

Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project

Public Advisory Group Meeting # 39

October 19 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
Walter Fister	BCTS	(250) 262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Reg Gardner	Canfor	(250) 787-3641	reg.gardner@canfor.com
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	(250) 784-1209	Mark.VanTassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	(250) 262-6551	andrew@taylordunnage.ca
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	(250) 787-3651	darrell.regimbald@canfor.com
Andrew Tyrell	Canfor	(250) 787-3665	andrew.tyrell@canfor.com

[mailto:](mailto:andrew.tyrell@canfor.com)

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Andy Ackerman	Urban Communities	(250) 787-8457	ackerman@telus.net
Dave Harris	Range-NPCA Ranching	(250) 827-3503	d.h.Harris@pris.ca
Oliver Mott	Environment/Conservation	(250) 785-9508	ogmott@hotmail.com
Jason Gowda	Oil and Gas Industry	(250) 219-7143	jason.gowda@encana.com
Budd Phillips	Non-commercial Rec NC	(250) 785-1283	budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com
Colleen Brown	Energy-	(250)787-7650	cbrown@aeoliswind.com

Advisors

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Elizabeth Hunt	MFR	(250) 784-1237	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca

Other

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	(250) 305-1003	gwallin@wlake.com
Larry McFadden	Recorder-BCTS	(250) 262-3324	Lawrence.McFadden@gov.bc.ca
Jim McKnight	Public	(250) 785-9758	jimkoi@telus.net

B) Meeting Summary

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review of Meeting Agenda
3. Confirm appointments to PAG - DR
4. Review of Meeting # 38 draft Summary - GW
5. Review of Outstanding Actions – DR
6. Update from Participants – all
7. Review changes to SFMP, approval status – WF
8. Mountain Pine Beetle Update – AT
9. Review FOS & analysis results – MVT & AT
10. Review of internal & external audit results – DR, BF
11. Review of Annual Report Status – BF
12. Overview of Process & 2011 Meeting Schedule - DR
13. Time for Public Presentation (if any)
14. Administer PAG survey
15. 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 # 38 draft Summary

- Meeting #38 summary was accepted by PAG; with following corrections to Meeting Attendance Records: Teena Demeulemeester was representing the West Moberley First Nations and not Range, Dale Johnson was representing Range, Rod Kronlachner representing Oil and Gas, and Budd Phillips representing Non-commercial Recreation (Hunting and Fishing).
- **PAG Meeting #38 summary accepted by PAG**

4) Review of Outstanding Actions from Previous Meetings

- **Handout #1:** Summary of Actions from Meeting #38, noted below, were discussed with the PAG. Handout was provided to PAG.
- **Action Item #1:** Review outstanding Action from PAG Meeting #37: Participants will review Training and Skills indicator and target statement to address the above considerations. **Response – Participants will present a revised indicator in the spring 2011 meeting.**
- **Action Item #2:** Participants to consider including a list of acronyms an increasing the size of some of the maps and figures in the draft SFMP. **Response – The glossary was expanded and acronyms included, some of the maps and figures were increased in size where formatting permitted in SFMP.**
- **Action Item #3:** Participants to review the wording of “*several years*” in the statement “*a temporary reduction in forage volume following harvesting the deciduous stands, attributable to the high density of regeneration aspen for several year following harvesting*” on page 60 of draft SFMP. **Response – the statement was revised in the SFMP submitted to government for approval. The SFMP was revised to indicate that the forage reduction following harvesting could last for a number of decades.**
- **Action Item #4:** Participants to review the Seral Stages section pg. 87 of draft SFMP for possible clarifications. **Response – the participants revised the wording of this section of the SFMP to provide additional clarity.**
- **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. **Response – the Participants sent a copy of the 2008 Annual Report to Teena.**
- **Action Item #6:** Participants to email PAG with summarized feedback from public review and determine if April 15, 2010 meeting is necessary. **Response – Participants decided that a meeting was not necessary due to the minimal amount and nature of revisions resulting from the public review.**

5) Confirm appointments to PAG

- Handout #2 Public Advisory Group Mailing List – provided to PAG. PAG noted that contact information for some members was outdated and provided revised information.
- Handout #3 FSJ Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Notice of Membership 2010 provided to PAG.
- Handout #3 to proposed to be published in the Alaska Highway News including the confirmed new members :
Dave Harris (Range Representative), Andy Ackerman (Urban Communities Representative), Lyle Mortenson (Halfway River First Nation Representative, Prophet River First Nation

Representative), Roslyn Pokiak (Halfway River First Nation Alternate), Brian Wolf (Prophet River First Nation Alternate) and Colleen Brown (Energy Representative).

- it was noted that two members have moved (Chad Dalke and Rod Kronlachner)
- no individual indicated they did not want their name shown in the newspaper as shown in Handout #3.

6) **Update from Participants**

a) **Reg Gardner – Canfor:** reviewed new developments at Canfor: New forest license held by PVO SB, FSJ mill upgrades, and Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement.

- Question: If this new license non-replaceable does this mean it is non-renewable?
- Answer: It is non-replaceable and therefore non-renewable.
- Question: What is “J” grade mean?
- Answer: “Japan” grade, a high quality stud with minimum defects.
- Question: Regarding the CBF Agreement, the map you have showed does not show the area west of the Alaska Highway.
- Answer: That is correct, the CBF Agreement does not include the area west of the Alaska Highway, but we have committed to manage ungulate winter ranges as per the general wildlife measures identified by Government for all approved caribou UWR areas in the North Peace in the SFMP.
- Question: You have used the term “Protected Area”, does this term have the same definition used under the Parks and Protected Area Act of B.C?
- Answer: Not sure, but this is an agreement between companies, FPAC and environmental non government organizations, therefore “Protected Area” is not a government definition for this agreement.
- Question: In the CBF Agreement, there is indication about deferring harvesting in the Fort Nelson area, are you planning to start harvesting again?
- Answer: Cannot answer that question at this time.
- Question: Regarding the increase in the sawmill consumption, where will the timber supply come from?
- Answer: There is an excess of conifer supply in this area. Most of the increase in consumption will come from woodlots and purchased wood.
- Question: The new Forest License, given that it is replacing one that is expiring, is the tenure for the OSB plant required to be constantly renewed, and is it not an on-going tenure?
- Answer: That is the only tenure the PV OSB holds. The other tenures are held by Canfor or LP. This is a separate license from the licences held by Canfor and LP.
- Question: So this is an additional 50,000m³ to the 800,000m³ already held by the other licenses?
- Answer: This is a new license and considering the expiry of licence A60049, represents a net increase of 30000m³.

b) Brian Farwell, BCTS

- BCTS is not a signatory to the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement and therefore not tied to this agreement. We have no plans to be harvesting in the area covered by the CBF Agreement.
- We have advertised ten timber sale licences. These blocks consisted of four deciduous and six coniferous. Only one deciduous block has been sold.
- Of the coniferous blocks, four are pine leading and two spruce leading. All had some mountain pine beetle activity. We are going to re-package and re-advertise these sales.
- Our silviculture activities are going to be down due to fewer blocks being harvested however we are still maintaining our survey and brushing programs.
- Our government organizational structure has changed but these changes have primarily affected the “headquarters” level and not our Fort St. John and Dawson Creek offices.
- Question: Do you foresee any impact on the Pilot Program due to these organizational changes?
- Answer: No, if anything these changes should strengthen it.
- Question: With the cuts to the Ministry of Forests, and I have heard there are two more rounds of cuts coming, are these cuts going to affect the pilot?
- Answer: I have not heard of any further cuts to the MoF. There should be no impacts on the pilot. The southern business areas have been successful with selling their timber sales and this has offset present sale situation.
- Question: What are the obligations with regard to the TSLs with mountain pine beetle affected wood?
- Answer: We are going re-look at the heavily affected stands and repackage by possibly changing the silviculture operation plans and then re-advertise. We also hope that demand will increase after Canfor has completed the upgrades at their mill.

c) Andrew Moore, Cameron River Logging

- Value added business has been down.
- Collecting pine logs from Canfor blocks and sending them to Prince George to be utilized as utility poles.

BREAK

7) Review of SFMP, approval status

- Walter Fister gave an update regarding the status of SFMP #2 – currently the SFMP is in final stages of the the approval process. Walter provided a Powerpoint presentation that summarized status of the SFMP and changes made to the SFMP as a result of comments received during public and government review.
- Final version of SFMP# 2 was submitted to MFR on September 27, 2010. Hoping it will be approved by end of October.

- Post public review - no changes to the strategies were made.
- Minor wording changes were made to some of the indicators as a result of comment provided by First Nations and by Government. Wording changes were made as follows:
 - Indicator #6.13, “Seed used” on page 128, the word “*used*” replaced the word “*collected*”.
 - Indicator #6.14, “Deciduous regeneration” wording change on page 130,
 - Indicator #6.56, Treaty rights statement, Title changed to “*Maintenance of Wildlife and fisheries habitat.*”
 - New indicator: #6.62, Brushing Program – aerial herbicide use around tracking aerial herbicide use. The number of hectares taken out of what was originally planned shall be reported. Tracking will be done based on how much the total area treated has been reduced from what was planned based on recommendations from First Nations and the public. The participants will report annually the number of hectares removed from their aerial herbicide plans based on input from First Nations or the public.
- Question: Are there any outstanding comments or questions or issues from First Nations that have not been addressed?
- Answer: There were a number of questions around some of the indicators. We responded to all questions and addressed all concerns that had a suggested revision to the SFMP.
- Question: In regard to the new indicator, there is a reporting process but is there an actual target level for reduction?
- Answer: No, as there wasn’t a request to show a target level but to have an indicator to show that we are making effort at reducing the amount of area actually treated from what was originally proposed.

8) Mountain Pine Beetle Update – Andrew Tyrrell, Canfor

- A PowerPoint presentation was used to review the Mountain Pine Beetle activity in the Pilot Project area.
- Reviewed results noted from aerial reconnaissance flight taken in July 2010.
- Question: Historically, where MPB has been around, has the forest regenerated?
- Answer: Yes.

- Question: What is the market for beetle wood?
- Answer: Canfor has the capacity to process this wood. Canfor is customer focused therefore we adjust our harvest plans so that we can satisfy the demand for our products.
- Question: Are you expecting major forest fires?
- Answer: In the past we have had bad forest fire years such as 2006, but we are doing what we can to harvest the dead standing pine stands to address the beetle, salvage damaged timber, meet customer requirements and reduce fuel for wildfires.
- Question: What are your markets?
- Answer: Most of our wood goes to the United States; a small amount is sold domestically. Market has increased in China and Japan.
- Question: Is beetle wood something that can be sold in Japan?
- Answer: Not if it has stain in it. Stain downgrades the demand, particularly from Japan.
- Question: What does the future hold?
- Answer: In Fort St. John we are not as reliant on pine as some other areas of the province. The future looks good. Right now we have a pine focus but we have lots of spruce in our area.
- Question: Are we looking at other uses for the beetle-killed pine, such as bio-fuels?
- Answer: Over time, as the dead pine ages, it becomes less suitable for sawlogs, therefore other opportunities may be considered, primarily by government and other industries. The government has announced an initiative to provide opportunities for the bioenergy sector. To date this is primarily focused on utilizing residue from harvesting operations for the generation of energy. This program will likely be more attractive in the southern part of the province where distance to energy plants is more attractive. The south Peace area is a few years ahead of the north Peace with regards to the number of dead older pine stands.

9) Review FOS & analysis results – Mark Van Tassel and Andrew Tyrrell

- A Powerpoint presentation was given on the Forest Operations Schedule for 2010- 2016.
- The presentation includes answer to the question _”What is the FOS?”.
- The FOS is a collection of maps and tables that identify all proposed logging road construction activities for at least 6 years. It is legally required.
- A presentation was given on the process used to create this FOS.
- The FOS will be submitted to government in December 2010, after conclusion of the public review process.
- Question: Are you required to report annually on what you have done?
- Answer: Yes, our management activities are summarized in the Annual Report.
- Question: Does affected tenure holders mean “overlapping” or “adjacent” tenure holders?
- Answer: Usually “overlapping”.
- Question: Have you provided information to wind energy tenure holders?

- Answer: At this point I do not believe we have because we have not been asked by the MFR to share the FOS information with that industry. The participants would be happy to review comments from the wind energy sector

10) Review internal & external audit results – Darrel Regimbald and Brian Farwell

A PowerPoint presentation of the KPMG external audit was used to communicate the results of the audit. The results were:

- No major non-conformances
 - 2 minor non-conformances
 - 2 opportunities for improvement
 - 4 good practices were identified.
- The minor non-conformances were discussed in detail.
- The new opportunities for improvement were discussed in detail.
- The good practices were reviewed and discussed.
- Actions from Audit were reviewed and discussed.
- Auditor recommended registration with CSA continue.
- The Auditor identified areas they will focus on in the 2011 audit:
 - Review the new FOS and SFMP;
 - Compliance audit against the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation;
 - New indicators required to transition to the new CSA standard;
 - Any significant changes to legislation;
 - Review of serial stage patch size monitoring.
- The internal audit was not reviewed in detail at the PAG's request. The major non conformance was described as follows: The audit found Canfor had mistakenly identified a ***purchased wood agreement*** as being ***certified wood***.
- Question: Was the internal audit more difficult?
- Answer: Yes.
- Question: The audit focused on Canfor and LP but what about Tembec?
- Answer: Tembec, Cameron River Logging, Dunne-za, and LP all have licences within the Fort St. John planning area and Canfor manages these licences on their behalf and therefore were included in the audit, however the audit findings are noted in Canfor's name as the managing participant.

11) Review Annual Report status – Brian Farwell

- Still working on the Annual Report for the 2009-10 reporting period.
- Need to have another meeting this fall to review the Annual Report. Will send a copy of the annual report to the PAG members for review.

- The participants proposed two possible meeting dates: November 30th or December 2nd. The focus of this meeting will be to review the annual report and to begin process to review the participants suggestions for additional indicators to effect conformance of SFMP# 2 to the New CSA Z809-08 standards requirement to address core indicators..

12) Overview of Process & 2011 Meeting Schedule - Darrell Regimbald

- The activities for the PAG for the upcoming year were reviewed. Participants suggested a meeting in November and possibly two meetings in the spring to finalize process of addition CSA core indicators to the SFMP.
- A PAG member asked that as much notice as possible be given for meeting dates.
- Question: Was there a field tour this year?
- Answer: There was not.
- A PAG member commented that pictures in the Audit Report would be helpful.

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

14) Feedback on Meeting

- Presentations were well done but could have used more pictures.
- Make the agenda more dynamic.
- More discussion time after the presentation.
- Meeting room acoustics poor, maybe due to the speaker's voice and the table set up.
- Thanks to PAG for all their work and feedback on the SFM plan. A special welcome to new members in attendance: Colleen Brown, Dave Harris, Jason Gowda, Andy Ackerman. Also a special thanks to long time members: Oliver Mott and Bud Philips was provided.

PAG Meeting #39 Action #1: Correct the attendance records in PGA Meeting #38 minutes to show Teena Demeulemeester was representing the West Moberley First Nations and not Range, Dale Johnson was representing Range, Rod Kronlachner representing Oil and Gas, and Budd Phillips representing Non-commercial Recreation Hunting and Fishing.

PAG Meeting #39 Action #2: Participants to provide a list of acronyms with definitions and a definition of seral stage to PAG members.

PAG Meeting #39 Action #3: Participants to confirm if Chad Dalke and Rod Kronlachner, who have moved, are no longer interested to be members of the Public Advisory Group.

PAG Meeting #39 Action #4: PAG Member, Colleen Brown will provide the Participants verifiable spatial Wind Tenure information.

PAG Meeting #39 Action #5: It was suggested that in future the external audit report presentation provided to the PAG should indicate Canfor is managing Tembec, Cameron River Logging, Duenna-za, and LP forest licences and therefore; any findings on these licences are addressed to Canfor.

PAG Meeting #39 Action #6: Brian Farwell will send an email to all PAG members asking for a reply to which date they would prefer for the next PAG meeting, November 30th or December 2nd. The date chosen will be determined by majority rules. Also, this email will ask if the PAG member would like a paper or digital copy of the Annual Report.

Handouts from Meeting #39

1. Summary of Actions from Meeting #38
2. Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project-Public Advisory Group Mailing List
3. Fort St. John Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Notice of Membership 2010.
4. FSJ Results Based Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Meeting #38 Summary

Summary of Actions from Meeting #39

- **Action Item #1:** Action #1: Correct the attendance records in PAG Meeting #38 minutes . **Response – Completed, copy submitted to PAG.**
- **Action Item #2:** Participants to provide a list of acronyms and a definition of seral stage to interested PAG member. **Response – completed - list of acronyms is included in SFMP, Participants provided hardcopy of acronyms including seral stage definition, to PAG member during the meeting.**
- **Action Item #3:** Participants to confirm if Chad Dalke and Rod Kronlachner, who have moved, are no longer interested to be members of the Public Advisory Group. **Response – contacted Chad and Rod, both wish to sit on the PAG as Oil and Gas alternates.**
- **Action Item #4:** PAG Member, Colleen Brown will provide the Participants verifiable spatial Wind Tenure information. **Response – Participants met and discussed the topic with Colleen, source of spatial data is confirmed.**
- **Action Item #5:** It was suggested that in future the external audit report presentation provided to the PAG should indicate Canfor is managing Tembec, Cameron River Logging, Dunne-za, and LP forest licences and therefore; any findings on these licences are addressed to Canfor. **Response – Participants will ensure future external audit presentations clarify the licenses/licensees reviewed and the managing participant responsible for the audit actions.**
- **Action Item #6:** Brian Farwell will send an email to all PAG members asking that they indicate which date they would prefer for the next PAG meeting; November 30th or December 2nd. The date chosen will be determined by majority rules. The PAG member will also be asked to indicate if they would prefer a paper or digital copy of the Annual Report. **Response – Completed by way of email. Two members requested and were mailed a hardcopy of the annual report.**