

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project  
Public Advisory Group Meeting #33**

**June 22nd, 2009  
1800 to 2100hrs**

**Quality Inn**

**Meeting summary**

**Meeting Attendance:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
<b><i>Participant</i></b>			
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	7873651	<a href="mailto:Darrll.Regimbald@canfor.com">Darrll.Regimbald@canfor.com</a>
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	7873665	Andrew.tyrrell@canfor.com
Dawn Griffin	Canfor	787-3607	Dawn.Griffin@canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	787-3613	Dave.menzies@canfor.com
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@canfor.com
Don Rosen	Canfor	788-4379	Don.Rosen@canfor.com
Brian Farwell	BCTS	262-3337	Brian.Farwell@gov.bc.ca
Walter Fister	BCTS	262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca

***PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates***

Dale Johnson	Range	262-3260	dkjohnsonranch@xplornet.com
Ron Wagner	Labour	787-0172	rwagner@telus.net
Fred Jarvis	Rural	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>
Teena Demeulemeester	WMFN	788-3676	<a href="mailto:forestry@westmo.org">forestry@westmo.org</a>
Orland Wilkerson	Urban	787-6243	wilkerson@unbc.ca
Chad Dahlke	Oil and Gas	780-831-6002	chad.d.dalk.@conocophillips.com
Fred Klassen	Forestry Workers	787-1429	klassen@intpac.ca
Oliver Mott	Environment	787-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com

***Advisors***

Rod Backmeyer	Integrated Land Mgmt Bureau	787-3236	Rod.backmeyer@gov.bc.ca
Victoria Kress	MOFR	784-1281	victoria.kress@gov.bc.ca

Joelle Scheck	Ministry of Environment	787-3393	Joelle.Scheck@gov.bc.ca
---------------	----------------------------	----------	-------------------------

***Observers***

Stacy Gibbons	Canfor	787-9168	<a href="mailto:Stacy.Gibbons@canfor.com">Stacy.Gibbons@canfor.com</a>
Joey Welch	Canfor		<a href="mailto:Joey.Welch@canfor.com">Joey.Welch@canfor.com</a>
Jocelin Teron	Canfor		Jocelin.Teron@canfor.com
Sandra Fox	First Nations	788-1956	<a href="mailto:sandy_fox_24@hotmail.com">sandy_fox_24@hotmail.com</a>

Stella Gauthier                      First Nations                      788-1858                      stella.gautier@gmail.com

**Facilitator**

Gail Wallin                      Facilitator                      305-1003                      Gwallin@wlake.com

**1. Review of Meeting #32 Summary and outstanding actions**

- Action #1: Completed
- Action #2: Completed
- Action #3: Completed
- Action #4: Completed
- Action # 5- Agenda Item for this meeting
- Action # 6- Mandatory discussion item Criterion # 1 is reviewed
- Action #7: Completed
- Action #8: Completed

**Outcome:** Meeting #32 summary was accepted

**2. Review of Meeting agenda**

- Draft agenda was reviewed, no new items to add, agenda was accepted.

**Action item # 1: Put page numbers on next meeting summary pages**

**3. Welcome and Introductions**

- Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, and observers

**4. Darrell Regimbald addressed the PAG and informs the direction of the meetings up until December 2009.**

- Renewing the SFMP for 2010, the criteria and indicators will be reviewed over the next few PAG meetings, with an emphasis on the Landscape Level Strategies. In the New Year the focus will turn towards CSA certification.

**5. Walter Fister reviewed a question regarding permanent access structures (Action #5 from last meeting)**

- Displays visual examples of permanent access structures that are left in blocks as well as their percentage with reference to the size of the block.
- **Question from PAG:** What wildlife species would be most impacted because of permanent access structures.
- **Advisor Response:** Roads do have an effect on wildlife, but effects vary from species to species.

- **Participant comment:** Biodiversity, wildlife, and access are scheduled to be addressed in future PAG meetings.

**PAG was provided with the SFMP Matrix, handout provided SFMP landscape level strategies.**

**Gail Wallin reviewed SFMP matrix with the PAG,** and asked Andrew Tyrrell to offer a definition of “riparian”.

## **6. Andrew Tyrrell reviewed the Riparian Management Strategy with the PAG**

- Strategy #3 is suggested by the PAG to include the reference to wildlife benefits. Participants agreed to add in reference in strategy #3.
- Strategy #4 is suggested to include reference to sensitive watershed assessment.
- **Question from PAG:** Is Peak Flow Index sufficient for riparian management, does this include an assessment of watershed sensitivity?

**Action item #2 for next meeting: review concept of sensitive watersheds and respond to PAG. Tie discussion to the Peak Flow Index (strategy #4).**

**Outcome:** Riparian Management Strategies 1- 4 are accepted by the PAG

- Andrew reviewed Indicators 7, 34, 35, 36, 37, of water quality and quantity, as well as the targets of each indicator, including the proposed revisions.
- Indicator 35 proposed change by the working group to “annually”

**Action item #3: Target 34 measurement unit to be changed from “percent of” to “percentage of”.**

- Indicators 22 and 23 that relate to riparian management were discussed with the PAG. No change is proposed to indicator 22. Indicator 23 is proposed to be dropped from the next matrix. reviewed

**Outcome:** Indicators 7, 22, 34,35,36,37 are accepted by the PAG. Deletion of indicator # 23 was accepted by the PAG.

Gail Wallin gave the Range and Forage Management landscape level strategy handout to the PAG.

## **7. Walter Fister reviewed the strategies of Range and Forage Management**

- Strategy #1 is explained
- **PAG Comment:** A PAG member asked that more information about the impact of aspen logging on grazing opportunities is provided during Timber Range Action Plan discussions.
- **Response:** Walter Fister indicated that the participants would like to deal with each range tenure on a case-by-case basis, with each tenure holder’s concerns taken into consideration.
- **Question from PAG:** How does aspen logging reduce the growth of grasses?

- **Response:** Walter Fister identified that the very good grazing opportunities provided by large mature open stands of aspen are reduced following aspen logging . While there is still grass growing in new aspen plantations, the dense natural regeneration of aspen after logging reduces visibility and accessibility for cattle to roam and graze in a given area.
- **PAG Comments regarding proposed Strategy #2:** PAG commented that the restoring of old fences and cattle guards may be irrelevant since the area may not be suitable for cattle grazing after harvesting.
- Strategy #3 was reviewed with the PAG
- **Question from PAG:** What about the potential danger of noxious weeds being carried in by the heavy equipment of the participants' contractors?
- **Response:** Participants note that it is difficult to pin down the users of an area that may bring noxious and invasive plants into an area, given the many different users of roads. The participants believe that grass-seeding activities in Strategy #3 is the area that they can have the most positive affect on addressing noxious weeds.

**Outcome:** Range and Forage Management Strategies 1-3 are accepted by the PAG..

- Walter Fister reviewed the indicators and targets related to the Range and Forage Management Strategy.
- **Comment from Advisor:** Group called NE invasive plant committee dealing with invasive plants in the local area.

**Action item # 4:** Consider reference to NE invasive plant committee (dealing with invasive plants) in SFMP text (for potential reference in plan or matrix).

**Outcome:** Indicators 10, 41, and 42 are accepted by the PAG.

## 8. Darrell Regimbald reviewed the Visual Quality Management Strategy.

- **Question from advisor:** How are visual quality objectives set and how are they different from assessments completed by the Ministry of Forests and Range? PAG further discusses scenic areas that have designated visual quality objectives, and those without designated visual quality objectives. Some uncertainty over the roles of the various government agencies in developing and managing visual quality objectives.

**Action item #5: Contact MOFR to get clarification of agency responsible to complete the visual quality inventory (Ministry of Forests and Range or ILMB). Ensure the participants have latest version of visual quality inventory.**

**Outcome:** Visual Quality Management Strategy is accepted. Indicator 44 accepted by PAG.

## **9. No Public Presentations**

## **10. Next meeting date**

- July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009

## **11. Feed Back on Meeting**

Dave Menzies briefly discussed results of meeting #32 PAG survey questionnaire responses with the PAG. Participants will address areas of concern noted on the surveys.

Gail Wallin suggested that the PAG provide greater feedback through the surveys, and welcomes more feedback about the process and the group's performance. General feedback regarding meeting # 33:

- Happy with the amount of presentation for each topic
- Satisfied with the answers given to questions from the PAG.
- It is also suggested that in case the planned material is finished early that the participants have alternate material to submit to the PAG.