Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #69
Thursday, October 15, 2024
Northern Grand Conference Centre

PAG Meeting (Open to Public) 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm

Meeting Attendance:

Participants

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Carmen Anderson	Canfor	250-787-3629	carmen.anderson@canfor.com
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	250-787-3665	andrew.tyrrell@canfor.com
Ethan Brandt	LP	250-261-3619	ethan.brandt@lpcorp.com
Sarah Curtis	LP	250-261-3451	sarah.curtis@lpcorp.com
Darin Hancock	LP	250-261-4371	darin.hancock@lpcorp.com
Elmer Teschke	BCTS		
Samuel Asirifi	BCTS	647-936-9286	samuel.asirifi@mail.utoronto.ca
Lyle Mortenson	Halfway River First Nation	250-784-8001	lylemort@telus.net
Sara Rowe	Doig River First Nation	250-793-0993	srowe@doigriverfn.com

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Lisa Hardy	Saulteau First Nation	778-256-4791	forestry@seaulteau.com
Dave Harris	Range	250-827-3503	dharris@pris.ca
Jim McKnight	Environment / conservation	250-785-9758	jimk01@telus.net
Budd Phillips	Recreation	250-793-4735	
Darryl Kroeker	Trapping (Alternate)	250-219-0798	dkroeker@pris.ca
Ray Ensz	Trapping	250-793-2825	
Andy Ackerman	Urban Communities	250-787-8457	ackerman@telus.net

Other

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	250-305-9161	gwallin@wlake.com
Kara Green	MOF	250-262-1694	

Meeting start: 6:00 pm

1. **Welcome and Introductions [AT, GW]**
   - Land Acknowledgement

2. **Review of meeting agenda and meeting protocol [GW]**
3. Structure
   - Focusing on updates from participants
   - Focus on annual report
   - Audit results
   - SFMP #4 update
   - Reviewing TOR

   Round table introductions for all present at meeting.

4. **Review of Meeting #68 draft summary, action items and approval [GW]**
   - No objection, meeting summary approved

   Actions from last meeting not completed are listed below and to be addressed.

Previous Action	Responsibility	Comments
Propose a date for next PAG meeting – focused on fire salvage.	Participants	Apologies from participants for not actioning on this – item will be removed as not completed.

5. **Looking forward on the SFMP**
   - **Canfor Update [CA]**
     - Closure of Canfor Sawmill
       - High operating costs, regulatory complexity, inability to reliably access economical viable timber
       - Last date for deliveries late Oct, last mill production December 20th
       - Plans to divest some Northen BC tenure in long term tenures or short-term fiber agreements to help other operations. Interest from several parties.
   - **Next Steps for SFMP [CA]**
     - PAG will continue as requirement of FSJPPR
     - SFMP #4 process will continue with Canfor at the table.
   - **Question and Answers**
     - Q: If sold to another company, will it continue to be a member of the PAG
       - A: They are not required, its an option to opt in. But likely would be the easiest situation for them to keep going.
     - Q: Consideration of the PAG process was to be re-assessed by government once Blueberry Agreement came into effect?
       - No, that is the SFMP. It is being rewritten.
     - Q: Canfor is using a public resource. The people do not have a say in what's going on. Canfor is up for sale but who is talking on behalf of the people on the sale of the operation?
       - A: Government does have to approve any tenure transfers. There is a

public interest component, and it goes through consultation.

- A: Unsure if this is public consultation. **ACTION** to find out what kind of process a tenure transfer goes through.

- Q: Why is there no information on a tenure transfer – Mackenzie transfer was done recently.
  - A: Does not happen overnight.
  - C: Not so much worried about the time of transfer, worried about the process.

6. **Update from Participants [ET, SR, LM, SC]**

- **BCTS Update – ET**
  - License Posts
    - Q1 – 1 TSL no bid
    - Q2 – no sales posted
    - Q3 – 1 TSL reposted, a few more to be posted (ongoing).
    - Q4 – 1 more to be posted (future)
  - Development
    - 150k m3 planned timber development
    - Approx 700ha, 19 blocks
    - Late start to contracts
  - Other contracts
    - 2 planting contracts, 2.9 million trees, 54 blocks.
    - Manual brushing, 250 ha, 5 blocks
    - 2 silviculture survey contracts
  - Staff changes
    - New Cert Standards Officer: Colin Tyson
    - Planning Team – two new Planning Foresters recruited
    - Hiring: 5 positions
  - Question & Answer:
    - Q: With sale offerings, and closures in the area, who is buying your sales these days?
      - A: Some sales are going farther out – one went to a manufacturing facility in Williams Lake.

- **DRFN Update – SR**
  - Doig is now a participant of the Pilot Project
  - License under WSOA (2 years)
    - Started process after 2023 fires
    - Focused in Fontas area, Doig trapline areas.
    - Worked with Canfor and W&M
      - Unfortunately, were not able to log full amount – poor weather for winter operations, fire burning felled timber in December, no snow.
      - Experienced permitting challenges
    - Looking forward to other opportunities
  - Helping with SFMP rewrite
  - Question & Answer:
    - Q: Why is it only a two-year license?
      - A: Was meant as an opportunity for FN to access fibre – was only up to 50k m3. Would make sense for small fire year and to extend your ability to salvage for 2 years. Difficult to work with under large fire years. Can only be within the fire perimeter. Lots of administrative hurdles so the 2 years helps to bridge the gap.

- **HRFN Update – LM**
  - HRFN interested in salvage
    - Concerns about longevity of wood
    - Got involved because the incentive to log more salvage from WSOA without removing from AAC
    - Opinion that licensees should have been paid to go out and log the salvage dues to

diminishing returns – required to replant
    - Timber has deteriorated and there is little incentive to log now.
    - Concern with how long permits have taken
- Update on agreement with HRFN
    - Was mentioned that there would be no commercial logging – this is an error that was reported by accident.
- Question & Answer:
    - Q: Mention of paying planters to go in and plant – do they go plant off burnt areas (not harvested)?
        - A: Non obligation areas may have some replanting. Licensees would typically not, but the government may fund projects.
        - A: There is some attempt to reforest if there are silvicultural obligations.
        - A: Section 108 – company will apply for funding to replant an area they have removed timber from
            - Incentive to take money and replant some areas where there is no obligation.

- **LP Update – SC**
    - Mill updates
        - 173 employees current
        - Increased from 3 to 4 shifts
        - Finished $18.5 million sanding project
        - $6 million spend by year end
        - 15 Day shut down complete
    - Woodlands update
        - 16.5k m3 harvested on crown
        - 205k m3 purchased from private land (BC)
        - Focus on wildfire salvage – permitting issues
        - Pulpwood Agreement is expiring in a few weeks – hoping to get a Non-Replicable Forest License but we have not heard anything.
    - Question & Answer:
        - Q: Why the delay on NRFL? That has economic consequences
            - A: This was supposed to replace our 2021 license – there seems to be hesitancy from government due to land use change in the region to accept things quickly.
        - Q: What is the impact of Canfor closing to LP in terms of fibre
            - A: Not a huge impact.
        - Q: is the NRFL still 100k m3
            - A: Yes
        - Q: If you permit under the PA right now you can't log them?
            - A: Yes, but we can transfer permits already submitted.

- **General Questions**
    - Q: CRL question – Are they still a participant?
        - A: Technically yes – they need to submit a letter to the DM requesting not to be.
    - A: With election and new Minister of Forests – is there any sense of government slowing down right now?
        - Q: Interregnum – no big decisions that can bind in the future. Day to day district level can continue. But nothing bigger than that which requires minister approval can occur

- **General Updates**
    - Forest Practices Boar Tour Sept 11 – thanks for coming out!
        - Feedback
            - Really enjoyed it. Great discussion with the board.

7. Annual Report Review [ET]

- Context
  - AR submitted annually by Oct 31
  - Provided to DM and PAG
  - Summary of performance, re: SFM indicators, LLS
  - Consistent with targets
    - 60 of 66 performance indicators
    - 28 of 33 legal indicators
    - 7 of 9 landscape level strategies
- Exceptions
  - #2 Seral Stages
    - Did not meet timeline for 100% of OFMA identification
  - #8 Shrubs (also impacts #51)
    - Cannot meet target for Kahntah LU
    - Due to minimal harvesting in LU
  - #30 Establishment delay
    - BCTS establishment delay (conifer) was 2.55 years, not within acceptable performance range of 2.5 years
    - Due to Donnie creek fire
  - #48/48a AAC partition Conifer Planning and Performance
    - Within variance for conifer planned in core
    - Offside
  - # 51 Maintenance of Wildlife
    - 11/14 indicators met
    - 2, 8, 30 not met
-

8. TOR Review and Approval [GW]

Overview of the structure of the TOR

- **ACTION**
  - Update current list of Participants
    - Add DRFN and HRFN
  - Change section F.1. in terms of reference to state "…current industry rates.."
- **ACTION** – Circulate updated version of TOR
- Q: What is the strategy to get a representative for every interest?
  - A: As both PAG and Participants – we can identify what we are missing, and we can make some phone calls or put an ad out in a newspaper.
  - A: At the trade show booth, we tried to get interest. Had a few conversations and encouraged people to get involved. Have not hear back.
  - **ACTION** – Compile current membership list and identify gaps
- **TOR marked as approved October 15, 2024**

9. Audits Updates

Canfor – AT

- Internal Audit Aug 2024
  - SFI 2022 Forest Management Standard
  - FSJPP Regulation
  - Forestry Management System
- External Audit to occur next week in Chetwynd
- Internal Audit
  - 9 person Day
    - 3 Minor Non-Conformities
    - 2 Opportunity for Improvement

        - 2 Notable best practices
    - Minor non-conformities
        - Road construction in riparian management areas/riparian retention (water quality conservation)
        - Operations around AOP (Archaeology)
            - Did not cut all trees in AOP providing opportunity for soil disturbance if trees blow over
        - Emergency equipment missing
    - Framework for non-conformities
        - Record within internal system and do a root cause analysis and action plan to prevent in future
    - Opportunity for Improvement
        - Consider showing riparian management areas on LP maps to identify streams with stem retention
    - Best Management Practices
        - Small stream retention
        - Adoption of SiteDocs by contractors

Question and Answer:

- Q: When external auditor comes is it a random sample?
    - A: At start of audit season there is an audit plan. Spread out through all the different items to check. For sites it is based on logistics – what we can get to in a day. Work together with auditor and collaborate on sites to visit. They tend to like to see complexity when going out to sites.

LP – SC

- Internal and External
- Internal
    - Fibre sourcing standard, forest management chain of custody
    - 3 minor non-conformances
        - Reforestation obligations (FM) – RESULTS reporting not completed prior to Silviculture Forester departing
        - Legislative Updates (FM) – Changes to spill reporting, Wildfire Regulation not incorporated in to ERP
        - Logo Use (CoC) – shrouds on OSB lifts had incorrect websites
    - 8 opportunities for improvement
        - Spill kits
        - Missing maps
        - Corrective Action Form
        - Dated policies
        - Timber Purchase Contracts
        - Archaeology data – progress for regular updating
        - Field inspection form improvements
        - Collaboration between Dawson Creek and Peace Valley
- External
    - Forest management and chain of custody
    - No findings

Question and Answer:

- Q: How can LP certify wood coming from private wood?
    - A: It is a different certification standard than for forest management/crown wood. It is an audit for fibre sourcing. It is a different scope.
- Follow up Q: What is the opportunity for performance auditing when there are issues on private land (e.g. trespass, logging up to rivers)
    - A: We do our best to direct the qualified professional loggers to do best management practices. Recourse for wrongdoings that occur include not signing up private landowners and not buying wood. They are still required to follow Federal Law

- C: Under SFI there is Forest Management and Fibre Sourcing – auditors are taken out to private land, and they do boots on the ground. The fibre sourcing standard is a bit thinner than the forest management standard – but there is certainly a focus on water.

10. BREAK (15 mins)

11. SFMP #4 Updates [AT, SC]

Overview

- Participants received a conditional 2-year extension to SFMP #3 in May 2024
- Conditions related to BRFN IA and T8 Consensus agreements, and moose and aerial herbicides
- Working with nations and province to rewrite SFMP
  - PAG too
- Target to Submit Oct 15, 025
  - Public and First Nations Info Sharing to begin June 15th

Process Flow, Timelines [SC] (Reference to flow chart handout)

- Distinguish managing vs regular participants
- Doing on a strategy basis
  - Start with gap analysis – comments from extension letter
  - Propose changes – make draft strategy
  - Send out to various groups for review (FN, GOV, PAG)
  - Compile feedback and create final draft
  - Resend final draft to FN, GOV, PAG
  - Outstanding feedback addressed, then move onto next strategy and final compiling

Progress to Date [SC]

- 7 strategies have been reviews
  - Timber Harvesting
  - Road Access
  - Riparian Management
  - Range and Forage Management
  - Forest Health Management
  - Soil Management
  - Visual Quality

Landscape-level Strategy Discussions [CA]

Range and Forage Management

- Three Sub Strategies
  - Strategy to repair range improvements
  - Noxious weed and invasive plant management
  - Tiber and Range action plan strategy
- Proposed changes
  - Addition of a new indicator – preventing the spread of invasive plants
    - Was included in Indicator 10 but was not reported out on
  - Added wording regarding review of seed use and any fencing for damage to natural range barriers with First nations
  - Added wording under indicator #39 – Damage to Range Improvements to include more wildlife friendly options (Wildlife friendly fencing requires government approval)

Questions and Answer

- Q: Do you use certified seeds?
  - A: Yes, indicator 10 is about using certified seeds - % of noxious weeds in seeds. We retain certification documents for the seed used.
- C: Ranchers have gone to the Range Branch and expressed that there is not a need for more than three strand fences for most range applications. The ranchers agree that wildlife friendly fencing should be implemented and have expressed this with the government.

- C: The Range Department needs to think beyond just their interest – don't just think about cattle. The ranchers should not be forced to use fencing standards that are not needed.
- **ACTION** – include wildlife friendly fencing considerations into SFMP
- Q: Is there an action item for the PAG to take back regarding fencing standards?
    - A: There is a government standard for fences that the participants must follow to build fences. It is up to the government to determine what kind of fence is required.
    - **ACTION** – get government clarification on requirements for range fences.

SFMP #4 – moving forward

- Participants would like to review updates to SFMP with PAG
- **ACTION** - Tentative date for next meeting – December 11th.
    - Thinking 1 to 3 meetings between now and march – December, February, and April
- PAG Suggestions
    - Show just changed indicator and target statements (just the high-level executive summary)
    - Show what the indicator and target statements was, and what the proposed changes are.
    - Ensure active links and example are included as we go through the review process – provide context during the review process.
        - C: Lyle and Dave can provide context on wildlife friendly fencing options.

12. PAG Satisfaction Survey 2024 & permission to publish PAG names [ET]

- Complete before you leave – also an electronic version received by email.
- Permission to post names and affiliations on the FSJPP website.
    - Every individual PAG member said yes.

13. Q&A Sesson; Feedback on meeting [Gail Wallin]

- All good. Please send email with suggestions if anything comes up.

Thanks everyone for coming and for meaningful participation.

Actions

New Action	Responsibility	STATUS	Comments
PAG would like to have an update from government for what the tenure transfer process is, and where is the opportunity for public input.	Government Representative	NEW	
Update TOR – participant list and travel compensation verbiage	Participants	NEW	
Circulate updated TOR to PAG	Participants	NEW	
Compile PAG membership list for PAG to identify gaps of representation	Andrew Tyrell	NEW	
Lisa Hardy to confirm with participants what her role is in the group	Participants	NEW	
Ensure that the SFMP addresses wildlife friendly fences	Participants	NEW	
Have update from government for what is required for wildlife friendly fencing	Government	NEW	
Send out invite to PAG for SFMP review meeting – tentative September 11th	Participants	NEW	

Meeting end: 8:20 pm