

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #28**

**October 11, 2007
6:00 pm to 9:20 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>
Participants			
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	250-787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	250-787-3613	Dave.Menzies@canfor.com
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	250-787-3651	Darrell.regimbald@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
Paul Albu	BC Timber Sales	250-262-3328	Paul.Albu@gov.bc.ca
Mark vanTassel	BCTS	250-784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	250-789-3621	Andrew@taylordunnage.ca
Ronald Laurentin	BCTS	250-262-3330	Ron.Laurentin@gov.bc.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
Vicki Allen	Trapping	785-5597	Box 99 Baldonnel BC V0C-1C0
Orland Wilkerson	Urban Communities	250-787-6243	wilkerso@unbc.ca
Oliver Mott	Environment	250-785-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com
Chad Dalke	Oil and Gas	780-831-6002	Chad.d.dalke@conocophillips.com
Jack Trask	Range	250-793-3046	jacktrask@pennwest.com
Dale Johnson	Range	250-262-3260	FAX: 262-3260
Advisors			
Elizabeth Hunt	Ministry of Forests and Range	250-784-1242	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca
Dale Morgan	Ministry of Forests and Range	250-784-1201	Dale.Morgan@gov.bc.ca
Presenters			
Howard Harshaw	Presenter-UBC	604-822-3970	harshaw@interchange.ubc.ca
Observers			
Roger St. Jean	Oil and Gas Commission	250-787-3234	Roger.stjean@gov.bc.ca
Gord Haines	Public Observer		
Cynthia Desjarlais	Observer-WMFN	250-788-3676	Box 1294 Chetwynd, BC V0C-1J0
Tina	Observer-WMFN	250-788-3676	forestry@westmo.org
Demeulemeester			
Kieran Broderick	Observer -Treaty 8 Tribal Association		kbroderick@treaty8.bc.ca
James Vince	Public Observer-Trapping		Box 266, Hudson Hope BC, V0C-1V0
Facilitator			
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	250-305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com

1. Welcome

- Facilitator welcomed all members to the meeting.
- Meeting opened at 6:35pm.
- Roundtable introductions were made. Those people attending introduced themselves and specified what interest group they represent.
- Darrell Regimbald introduced himself as Jeff Beale's replacement at Canfor.
- Facilitator called for public presentations and none were made.

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.

3. Review of Meeting Summary (April 23rd, 2007)

- Facilitator asked if anyone did not receive minutes from the last meeting or if anyone would like to receive minutes and is currently not on the mailing list.
 - Everyone received the minutes from the last meeting.
 - 3 people requested to be added to the distribution list for this month's PAG meeting summary.

ACTION 1 : Add Teena Demeulemeester, Cynthia Desjarlais and Kieran Broderick to the PAG meeting summary attendance list and ensure Meeting Summary #28 is sent to them.

Review of Minutes

- PAG reviewed draft meeting summary notes from the April 23rd, 2007 meeting. Two changes were requested to the meeting summary:
 - BCTS participant, Mark VanTassel was incorrectly listed as an advisor on the meeting summary.
 - Items 9 and 10 from the PAG Meeting #27 Agenda was left off the meeting summary.

ACTION 2: Change meeting summary for PAG meeting #27 to list Mark Van Tassel under participant rather than advisor.

ACTION 3: Change the Meeting Summary for PAG meeting #27 to include items #9 and 10 from the agenda, Vegetation Resource Inventory and Forest Practices Board Audit Results respectively.

- None of the meeting attendants requested a copy of the revised meeting summary #27.

Review of Actions

- PAG reviewed action items #1-13 from meeting #27 summary notes.
- Most Actions were accepted by the PAG as complete
- With respect to actions 2 and 3 from meeting #27 (RCMP trail and Heritage Conservation Act Presentations):

Question from the PAG: Can we discuss the RCMP trail?

Response from Participant: The RCMP trail is proposed as a heritage trail and the proposal is in the consultation phase.

The facilitator proposed combining Actions 2 and 3 from Meeting Summary #27 to develop a new action that would call for a presentation on the RCMP trail *if* it gets Heritage trail status.

Question from the PAG: what is the timeline for the consultation process?

Response from Participant: the Ministry of Tourism, Sports and the Arts handle the heritage trail proposals. The advisors and participants have very little knowledge on the process and timelines involved with the heritage trail proposals.

The facilitator suggested a presentation from the Ministry of Tourism, Sports and the Arts on Heritage Trails

- With respect to Action #11 from meeting #27 (Vegetation Resource Inventory and Forest Practices Board Audit presentations):
 - Forest Practices Board Audit Results of BCTS operations to be done tonight.
 - Vegetation Resource Inventory (VRI) is to be deferred indefinitely.

Request From PAG: Can we have acronyms spelled out in meeting handouts and summaries?

Response: Yes.

Question from PAG: Is VRI data available publicly?

Response: The new VRI data for the Fort St. John TSA is incomplete at this time, but once it is completed it should be available publicly through the Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR).

- With Respect to Action #13 from meeting #27 (PAG field Trip):
 - Andrew Tyrrell reviewed the field trip agenda items

Comment from PAG: PAG member expressed interest in attending field trip when contacted the first time by participants, but no follow-up contact was made with details of the trip so the member did not attend.

Question from PAG: Is there a chance the field trip could be repeated

Response: There will likely be another field trip next spring but it is unlikely it will be the same topic.

Facilitator called for comments on the field trip from those that attended

PAG Comments:

- Host had impressive knowledge of bird songs and calls and the different species.
- Good Lunch
- Bird Survey and Mountain Pine Beetle stops were very interesting

Comment from PAG: We were told we would get bird identification books but I never received one.

- A new sign-up sheet was sent around for those who wanted to receive bird identification books.

Question from PAG: It has been reported that habitats are shifting north-ward. Was there any information presented at the field trip about habitat shifts of local species?

Response: There was some mention of this phenomenon in the presentation at the April 23 2007 Public Advisory Group meeting. There is evidence that it occurring with some species that occur in B.C., including the Peace area (eg. Yellow Warbler).

Question from the PAG: Is the pilot project website still online?

Response: Yes. If you perform a Google search for "Fort St. John Pilot Project" the web address will come up

Request from the PAG: Can you put a link in the meeting summary to the pilot project website?

Response: Yes

- The following were Additional Actions identified:

ACTION 4: Investigate the possibility of having the Ministry of Tourism, Sports and the Arts do a presentation at a future PAG meeting on the background, process, timelines and forest management implications of Heritage Trail designations.

ACTION 5: Send out Bird Identification Books to those who put their name on the sign-up sheet sent around at the PAG meeting.

ACTION 6: Put a link to the Fort St. John Pilot Project website in the meeting summary header.

4. Local Public Opinion Survey on Forestry Issues

Presentation:

- Howard Harshaw presented the results of the public opinion survey done in Fort St. John
- There were 255 Respondents to the 30-page survey.

Comments/Discussion:

Question from PAG: Did you check non-response bias?

Response: Yes. Early and late responders were analyzed and no differences were identified.

Question from PAG: Were the other 10% from other communities (in reference to the statistic that only 89.2% of the respondents were from “Fort St. John”)

Response: No the other 10% was from rural or outlying areas of Fort St. John.

Question from PAG: Do you think the age factor was a result of the way the survey was presented i.e. paper vs. web-based? Would you have gotten a response from younger people if it had been online? (In reference to the fact that the average respondent was aged 48.3 years).

Response: Perhaps. In general older people are more responsive to surveys because they have more time available and may have stronger convictions and values.

Question from PAG: What was the timeframe the respondents were permitted to respond within?

Response: The surveys were received over a 3-month period.

Question from PAG: Is 25% a good response rate for a survey like this?

Response: It is decent. We were hoping for 30%.

Question from PAG: Did anyone say they had no connection to the forest? (In reference to a question that asked what your main connection to the forest was).

Response: No. Everyone identified at least one connection.

Question from PAG: Did you use a 4 point or a 5 point scale for the survey?

Response: 5 point scale.

Comment from PAG: People are willing to make sacrifices as long as it's not their own. (In reference to the results of question 4 from the survey).

Question from PAG: What was the First Nation representation in the survey?

Response: We didn't specifically ask about the heritage of the respondents but there was a question that asked about the respondent's connection to the forest and one of the options was “First Nations”. 5% of Respondents selected this as an option, so we infer that 5% of respondents were of First Nations decent.

Question from PAG: How do you read this graph? (In reference to the results of question 4).

Response: The important thing is the relative distance between the values.

Question from PAG: Do the results correspond with the economic state of the community in which the survey was completed? For example Quesnel's economy may be worse off than Fort St. Johns. (In reference to the results of Question 5 “economic stability”).

Response: Possibly.

Question from PAG: Were these self-initiated responses or was it a predetermined list they could select from?

Response: A list but you could choose more than one response from the list.

Question from PAG: Was there enough depth in the survey to analyze attitude differences between communities?

Response: Yes. Trends were the same between all 9 communities surveyed but we are actively working on finding more detail on this.

Question from PAG: Are you going to weight these based on Community census information?

Response: Yes. This is something else we are working on.

Question from PAG: Did you have other PAGs do the survey? The Prince George PAG did their community survey. Are the results available somehow?

Response: Unsure. The results of the PG PAG survey may be available through Paul Jeakins.

Question from PAG: All communities that were surveyed had SFM plans in place. Would there have been a difference if the community surveyed had no SFM plan?

Response: I would expect there to be a difference. There is interest in investigating this but there is limited funding to carry it out.

Comment from PAG: Having both types of communities do the survey would be a good way to find out if the SFM processes are working and effective.

Website address for Survey results and information: www.sfm-pos.ca

Contact Information:

Howard Harshaw, PhD

2nd floor, Forest Sciences Centre

2312-2424 Main Mall

Vancouver, BC

Canada, V6T-1Z4

Tel: 604-822-3970

Fax: 604-822-9106

e-mail: harshaw@interchange.ubc.ca

5. Review of the Draft Annual Report

- The facilitator explained that there might be differences between the Annual Report that was mailed to PAG members and the one we will be discussing tonight due to some last minute changes made.
- A summary of the changes made (errata) to the annual report was distributed.
- In the interest of time, the facilitator asked the PAG if there were any specific comments or concerns about the annual report that they wanted to review.
 - PAG members identified 2 areas they wanted to review:
 1. Table on page IV. The table is confusing and the intent of the table and content is not made clear.
 2. Section 3.41 Range Action Plan.

Presentation:

- Dave Menzies explained there are 2 types of indicators the participants must report on in the annual report. There is the performance to indicators that are non-legal, these are CSA requirements, and those indicators that are legal, or regulatory.
- Dave reviewed key achievements of the participants and highlights of the operations from 2006-2007.
- Performance on landscape level strategies was reviewed as well as performance on achieving indicator targets. Participants were consistent with targets or the variances on all regulatory indicators related to the landscape level strategies.
- Participants overall are in conformance to 57 indicator targets or variance, however 4 indicator targets were not met. These were: water quality concern rating (#35), harvest strategy (#49), value of contracts (#55) and Conformance to elements pertinent to treaty rights (#56).
- Each of the 4 indicators with targets not met were reviewed and contributing factors and any planned corrective actions discussed.

- 8 contraventions were reported to government. 2 of these were administrative, 3 were logging, and 3 were silviculture related.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG: What impact did your aggressive Mountain Pine beetle control efforts have?

Response: We will be discussing that later in more detail. A quick review of the efforts: the dry weather worked in our favor. Flew the area, identified the beetle sites, treatment plans were developed and implemented on all the confirmed beetle sites. Treatment plans included fall and burn, baiting, and harvesting. Weather has not been working in our favour this year.

Question from PAG: Was this what was done in Farrell creek. There looks like there are still a lot of red beetle trees left behind.

Response: Some of the area was on private land and could not be logged, there were also trees left behind because they were non-merchantable logs (i.e. Too small to run through the mill).

Question from PAG: Can you please clarify non-compliance vs. contravention vs. conformance?

Response: non-compliance is not meeting a legal requirement. Contravention is when we believe there has been non-compliance so we have reported it as such. Conformance is not meeting a non-legal requirement; not following an internal process.

Question from PAG: For indicator #55, you mentioned that the fires and the beetle may have been the main cause of the non-conformance. Can you explain this further?

Response: We haven't analyzed the reason for this non-conformance in a lot of detail but we know that the unexpected fires and the arrival of the mountain pine beetle contributed to the non-conformance. When dealing with these unpredictable forest health concerns, it causes existing plans to change and there is a need to expedite treatments. When working on short timelines it is difficult to tender out contracts.

Question from PAG: We have discussed black water previously. Has the new method of surveying identified that these areas of black water are more dangerous than originally thought? (Referring to the new stream crossing quality assessment procedure and training that was discussed as a part of the follow-up actions taken due to the non-conformance to indicator #35, Water Quality Concern Rating).

Response: The new stream crossing quality guidelines developed in part by Pierre Beaudry and the reason they were developed was explained.

PAG Comment: that did not answer the question.

Response: Facilitator clarified that the new stream crossing quality assessments did not measure of the quality of water but rather a new process used to assess the potential of a stream crossing to deliver sediment into the stream.

- The facilitator went back to the two items previously identified by the PAG members as topics for discussion: The table on page IV and indicator 3.41.

Comment from PAG: The caption above the table on page IV does not reflect the data in the table. It doesn't adequately describe the content.

Response: The intent of the table was clarified and the data in the table was explained for the PAG.

Comment from PAG: There should be some clarification on the word "significant". It is used in a lot of different contexts in the document but is not defined anywhere. What is minor vs. significant. The reference to the progress completed does not seem significant.

- PAG member had reviewed the content of indicator 3.41 and decided that it was something that could be discussed outside of the meeting. The member will talk directly to field people to resolve concern.

ACTION 7: Clarify or reword the caption above the table on page IV of the annual report to better describe the contents of the table.

- The facilitator called for any additional comments or concerns.

Comment from PAG: There is a typo on page IV.

ACTION 8: Correct Typo on page IV of the annual report sent to PAG members.

Question from PAG: Could you please clarify the requirement to do non-conventional logging?

Response: Theoretically, if you don't cable log the AAC for the Timber Supply Area may drop. This is due to the way the Allowable Annual Cut (AAC) is calculated and the Timber Supply Review (TSR) is done.

Question from PAG: With respect to indicator #56, did you canvass the Joint Management Advisory Committee (JMAC)?

Response: For indicator 56 we report out on 9 different indicators if we do not meet a single one of those, we have a non-conformance to Indicator 56.

Comment from PAG: But did you consult with the JMAC?

Response: We have not recently consulted the JMAC on this particular issue. Discussions occurred at the time the SFMP (Sustainable Foret Management Plan) was being developed. The PAG discusses and approves each indicator we report on. The JMAC did not wish to be involved in either the PAG process or the SFMP process at that time.

Question from PAG: Could you use a different font in the annual report? We get black and white copies of the report and there is reference to red font color that we cannot see. It would be easier for us to interpret if there was a different type of font.

Response: that was done to make it easier for the Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR) to distinguish between the legal and non-legal indicators. We will look into something.

- The facilitator announced that the revisions to the annual report will be available on the pilot project website.

ACTION 9: Post the revisions to the annual report on the web.

ACTION 10: Look into a new font or distributing color copies to the PAG in future annual reports.

6. Update on Mountain Pine Beetle

- Due to time constraints, the facilitator proposed this agenda item be deferred until the next meeting.
- No objections from the PAG.

7. Review of Audit Results

Forest Practices Board Audit of BCTS operations

Presentation:

- Brian Farwell from British Columbia Timber Sales (BCTS) distributed the Report from the Forest Practices Board (FPB) Audit to meeting attendants.
- The FPB Audit was a compliance audit of forest planning and practices of BCTS' and timber sales licence holders' operations in the Fort St. John Pilot Project area September 5th to 8th.
- The Report was positive. The FPB noted that BCTS and its timber sale licensees complied with legislative requirement, and encouraged them to continue with the current framework of planning and forest practices (i.e. the Pilot Project).

Discussion/Questions:

No questions or comments were received from the PAG.

2005 Compliance Audit

Presentation:

- Dave Menzies from Canfor presented the results from the 2005 compliance Audit that looked at operations from 2003-2005.
- The results were sent to PAG members along with the annual report.
- There were no significant non-compliances identified
- 6 Opportunities for Improvement were identified
- 3 targets relating to landscape level strategies were not met as reported in the 2005 annual report.
- 4 other targets (not relating to landscape level strategies) were not met as reported in the 2005 annual report.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG: What is the difference between significant and minor non-compliance?

Response: It has to do with the CSA auditing standards.

ACTION 11: Ask KPMG to include a definition of significant non-compliance and minor non-compliance in the next audit summary.

ACTION 12: Define terms used in Audit reports

See section 3 of the following document for definitions and abbreviations:

http://www.csa-international.org/product_areas/forest_products_marking/program_documents/CAN_CSA_Z809-020_English.pdf

PDF of the above document will also be attached to meeting summary.

Canadian Standards Association (CSA) Audit

Presentation:

- Wes Neumeier reviewed the CSA audit results.
- 3 minor non-conformances were reviewed. A non-conformity found in BCTS operations (NC-2007-01) was not reviewed with the PAG due to a lack of information.

Non-conformity #	Description of Issue(s)	Proposed Corrective Action(s)
NC-2007-01	See BCTS Peace ISO 14001 Report and action plans. This non-conformity was previously issued as part of the BCTS Peace ISO 14001 surveillance audit. An approved action plan is already in place to address this non-conformity, which is reported here for the sake of completeness.	See BCTS Peace ISO 14001 Report and action plans
NC-2007-02	Review of the Canfor public website indicated that there was a reference to Canfor's Rustad sawmill (which is no longer ISO 14001 certified) as being certified to ISO 14001.	Discuss and review at Canfor Sustainable Forest Group meeting. Recommend removing reference of Rustad sawmill's being certified to ISO 14001
NC-2007-03	Both ISO 14001 and Z809 require that Organizations establish and maintain procedures to identify applicable legal requirements and take these into account in establishing its management system. Our assessment determined that while this had been done satisfactorily overall, there was an isolated weakness in relation to requirements of the Fort St. John Pilot Project Regulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deactivation guidelines are being used for low and medium risk roads. However, the FSJPPR requires a deactivation prescription signed off by the participant. NB: the practices being conducted on the ground were deemed to be satisfactory.	Rename Deactivation Guidelines used for low and medium risk roads to Deactivation Prescription for low and medium risk roads, and revise to include sign off by the person prescribing and the participant. Determine if FSJPPR should be revised to exclude requirement for formal deactivation prescriptions on low and medium risk roads

- 9 opportunities for improvement (OFI) were identified during the audit. Only one (relating to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the PAG) was reviewed with the PAG.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG: Is a cheat sheet for all the acronyms available?

Response: there is a glossary in the appendices of the SFMP available on the web.

ACTION 13: Provide more detail in the meeting minutes around the non-conformity NC-2007-01 found during the CSA Audit.

Details on NC-2007-01: Interviews with operators on a BCTS block indicated that the licensee had not conducted an appropriate pre-work and critical site requirements had not been communicated to the operators.

ACTION 14: Provide PAG with list of common forestry acronyms.

http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/library/documents/acronyms/Acronyms_August2007.pdf

PDF of the above document will also be attached to the meeting summary.

ACTION 15: Provide the link to the SFMP in the meeting summary as a source of definitions for common forestry terms.

[http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/documents/FSJ Pilot Project Draft SFM Plan \(Part 2 - Appendices\).pdf](http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/documents/FSJ_Pilot_Project_Draft_SFM_Plan_(Part_2_-_Appendices).pdf)

Question from PAG: The audit findings demonstrate that the participants are doing a good job but the effect on the landbase is unclear. How are we doing overall? It's a pilot project intended to test that. Will the pilot continue?

Response from Advisor: When is a pilot no longer a pilot? This question has been asked at the highest levels of government and is not easy to answer. We need to identify what we want out of the pilot project. We will be getting a third party review on the project and the report will be out by the end of summer 2008.

Comment from PAG: Seems to me that there has never been such public involvement in a process like this. I am hoping for expansion rather than omission.

Facilitator: Do you want to see this on the agenda for future meeting?

PAG Response: Yes.

ACTION 16: Investigate the possibility of having a presentation on the future of the Pilot Project and results of the third party review on the pilot project at a future PAG meeting.

8. First Nations' Involvement with Licensee Participants

- Due to time constraints, the facilitator proposed this agenda item be deferred until the next meeting.
- No objections from the PAG.

9. Review PAG Membership & Consent to Publish PAG Membership Names Authorization to Publish PAG member's names

- PAG members were asked to grant participants permission to publish their names in the newspaper as part of an advertisement requirement under the Fort St. John Pilot Project Regulation.
- All members in attendance agreed to have their names published.

ACTION 17: Contact members not in attendance to get permission to publish their names in the newspaper for the purpose of an advertisement.

Comment from PAG: Wayne Sawchuck has said he has not withdrawn from the PAG even though his name has been removed from the membership list.

ACTION 18: Follow-up with Wayne Sawchuck to see if he still wishes to participate in the PAG.

10. Public Presentations

- No public presentations were made.

11. Next Meeting and Focus

- Facilitator reviewed potential topics for next meeting:
 - Pilot Project Review
 - Ministry of Tourism, Sports & the Arts presentation on Heritage trail application process and forest management implications.
 - Mountain Pine Beetle
 - First Nations
 - Matrix review
- Facilitator proposed early March for the next PAG meeting

- PAG agreed early March would be good timing as long as it does not conflict with spring break.
- 1st week of March was suggested by PAG.

ACTION 19: Send out 2007/2008 Matrix prior to the next PAG meeting.

- **Facilitator asked for general comments from PAG**

Comment from PAG: The Participants should be commended for the job they've done.

Comment from Observer: Too much on Agenda at every meeting. Should consider increasing the meeting frequency.

Comment from Participant: The participants appreciate all the comments received from the PAG.