

Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting # 38
February 01 2010 from 5:30 to 9:30
Fort St. John Quality Inn, Northern Grand Meeting Room

A) Meeting Attendance:

Participants

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Brian Farwell	BCTS	(250) 262-3337	Brian.Farwell@gov.bc.ca
Dawn Griffin	Canfor	(250) 787-3607	dawn.griffin@canfor.com
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
Wes Neumeier	Canfor	(250) 787-3645	wes.neumeier@canfor.com
Shawn Sullivan	BCTS	(250) 784-1288	shawn.sullivan@gov.bc.ca
Christy Nichol	TEMBEC	(250) 782-3302	Christy.Nichol@lpcorp.com

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Fred Jarvis	Rural Communities	(250) 262-2913	fredjarvis@shaw.ca
Darren Thiel	Commercial Recreation	(250) 262-9482	dthiel@shaw.ca
Stanley Gladysz	Non-commercial Recreation- non-consumptive	(250) 785-2596	Box 394 Charlie Lake, V0C1H0
Ray Ensz	Trappin	(250) 789-2825	rbensz@shaw.ca
Teena Demeulemeester	WMFN	(250) 788-3676	forestry@westmo.org
Dale Johnson	Range	(250) 788-9508	forestry@westmo.org
Rod Kronlachner	Oil and Gas Industry	(250) 262-3260	dkjohnsonranch@xplornet.com
Budd Phillips	Non-commercial Recreation- hunting and fishing	(250) 219-1760 (250) 785-1283	rod.kronlachner@encana.com budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com

Advisors

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Joelle Scheck	MOE	(250) 787-3393	joelle.scheck@gov.bc.ca
Elizabeth Hunt	MFR (Peace District)	(250) 784-1237	elizabeth.hunt@gov.bc.ca
Anna Monetta	MFR (PG Region)	(250) 565-4295	anna.monetta@gov.bc.ca
Roger St. Jean	Oil and Gas Commission	(250) 787-3234	
Rod Backmeyer	ILMB	(250) 787-3263	Rod.Backmeyer@gov.bc.ca

Other

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	(250) 305-1003	gwallin@wlake.com
Paul Demeulemeester	Public	(250) 788-9508	
David Menzies	Public	(250) 787-7877	dmenzies@pris.ca
Amanda Horning	Recorder-Canfor	(250) 787-3609	amanda.horning@canfor.com
Larry McFadden	Recorder-BCTS	(250) 262-3324	Lawrence.McFadden@gov.bc.ca
Dave Harris	Public	(250) 827-3503	
Lyle Mortenson	HRFN	(250) 782-2227	lyle@LRM.ca
Colleen Brown	Energy-Aeolis Wind	(250) 787-7650	cbrown@aeoliswind.com
Jim McKnight	Public	(250) 785-9758	jimkoi@telus.net

B) Meeting Summary

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review of Meeting Agenda
3. Review of Meeting # 37 draft Summary
4. Review of Outstanding Actions
5. Review of Meeting # 37 PAG Satisfaction Survey
6. Biennial Review of PAG TOR
7. Overview of Process & 2010 Meeting Schedule
8. Review of Revised SFMP
9. Identify PAG feedback on draft SFMP
 - a. review changes to the legal landscape level strategies since PAG review
 - b. review changes made to indicator and target statements since PAG review
 - c. review section 8 changes to FSJPPR requirements
10. Review of 2009 Compliance External Audit
11. Time for Public Presentation (if any)
12. Feedback on Meeting

1) Welcome and Introductions

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

2) Review of Meeting Agenda

- **Agenda was accepted.**

3) Review of Meeting # 37 draft Summary

- Meeting #37 summary was accepted by PAG; with following corrections to Meeting Attendance Records:
 - Christy Nichol added, Ray Ensz's phone number corrected, and Brian Wolf's email corrected
- **PAG Meeting #37 summary accepted by PAG**

4) Review of Outstanding Actions

- Handout #1: Summary of Actions from Meeting #37
- Handout #2: SFMP Indicators Updated post PAG Meeting #37
- **Action Item #1:** Analysis regarding minimums for baseline targets for patch size indicator has not been completed due to staffing issues. **Completed, indicator target revised and noted in copy of SFMP and CSA matrix distributed to PAG in January 2010.**
- **Action Item #2:** Participants to prepare a proposal for review by advisors regard reduction in timber stocking standards to address other values such as range. **Partially complete. SFMP includes statement that the landscape level reforestation strategy provides flexibility at cutblock level to vary regimes and provide for other values as they progress to a landscape level target for yield. Participants will work with advisors to identify situations where other values may be managed for through reduced timber stocking.**
- **Action Item #3:** Indicator # 11 Species at Risk Forest Management Guidelines. Wording of how the variance will be applied will be clarified. **Done, see documents "SFMP Indicators Updated Post PAG Meeting #37", emailed to PAG in December 2009.**
- **Action Item #4:** Indicator # 39 Ecosystem Carbon Storage. Participants will review indicator and target and clarify to PAG members the area the indicator statement refers to (entire DFA- Defined Forest Area, vs. area operated on). **Done, see documents "SFMP Indicators Updated Post PAG Meeting #37", emailed to PAG in December 2009.**
- PAG member asked for clarification on DFA acronym: Defined Forest Area
- **Action Item #5:** Indicator # 47 Timber Processed in the DFA. The participants will review and revise as necessary all SFM objectives within the SFM plan. **Done, see documents "SFMP Indicators Updated Post PAG Meeting #37", emailed to PAG in December 2009.**
- **Action Item #6:** Indicator # 56 Conformance to Elements Pertinent to treaty Rights. Participants to revise target statement. **Done, see documents "SFMP Indicators Updated Post PAG Meeting #37", emailed to PAG in December 2009.**

- **Action Item #7:** Indicator # 57 Number of Known Values and Uses Addressed in Operational Planning. Target statement grammar concern brought up by PAG “...referrals will be addressed ...” vs. “...referrals that will be addressed...”. Participants will look at the target statement to determine if rewording is required. **Done, see documents “SFMP Indicators Updated Post PAG Meeting #37”, emailed to PAG in December 2009.**
- **Action Item #8:** Participants will review Training and Skills indicator and target statement to address the above considerations. **Outstanding, will be discussed with PAG later in 2010.**
- **Action Item #10:** Participants will present the 2009 FSJPPR compliance audit results with the PAG at a future PAG meeting. Completed, see agenda item #9.

PAG Meeting #38 Action #1: Review outstanding Action from PAG Meeting #37: Participants will review Training and Skills indicator and target statement to address the above considerations.

5) Darrell Regimbald reviewed results from Meeting # 37 PAG Satisfaction Survey

- Handout #3: Summary of PAG Meeting #37 Results
- All three categories showed good results
- Comment received concerning desire to view DFA harvest plans at spring meeting. It was discussed that participants are currently preparing next Forest Operation Schedule (FOS). The results of analyses to test consistency with SFM indicators will be shared with the PAG. The FOS will be available for review and comment by public and First Nations this fall.
- Comment received from PAG member that some of the language in the SFMP is overwhelming to the non-forester and executive summaries may be easier to understand.

6) Gail Wallin lead the Biennial Review of the PAG Terms of Reference

- Handout #4: Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project PAG Revised and Approved Terms of Reference (draft)_ February 01, 2010.
- C.2.a.iii. PAG suggestion to change participants to chair of participants or meeting organizer to make it more clear who participants are to the public.
- C.2.3.ii. PAG suggestion to add in Quality Inn to suggested meeting locations.
- E.1.b. Discussion that that a minimum of 2 weeks in advance is sufficient for distribution of draft meeting agenda
- E.4. PAG Surveys were added
- G.1.a Added xii. Energy to represent energy sectors not involved in oil & gas.

- G.1.b.ix. Removed Ministry Agriculture & Lands.

All Terms of Reference revisions are approved by PAG and participants

7) Overview of SFMP revision process

- Handout # 5 FSJPP SFMP Revision
- Overview of process, progress to date, and outstanding tasks reviewed
- It was noted that a request was submitted to the MOFR to extend the term of the current SFMP, to allow operation while the new proposed plan is under review.
- Discussed potential PAG meeting schedule for 2010.

BREAK

8) Review of Revised SFMP

- Handout #6 Landscape Level Strategy Comparison Old vs New, comparing LLS from 2004 SFMP to those drafted for 2010 SFMP
- Handout #7 Fort St John Pilot Project Sustainable Forest Management Plan #2 Submitted for Public Review and Comment
- Handout #8 Appendix 2: Sustainable Forest Management Matrix

a) Identify PAG feedback on draft SFMP

- PAG members were given the opportunity to ask specific questions on the draft SFMP and to provide general feedback.
- PAG member commented positively on the SFMP indicator for Coordinated Developments with regard to the potential to share annual access with the Oil and Gas industry. No further comments were made.
- Participant relayed the following comments received from an absent PAG member:
 - commented that a list of acronyms would be useful at the front of the document for reference.
 - commented that map figures were too small, and points of reference like towns/ rivers would make it easier to use.

PAG Meeting #38 Action #2: Participants to consider including a list of acronyms and increasing the size of some of the maps and figures in the draft SFMP.

- Discussion on Pg.53 4.1.6 Coordination of Planning Strategy. *”Participants will coordinate the planning of forestry operations to achieve business efficiencies, facilitate analyses of cumulative forest management impacts in relation to SFMP strategies, and provide consolidated information sharing and consultation products to interested parties in a Forest Operations Schedule.”* Questions arose by PAG members about this

strategy's meaning and how it is measured. One example cited was the participants' consolidated Forest Operations Schedule. It was explained that the FOS represents all the participants' planned harvest for a minimum 6-yr period, and that analyses are conducted to determine if consistency with the SMFP indicators. The participants realize efficiencies through one set of analyses, and the public and First Nations are able to review one complete plan rather than multiple plans (i.e. one from each participant)..

- Indicator 41. pg. 60 "*a temporary reduction in forage volume following harvesting in deciduous stands, attributable to the high density of regeneration aspen for several years following harvesting*". PAG member stated that the statement appears short-term, while in actual fact the impact may be long term from a rancher's point of view.. Participants discussed the relevance of scale. The statement is trying to capture the dynamic nature of forest and range land. It was agreed that the wording in this statement could be revised based on the PAG member's observation.

PAG Meeting #38 Action #3: Participants to review the wording of "several years" in the statement "*a temporary reduction in forage volume following harvesting in deciduous stands, attributable to the high density of regeneration aspen for several years following harvesting*" on page 60.

- It was commented that the plan was very well revised and put together
- Pg. 87-Seral Stages. It was discussed that this section including the description and the subsequent tables need to be made more general and less technical.

PAG Meeting #38 Action #4: Participants to review the Seral Stages section pg. 87 for possible clarifications.

- Pg. 224, Indicator 6.40, PAG member brought up question about the coordinated developments, and where it would be reported. In response, participants explained the annual report and its location. PAG member requested copy of last copy of the 2008-09 Annual Report for review.

PAG Meeting #38 Action #5: Participants to provide Teena Demeulemeester a copy of the Fort St John Pilot Project Sustainable Forest Management Plan 2008/09 CSA and Regulatory Annual Report

b) Andrew Tyrrell reviewed changes to the legal landscape level strategies since PAG review

- Using Handout #5 Landscape Level Strategy Comparison Old vs. New it was discussed that there were changes to the soil disturbance strategy. The participants originally

presented two soil management strategies; the second was the permanent access sub-strategy, which was basically duplicated under the road access management strategy. It was decided to keep one strategy and remove the other for conciseness and to avoid confusion. No change to the intent or implementation of the strategies.

c) Brian Farwell reviewed changes made to indicator and target statements since PAG review:

- A PowerPoint presentation was used to review the legal and non-legal SFMP indicators and the CSA standard.
- The exact changes were then reviewed as follows:

1.1 include word :, ‘maintain’

1.1.1 Change to indicator, ‘All forest type groups by landscape will meet or exceed the minimum area percentage in table 9’

1.1.2 addition of ‘(9 of 18)’

1.1.4 Changed to make consistent with numbers ‘zero blocks will have non conformances to soil disturbance limits’

1.2.10 Minor change to name of list ‘Peace River Regional District’

1.2.11 slight wording change: refers to more than one species at risk management guideline.

1.2.12 Added Objective ‘Provide a safe work environment for DFA forestry workers and the public’— CSA element and local DFA value for this indicator not yet identified.

1.3.13 Changed to what was agreed to by PAG Now “all seed”.

1.4.18 fixed spelling mistake

1.4.23 Added Objective ‘Provide opportunities for First Nations to participate in forest economy’— CSA element and local DFA value for this indicator not yet identified.

2.1 word changing ‘maintain’

2.1.25 changes “sites” to “silviculture obligation areas”

2.1.29 changed terminology to match compiler documentation terminology

3.1.33 Added objective ‘Involve First Nations in review of forest management plans’— CSA element and local DFA value for this indicator not yet identified.

- PAG member expressed interest in providing some additional wording to 3.1.33 to the participants for consideration.
- Participants indicated that there would be opportunity to do so during the 60-day review and comment period.

3.2.34 minor wording change

5.1.41 changed to percent

5.1.42 changed to match indicator units

5.2.48 changed wording to be clearer on where wood is sent

5.2.50 minor wording change

All revisions accepted by PAG.

d) Mark Van Tassel reviewed section 8 changes to FSJPPR (Changes in Requirements)

- A PowerPoint presentation was used to communicate the proposed changes to the FSJPP Field Performance Requirements. See FSJPP SFMP Changes in Requirements PowerPoint notes for more detail.
- PAG member asked for clarification if roads would still require being authorized under permit. It was discussed that roads would still require being under permit, but the proposed additions to FOS schedule C would simply remove the requirement for an amendment to the FOS to use an existing road
- **All proposed changes were accepted by the PAG.**
- PAG member asked when the FSJ area would lose the Pilot, and how many Pilots were still remaining in the province. Participants explained that the Pilot’s life was extended another 6 years, and it has been suggested that after that period the Pilot will be incorporated into the current legislative body of the time. It was made clear that the CSA certification and the PAG process would continue no matter if the Pilot existed or not. It was also mentioned that the FSJ Pilot is currently the only Pilot remaining in the province.

9. Darrell Regimbald reviewed the 2009 Compliance External Audit

- Handout #9 2009 FSJPPR Compliance Audit Results
- A PowerPoint presentation was used to communicate the results of the audit
- The new opportunities for improvement were discussed (OFI #1, 2, 5 and 9)
- Each OFI was explained in detail
- Overall there was a high level of compliance found in the audit
- PAG member wanted to know how the auditors select what they audit. It was discussed that the auditors are provided with all recent and current activities within the specified timelines, and that they choose certain activities completely on their own, and strive to select a representative cross-section of active and completed activities.
- PAG also wanted to know if a copy of the audit would be made available for public viewing. Participants responded that a summary of the compliance audit would be made available for the public by the auditors in approximately 2-3 months, and could be accessed through the Pilot Project website.

- PAG member brought up OFI # 9 and wondered what happens when the participant and the auditor have different interpretations. Participant explained that they are waiting for a response back from the auditor concerning the issue.

10) Time for Public Presentation (if any)-NONE

11) Feedback on Meeting

- The draft was well summarized, and used recommendations in a knowledgeable way.
- Recognition out to Dale Johnson (outgoing member) for all his participation. Dale indicated earlier in the meeting his intention to step down from the PAG.
- Recognition to Dave Menzies for all his work on the plan
- Thanks to the PAG for all their work and feedback on the plan.

Additional Meeting Information

- Public Review Period Feb 8-April 8
- Proposed meeting April 15, 2010 if necessary to review feedback from public review process, an email will be sent out to summarize the feedback.

PAG Meeting #38 Action #6: participants to email PAG with summarized feedback and determine if April 15, 2010 meeting is necessary.

- Membership Information Discussed:
 - Urban Communities-currently inactive
 - Non-commercial Recreation Hunting/Fishing, Labour, Rural, First Nations, Forest Contractors/Workers currently have no alternates
 - Energy currently has no representative or alternate.
- PAG asked how can the public get a copy of the Draft SFMP open for public review. Participants explained that the Draft SFMP can be reviewed at the MFR office in Dawson Creek, the Canfor office in Fort St. John, and the FSJPP website. It is the participants' intention to have the plan available at the Fort St. John tradeshow. It was also discussed that there will be advertisements in the paper and on FSJNow with the office hours and website address.

Handouts from Meeting #38

1. PAG Meeting #37 Draft Summary
2. Summary of Actions from Meeting #37
3. SFMP Indicators Updated post PAG Meeting #37

4. Summary of PAG Meeting #37 Survey Results
5. Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project PAG Revised and Approved Terms of Reference (draft) as of February 01, 2010
6. FSJPP SFMP Revision
7. Landscape Level Strategy Comparison (2004 SFMP vs. 2010 proposed)
8. Fort St John Pilot Project Sustainable Forest Management Plan #2 Submitted for Public Review and Comment
9. Appendix 2: Sustainable Forest Management Matrix
10. 2009 FSJPPR Compliance Audit Results

Summary of Actions from Meeting #38

- **Action Item #1:** Action #1: Review outstanding Action from PAG Meeting #37: Participants will review Training and Skills indicator and target statement to address the above considerations.
- **Action Item #2:** Participants to consider including a list of acronyms and increasing the size of some of the maps and figures in the draft SFMP.
- **Action Item #3:** Participants to review the wording of '*several years*' in the statement '*a temporary reduction in forage volume following harvesting in deciduous stands, attributable to the high density of regeneration aspen for several years following harvesting*' on page 60 of draft SFMP.
- **Action Item #4:** Participants to review the Seral Stages section pg. 87 of draft SFMP for possible clarifications.
- **Action Item #5:** Participants to provide Teena Demeulemeester a copy of the Fort St John Pilot Project Sustainable Forest Management Plan 2008 CSA and Regulatory Annual Report.
- **Action Item #6:** participants to email PAG with summarized feedback from public review and determine if April 15, 2010 meeting is necessary.