

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #35**

**Sept 24, 2009
6:00 to 9:30 pm**

Quality Inn, Plaza 1 Meeting Room

Meeting summary

Meeting Attendance:

Participants

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Brian Farwell	BCTS	262-3337	Brian.Farwell@gov.bc.ca
Walter Fister	BCTS	262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Dawn Griffin	Canfor	787-3607	Dawn.Griffin@canfor.com
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	789-3621	Andrew@taylordunnage.ca
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	787-3651	Darrell.Regimbald@canfor.com
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@canfor.com
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	784-1209	Mark.Vantassel@gov.bc.ca

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Fred Jarvis	Rural Communities	262-2913	fredjarvis@shaw.ca
Dale Johnson	Range Forest	262-3260	dkjohnsonranch@xplornet.com
Fred Klassen	contractors / workers	787-1429	klassen@intpac.ca
Ron Wagner	Labour	787-0172	rojwagner@telus.net

Advisors

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Rod Backmeyer	ILMB	787-3236	Rod.Backmeyer@gov.bc.ca
Elizabeth Hunt	MoFR	784-1237	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	MOE	787-3393	Joelle.Scheck@gov.bc.ca

Observers

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Amanda Horning	Canfor	787-3600	Amanda.Horning@canfor.com
Dave Menzies	Public	787-7877	dmenzies@pris.ca
Kip Letkemen	Public	787-8681	

Facilitator

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com

Welcome and Introductions

- Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, members, and observers. Observers given full participation.

2. Review of Meeting agenda

- Draft agenda was reviewed. Missing agenda item #9. New Item #11 added.
- Updated: Agenda item 9. Reforestation Landscape Level Strategy (DG)
- Updated: Agenda item 10. Forest Health Landscape Level Strategy and Indicators (AT)
- New item #11 Patch size, seral stage distribution and adjacency strategy #6 and #9 (MVT), item added at end of meeting due to time.
- Agenda was accepted.
- PAG Meeting #34 summary was accepted by PAG.
- Reviewed the summary of actions from last meeting.

1. Summary of Actions from Meeting # 34

- Action #1: Take and consider PAG input and resume discussion of target #40 at the next meeting. **Completed**, refer to agenda item #6.
- 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. **Completed**, refer to agenda item #6.
- Action #3: Participants to set date for field trip and September PAG meeting and advise the PAG. **Completed** prior to field trip on Sept 17, 2009, refer to agenda item #8.
- Action #4: Participants to email proposed strategies and other material to PAG prior to meeting (Sept 24, 2009). **Completed**.

4. Darrell Regimbald reviewed meeting questionnaire results

- Handout #1: Summary PAG Meeting #34 Results
- All three categories showed good results.
- Ranges of scores was shown as suggested.
- Continue with pre-PAG meetings with advisors.
- Expressed desire to continue with surveys.

5. Darrell Regimbald overview and summary of process (where have we been, where are we going)

- Handout #2: SFMP Overview of Process
- Focus to provide input to SFMP, and have it revised and submitted for approval.
- Goal to go through all indicators and strategies for the new SFMP by December 2009.
- Public review/comment period January-March 2010, concurrent with submitting to government. Expect approval April 2010.
- New CSA-Z809 SFM standard has been released, with a three-year window to bring plans into conformance. Next SFMP will work on this issue after approval of 2010-2016 SFMP
- Reviewed progress to date achievements and outstanding reviews.

- October, annual report, may start to review remaining indicators. Perhaps two meeting in November 2009, complete outstanding indicator review. Meeting early January for PAG to review plan before being released to public. Refer to agenda item # 13.

6. Mark Van Tassel lead follow-up discussion on timber harvest strategy #6 Allowable Cut levels and Indicator #40 Coordinated Developments from July's Meeting (Action 1 and 2 from meeting 34 Completed).

- Handout # 3: Fort St. John Pilot Project, Landscape Level Strategies Road access strategy #3: Access Coordination, indicator #40 coordinated development (non legal)
- Brief explanation of forestry relations with other industries such as oil and gas, wind tenures etc. Discussion that oil and gas are not required to have their long term planning process open to public.
- It was noted that new Oil and Gas Activities Act and Resource Roads Act which may make it easier to measure this indicator. Until these new regulations come out, we have to work with what we have.
- "Successful" vs. "unsuccessful" wording was not liked at last meeting. Change was proposed.
- Change target to read "report annually the number of proposed coordinated developments that occurred".
- Expand list of what coordinated developments includes. For example number of proposed FOS roads that are utilized by O&G, number of roads use agreements, with other industrial users, the number of participants roads in the FOS that are revised to utilize O&G roads.
- **Outcome: PAG in agreement with this word changing for indicator #40 Coordinated development (non legal).**
- **Action #1 from Meeting #34 Complete.**
- This indicator can be changed as new regulations come in the future

- Timber Harvesting Strategy #6: Sustainable timber harvest levels (2004-H/S: #7 Allowable Annual Cut Levels). Currently not a legal indicator. Differences exist between BCTS and other participants operation with timber volumes and how they are issued. BCTS has cut allocation, licensee participants have cut control mechanism linked to their licenses.
- Other participants than BCTS are legally held by a cut control clause. Indicator #6 holds BCTS to the same type of standard.
- The participants working group took the PAG's suggestion to consider making this indicator legal. It was concluded that since it already is a legal indicator in participants' license documents (other than BCTS), they would already be penalized if the clause were broken. Therefore if indicator #6 was made a legal indicator it would be a double penalization.
- **Outcome: PAG in agreement, Timber Harvesting Strategy #6 will remain non-legal.**
- **Action #2 from Meeting #34 Complete.**

7. Mark Van Tassel gave a presentation on Seral stage, Patch size and Adjacency landscape level strategy and related indicators and targets.

- Handout #5: SFMP (2010) Patch Size, Seral Stage Distribution and Adjacency Strategy
- Background information was discussed concerning seral state, and current age class groupings.

- Proposal of changing the threshold for 'old' deciduous from 120 years to 100 years based on C. Delong's Northern Interior Forest Region and NDU research which shows this is more accurate to biology of the stands. Once deciduous stands reach 100 years of age it is 'old', and 120 years plus it becomes decadent and overmature.
- Concern brought up by PAG about why Forest Inventory Zones (FIZ) in northeast BC consider aspen as 'mature' at 140 years old or greater.
- Participant response: Discussed that cruising tenure and ecology specialist are not working together thus the difference. Also that FIZ are concerned with individual tree properties while this strategy is concerned with stand properties.
- Concern about rationale about why participants want to reduce old age of aspen to 100. Discussed that Delong's research shows it should be at 100. Originally 120 years old was somewhat of a initial guess because not much information was known about deciduous. With more focus on deciduous, research now showing 100 years old to be the more accurate age for 'old' classification.
- Discussed importance to keep proportional amounts of young, mature and old across the landscape for conservation of wildlife habitats. Too much old growth creates potential for forest health concerns.
- NDU discussion. NDU has larger areas, based on large natural disturbances. Want to emulate these natural disturbance events. Already done in Dawson Creek and Fort Nelson TSAs.
- MVT used maps on walls to demonstrate concepts, and differences between Landscape Units and Natural Disturbance Units. Seral stage and patch-size maps displayed entire TSA. Natural Disturbance Units were displayed on a separate for entire Prince George Forest Region for reference.
- Proposal to change Seral stage strategy to "manage old forest targets by NDU".
- Government does not want to proceed with spatially identified old growth management areas. Different regulations should be coming out in the near future such as the Oil and Gas Activities Act which will require management for old growth. Currently only forestry resource companies do this. Recommendation to run this indicator non-spatially until other industries have their regulations approved.
- Concern about rotating reserves was brought up. If we remove the management by LU by NDU and change them to by NDU alone, the need for these reserves is removed. However, mainly these rotating reserves exist for cultural concerns. This may disappear from the FOS for the time being they would still be the first areas to be delineated back to spatially identified old growth management areas.
- Proposal to change Seral Stage Distribution Management Strategy Indicator #2 to 'the minimum proportion (%) of late seral forest by NDU' —
- Table 1. Natural Disturbance Unit Old Seral Stage & Young Patch Distribution discussed
- **Outcome: PAG accepted the proposed change to Seral Stage portion of strategy to the related Seral Stage indicator and target.**
- Patch Size - background information was discussed concerning patch size, and current age class groupings.
- Presented proposed change of legal indicator #3 to 'percent area by patch size class (0-50, 51-100, and >100) by NDU'
- Proposed change of target of indicator #3 to 'a minimum of x of 18 (Y%) of the baseline targets for early patches will be achieved during the term of this SFMP'

Action #1: complete further analysis to derive the minimums for baseline targets of early patches for the 2010-2016 SFMP.

- **Outcome: PAG accepted changes proposed to patch size indicator #3 and target of indicator #3.**
- Concern from PAG: through managing by NDU will participants be able to harvest larger blocks?
- Response from Participants: No, block sizes will not be affected by the change of measuring on an NDU basis compared to an LU basis. Referred back to table one.
- Discussion of how a young seral patch can be made up by more than one polygon, either cut block or natural disturbances including fire.
- Question from observer: How will small MPB patches impact progress towards achieving patch size targets.
- Response from participant: Those areas will not show up until the next forest inventory project is completed, which will be after the term of the next SFMP, so no immediate concern regarding the indicator or target.
- Comment from PAG: Concern expressed about previously set aside areas (eg. Fish and Wildlife reserve areas), which are becoming either windblown or infested with MPB. Can these be looked at for potential salvage, or are they off-limits?
- Response from Advisor: Fish and Wildlife reserve areas are not currently off-limits for harvesting operations. They are map notations only. There is a current process identifying impacts in these areas.

- ‘Adjacency’ strategy discussion:
- Discussion about green-up and managing for biodiversity. The ‘adjacency’ concept was introduced and managed for prior to the current NDU approach. Adjacency theories are inherently addressed in the NDU approach. The participants feel that they meet adjacency issues through the proposed seral stage strategy.
- Discussion around shape index. Shape index was always achieved on participants proposed block shapes. Actual laid out block shapes are more irregular than proposed block. Block shapes are becoming more complex and participants feel that measuring this is just an extra analysis for something they always meet.
- **Outcome: PAG accepted the adjacency portion of the strategy as presented by the participants.**
- Background information for shape index was presented
- The participants proposed to drop indicator #4 – ‘Shape Index’.
- PAG reminds that shape index was important in the past (when the current plan was developed), and is curious why it is not worth measuring going forward if it something that can easily be achieved.
- Question from PAG: Won’t shape index decrease when block sizes increase with the NDU way of thinking (eg. amalgamating former blocks into one larger one)?
- Participants response: Large blocks have more complex boundaries and in-block structures. High shape indices result from following complex timber types on the ground.
- Participants bring up that FSJ is the only place in province that is measuring shape index. And that it is not a real measure because some patches are result of natural disturbance such as fire. We can only control the shape index of block we harvest.

BREAK

Action #2: reconsider dropping shape index indicator #4, suggest another measure that participants can use.

8. Feedback – Field Trip Deciduous & Mixedwood Reforestation Strategy

- Handouts #6: Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Field tour – Reforestation (meet @ BCTS field office – 7:45am) September 17, 2009, BCTS Site Level Plan Maps for A59301 & A63403, Canfor Site Level Plan Maps for 02015, 05003
- Dawn Griffin quickly reviewed the field trip itinerary and what they viewed
- PAG member and advisor expressed that the different mixedwood strategies were interesting, and that they appreciated seeing participants trying new treatments and using them as research
- PAG members who did attend the field trip discussed that the date was a priority scheduling conflict
- PAG would like to see field trips continue, and next one will be discussed closer to date.

9. Dawn Griffin presentation on Reforestation Landscape Level Strategy

- Handouts #7: SFMP (2010) Reforestation Strategies, SFMP (2010) Reforestation Indicators (non-legal)
- Powerpoint Presentation by DG: describing MSQ (Mean Stocked Quadrant) and stocking standards in the FSJ Pilot Project. Conifer compiler, looking to update. New research about to pilot using standards by Craig Farden on intimate mixed woods.
- The participants propose to change the measurement of deciduous blocks reforestation from block level to multi-block (landscape level). They will develop a ‘compiler’ to assess deciduous reforestation success. This will involve a MSQ survey program for deciduous areas.
- Reforestation Legal Strategy: Indicator #28 Species Composition, no change to this indicator.
- **Outcome: No change to Reforestation Legal Strategy: Indicator #28 accepted by PAG**
- Reforestation Legal Strategy: Indicator #29 Reforestation Assessment. Conifer target remains unchanged. Addition of deciduous. New indicator would read ‘Merchantable volume (m3) for coniferous and separate deciduous areas.
- Proposed target would remain the same for conifer, and include deciduous. New deciduous target for indicator #28 would read ‘For deciduous area, merchantable volume will meet or exceed target volume (90% of predicted maximum volume) within the reforestation period’.
- This target is slightly lower than that of conifer because of the lack of benchmark information. Not many deciduous surveys have been completed. Target may change as we get more information.
- **Outcome: Changes to Reforestation Legal Strategy: Indicator #29 and targets of indicator #29, accepted by PAG**
- Reforestation Legal Strategy: Indicator #30 Establishment Delay, keep conifer and deciduous targets, add mixedwood target.
- New mixedwood target would read ‘ The area weighted average establishment delay for mixed wood stands regeneration will not exceed three years’
- **Outcome: PAG accepts targets for mixedwood to Reforestation Legal Strategy: Indicator #30.**
- Reforestation Non-Legal Indicator #13 Coniferous seeds, change variance to become up to date with rest of province.

- New Variance will read ‘ Transfer guidelines will follow “The Chief Forester’s Standards for Seed Use”.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts change of variance for Reforestation Non-Legal Indicator #13.**
- Reforestation Non-Legal Indicator #14 Aspen Regeneration, alteration of the indicator, variance and target to allow for artificial planting of deciduous species
- Proposed Indicator #14 Deciduous Regeneration.
- Proposed Target 100% natural regeneration for deciduous.
- Proposed Variance: the acceptable variance is 10% of area naturally restocked to deciduous could be vegetative propagules or deciduous seedlings.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts new indicator target and variance for Reforestation Non-Legal Indicator #14.**
- Concern brought up about grazing and deciduous block. PAG wonders if there is a consideration for reducing stem count of deciduous to allow for grazing.

- Response: Participants feel that with deciduous being included in the landscape strategy that more flexibility will be possible on a site specific basis.

***Action #3: Ensure that deciduous stocking and grass can be addressed somewhere in the plan. Mutually agreed variance between range tenure holder and participants**

10. Andrew Tyrrell review Forest Health Landscape Level Strategy and Indicators

- Handouts #8: SFMP (2010) Forest Health Management Strategies, Forest Health Strategy #3, indicator illustration
- Reviewed Forest Health Strategy #1
- **Outcome: PAG accepts Forest Health Strategy #1.**
- Reviewed Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #1,
- **Outcome: PAG accepts Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #1.**
- Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #2, proposed indicator change: ‘the minimum proportion (%) of late seral forest by NDU’
- Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #2 proposed target: The minimum proportion (%) of late seral forest by NDU as identified in table 1 will be met within the identified timelines.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts changes to Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #2 and target.**
- Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #3: proposed change to indicator: Percent area by patch size class (0-50, 51-200, and >100 ha) by NDU
- Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #3 proposed change to target: a minimum of x of 18 (Y%) of the baseline targets for early patches will be achieved during the term of this SFMP
- **Outcome: PAG accepts changes to Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #3 and target.**

- Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #26: proposed change indicator: “the relative proportion of area of merchantable fire damaged stands salvaged within a management intensity class”
- Difficult to assess the extent of some forms of disturbances. For example – Fires - have satellite imagery that allow the extent of this disturbance type to be accurately measured.

- Proposed change target: (change of dates) The relative proportions of salvage will be highest in the high intensity zones, and lowest in the low intensity zones over the SFM Plan period (April 1, 2010-March 31, 2016).
- **Outcome: PAG accepts changes to Forest Health Strategy #1 indicator #26 and target.**
- Forest Health Strategy #2: revised “The participants will identify potential forest health issues within the participants silviculture obligation areas (harvested blocks), and prioritize those which may have significant impact on forest resources. Within the participant’s silviculture obligation areas, the participants will detect and monitor significant forest health agents in a timely manner, and, where potential impacts are significant, implement cost effective treatment controls where practical.”
- “*Significant*” will be further defined in the indicator write up (i.e.anything that prevents free-growing declaration).
- This direction is consistent with the requirements of CSA.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts changes to Forest Health Strategy #2**
- Forest Health Strategy #2 indicator #25: proposed change “Percentage of silviculture obligations with significant detected forest health damaging agents, which have treatment plans developed for them.”
- Target: 100% of sites with significant forest health damaging agents will have treatment plans developed for them, and initiated within 1 year of detection.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts changes to Forest Health Strategy #2 indicator #25 and target.**
- New Proposed Forest Health Strategy #3: Where practical, prioritize harvesting of conifer blocks to those areas that are most susceptible to prevalent catastrophic forest health damaging agents.
- Proposed Indicator: Percentage of new conifer leading harvest blocks in the 2010 Forest Operations Schedule that are pine leading.
- Proposed target: a minimum of 60% of new conifer leading harvest blocks in the 2010 FOS will be pine leading.
- Clarification was made that this is a one-time measurement of the proportion of new conifer leading blocks that are pine leading in 2010 FOS. Explanation was aided with map handout which shows at least 60% of example block has polygons with lodgepole pine as the leading species
- Proposed variance: a 10% variance is required in the event that harvesting of proposed blocks mat not occur to allow for management of other resource values, to allow for inventory variances and to avoid isolation of non pine leading timber.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts addition of Forest Health Strategy #3 and associated indicator, target, and variance.**
- Discussion about how blocks are shaped, through photo interpretation, timber types
- Discussion about what other breakouts to expect (bruce spanworm defoliated aspen this last summer).

11. Mark Van Tassel reviewed indicators #6 (CWD) and #9 (MVT), <item added at end of meeting due to extra time.>

- Refer back to Handout #5: SFMP (2010) Patch Size, Seral Stage Distribution and Adjacency Strategy
- Indicator #6: Average Coarse Woody Debris volume/ha on blocks logged in the DFA

- No change to indicator, change to target (dates): Minimum target average retention level over the DFA will be 46 m³/ha (50% of the average per-harvest volume) on harvested blocks assessed for the period between December 1, 2008 and November 30, 2016.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts date change to indicator #6.**
- Indicator #9: Cumulative wildlife tree patch percentage in blocks harvested under the FSJPPR in each LU. Participants propose to continue with this indicator with no changes.
- **Outcome: PAG accepts indicator and target as presented.**

12. No Public Presentations

13. Next meeting date

- Next meeting Oct 22, 2009, Quality Inn, Plaza 1 Meeting Room 5:30-9:30pm
- Next meeting will be Annual Report Meeting, with special guest presenter Alicia Goddard: Boreal Caribou and FSJ TSA
- Possibility of two meetings in November on dates 12, 19, 26. Please email Darrell Regimbald for dates that do not work.
- January meeting to look at SFMP draft

14. Feed-back on Meeting

- Complex topics were covered efficiently and in a concise manner.
- Complaints about temperature and noise in room.
- Suggestion to get microphone set up for next meeting.