s within MK.
- Facilitator asked the PAG if other presentations would be helpful. Response was that there is no way of knowing, as the information is too complex.

- PAG asked for a list of other things that could be modeled.
- Advisor suggested that the participants provide pictures of the various forest stages (mature, old, etc.).
- PAG member suggested including oil and gas information such as ALPAC has done, and incorporating carbon credits.

8. Outstanding issues from this meeting

1. Indicator 5: what percentage of harvest area will this indicator (snags) apply to?
 - Snag scale is an outstanding issue for which an answer will be emailed to each PAG representative. Comments are to be provided back to the participants via email.
2. Indicator 12:
 - PAG asked for a wildlife biologist and a timber supply analyst to review.
3. Indicator 16:
 - Participants will add wording to include consistency with objectives of MK management area to indicator and target.
4. Indicator 44 (raised under 15):
 - PAG requested Participants to check for accuracy of LRMP visuals objectives in PA's in table 1 on page 9 ("Visual 1") and to clarify that areas adjacent to protected areas are managed for visual quality.
 - Participants will add wording for clarification and will review the specific objectives related to visuals in the LRMP.

9. Next Steps

- Revisions will be contained in the SFMP available to the public, First Nations, STAC, and gov't agencies (60 day review)
- Public process ends November 21. Participants will reconvene PAG, present input received and participants' responses. PAG meeting scheduled for November 18 and 24 2003, depending on extent of public response.
- Submit to regional manager December 1 2003.
- Copies of the plan will be at Canfor, Slocan LP, and Ministry of Forests.
- October 14 to 17 is the KPMG CSA audit. KPMG auditors may wish to speak with PAG members.

Changes made to the matrix tonight may not make it into the text document going to public, but will instead be in the form of an insert into that document. The Website will contain the most up to date version.

Meeting ended 2107 hours.