

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project  
Public Advisory Group Meeting #34**

**July 9th, 2009  
5:30 to 9:30hrs**

**Quality Inn, Plaza 1 Meeting Room**

**Meeting summary**

**Meeting Attendance:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
<i><b>Participants</b></i>			
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	787-3651	darrell.regimbald@canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	787-3613	Dave.menzies@canfor.com
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Tyrell	Canfor	787-3665	Andrew.Tyrell@canfor.com
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	789-3621	<a href="mailto:Andrew@taylordunnage.ca">Andrew@taylordunnage.ca</a>
Walter Fister	BCTS	262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca

***PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates***

Dale Johnson	Range	262-3260	dkjohnsonranch@xplornet.com
Roy Lube	Outdoor Recreation	787-7619	rlube@telus.net
Ron Wagner	Labour	787-0172	rojwagner@telus.net
Darren Thiel	Commercial rec	262-9482	dthiel@shaw.ca
Budd Phillips	Non Comm Rec.	785-1283	<a href="mailto:budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com">budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com</a>
Fred Jarvis	Rural Communities	262-2913	<a href="mailto:fredjarvis@shaw.ca">fredjarvis@shaw.ca</a>
Stanley Gladysz	Recreation	785-2596	<a href="mailto:sgladysz@pris.ca">sgladysz@pris.ca</a>
Orland Wilkerson	Urban Communities	787-6243	wilkerson@unbc.ca
Oliver Mott	Environment	785-9508	<a href="mailto:ogmott@hotmail.com">ogmott@hotmail.com</a>
Natalie Clarke	FSJ Trappers Assc.	263-4525	<a href="mailto:nclarke@urban-systems.Ltd">nclarke@urban-systems.Ltd</a>
Chad Dalke	Oil & Gas	831-6002	<a href="mailto:chad.d.dalke@conocophillips.com">chad.d.dalke@conocophillips.com</a>

***Advisors***

Rod Backmeyer	ILMB	787-3236	Rod.backmeyer@gov.bc.ca
Graham Suther	MOE	787-3283	graham.suther@gov.bc.ca
Elizabeth Hunt	MOFR	784-1237	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca

***Observers***

Joey Welch	Canfor	787-3600	<a href="mailto:joey.welch@canfor.com">joey.welch@canfor.com</a>
Cliff Lamb		263-4525	Box 100 Rose Prairie, BC

***Facilitator***

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

## **1. Summary of Actions from Meeting # 33**

- Action #1: Completed – meeting summary has page numbers.
- Action #2 Discussion of Fisheries Sensitive Watershed analysis to be completed at today's meeting July 9, 2009 – see agenda item # 7.
- Action #3 Completed – Target #34 measurement unit changed to “percentage of”.
- Action #4 Completed – SFMP range indicator description will reference the Northeast Invasive Plant Committee.
- Action #5 Completed – MOFR completes visual quality inventories.

## **2. Review of Meeting agenda**

- Draft agenda was reviewed, no new items to add, agenda was accepted.
- Meeting summary was accepted by PAG
- Reviewed the summary of actions from last meeting.

## **3. Welcome and Introductions**

- Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, members, and observers

## **4. Elizabeth Hunt explains the process of visual quality inventory.**

- MOFR completes visual quality inventories, Integrated Land Management Bureau sets visual quality objectives.

**(Action item # 5 completed)**

- Rod Backmeyer provided the PAG with a handout on visual quality assessments conducted by the MOFR .

## **5. Darrell Regimbald reviewed the direction of the PAG meetings, an overview of the process was handed out the PAG**

- The handout described the SFMP review process, summary of SFMP landscape level strategy review achievements to date, as well as the items to be reviewed at meetings to come till December 2009.
- Participants will address the PAG at a future meeting regarding decision on Site Index indicator inclusion in SFMP indicator matrix.

## **6. Mark Van Tassel conducted a Powerpoint presentation on Fisheries Sensitive Watersheds, as requested by the PAG at the last meeting.**

**(Action item #2 from meeting #33 Completed)**

- **Question from PAG:** What effect would the damage of lower channels of a stream, such as BC hydro site C on the Peace River, have on the fish in upper channels of streams?
- **Response:** difficult to answer, without knowing the habits of the fish in the affected upper stream reaches. Fisheries Sensitive Watershed analysis sets objectives for watershed management to reduce negative impacts on fish habitat. The riparian management strategies in the SFMP are designed to minimize negative impacts on fish habitat from timber harvesting and road development operations. MOE Advisor adds that there are no fisheries sensitive watersheds in the Fort St. John region, and that there are only 8 of them across the province. The watershed assessment is a new tool being recently implemented in the MOE.
- **Question from PAG:** Who classifies the streams in categories in the SFMP for Canfor's assessments?
- **Response:** A person who is qualified such as an RPF, RFT, or biologist who has field experience and training to conduct stream assessments.

-----10min Break-----

## 7. Road Access Management Strategies #1-3 are reviewed with the PAG

### Darrell Regimbald reviewed the Road Access Management Strategy #1.

- Proposed strategy #1 is explained, minor wording change to be more clear and specific is proposed.
- Reviewed associated indicator and target #24.

### Dave Menzies reviewed Strategy #2 as well as indicator and target #45

- A map showing the road access was handed out to the PAG
- A handout on the Resource Opportunity Spectrum was given out to the PAG.
- **Comment from Advisor ILMB:** Motorized access as shown on the map provided, over estimates the usable road coverage, and therefore underestimates the total amount of primitive and semi primitive non motorized area. The map is misleading since there is restricted public use of many resource based roads in the MKMA.
- **Question from PAG:** Is site specific input on certain roads available for public comment regarding their development in the future?
- **Response:** Yes there will be time for the public to comment as blocks and roads are developed during the next 6 year FOS plan. The 2010-2016 FOS plan will be open for public input.

**Outcome:** Strategies 1-2 are accepted by the PAG for Road and Access Management. Indicator and target #24 and #45 are accepted by the PAG for Road Access Management.

### Walter Fister reviewed the Road Access Strategy #3 (Access Coordination)

- **Question from PAG:** How can you tell how many developments are proposed, and how many are carried out? What is the ratio?
- **Response from Participants:** It is a good point of how the target is written, it could be revised. We share our harvesting and road construction plans with the Oil and Gas Commission, who in turn, provide this information to their clients. Oil and Gas provide us with referrals regarding their road and facility development plans. This two way sharing of plans provides an opportunity to both industries to coordinate road access development. This coordinated development thereby has the potential to reduce overall impact on the landbase from both industries, in comparison to a scenario if there was no sharing of plans and access coordination.
- **Comment from PAG:** The indicator should include the measurement of successful and unsuccessful agreements between oil/gas and forestry.
- **Comment from PAG:** The indicator should tell us how much cooperation there is between industries.
- **Comment from PAG:** Is the idea of this indicator to look for more integrated development between industries, and lowering the footprint of oil and gas.
- **Comment from PAG:** Changes to petroleum development regulations are coming, and reduction of their footprint by oil and gas through joint development with other industries is a key goal of the oil and gas commission.
- **Response from Participants:** yes, the intent of the strategy is to provide opportunity for forest industry access plans to be shared with the Oil and Gas industry, thereby providing an opportunity to coordinate infrastructure development in common operating areas. This will provide opportunity to eliminate duplication of entries and minimize the combined impact of both industries road development activities.
- **Comment from PAG:** Oil and Gas industry roads are engineered differently than forestry roads, and that is why a lot of the time oil and gas roads are longer and built differently.
- **Comment from Participants:** One of the concerns the forest industry has with using oil and gas roads is because they can be too steep or dangerous for loaded logging trucks.
- **Comment from PAG:** Should this indicator include the number of kilometers of joint cooperation?
- **Comment from PAG:** The indicator may be trying to measure the wrong thing; maybe we should leave this indicator till the fall or scrap the indicator all together, could consider dropping the target reference to success vs. unsuccessful and use as the metric “the number of implemented coordinated developments”
- **Response from Participants:** we are not proposing any change to the indicator, it remains as the “Number of coordinated developments”. We feel this is a valuable indicator. We have no direct control over the road access development decisions made by other industries. Other industries do not always implement the projects we may propose and they do not report back to us to identify the projects actually implemented. Therefore tracking

successful vs. unsuccessful coordinated projects is difficult. We have proposed as a target the “number of proposed coordinated developments that are successful”. To make this more meaningful we could report on the number of kilometers of road associated with coordinated developments such as the number of proposed FOS roads that are utilized by other industries, the number of road use agreements with other industrial users and the number of participant roads in the FOS that are revised to utilize Oil and Gas roads. We will consider the feedback provided, and report back regarding the direction we would like to take with the indicator target.

**Outcome:** Road access management strategy # 3 and Indicator #40 are accepted by the PAG.

**Outstanding:** The review of proposed target statement for Road access management indicator #40 is not completed.

**Action # 1-Take and consider PAG input and resume discussion of target #40 at the next meeting.**

**Question from PAG:** What is the definition of a “road” used for the Resource Opportunity Spectrum?

**Response from Advisor:** Each area has to be looked at subjectively; roads can have varying access depending on their location, the MKMA Act helps to define “road”.

**PAG was provided an overview of Graham River Integrated Management Plan (GRIMP) and clustered harvesting concept**

**PAG was handed out summary of proposed changes to strategies and indicators of timber harvesting.**

#### **8. Dave Menzies reviewed Timber Harvesting Strategies #1-3**

- Indicator and target #18 was reviewed
- **Comment from Advisor:** There are questions about what operational harvesting means when used in targets and indicators.
- **Response:** Operational harvesting is defined in the SFMP, it includes falling and skidding.
- **Question from PAG:** Can you define a cluster?
- **Response:** It is a group of blocks that are grouped together for management purposes that helps to reduce the impact on the land such as for wildlife impact.
- Indicator and target #19, #20, and #21 were reviewed.

**Outcome:** Timber Harvesting Strategies 1-3 accepted by PAG. Indicator #18, #19, #20 and #21 accepted by PAG.

## 9. Andrew Tyrrell reviewed Timber Harvesting Strategies #4 and #5

- Map provided on the wall to explain where the deciduous timber supply is located in the TSA. Brief description provided of elements considered in determining Allowable Annual Cut and long term harvest level.
- Indicator and target #52, and proposed new indicators “timber profile deciduous” were discussed as well as variance to target #52.
- **Question from PAG:** Do you think the Allowable Annual Cut (AAC) will be reduced?
- **Response:** The plan is to use more of the TSA to ensure the AAC stays the same, it will be reviewed by the province during the next timber supply review.
- Proposed legal indicator #50 is reviewed.
- **Question from PAG:** How does this indicator become a legal one?
- **Response:** This is the beginning of the process to become a legal indicator. Approval of the SFMP will complete the process.
- **Question from PAG:** What is the real incentive for an indicator to be a legal indicator?
- **Response:** There is no real incentive, but we feel that it is in synch with the legislation and our SFMP.

**Outcome:** Strategy #4 & #5, and indicators targets and variances #52 & #50 accepted by the PAG.

## 10. Mark Van Tassel reviewed Timber Harvesting Strategies #6 & #7: Sustainable Timber Harvest Levels

- Indicators and targets #53 and #48 were reviewed.
- **Question from PAG:** Why is the indicator for strategy #6 not a legal one?
- **Response:** It was never a legal indicator in the previous SFMP. It is not identified in the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation as a required strategy.
- **Comment from PAG:** Is this an indicator that should be a legal one, if its already important for your certification.
- **Response:** The indicator is not required by the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation as legal content of the SFMP. From a CSA perspective, it is important to show sustainable management of long term harvest levels. There is no requirement from CSA for an indicator to be considered a legal indicator.
- **Question from PAG: (regarding strategy #7)** Is salvage logging included in the total Allowable Annual Cut?
- **Response:** Yes it does include salvage logging.
- **Comment from PAG:** This indicator which is part of strategy #7 should include a reference to the “Fort St. John area” or “defined forest area”.

**Outstanding:** PAG expressed support for timber harvesting strategy #6 and indicator #53, but suggest that the participants should consider the pros and cons of designating Strategy #6 and its indicator #53 as legal.

**Action # 2 - participants to consider PAG input and report back at next meeting regarding decision to make timber harvesting strategy # 6 legal or non legal.**

**Outcome:** Strategy #7 is accepted by the PAG. Indicator #48 is changed to include a reference to Fort St. John defined forest area in. PAG accepts timber harvesting strategy # 7 and revised indicator and target #48.

### **11. Darrell Regimbald reviewed Timber Harvesting Strategy #8: “Silviculture Systems”**

- No changes proposed to the strategy #8, indicator and target #27.
- **Question from PAG:** Why are we going over this strategy if there are no changes?
- **Response:** We are going over all strategies whether they are being changed, deleted, added, or left alone. This gives the PAG an opportunity to raise any concerns they might have with any strategy.

**Outcome:** PAG accepts proposal to retain existing timber harvesting strategy # 8 and indicator and target #27 with no revisions.

### **12. Darrell Regimbald reviewed Timber Harvesting Strategies - “Utilization Standards” and “Harvesting Systems”**

- Discussed participant’s proposal to drop existing timber harvesting strategies “Utilization Standards” and “Harvesting Systems” and associated indicators #51 and #49 from the replacement SFMP.
- **Question from PAG:** Does this limit the potential for cable logging?
- **Response:** No it does not limit the option of using cable systems where appropriate and economically feasible.

**Outcome:** Proposal to drop “Harvesting Systems” and “Utilization Standards” strategies and associated indicators #49 and #51 from the replacement SFMP is accepted by the PAG

### **13. No Public Presentations**

### **14. Next meeting date**

- Possible dates for fall field trip: September 10<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> 2009. Focus to be on discussion of proposed reforestation strategy. Possible PAG meeting dates suggested: September 17, 21 or 24, depending on date selected for field trip.
- **Comment from PAG:** Would like the field trip to include discussion of the difference between ground based herbicide and aerial spraying.
- After field trip date is confirmed, the PAG meeting date can be made.

- PAG member cannot make proposed meeting October 15<sup>th</sup>, October 22<sup>nd</sup> suggested as possible backup meeting date.

**Action # 3 – Participants to set date for Field trip and September PAG meeting and advise the PAG.**

The participants have scheduled the PAG field trip for September 17, 2009. Focus for the field trip will be on the reforestation strategy. The September PAG meeting will be held September 24, 2009.

**15. Feed Back on Meeting**

- Gail Wallin suggests that the PAG provide greater feedback regarding the items noted on the PAG survey questionnaire, and welcomes more feedback about the process and the group's performance.
- Survey questionnaire handed out
- **Question from PAG:** Can the proposed strategies and other material be emailed prior to the meeting?
- **Response:** Yes the material can be emailed prior to the meeting.

**Action # 4 – Participants to email proposed strategies and other material to PAG prior to meeting.**