

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #71
Wednesday, February 19, 2025
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
Steve Hewitt	LP		
Emily Pollington	BCTS		
Lyle Mortenson	Halfway River First Nation	250-784-8001	llemort@telus.net
Sara Rowe	Doig River First Nation	250-793-0993	srowe@doigriverfn.com
Chris Maundrell	Prophet River First Nation		

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
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	Rural Communities, Trapping (Alternate)	250-219-0798	dkroeker@pris.ca

Other

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
Gail Wallin	Facilitator	250-305-9161	gwallin@wlake.com
Joelle Ward	Advisor		
Shayla Blue	WLRS		

Meeting start: 6:00 pm

1. Welcome and Introductions [AT, GW]

- Land Acknowledgement

2. Review of meeting agenda and meeting protocol [GW]

3. Review of Meeting #70 draft summary, action items and approval [GW]

- Draft summary approved by PAG as emailed

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

Action	Responsibility	STATUS	Comments
PAG would like to have more info on public comment process for tenure transfers	Government Representative	In progress	
Compile PAG membership list for PAG to identify gaps of representation	Andrew Tyrrell	In progress	
Ensure that the SFMP addresses wildlife friendly fences	Participants	In progress	
Rearrange room setup so people can see and hear better ("U" moved in closer)	Ethan Brandt	DONE	Changes made for this meeting

Item 1: A little bit more needed – Participants will follow up with Yvonne on this

Item 2: Will go over this tonight

Item 3: Still in progress – have not finalized indicator but will keep updating as we move along.

- Comment from DH

- o Julie Robinson said FOR going to talk to FN about wildlife friendly fences. Asked cattleman’s association re: double strand bottom wire, no barbs.
- o Would like to have a meeting with everyone together – FN, Cattleman’s, and Range branch.
- o DH to give update on this as it continues.

Item 4: Complete – all may provide feedback at the end of the meeting.

4. Review TOR PAG Representative categories, vacancies, and potential gaps [CA]

- Do we want to live with the current list, or do we want to recommend any changes?
 - o Consensus
- Vacancies
 - o Commercial Rec
 - o Forest Contractors/workers
 - o Labour

Visit the Fort St. John Pilot Project website - <http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/>

- Oil & Gas industry
- Non-Commercial Recreation – Non Consumptive
- Energy
- Group feedback on categories?
 - C: There are not many commercial recreation operations. Change to guide outfitter potentially?
 - C: Maybe someone at LP could be a representative for Labour. Forest contractors/workers could recruit from our layout/logging contractors.
 - C: Guide outfitters do not know that this group exists – this should be addressed.
 - C: Potentially restoration workers/people who work in restoration
 - Could fit under forest worker contractors/workers
- Consensus
 - Change oil and gas and Energy to just Energy
 - Forest Contractors/Workers and Labour
 - Leave the same
- Advisors
 - Some organizations that we do not have advisors for
 - Is it appropriate to remove participants from the Advisor's list?
 - Group consensus that we can do this
- Suggestions for recruiting for categories
 - **ACTION** – Shayla blue to distribute vacancies to NE Round Table
 - **ACTION** – Categories be sent out to PAG group to remind folks what we are recruiting for.
 - **ACTION** – Emily to refer colleagues who are interested in joining to Ethan and Andrew
 - Recruitment ideas
 - Trade show – information sheet to hand out to people
 - Online newspaper ads – we did put out solicitation at last posting of PAG to the EnergeticCity.ca
 - Social Media
 - Specific Invites?
 - Others?

5. SFMP #4 Update [CA]

- **Progress to date**
 - Timelines – We are coming down to the wire
 - Draft for PAG review due May 1st
 - Public review and FN info sharing follows June 15th
 - Hoping to have another meeting with PAG in April to provide final draft.
- **Input on specific indicators – new and revised**
 - **Proposed Changes**
 - Indicator 8 – Shrubs - DROP
 - Does not drive management action – just a reporting indicator
 - No about shrub species – about shrub structural stage. Structural stage of forest succession in really early seral or perpetual shrub communities.
 - Can't really do anything – participants do not believe it is useful within the SFMP.
 - **PAG all in agreement that we can remove this indicator.**
 - Indicator 29 – Reforestation Assessment - CHANGE
 - Consider rolling average to TMV targets
 - Currently separated by BCTS, Canfor for Conifer, BCTS, LP for Deciduous
 - **PAG in agreement that we can change this indicator**
 - Indicator 31 – Long Term Harvest Level - DROP
 - TSR are done by the province, the participants do not have control over this.
 - **PAG all in agreement that we can remove this indicator**

Visit the Fort St. John Pilot Project website - <http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/>

- Indicator 44 – Timber Processed in the DFA - CHANGE
 - No conifer mill currently. LP sharing volume with Dawson Creek operation (outside DFA). Logging still reports local economy, and conifer logging will no longer be processed in the DFA.
 - Still an important piece of information – instead change to reporting indicator to report where the volume is being processed and where volume is being sourced
 - C: One of the most disappointing aspects in this area is the lack of timber harvesting processing facilities. Taking this out of our objectives could remove some of the pressure that needs to be put on the government to make sure that we get facilities to come back to this region
 - C: Agreed – we want to keep this up here – timber that is leaving are jobs that are leaving.
 - Q: can the managing participants do this by just reporting?
 - A: This sounds passive. We need to keep pressure on to keep these facilities more local.
 - C: In defense of keeping it – there is no legal obligation for a licensee to mill it within the forest area. If it is kept, it will just be offside until another licensee fills the gap. This will not provide pressure; pressure needs to come from other areas.
 - C: This is a large part of an SFM – other plans have timber harvested that are not within the DFA.
 - C: We need to be progressive
 - C: There is value in explicitly reporting out where the wood is going. It will be more pronounced (for example) with Canfor and 100% is going out. Also do not think the indicator should go away but maybe reflect a bit better what is happening so it can be more explicit on how the timber is moving in and out. FN is a good example of the community being unhappy with logging happening in the community but being taken outside of it. How can we maintain transparency in this regard.
 - C: No action to be derived from reporting that we are not in compliance every year. Spirit of intent should stay – just change the indicator to reporting out.
 - C: Understand dilemma but need to keep perspective that the value of the timber is not being fully redeemed in the community is being sourced. Timber should be managed to be utilized by the community where it is harvested. There was concern back when oil and gas was harvesting a lot of wood and nobody was knowledgeable of where it was going or how it was being used/wasted. We need to keep the pressure on so this does not happen again.
 - C: There used to be lots of sawmill camps – lots of the farmers logging all winter, rough sawn product would come out of the bush to go to a planer mill in town. It became very difficult for them to get licenses because of large companies.
 - Consensus: Not happy with not enough lumber being processed locally, and lumber being harvested is shipped out.
 - **Bring this indicator back and give acknowledgement that we still care about this and want to keep the topic pressed.**
- Indicator 53 – Regulatory Public Review and Comment Processes - DROP
 - We have audits on this and are held to this standard within the regs. Lots of oversight on this.
 - **PAG in agreement we can drop this indicator.**
- Indicator 51 – Maintenance of Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Values – ELEVATE and DROP
 - Proposing to elevate this to a higher level as a strategy. This means dropping this indicator and capturing it elsewhere.
 - Q: Is this giving a higher-level status?
 - A: YES – it makes this a higher-level driving strategy
 - **PAG in agreement to remove this indicator.**
- Indicator 57 – Brushing Program Herbicide use - CHANGE

Visit the Fort St. John Pilot Project website - <http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/>

- Change to participants will obtain FN consent on 100% of the areas treated with herbicide
- **PAG in Agreement to change this indicator**
- Indicator 60 – Deletions to Forest Area - CHANGE
 - Update to 2018 TSR are – update target statement to more accurate percentage
 - Commitment to keep roads, trails, and landings to a limited amount. Linked to Timber Supply Review.
 - Q: Has a new timber supply review been initiated?
 - A: Not that we know of – there should be.
 - **PAG in agreement to change and update will be provided once it is changed.**
- **Break (10 mins)**
- **Biodiversity and Wildlife Habitat Strategy – Draft for input**
 - Recap
 - Proposed and are moving forward with optional landscape level strategy
 - Addresses expectation outlined in SFMP extension letter
 - Address potential gaps in current SFMP
 - Bring together several existing indicators that address biodiversity and wildlife habitat
 - Introducing new indicators that reflect the evolution of participant's practices
 - NOT wildlife management – we manage for wildlife habitat through positive and negative interactions.
 - Potential Gaps
 - Wildlife habitat features, trails, etc.
 - Moose habitat features and features, mineral licks
 - Connectivity
 - Resilient landscapes
 - Fish
 - Strategy Updates
 - Course Woody Debris Strategy
 - Ensure CWD structural piles are created in harvested areas and practices will ensure continuation of minimum levels of dispersed CWD are retained in managed stands
 - Indicators: CWD Structure, CWD Volume
 - C: When it comes to CWD and there is a fire – it certainly helps to carry the fire, and it burns a lot hotter than the surrounding shrubs. On rangeland we want an open ground for the cattle to graze on. Cattle won't walk in course woody debris. The strategy has to be a bit different on the grazing tenures to manage.
 - A: There is some variance within some alternate management objectives (i.e. range), but it is recognized that it is an important part of an ecosystem.
 - Retention Strategy
 - Implement measures to ensure suitable levels of vegetation structure are retained in harvested areas
 - Indicators: Dispersed Retention (Snags and Cavity Sites), Riparian Reserves, WTPs, River corridors (area expanded), Small Streams and NCD Management (NEW)
 - Moose Habitat Enhancement Strategy
 - Speaks to gaps outlined in extension letter
 - Implement measures to enhance moose habitat in areas of moderate to very high habitat capability
 - Indicators: Moose Habitat Enhancement, Forest Types, Seral
 - Q: What else is included in moose habitat enhancement?

Visit the Fort St. John Pilot Project website - <http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/>

- A: Mostly access, roads, browse areas, buffers, licks, etc. Will go over in following slides
- Migratory Birds Strategy
 - Reducing incidental take of migratory birds during harvesting operations
 - Not new – we already implement this in each of our operations
 - Indicator: Migratory Birds Risk Avoidance
- Strategies being considered
 - Wildlife Features
 - Species At Risk
 - Fisheries Habitat
- **No feedback provided by PAG on new strategy**
- Moose Habitat Enhancement Strategy
 - New Indicator
 - Indicator Statement: Application of the Moose Habitat Enhancement Checklist in the Moose Priority Area
 - Target Statement: Participants will assess all blocks proposed in the Moose Priority Area using the Moose Habitat Enhancement checklist, and apply BMP's as applicable
 - Comes from Wildlife Infometrics study from 2018 – divides TSA into two areas – moose priority area, and area that overlaps with caribou range.
 - Look at moose habitat capability, within areas outside identified caribou range.
 - Considering the management of moose habitat, recognizing a potential impact to caribou due to wolf predation while managing for moose
 - Checklist will provide direction at all stages of forest operations
 - Q: Will you share the checklist with the group?
 - A: Yes, when it is completed.
 - C: Make sure that when you are writing indicator – make sure that you are very explicit that the participants are still managing for important moose habitat in other areas and operations
 - Q: Why focus on winter rather than summer?
 - C: This is not habitat enhancement – it is habitat protection or mitigation. Perhaps consider a name change to be more clear on what we are doing. Mitigating impacts is good, but we should be clear on this.
 - C: Appreciate where this is going. From Doig's perspective, similar concepts of not just managing for one. Bison also have an interaction (in certain localized areas). Moose are important for nations, so whatever can be incorporated with respect to moose is a good direction. We don't want to not think about moose just because it is a "caribou area"
 - C: Make sure you are also factoring site specific strategies for your other species at risk too.
 - C: Considerations are not exclusive to moose – these considerations are beneficial to other species too.
 - **ACTION** – Andrew to send out Wildlife Infometrics report to PAG members that are present tonight

6. Potential topics for next PAG meeting [EB]

- Wildlife
- Oil and gas – update from producers

7. Q&A Session; Feedback on meeting [Gail Wallin]

- Group liked the more compact U shape
- Still a bit tough to read the screen
- On busy slides – please give a handout rather than just a busy slide on the screen

Visit the Fort St. John Pilot Project website - <http://www.fsjpilotproject.com/>

Thanks everyone for coming and for meaningful participation. Attendance and consistency are very appreciated!

Meeting end 8:30pm.

Actions

Action	Responsibility	STATUS	
PAG would like to have more info on public comment process for tenure transfers	Government Representative	In progress	
Compile PAG membership list for PAG to identify gaps of representation	Andrew Tyrrell	In progress	
Ensure that the SFMP addresses wildlife friendly fences	Participants	In progress	
Shayla blue to distribute vacancies to NE Round Table	Shayla Blue	NEW	
Categories to be sent out to PAG group to remind folks what we are recruiting for.	Ethan Brandt	NEW	
Emily to refer colleagues who may be interested in joining PAG to Ethan and Andrew	Emily Pollington	NEW	

Meeting end: 8:30 pm