

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project**  
**Public Advisory Group Meeting # 46**  
**Thursday, October 24, 2013 from 5:30 to 9:30**  
**Fort St. John Quality Inn, Northern Grand Meeting Room**

**A) Meeting Attendance:**

*Participants*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Walter Fister	BC Timber Sales	(250) 262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Stephanie Smith	BC Timber Sales	(250) 784-1209	Stephanie.Smith@gov.bc.ca
Darrell Regimbald	Canfor	(250) 787-3651	darrell.regimbald@canfor.com
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	(250) 787-3665	andrew.tyrrell@canfor.com
Larry McFadden	BC Timber Sales	(250) 262-3324	Lawrence.McFadden@gov.bc.ca
Jennifer McCracken	Canfor	(250) 787-3641	Jennifer.McCracken@canfor.com
Matthew Donovan	Canfor	(250) 263-8533	matthew.donavan@canfor.com

*PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Lyle Mortenson	Halfway River First Nation/ Prophet River First Nation	(250) 782-2227	lyle@lrm.ca
Karen Goodings	Rural Communities-alternate	(250) 262-1558	kgooding@pris.bc.ca
Jim McKnight	Environment	(250) 262-1673	jimk01@telus.net
Budd Phillips	Non-Commercial Recreation	(250) 785-1283	budd.phillips@worksafebc.com
Dave Harris	Range	(250) 827-3503	dhharris@pris.ca
Jason Gowda	Oil and Gas Industry	(250) 219-7143	jason.gowda@encana.com

*Advisors*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Elizabeth Hunt	F.L.N.R.O.	(250) 784-1237	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca

*Other*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	(250) 305-9161	gwallin@wlake.com
Emily Francis	Canfor	(778) 838-6154	emily.francis@canfor.com

## **B) Meeting Summary**

### **Agenda**

1. Welcome and Introductions - Gail Wallin
2. Review of Meeting Agenda - Gail Wallin
3. Review of Meeting #45 draft summary – Gail Wallin
4. Review of Outstanding Actions – Darrell Regimbald
5. Review of 2013 Audit Results – Andrew Tyrrell/Walter Fister
6. Update from Participants – Matthew Donovan/Walter Fister
  - Canfor, BCTS
7. Review of 2012 SFM Annual Report-Darrell Regimbald/Stephanie Smith
8. Survey Results/Improvement Opportunities
  - Review of mtg #45 Survey Results-Darrell Regimbald
  - Review of annual PAG Public Process Satisfaction Survey Results-Jennifer McCracken
  - Feedback from PAG
9. Other information updates:
  - OGMA Process-Stephanie Smith
  - Mountain Pine Beetle update-Jennifer McCracken
  - Timber Supply Review-Darrell Regimbald/Elizabeth Hunt
10. Summary of May Field Trip – Walter Fister
11. Review of PAG membership and Notice-Darrell Regimbald
12. Overview of 2014 Meeting Schedule - Darrell Regimbald
13. Feedback on Meeting, Survey

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

- Roundtable introductions from PAG, participants, members, and observers.
- Participation in the meeting was extended to all present.

### **2) Review of Meeting Agenda**

- Agenda was accepted. No changes were made.

### **3) Review of Meeting # 45 draft Summary**

*Meeting #45 summary was accepted as circulated by PAG. No changes were made.*

### **4) Review of Outstanding Actions**

- **PAG Meeting #45 Action Item #1:** Provide copies of the Ecosystem Representation Analysis Review to Joelle Scheck (F.L.N.R.O.) and Patrick Smook (O.G.C.).

**Completed-** Jennifer McCracken provided copies of the *Ecosystem Representation Analysis Review* presentation to Joelle Scheck and Patrick Smook.

- **PAG Meeting #45 Action Item #2:** Stephanie Smith will send out via email some potential dates.

**Completed-** Stephanie Smith sent emails inviting the PAG and Advisors to participate in the Field Tour, which was held on May 30, 2013.

## **5) Review of 2013 Audit Results – Andrew Tyrrell/Walter Fister**

Andrew Tyrrell (Canfor)

- i. Internal Audit (July 2013) - no major non-conformities, 2 minor non-conformities, 10 opportunities for improvement, 3 Best Management Practices identified. Results were reviewed with PAG.
- ii. External Audit (August (off site document review) - October (site visit) 2013) jointly with BC Timber Sales – No major or minor non-conformities, 5 Opportunities for Improvements (OFI) - 4 of Canfor's 1 BC Timber Sales, 2 Best Practices. Audit results were reviewed with PAG.

Auditors recommended continued certification of the Participants.

Question: How do the auditors respond with repeated non-conformances (such as the issue with worker training records)?

Answer: If the issue is not addressed, such that it continues to be an audit finding, the issue may be elevated in ranking in a subsequent audit, for example, an issue that was categorized as an Opportunity for Improvement in the past audit, might be elevated to a minor non-conformance, if not dealt with to the satisfaction of the auditors, in a subsequent audit.

Question: Was the issue of properly tracking training records an issue with contractors working for Canfor or with Canfor employees?

Answer: This issue, noted in the Canfor internal audit, was identified with respect to Canfor employees. The finding did not mention Canfor's contractors. In discussion with the employees, they said they had completed the required training, but we could not find documentation to confirm they had. We have recommended revisions to our corporate employee training record keeping system so that employee training can be tracked more accurately.

Walter Fister (BC Timber Sales)

- i. Internal Audit (July 2013) – no major non-conformities, 1 minor non-conformance, 1 opportunity for improvement and 5 Best Management Practices. Audit was conducted in the Fort St. John, Fort Nelson and Tree Farm License 48 (Dawson Creek Field Team), results pertaining to Fort St. John only were reviewed.
- ii. External Audit (August-October 2013 jointly with Canfor) – no major or minor non-conformities, 2 Opportunities for Improvement. The Opportunities for Improvement are as follows:  
OFI #1: The most recent official PAG meeting minutes were not posted on the website (both Participants responsible).  
OFI #2: Herbicide Use: Auditor felt that herbicide was un-necessarily applied on areas of TSL A60196.

Question: Explain the overspray of the herbicide.

Answer: Out of a population of blocks that were sprayed in 2013, the auditor selected the block in question for review. The auditor visited this block and felt the percentage of the block to be sprayed was too high, resulting in some areas being treated that in his estimation, didn't need treatment. During the office review portion of the audit, we demonstrated to the auditor what processes were used to choose this block for herbicide treatment. Post field review of the planned treatment area, it was decided to reduce the area to be treated. However, when it came to carrying out the revised plan, it was not adequately communicated to the staff member monitoring the treatment or the pilot, resulting in more area of the block being sprayed than was necessary. The auditor felt the percentage of the block to be sprayed was overly aggressive.

Question: Are there any instances that you sprayed on rangeland?

Answer: The majority of the range interactions we encounter are on deciduous areas. We wouldn't spray an aspen (deciduous managed) block, except if the aspen block regeneration failed and we had to convert it to a conifer block. If that

were the case, there is a potential we might apply herbicide on such a block. Prior to spraying, we would send a notification to the range tenure holder.

Question: Do oversprays get reported to First Nations?

Answer: Answering for BC Timber Sales, we do not report oversprays to First Nations or stakeholders.

Answer: Answering for Canfor, oversprays are only reported to Ministry of Environment. However, incidents of oversprays that are contrary to our plans are noted in the SFM annual report, which is publicly available.

Comment from PAG member: I recall an instance when during consultation, a First Nation group asked BCTS not to spray a specific area of a block. BCTS mistakenly did spray this area but reported it to the First Nations immediately. They did the right thing.

Comment from PAG member: In the past, I have observed instances when there has been a disconnect between the prescription and who is performing the work. Changing weather conditions from survey to spray season is also an issue. In one case after a heavy period of rain, we flew over a block where there was a lot of standing water. The choice was made not to spray that block in that situation.

Comment from a Participant: The weather conditions are dealt with accordingly during the spray program, as the monitors fly each block prior to spray to identify if there are any site conditions that have changed which require alteration to the treatment plan. Weather monitors ensure that spraying does not occur during inappropriate weather conditions.

Comment from PAG member: There appears to be two mistakes, 1) the criteria to determine whether to spray, 2) overspray; what is the objective criteria?

Answer: The auditor had to tie this finding into the CSA specifications, which in this situation is our Pest Management Plan (PMP). It states that we will make effort to reduce or minimize the use of herbicide. In this application, the target species in the PMP were present on this block. The take home message for us is: if our staff are having real uncertainties about a treatment decision, that is to be

considered a red flag to us that perhaps this block may not need herbicide treatment.

Question: What is in the system that will prevent the same mistake from reoccurring?

Answer: The auditor indicated this issue as an Opportunity for Improvement (OFI). We believe the checks and balances that are presently in place are adequate to ensure herbicide is being applied properly. We are trying to minimize its use. However, we made a mistake in this case.

Comment from a PAG member: It appears there is a gray area, where some people would spray and someone else would not.

Question: This has come out of an audit and you are required to address this issue. What is in the system to prevent this same mistake reoccurring?

Answer: This is an OFI and we have the option to consider an action plan if we feel it is going to benefit our process and without further review, at this point I don't know if we need an action plan, as the existing procedures, may be adequate, given that pre-treatment field review indicated that the treatment area should be reduced. Unfortunately the revised treatment plan was not adequately communicated to the project monitor.

### Actions

**PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #1:** Walter Fister will report at the next meeting what action will be taken, if any, regarding the herbicide use on TSL A60196.

Comment from PAG member: There needs be input from people impacted by herbicide use.

Answer: We publicly advertise our spray program in newspapers and send out letters to stakeholders.

Comment from PAG member: Yes we have received herbicide use notices.

Comment from PAG member: The notice in the newspapers will not work for everyone as they may not get the Alaska Highway News.

**PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #2:** Participants to provide a short presentation on herbicide use at a future PAG Meeting.

**6) Update from Participants**

- Matthew Donovan gave an update on Canfor's operations.

Highlights:

- Expanding in Japan market;
  - Canfor has sold their interest in the Peace Valley OSB to LP;
  - High rainfall this summer has affected the access to wood for the mill;
  - Two people have retired which has created a shift in job positions in the Fort St John Woodlands Division. (A slide was shown showing a list of Canfor employees and their job position).
  - Andrew Tyrrell will be moving to harvesting. His replacement has not yet been identified.
- Walter Fister gave an update on BC Timber Sales' operations.

Highlights:

- New Deputy Minister is Tim Sheldon;
  - An "Opportunities Review" process has been conducted on BCTS's organization over the last 8-10 months. It is now available for public review.
  - Efficiencies Review has been conducted but is not available for public comment. Questions have been asked of stakeholder such as should BCTS exist? Does it have a role in the forest industry?
  - Fort St. John Sale Schedule: We were directed to advertise our full apportionment of wood. BCTS FSJ will be offering 380,000m3 of confer, 13 TSLs before February 2014. No deciduous sales will be offered because Dawson Creek has an abundance of deciduous sales.
  - Silviculture Activities: BCTS completed a hoe mounding and donaren mounding site prep contracts. Planted 850,000 trees in 2013.
- No report from Cameron River Logging was presented.

## 7) Review of 2012 SFM Annual Report – Darrell Regimbald/Stephanie Smith

Darrell Regimbald reviewed the purpose of the Annual Report and the requirement to present it to the PAG prior to submitting the report to Government by the end of October.

### **Key Achievements:**

- Second full year operating under SFMP #2;
- Consistent with targets for 63 out of 66 indicators;
- Consistent with Regulatory Landscape Strategies with targets for 26 out of 28 indicators achieved;

Not Consistent with two Regulatory Landscape Strategies Indicators: Indicator #30 (Establishment Delay) and Indicator #44 (Visual Quality).

### **Operational Highlights:**

- Participants harvested 4,815 hectares during the reporting year.
- 3 million trees planted over 2700 hectares during the reporting year.

### **Indicators not achieved:**

#### Indicator #30 Establishment Delay

- Canfor did not achieve the target of 3 years for mixed woods blocks. The actual achieved was 4.9 years. BCTS did achieve this target.

#### Indicator #44 Visual Quality Objective

- 13 assessments were required in 2012 however 3 were not completed during the reporting period.
- This has been entered in *Incident Tracking System* (ITS).

#### Indicator #63 Worker Training

- BCTS is in conformance.
- Canfor not in conformance, training records for 7 out of 37 employees not confirmed because of tracking system shortcomings. While the 7 employees reported that they had received the required training, this could not be confirmed in the tracking system.
- Entered in the *Incident Tracking System*.

Summary of Contraventions: A review of contraventions reported to M.F.L.N.R.O. was discussed with the PAG members. All have been reported to appropriate government agencies and entered into *Incident Tracking System*.



- Five cases of harvesting equipment trespass were reported (4 Canfor, 1 BCTS). No penalties have been given to date.
- Herbicide application outside planned area. Canfor: 5 blocks, with combined area less than 0.5 hectares. BCTS: 1 block 0.2 hectare. No penalties have been issued to date.
- Potential Impact to Archeological Site: Block 09007 harvested by Canfor in 2010, two fluted points were found by an archeologist on an in block road, conducting work on behalf of an oil and gas company in 2012. MFLNRO directed Canfor to conduct an Archeological Impact Assessment on this site.

Question: How is that a contravention, if you didn't know about it at the time of harvest?

Answer: Under the Heritage Conservation Act, not knowing is not an excuse.

Question: Are you doing some pre-harvest site work?

Answer: Yes, we do an Archeological Assessment on blocks that have a high potential for arch sites.

The PAG members were asked for comments on the Annual Report.

Question: Five trespasses were found, but you didn't indicate the significance of each, such as size, and didn't provide pictures. Did someone from the appropriate government agency visit the trespass sites?

Answer: Ministry of Forests visited at least two of the trespasses. Not sure if anyone from the Ministry of Environment visited the herbicide contravention sites. In the report we state the size of the contravention when notifying the respective agency. The size probably is a consideration in their decision to visit the site or not.

The PAG members asked that when reporting trespasses, that more information be provided such as the size. They would like pictures showing the trespass provided. They would also like to know if the trespass has been inspected by a government agency.

**PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #3:** When reporting infractions such as trespasses at PAG meetings, Participants should include information such as the size of the trespass and provide visuals so that the PAG understand the finding(s) more fully. Also the

Participants should include if a government agency has or hasn't completed an investigation.

Comment from Elizabeth Hunt (MFLNRO): If Compliance and Enforcement staffs are notified by Canfor of a minor trespass, Canfor wouldn't know if they have been out or not. It is not secretive but it is confidential.

## **8) Survey Results/Improvement Opportunities – Jennifer McCracken/Stephanie Smith**

- **Review of PAG meeting #45 satisfaction survey** – summary of results was presented.
- **Review of annual PAG Public Process Satisfaction Survey Results** – comments were reviewed. Getting solid results from our surveys. Some improvements suggested by PAG members were:
  - Increase dialogue, more interaction;
  - Utilize more visuals;
  - Less technical presentations;
- PAG members present at meeting were asked for suggestions on how to make this a better and more effective PAG. Some suggestions are:
  - Get more visual, more details;
  - Presentation around herbicide use;
  - Some outside speakers;
  - Bring in resource people to speak on specific topics such as how to determine when to spray herbicide
  - Less technical in presentations. Talk less as a forester and talk like a member of the public.

Question was asked of the PAG members: Presently we are managing the PAG Public Satisfaction Survey annually and the meeting survey, after every meeting. PAG was asked “Would you like the meeting survey combined with the satisfaction survey therefore resulting in less surveys to complete?”

PAG Members indicated that they are over surveyed. If there were fewer surveys they could give responses that have more value. The surveys need to be as simple as possible.

**PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #4:** Participants will proceed with an annual consolidated survey but the facilitator will ask at each meeting what you like or didn't like.

**9) Other Information updates:**

- **OGMA (Old Growth Management Areas) process** - Stephanie Smith:  
During development of SFMP #2, the Participants decided after consulting with FLNRO to establish a process to implement spatially identified, legally recognized OGMAs. The OGMA process is still ongoing. Draft OGMAs will be identified by end of November 2013. MFLNRO have targeted to begin the consultation process for the establishment of the OGMAs in February 2014.

- **Mountain Pine Beetle update** – Jennifer McCracken:  
A review of the MPB lifecycle was presented. Pictures of trees with galleries were shown. Examples of red and grey trees were given. A map showing the attack frontage in the north and south. No pine left in the centre of the province. Highest damage was 1 million ha in 2011, down to 627,561 ha in 2012.

Question: When you say severity, do mean more trees are being attacked?

Answer: Yes, the number of trees in a stand being attacked.

- **Timber Supply Review** – Elizabeth Hunt  
This review is completed every 10 years in every Timber Supply Area. The Fort St. John TSR is due in spring of 2014.  
After data is collected, it will have a 60 day public review period.  
Chief Forester will determine the volume of timber available; the minister will then allocate the volume. The allocation will be for 10 years.  
It will be advertised in several newspapers, information will be sent to those people who request it.

**10) Summary of May Field Trip** – Walter Fister

Four PAG members attended the May 30<sup>th</sup> field trip. Good turnout considering the poor weather. Group looked at visual quality, coarse woody debris demonstration and viewed a block with grass competition issues. The group also discussed well growing requirements and interaction with oil and gas.

Comments from group were positive: It was very informative, even with the poor weather. It was nice to stop at Inga Lake.

### **11) Review of PAG Membership and Notice – Darrell Regimbald**

Participants are required to publish the names of the members of the PAG. A copy of the proposed advertisement was shown. The absent members will be notified by email of the intent to publish the notice.

All members present agreed to have their name and interest they are representing published (*Note: Lyle Mortensen had left the meeting earlier and was not present*).

### **12) Overview of 2014 Meeting schedule – Darrell Regimbald**

Participants anticipate a spring meeting will be held in February or March 2014.

Some topics that members anticipate discussing at future meetings are:

- Herbicide use;
- Fibre Utilization
- Cumulative effects

### **13) Verbal Feedback on Meeting Survey**

- Don't use this room again.
- Possibly use another hotel, cultural centre, Pomeroy Hotel by highway.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm**

### **Handout from Meeting #46**

- 1) FSJ Results Based Pilot Project Public Advisory Group Meeting #45 Summary and actions.
- 2) Meeting #46 agenda.
- 3) Mailing List
- 4) Notice of Membership 2013

## **Summary of Actions from Meeting #46**

***PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #1:*** Walter Fister will report at the next meeting what action plans will be taken if any regarding the auditor's OFI regarding the herbicide use on TSL A60196.

Update – Reviewed the steps in the assessment process with all team members, confirmed that all blocks to be treated are to be visited in the field and reviewed by BCTS staff, in light of this event to ensure treatment is necessary.

***PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #2:*** Participants to provide a short presentation on herbicide use at a future PAG Meeting.

Planned presentation to be given at meeting 47.

***PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #3:*** When reporting infractions such as trespasses at PAG meetings, Participants should include information such as the size of the trespass and provide visuals so that the PAG understand the finding(s) more fully. Also the Participants should include if a government agency has or hasn't completed an investigation.

Participants will provide additional information from the Annual Report, in the Annual Report presentation to allow the PAG to have a deeper understanding of non compliance incidents.

***PAG Meeting #46 Action Item #4:*** Participants will proceed with an annual consolidated survey but the facilitator will ask at each meeting what each individual liked or didn't like about the meeting.

Participants reviewed the 2 survey forms, determined that there was duplication and chose not to revise the annual public participation satisfaction survey. Participants will continue to ask all meeting attendees for input regarding meeting improvements and will capture suggestions provided in the meeting summaries.