

Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Meeting #27

April 23rd, 2006
6:00 pm to 9:20 pm

FSJ Cultural Center

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email or Postal Address</u>
Participants			
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	250-787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	250-787-3613	Dave.Menzies@canfor.com
Jeff Beale	Canfor	250-787-3651	Jeff.Beale@canfor.com
Wes Neumeier	Canfor	250-787-3645	Wes.Neumeier@canfor.com
Jennifer Nickel	Canfor	250-787-3695	Jennifer.Nickel@canfor.com
John Rowe	Canfor	250-787-3680	John.Rowe@Canfor.com
Brian Farwell	BC Timber Sales	250-262-3337	Brian.farwell@gov.bc.ca
Walter Fister	BC Timber Sales	250-262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Doug Braybrook	Tembec	250-788-4509	Doug.Braybrook@tembec.com
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	250-789-3621	Andrew@taylorlordunnage.ca
PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates			
Budd Phillips	Non-Commercial Rec – Hunting Fishing	250-785-1283	Budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com
Stanley Gladysz	Recreation	250-785-2596	sgradysz@pris.ca
Ron Wagner	Labour	250-787-0172	rojwagner@telus.net
Roy Lube	Non-Commercial Rec- non consumptive	250-787-7619	RLube@telus.net
Dale Johnson	Range	250-262-3260	FAX: 262-3260
Duane Salmond	Trapping	250-785-2571	Box 142, Charlie Lake BC
Larry Houley	Rural Communities	250-263-7752	FAX: 787-2279
Orland Wilkerson	Urban Communities	250-787-6243	wilkerso@unbc.ca
Chad Dalke	Oil and Gas	780-831-6002	Chad.d.dalke@conocophililips.com
Jack Trask	Range	250-793-3046	
Fred Klassen	Forestry Contractors	250-787-1429	Klassen@intpac.ca
Oliver Mott	Environment	250-785-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com
Peter Bueckert	Forestry Contractors	250-262-9580	bueckert@solarwinds.com
Ray Jackson	Guide outfitting	250-783-5220	horsesho@pris.ca
Advisors			
Mark vanTassel	BCTS	250-784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Elizabeth Hunt	Ministry of Forests	250-784-1242	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	Ministry of Environment	250-787-3393	Joelle.scheck@gov.bc.ca
Dale Morgan	Ministry of Forests	250-784-1200	Dale.morgan@gov.bc.ca
Anna Reginer	Integrated Land Management Bureau	250-787-3563	anna.reginer@gov.bc.ca
Paul Wooding	Canfor	604-661-5423	Paul.Wooding@Canfor.com
Presenters			
John Deal	Canfor	250-962-3313	John.Deal@Canfor.com
Michael Preston	West Cam Consulting	250-383-6145	Mike-preston @shaw.ca
Observers			
Roger St. Jean	Oil and Gas Commission	250-787-3234	Roger.stjean@gov.bc.ca
Facilitator			
Gail Wallin		250-305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com

<C:\staging\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D\in\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D.doc> [F:\Forestry Planning\Strategic Plans\Results Based Pilot\Public Advisory Group \(PAG\)\PAG Meeting Summaries\PAG Mtg 27 April 23rd, 2007-DRAFT.doc](F:\Forestry Planning\Strategic Plans\Results Based Pilot\Public Advisory Group (PAG)\PAG Meeting Summaries\PAG Mtg 27 April 23rd, 2007-DRAFT.doc)

1. Welcome

- Facilitator welcomed all members to the meeting.
- Meeting opened at 6:30pm.
- Roundtable introductions were made. Those people attending introduced themselves and specified what interest group they represent.

2. Review of Meeting Agenda

- Draft Agenda for the night's meeting was reviewed; no changes were recommended, agenda was accepted.
- Facilitator provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting.
- Meeting focus was identified as changes to the Fort St John Pilot Project SFM Matrix.

3. Review of Meeting Summary (October 26, 2006)

Review of Minutes

- PAG reviewed draft meeting summary notes from the March 30, 2006 meeting. One change was requested to the meeting summary.
 - Oil and gas representative, Chad Dalke wanted his member status changed from inactive to active in the meeting summary.

ACTION 1: Revise minutes from Meeting Summary #26 (October 26, 2006) to show Chad Dalke as an active member. –Complete JN April 24, 2007

- None of the meeting attendants require a copy of the revised meeting summary #26.

Review of Actions

- PAG reviewed action items from meeting #26 summary notes.
- Most Actions were accepted by the PAG as complete (details of actions can be found in the document: [List of Actions from October 19, 2006 PAG Meeting #26](#))
- With respect to Actions 10 through 14 from meeting #26:
 - Chad Dalke confirmed he is an active member of the PAG.
 - Alternate Range Representative was identified. (Jack Trask)
 - The commercial recreation representative had no suggestions for alternates nor did the rest of the PAG.
 - Trapping representative was confirmed (Duane Salmond) and an alternate was identified (Vicki Allen).
 - No suggestions were made for an alternate for Urban Communities.
 - Oliver Mott will be the Environment representative
- The following 2 action items are to be carried forward to the next meeting:

ACTION 2: Update on status of RCMP trail only if it receives official designation as a Heritage trail.

ACTION 3: Prepare a presentation on the Heritage Conservation Act and Heritage Trails for a future PAG meeting.

- The following were Additional Actions identified:

ACTION 4: Send a copy of the TOR directly to Trapping Representative via mail.

ACTION 5: Send a copy of the Landscape Level Reforestation Strategy directly to Trapping Representative via mail.

ACTION 6: Trapping Representative to be sent future annual reports directly via mail.

ACTION 7: Alternate Range representative to be sent a copy of TOR.

- One on-going action was identified:
- Public Interest was identified as having no member or alternate member. No suggestions for members or alternates were proposed.

4. Update from Participants

Doug Braybrook-Tembec

- Canfor manages the Tembec License in Fort St. John and is doing a good job.
- Continuing to build relationships with First Nations
- Mill production is consistent.
- Pursuing Forest Stewardship Council Certification on Dawson Creek Licenses.

Brian Farwell-BCTS

- Deciduous Sales: 163,000 cubic meters and 100% sold.
- Conifer Sales: 318,000 cubic meters and 90% sold
- Some of the conifer sales were fire salvage blocks.
- 950,000 trees planted in 730ha.
- Results of the Forest Practices Board Audit will be presented later.

Andrew Moore-CRL

- 71,764 cubic meters off license Canfor has.
- Manufacturing plant in Taylor went from 60 to 30 employees due to markets.
- The manufacturing plant is pursuing ISO 9001:2000 certification.

David Menzies-Canfor Sawmill

- Softwood Lumber dispute has been settled.
- Sawmill is running on 2 shifts.
- Sawmill is meeting or exceeding most targets set in business plan
- Woodlands has met targets for deliveries.
- High stumpage has impacted business
- Salvaged wood burnt in fires from last fall. This effort was well co-coordinated between BCTS and MOF.
 - 159,000 cubic meters were salvaged (this is 1/3 of Canfors quota volume)
- Mountain Pine beetle control efforts are underway
- Understory Retention is being implemented via strip cuts and avoidance techniques.

Jeff Beale-Canfor/LP OSB/FIRST NATIONS

- Logged 395,000 cubic meters this winter.
- Mill producing at 85%.
- The mill is shifting to larger OSB products and is losing money.
- Poor markets are expected to continue over the next 1- 1.5years.
- Service contract with Six Nations Ventures continues and is successful.
- Fires in the mill are still frequent but there is a plan to get infrared system that may help.
- The one appeal on the air emission permit was dropped and so all permits have been approved.
- WOLF Program was a success
 - Partnership with NENAS, NPSS, Canfor
 - 6 students completed the simulation portion of the course.
 - 4 students went on to do practicums and spent 8-40hours on equipment.
 - Canfor is pursuing the program through COFI.

Question from PAG: How well did the computer simulation translate into actual skills?

Response: The students were running at 10-20% efficiency in the field. There were issues that prevented the success of the 3-D simulation training including length of training, transporting students to class and the student screening process. WOLF claims that student will have 40-60 % efficiency after the simulator, but our graduates came out much lower.

Question from PAG: Has Canfor considered offering the program through Northern Lights College?

Response: This option has been investigated but the interest in the program may not be high enough to justify it.

- An amendment to the Forest Operations Schedule (FOS) was completed for the fire salvage blocks.
- Canfor presented the SFM plan to Doig River First Nations.
- Information sharing on Forest Investment Accounts (FIA) projects continues (particularly fall and burn)
- First Nations were harvesting timber for OSB and sawmills.

Mountain Pine Beetle Presentation

Presentation:

- John Rowe summarized the activities Canfor has completed to date in attempt to control the beetle and where they were completed. These include aerial survey, probing, treatment planning and fall and burn.
- 541 fading-tree sites were identified in the Fort St. John TSA, during helicopter reconnaissance flights. Only 425 of those sites turned out to be beetle-related. Most of the beetle-caused fading sites were in the southern parts of the TSA.
- Beetle is being found in spruce/pine timber-types and not just pure pine.
- 80 crews were working on fall and burn program and felled 4300 beetle infested trees.
- One beetle salvage block was harvested this winter on a combination of Crown and private land. 62% of the beetle- infested trees identified during beetle probing were included in the block. This one block eliminated approximately 23,000 beetle trees from the TSA.
- John explained future activities being planned in the TSA to attempt to control the beetle. These include: pheromone baiting, block layout, aerial surveys, and harvesting.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG: Do the trees have any natural immunity to mountain pine beetle?

Response: No.

Question from PAG: In your presentation you said nothing was being done in the Cache Creek operating area because it was mainly private land. What is to stop the beetle infesting pine in that operating area?

Response: This is an issue in the Cache Creek Operating area because Cache creek has a high amount of private farmland and a relatively low amount of forested Crown land compared to the other areas in the TSA. Canfor uses Forest Investment Account (FIA) money to fund their beetle control efforts. FIA money can only be spent on Crown (public) land therefore we cannot do any beetle control on private land with FIA money.

Question from PAG: Last meeting we were told there was a brochure that would be mailed out to everyone on the MPB. I have not received it and neither did a lot of other people I have talked to

Response: The MOF stated the brochure went out to everyone in the Peace through regular mail. Copies of the brochure are available at the MOF or Canfor offices.

- Brochures were distributed later in the meeting to attendants

Comment from PAG: A newspaper article may be more effective at reaching people than a mail-out.

Response: Canfor had a booth at the tradeshow, which included information regarding Mountain Pine Beetle and our management efforts related to it. **Comment from PAG:** I recommend calling the newspaper to run an article.

6. Changes to Matrix

Sections for Discussion:

- Facilitator announced there would be 2 changes to the indicator statements:
 - One was discussed and approved by the PAG last meeting
 - The second was to be proposed and discussed tonight.

Presentation:

- Andrew Tyrrell summarized the changes to the SFM Matrix:
 - Changes to indicator #16 were proposed and approved at the last PAG meeting. The changes were reviewed for the PAG.

Question from PAG: What does “Imple” mean in matrix that was handed out? (Referring to the field describing element 1.4: *Protected areas and sites of Special Biological Significance*.)

Response: This was a formatting error that cut off the rest of the sentence and the element should read: “ Implement management strategies....”
 - Revision to Indicator #25 was proposed in order to adapt the indicator and indicator target in SFM matrix to the efforts being made around beetle control and other forest health concerns. Andrew reviewed the current and proposed indicator statements.

Question from PAG: Define “significant”(referring to significant forest health damaging events from indicator #25).

Response: The SFM Plan defines significant damaging events.

Question from PAG: “Implemented” does not imply completion. The word “event” was used as opposed to “site”, what about situations when there is more than one event on a single site or vice versa. Referring to the wording changes proposed to indicator #25.

Gail Clarifies the point: Want to include Sites and Events in indicator statement.

Question from PAG: Why was the word “agents” used in the proposed revised statement rather than “ events” as in the current statement?

Response: Agents was used to be consistent with the target statement. In fact, the current indicator statement uses events so it is not consistent with the target statement.

Comment from PAG: It is best to be consistent with the wording.

Comment form PAG: further clarification on the definition of “site” would be nice. Is it a single tree or a larger scale?

ACTION: 8: Change current indicator statement #25 to use the word “agents” rather than “events” to be consistent with the wording in the target statement.

- Andrew reviewed the current and proposed target statements.
- The PAG accepted the proposed change to the target statement as proposed for Indicator #25.

[C:\staging\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D\in\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D.docF:\Forestry Planning\Strategic Plans\Results-Based Pilot\Public Advisory Group \(PAG\)\PAG Meeting Summaries\PAG Mtg 27 April 23rd, 2007-DRAFT.doc](C:\staging\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D\in\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D.docF:\Forestry Planning\Strategic Plans\Results-Based Pilot\Public Advisory Group (PAG)\PAG Meeting Summaries\PAG Mtg 27 April 23rd, 2007-DRAFT.doc)

ACTION 9: Revise the target statement for Indicator #25 as proposed.

- Andrew presented the changes to the wording of the acceptable variance statements for Indicators #25 and #22 to include provisions for forest health plans.
- Wes Neumeier presented changes in the method used to calculate Indicator #28.
- The PAG had no additional comments or questions on these changes.

Additional Changes to the Matrix:

- The facilitator asked if the PAG had any additional proposed changes to the Matrix.
- No additional changes were proposed.

7. Public Presentation (Trapping representative)

- The trapping representative gave a presentation on the concerns local trappers may have on impacts to marten and furbearer habitat in the Fort St. John area and suggestions for measures that may be taken to improve habitat in harvested areas. Some key points to the presentation were:
 - A handout was provided on Marten habitat requirements. The handout was based on studies done in the US but it applies here and also applies to other species.
 - The handout can be found at the following link: [Trapper association handout](#)
 - The Trappers are concerned with gravel roads most of which are oil and gas development roads. Marten will cross roads.
 - Marten are prone to stay out of thinned or logged areas because there is no canopy and because aerial predators increase in these areas.
 - Marten seen in cutblocks are usually displaced and are only passing through the area to get somewhere else.
 - Patches shown in previous presentations are too small for marten.
 - Corridors must have canopy to be of value to marten
 - Linear sight lines created through seismic and roads impact populations.
- The trapping representative proposed some ideas to improve marten habitat on harvested blocks
 - Trappers would like to see Leave strips of uncut forest left around perimeter of blocks. These do not necessarily have to be merchantable timber but must have some canopy.
 - Trappers would like to see 3-6ft debris piles left adjacent to block perimeter.
 - Trappers would like to see trap trails and seismic lines left open.
 - Trapper representative recognizes that requesting that no spraying be done on blocks is unrealistic but would like to propose that no spraying occur around the perimeter of block (approx 2-3 helicopter widths wide).
- The representative suggests that if Canfor talked to trappers they could come up with ways to improve furbearer populations.
- The representative feels Canfor is pretty good at dealing with the trappers but the contractors working in the field are not talking to the trappers.
- The representative showed an example of a marten nesting box that are put in the field to help populations.
- Representative was grateful for the opportunity to speak to the PAG.

Discussion/Questions

Question from PAG: How big are the holes on the nesting boxes and where are they positioned?

Response: The opening is 2.5 inches and they are put 20 feet up the tree. The higher the better. The marten boxes have been receiving about a 50% usage.

Question from PAG: Would a conifer block impact marten the same as a deciduous block.

Response: Marten mostly use mixed forest.

Comment from PAG: We've seen a lot of marten using deciduous cut blocks in Fort Nelson. They do not seem to be bothered by the deciduous openings. Perhaps there are better rodent populations available for them in openings.

Response: If the blocks area sprayed you won't see any marten use.

Response from PAG: Deciduous blocks are not ever sprayed.

- Gail explained how this presentation is related to indicator #46 of the Matrix: consistency with mutually agreed upon action plans for trappers.... She asked the PAG whether this was a good way to deal with the issues raised.

Comment from PAG: using indicator #46 to address this issue is a more flexible option than proposing changes to the matrix.

Trapper rep: The proposal made on behalf of the FSJ Trappers association but he believes the BC trappers association would also support this proposal.

- Pursuant to Indicator #46, Canfor offered to meet with the trapping representative to discuss options around the proposal.

Comment from PAG: there is a lot of work being done to address First Nations groups (evidence in the presentations) but is not a lot of effort being put forward to deal with the trappers

ACTION 10: The participants will contact the trapper representative to discuss options for addressing the issues presented at the PAG meeting.

8. Presentation to the Public Advisory Group-Breeding Bird Surveys

Presentation:

- John Deal and Mike Preston gave a Power Point presentation on different bird surveys being done in the Fort St. John TSA, some preliminary results of the surveys and the linkages to the FSJ SFMP.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG: Have there been any bluebirds turn up in your surveys?

Response (M. Preston): There was one bluebird identified in the survey. There is a population decline all over North America for Bluebirds.

Question from PAG: Who funded the survey?

Response (M. Preston): Forest Investment Account and Canfor.

Question from PAG: What is the expected length of the survey?

Response (M. Preston and J. Deal): The current surveys were established to identify trends. You need 3-5 years for trend monitoring. There is work being done to look for further funding.

Question from PAG: What is the overall impression of the health of the bird population?

Response (M. Preston): It is hard to make inferences on overall health of a bird population because all birds respond differently. The results of the survey were comparable to the data from the 70's and remains relatively unchanged. Declines are more obvious in Eastern Canada.

Question from PAG: Wouldn't it be critical to compare the results from surveys to untouched forest?

Response (M. Preston): It is almost impossible to gather data for untouched forest. There is effort being made to do this in the off-road surveys described in the presentation.

Clarification from Advisor: I was meaning the impact of global warming on management plans more than animals. The MOE should be considering the impact of global warming and beetle populations in their approach to management plans.

Comment from PAG: Stubs created in blocks should be placed closer to perimeter of the blocks so animals other than woodpeckers can use them.

11. Next Meeting

- Due to time constraints items 9 and 10 on the agenda will be postponed until next meeting.

Field Trip schedule

- There was a bird viewing field trip planned for tomorrow morning. After consulting with the members who expressed interest in the field trip, it was decided to postpone the trip to late May or early June to provide for better viewing opportunities and site conditions. The PAG was asked for any additional things they might want to see on a field trip. No suggestions were made.
- The PAG was asked if there was a preference to hold the field trip on a weekday or weekend.
 - The majority of interested members voted for a weekday
- The PAG was asked if there was a preference to hold the field trip in the last week of May or first week of June.
 - The majority of interested members voted for first week of June.

Topics & Dates for Next Meeting

- Gail announced the next meeting will be sometime in October.
- The PAG was asked if there were any ideas for presentation topics or dates.
 - No ideas or dates were presented by the PAG.
- Gail reviewed the agenda items from this meeting and noted that 2 agenda items will be carried forward to the next meeting: VRI and the results of the FPB audit of BCTS.

ACTION 11: Presentations on VRI and FPB audit of BCTS to be done at the October meeting.

- D. Menzies asked the PAG if they had been polled for the UBC public opinion survey.
 - 3 PAG members responded that they had been polled.
- The participants are proposing to present the results of the survey at the next meeting.

ACTION 12: Present the results of the social survey at the October PAG meeting.

Question from PAG: Does anyone have interest in viewing a trapping presentation during the field trip?

Response: some PAG members would be interested in a trapping presentation.

- Gail asked again if there were any additional ideas for future field trips. PAG member suggested Ungulate Winter Range.
- Gail suggested Canfor compile a list of agenda items for field trip.

ACTION 13: Compile a list of agenda items for field trip in May or June and distribute prior to trip.

Meeting Feedback

<C:\staging\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D\in\463F9796-29FC-28CB7D.doc>[F:\Forestry Planning\Strategic Plans\Results-Based Pilot\Public Advisory Group \(PAG\)\PAG Meeting Summaries\PAG Mtg 27 April 23rd, 2007-DRAFT.doc](F:\Forestry Planning\Strategic Plans\Results-Based Pilot\Public Advisory Group (PAG)\PAG Meeting Summaries\PAG Mtg 27 April 23rd, 2007-DRAFT.doc)

- Gail asked PAG for feedback on the meeting. PAG member said the language and acronyms being used made it hard to understand for a new attendee.

Summary of Actions from this meeting can be found in the following location:

[List of Actions from April 23rd PAG Meeting #27.doc](#)