

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project**  
**Public Advisory Group**  
**Meeting # 36**

**October 22, 2009**

**5:30 to 9:30**

**Fort St. John Curling Rink**

**A) Meeting Attendance**

**B) Meeting Summary**

**C) Action Items**

---

**A) Meeting Attendance:**

*Participants*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Brian Farwell	BCTS	(250) 262-3337	brian.farwell@gov.bc.ca
Walter Fister	BCTS	(250) 262-3328	walter.fister@gov.bc.ca
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	(250) 784-1209	mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	(250) 789-3621	andrew@taylordunnage.ca
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	(250) 787-3651	darrell.regimbald@canfor.com
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	(250) 787-3665	andrew.tyrrell@canfor.com
Rod Higgins	Canfor	(250) 787-3644	rod.Higgins@canfor.com
Wes Neumeier	Canfor	(250) 787-3645	wes.neumeier@canfor.com

*PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Fred Jarvis	Rural Communities	(250) 262-2913	fredjarvis@shaw.ca
Fred Klassen	Forest Contractors/Workers	(250) 264-7902	klassen@intpac.ca
Darren Thiel	Commercial Recreation	(250) 262-9482	dthiel@shaw.ca
Stanley Gladysz	Outdoor Recreation	(250) 785-2596	rlube@telus.ca
Roy Lube	Outdoor Recreation	(250) 787-7619	
Ray Ensz	Trapping	(250) 789-2825	rbensz@shaw.ca
Natalie Clark	Trapping	(250) 263-8252	nclarke@urban-systems.com
Oliver Mott	Environment	(250) 785-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com
Chad Dalke	Oil and Gas	(780) 831-6002	chad.d.dalke@conocophillips.com

*Advisors*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Alicia Goddard	MOE	(250) 787-3369	alicia.goddard@gov.bc.ca
Rod Backmeyer	ILMB	(250) 787-3236	rod.backmeyer@gov.bc.ca

*Other*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	(250) 305-1003	gwallin@wlake.com
Anita Messier	Recorder-BCTS	(250) 262-3325	anita.messier@gov.bc.ca

## **B) Meeting Agenda**

1. Welcome and Introductions
  2. Review of Meeting # 35 Summary
  3. Status of 3 Action Items from Meeting # 35
  4. Review Questionnaire
  5. FSJ Pilot Project Regulation Review
  6. Annual Report Highlights
  7. Review PAG membership and consent to publish PAG membership names
  8. Boreal Caribou Presentation: Alicia Goodard – MOE
  9. Discussion regarding select indicators not yet reviewed
  10. Wrap Up
- 

### **1) Welcome and Introductions**

### **2) Review of Meeting # 35 meeting summary**

- No additions, deletions or corrections to meeting summary were requested therefore meeting summary will stand as circulated
- No questions were asked regarding meeting summary

### **3) Status of 3 Actions Items From Meeting # 35**

- Action Item #1: Complete further analysis to derive the minimums for base line targets of early patch for 2010-2016 SFMP
  - Analysis is currently underway and a target has been set to have it complete by the end of October so the analysis can be reviewed and presented to the PAG during the November 19 meeting
- Action Item #2: Reconsider dropping shape index indicator # 4, suggest another measure that participants can use.
  - Will be addressed at the November 19 PAG meeting
- Action Item #3: Ensure that deciduous stocking and grass can be addressed somewhere in the plan. Mutually agreed variances between range tenure holder and participants
  - Will be discussed at November 19 meeting

### **4) Review Questionnaire**

- Results are consistently high, ranging from 3.88-5/5
- Lowest rating is meeting room adequacy: 3.88
- Next lowest is food and beverage: 4.5
- Suggestion to come up with strategies to increase attendance
- Comments regarding food, rooms, temperature, use of microphone, advisor involvement before meetings, rehearsing presentations, pilot project website printed on summaries
- 8/10 participants responded. Will hand out before end of meetings next time.

- PAG agreed to having questionnaires circulated less frequently-not every meeting. Will complete questionnaire at every second meeting.

#### 5) **Pilot Project Review**

- Government review of Pilot project regulation to determine if it should continue or whether it should discontinue.
- A committee produced a report looking at the Pros/Cons of the Pilot to inform and provide options regarding the fate of the FSJ Pilot Project to the Ministry of Forest and Range Chief Forester and Assistant Deputy Ministers
- Options given to the Chief Forester and MFR Assistant Deputy Ministers to consider:
  - Wind down the Pilot Project
  - Continue the Pilot such that we can continue to benefit from the learning's gained from it and apply those learning's to legislation throughout the province with the intent of eventually revamping it to reflect the good things recognized by the Pilot
  - Have a FSJ Pilot Project type legislation throughout the province
- Recommendations by the committee were to continue the Pilot so that the learning's from it could be incorporated into the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA)
- The Ministers agreed. The FSJ Pilot Project regulation will continue for another 6 year planning period
- Around year 4 of this planning period it is expected that the Pilot will again be reviewed and a decision will again be made on its fate
- A Key Benefit of the Pilot Project has been the landscape level planning strategies that have been used in our operational planning processes. The Pilot's landscape level based Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) drives the Forest Operations Schedule (FOS) used by the licensees in the Pilot. This successful element of the FSJ Pilot Project is something planners in the rest of the province would like to implement in their areas. Coordination between licensees on the land base has been a stumbling block with the use of the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA) in the rest of the province. Across the province all regions are having difficulty implementing landscape level planning strategies and have been looking to the FSJ Pilot Project Area to see how its been dealt with here where we have been very successful.

#### 6) **Annual Report**

- Presentation: FSJ Pilot Project 2008-2009 Annual Report Highlights
- The Annual Report document will be available at Fort St. John Pilot Project website – <http://fsjpilotproject.com/>
- For a copy of the final Annual Report contact either Darrell Regimbald or Brian Farwell
- A copy of the presentation will be emailed to the PAG and efforts will be made to email future presentations out in advance of the meeting

- The current annual report is a draft document. Final Report will be available to the public.
- The participants and PAG develop a set of indicator and targets, and each year's report describes how we are doing against them
- Summarizes Major Achievements for 2008-2009
- Highlights and Trends of Operational Activities
- Review of Conformance Levels to Regulatory and CSA Targets and Discuss Non-conformances
- Note Contraventions Reported to Government
- Review Specific Indicators at PAG's Request
- Comments/Questions regarding Annual Report
  - Peak Harvest Area in 2007 at ~5000 Ha which dropped off significantly in 2008 due to global economic recession which resulted in less orders for product
  - The Reforestation Strategy is a landscape strategy whereby a target level is set for the reforestation of all the blocks harvested in a given year. Stocking Standards are set by calculating the stems per hectare planted that will result in a future volume. Additionally field surveys are used post plant to predict future volume with more certainty. In the 3 years the 95% has been the target for the merchantable volume as a % of predicted Volume. We actually grew more than the stocking standards said we theoretically could have. More trees were put in the ground than were needed.
  - 
  - With respect to performance target for indicator #35 active and inactive crossings were previously reported on separately. Now the results of each are combined on the data reflected in the presentation. The rating drop post 2006 was due to factors such as staff and operator awareness and training and sampling and remediation practices.
  - With respect to indicators regarding trappers refer to page 62 of the report specifying indicator #46: "Consistency with mutually agreed upon action plans for guides, trappers and other known non-timber commercial interests" with a target statement of "Operations 100% consistent with resultant action plan"
  - PAG agreed a highlighted review of the Annual Report as given during this meeting was sufficient and more extensive detail in future reviews is not needed. A hard copy of the report should be mailed out prior to PAG meeting review of the report.
- Next steps will be to incorporate comments from the PAG into the report and submit it to the government and auditor KPMG. KPMG have not summarized the final results of their audit because they are waiting to look at the final report. Once KMPG have done so the results will be presented to the PAG.

- 7) **Review PAG membership and consent to publish PAG membership names**
- Only 1 correction - Trapping representative will be Ray Ensz and their alternate will be Natalie Clarke.
  - There was not any PAG member present that did not want their name and interest information listed in the paper, in the format presented at the meeting
  - Before the list can be published Brian and Darrell will have to contact any members not present today to make sure they consent to publishing their name and interest
- 8) **Boreal Caribou Presentation: Alicia Goodard – MOE**
- 3 Ecotypes: Boreal, Mountain and Northern
  - Boreal only in our corner of the province. Likes muskeg and peat land
  - 15 core areas or herds
  - Red listed in BC, Threatened SARA
  - Total of 1500 animals in the Peace region
  - Populations are decreasing rapidly because of increasing anthropogenic footprint on the land base, especially fragmentation of the land base and linear corridors used by wolves.  
Decreases in calf survival due to wolves is the primary population issue
  - Under FRPA Ungulate Winter Ranges (UWR) and Wildlife Habitat Areas (WHA) only apply to forestry. New legislation for oil and gas is expected in the spring
  - Maps showing UWR and WHA were presented
  - Predator control is a “hot potato issue in BC”. Has been successful in Alberta. In order to save the Boreal Caribou we will need to predator control. In 20 to 30 years they may be gone with out it
- 8) Discussion regarding select indicators not yet reviewed
- Indicator # 16: Ungulate Winter Ranges, Wildlife Habitat Areas and MKMA
    - . Still Very Relevant
    - . No proposed change
    - . No comments, opposition or questions. PAG accepts retention of indicator.
  - Indicator # 12: Caribou
    - . No proposed Revisions
    - . The participants propose to drop this indicator
    - . MOE draft General Wildlife Measures have been done for Caribou habitat and therefore Indicator #12 would be redundant as indicator #16 above covers this. Licensees are already legally required to deal with them
    - . Comments: MOE advisor supports that indicator 16 now covers this and therefore redundant to keep #12
    - . No opposition or questions. PAG accepts proposal to drop #12-Caribou

- Indicator #15: Class A Parks, Ecological Reserves and LRMP Designated Protected Areas
  - . Still very relevant
  - . No changes proposed
  - . No comments, opposition or questions. PAG accepts retention of indicator.
- Indicator # 31: Long Term Harvest Levels
  - . No proposed Changes
  - . Question from PAG: Are the numbers presented 2008-2009 numbers? Answer: No these are allocations not actual harvested amount.
  - . No comments or opposition. PAG accepts retention of indicator.
- Indicator # 5: Snags/Cavity Site
  - . Proposed change is to keep indicator but increase minimum diameter breast height (dbh) to 23 cm. Aligns with the new CSA (Canadian Standards Association) standard
  - . Comments: Need to change wording of SFM objective. Currently is a statement vs. an objective
  - . No questions or opposition. PAG accepts revision to indicator and target statement as proposed.
- Indicator # 8: Shrubs proportion (%) by Landscape Unit
  - . No proposed changes
  - . No comments, opposition or questions. . PAG accepts retention of indicator.
- Indicator # 17: Representative Examples of Ecosystems
  - . No proposed Changes except wording: “percentage of” to be used vs. “proportion of”
  - . No opposition comments or question. . PAG accepts retention of indicator, and wording change as proposed.
- Indicator # 43: Recreation Sites
  - . Addition to Meeting Agenda
  - . Slight change to target proposed: Crying Girl Recreation site is proposed to become an official MoFR Recreation Site managed by MOFR, but Canfor would still maintain it under agreement with the MOFR.
  - . Question from PAG: Shouldn't the indicator statement say the number of recreation sites maintained by participants- Answer: Yes this needs to be change too. Question from PAG: Could we fund more sites? Answer:- Yes potentially could enter into further agreements using government funding programs depending on availability.
  - . No comments or opposition. PAG accepts revisions to indicator as proposed.
- Indicator # 54: Dollars Spent Locally On Each Woodlands Phase
  - . Addition to Meeting Agenda
  - . Put on hold till numbers clarified regarding internal vs. external dollars and will be carried forward to next meeting

- Indicator # 55: Value and Total Number of Tendered Contracts vs. Total Contracts
  - . Addition to meeting agenda
  - . No proposed changes
  - . No questions, comment or opposition. PAG accepts retention of indicator.
- Indicator # 58: Regulatory Public Review and Comment Processes
  - . Proposed change to indicator. Minor revisions to indicator and target to keep same intent but update it. Have already obtained PAG acceptance as per regulation and TOR
  - . Propose indicator read as “compliance with the public review and comment process identified in the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation” and the target statement to read as “100 % compliance with the public review and comment processes Identified in the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation”.
  - . No questions, comments or opposition. PAG accepts revisions to indicator and target as presented.
- Indicator # 59: Terms of Reference for Public Participation Process
  - . Proposed Changes for more current wording
  - . Biennial review for the terms of reference
  - . No Comments, Questions or Opposition. PAG accepts the indicator as presented.
- Indicator # 60: Public Inquires
  - . No Proposed Changes
  - . No questions, opposition or comments. PAG accepts retention of indicator
- Indicator # 61: Information Presentations and Field Trips
  - . Proposing minor changes
  - . Broaden indicator and target to include outreach to the public. Change indicator to “number of information presentations or field trips provided for PAG and public” and the target to “Provide PAG and public with at least 1 presentation or field trip annually.”
  - . Participants accept PAG suggestion for indicator statement wording. PAG accepts indicator and target.

9) **Wrap Up**

- Next Meeting will be completing work around indicator and targets. There are about 10 more indicators still to review.
- Next meeting November 19, 2009 in the FSJ Quality Inn Northern Grand
- Comments
  - . One person thought the review of indicators was a bit rushed but others thought it was a good pace.
  - . Good Presentation of Caribou.
  - . Good food.

- . Presentation of all information overall was done well.
- . Noise from adjoining room a little bothersome
- . Handout will be provided to the PAG members prior to the meetings regarding proposed changes to indicators

**C) Summary of Actions from Meeting #36**

- Action # 1: Brian and Darrell will have to contact any members not present today to make sure they consent to publishing their name and interest
- Action # 2: Indicator # 54 (Dollars Spent Locally On Each Woodlands Phase) discussion put on hold till numbers clarified regarding internal vs. external dollars and will be carried forward to next meeting.
- Action #3: Provide PAG members with proposed changes to indicators prior to next meeting.