

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #32**

**May 28, 2009
1800 to 2100hrs**

Quality Inn, Plaza 1 Meeting Room

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendance:

Name	Interest	Phone	Email
<i>Participants</i>			
Dawn Griffin	Canfor	787-3607	Dawn.Griffin@canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	787-3613	Dave.menzies@canfor.com
Mark Van Tassel	BCTS	784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@canfor.com
Don Rosen	Canfor	788-4379	Don.Rosen@canfor.com
Brian Farwell	BCTS	262-3337	Brian.Farwell@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Moore	Cameron R Logging	789-3621	Andrew@taylordunnage.ca

Walter Fister	BCTS	262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
---------------	------	----------	-------------------------

PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates

Dale Johnson	Range	262-3260	dkjohnsonranch@xplornet.com
Ron Wagner	Labour	787-0172	rwagner@telus.net
Darren Thiel	Non-com. Rec(Hunting/Fishing)	262-9482	dthiel@shaw.ca
Budd Phillips	Non-com. Rec (Hunting/Fishing)	785-1283	budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com
Fred Jarvis	Rural Communities	262-2913	fredjarvis@shaw.ca
Roy Lube	Outdoor Rec.(non consumptive)	787-7619	rlube@telus.net
Stanley Gladysz	Outdoor Rec.(non consumptive)	785-2596	sgladysz@pris.ca
Teena Demeulemeester	First Nations (WMFN)	788-3676	forestry@westmo.org
Orland Wilkerson	Urban Communities	787-6243	wilkerson@unbc.ca
Rod Kronlacher	Oil and Gas	219-1760	Rod.Kronlacher@encana.com

Advisors

Rod Backmeyer	Integrated Land Mgmt	787-3236	Rod.backmeyer@gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	Ministry of Environment	787-3393	Joelle.Scheck@gov.bc.ca

Jon Gibbons	MOF	784-1203	Jon.Gibbons@gov.bc.ca
Ralph Barkhouse	MOF	784-1293	ralph.barkhouse@gov.bc.ca

Observers

Stacy Gibbons	Canfor	787-9168	Stacy.Gibbons@canfor.com
Sandra Fox	First Nations	788-1956	sandy_fox_24@hotmail.com

Facilitator

Gail Wallin	Facilitator	305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com
-------------	-------------	----------	-------------------

1. Welcome and Introductions

- Introductions round table

2. Review of Meeting agenda

- Draft agenda reviewed, no public presentations were tabled

3. Review of previous meeting summary and outstanding actions

- Action #1: Completed
- Action #2: Completed
- Action #3: Completed

Action #1- Add Andrew Moore to the e-mail list for pre-meeting mailings

Meeting Summary Accepted by the PAG.

4. Update on pilot project review draft report – (Dave Menzies)

- Results based legislative scheme
- SFMP that PAG is working on is a product of the pilot project
- Government has been reviewing it for the past +/-16 months
- So far the comments have been largely positive
- Not much development since last meeting on the Pilot Project Review Report
- **Question from PAG-** The survey they conducted, was that a part of their evaluative process?
- **Response-** Yes, and the survey results were favorable for PAG and other parties. The single biggest concern from MOF seems to be that there are two different pieces of legislation-one to manage forestry in FSJ, and a different one in Dawson Creek and the rest of the province.
- **Comment from MOF-** That is basically what the summary is, plus they thought that participants from the pilot project might have an unfair competitive advantage
- **Follow-up from the PAG member:** I asked that question, because I felt at times the person doing the interview was probing me for negative answers. And when they didn't get them they would rephrase the question in an attempt to get a negative answer.
- **Comment from a second PAG member:** I agree that was the intent.
- **Response:** I'll pass those comments on to the Pilot Project Review committee

Action #2: Send copy of minutes to chair of FSJ Pilot Project Review

Facilitator: Any further comments from the PAG- is there still an opportunity to pass on comments to the committee?

- Response: Any further comments from the PAG will also be passed on to the Review Committee chair.

PAG Member: My perception was that the interviewer was not neutral.

5. Update future SFMP direction and PAG input opportunities – (Don Rosen)

- Hierarchy-SFMP, LLS, CSA indicators
- Landscape level strategies & associated indicators
- CSA Z809-08 core indicators and requirements
- Relationship of values, objectives, indicators and targets

Action #3- send a link for CSA Z809-08 core indicators and requirements to members.

Response: link to this is:

< <http://www.shopcsa.ca/onlinestore/GetCatalogItemDetails.asp?mat=2419617> >

When you go to site it appears as if you have to purchase the standard, but the ‘click here’ link at the bottom of the page allows you to download it for free.

- **Question from PAG-** Has the certification affected the international market?
- **Response-** Certainly today. You are going to have an extremely hard time selling your product to customers if it is not certified. Some customers want different certifications. So I think it has changed the perception to some extent.
- **Question from PAG-** Would you ever pursue FSC certification?
- **Response-** We’ve looked at it corporately, but probably not going to from a cost point of view, but if enough customers demand it, than we would probably pursue it, but at this stage, we are not.
- **Question from PAG-** What are the major differences between CSA and FSC
- **Response-** To a large extent the underlying values of CSA and FSC are similar, and the issues are all the same.
- **Question from PAG-** Would you have FSC and an SFMP going at the same time in a parallel process?
- **Response-** I’m not sure if you can, but I think there is something in the SFMP standard that says that if you are FSC, you are only FSC

Comment from PAG- Tembec has FSC and they are also going for their SFMP as well.

- doing an SFMP is generally a requirement of certification, though some companies may have an SFMP and not be certified.

6. Criterion 3, soil and water proposed updates to SFMP

- **Soil quality and quantity discussion (Brian Farwell)**
 - Soil productivity (long term nutrient levels, shallow soils, best management practices for soil protection)
 - Seasons of operations (operating windows, impacts on soil during frozen and unfrozen conditions)
 - Site rehabilitation in areas of severe soil disturbance

- **Handout-** FSJ FSMP indicators/CSA core indicators matrix
- **Question from PAG-** You are talking at this point about crop rotation. You are not talking about other types of impacts
- **Response-** Nutrient depletion is one of the points we want to talk about. This standard applies to not just north eastern BC, but to a variety of areas, so if you are doing rotations of 15 to 20 years, you run the risk of nutrient depletion. This is not an issue here due to the length of tree rotations.
- Soil compaction is what we will be watching the most
- **Question from PAG-** We talked about compaction, what about the other site where you end up with excessive water saturation?
- **Response-** that would usually be a result of not maintaining your crossing structures, and that ties back to your roads, and proper deactivation. We always deactivate our roads to maintain natural drainage patterns
- **Question from PAG-** We did a field trip on the 95 road. On a cut block there were areas in there they couldn't get the trees to grow due to excessive water saturation, and it wasn't a road, that was the block.
- **Response-** occasionally after logging the water table can rise. Typically we would mound those areas. As long as you are not stopping the water flow, it can still be a very productive site.
- **Question from PAG-** How do we mitigate that?
- **Response-** We don't. The water table will rise through excavator mounding and create a raised microsite, and the tree will become established, and as it develops, the water will go down.
- **Question from PAG-** We've had an impact on the areas where we've had MPB attack on the water table down south. What can we anticipate for here
- **Response-** Within the boreal here we don't have the pine stands like they do down south. Even if we did have a total wipe out of every pine tree, we still have lots of other tree species that will take over. It is unlikely to see as significant an effect here because we don't have the pure pine stands that go on for miles and miles.
- Reviewed matrix values and objectives for soil quality and quantity
- No changes proposed to values and objectives for soil quality and quantity
- Reviewed CSA matrix soil indicators
- Reviewed Soil management strategy
- Working group proposing to drop site index indicator, and replace with new core indicator on site disturbance and CWD indicator.
- PAG member concerned about dropping the site index indicator without a better rationale.
- Response: We'll be reviewing the indicators in detail later in this meeting.
- Handout- Draft soil management strategy
- **Comment from PAG-** Strategy #1 says that participants "will implement" appropriate harvesting, and in strategy #2 participants "will strive". I notice a significant difference here

Action #4: Participants to review and revise the wording of Strategies by removing ‘strive’, to make the wording more consistent

- **Question from PAG-** I’m having difficulty understanding what 5% (permanent access) relates to. Can you give me a visual perspective?
- **Response-** 5km of road, 10m wide in a 100ha cut block

Action #5: Obtain a visual representation of what 5% permanent access disturbance looks like and present to PAG at next meeting.

- **Question from PAG-** What is the biggest block that you have laid out?
- **Response-** BCTS = 250ha, Canfor = 600-700ha
- **Comment from PAG-** I’m wondering why the wording was chosen “to limit the extent of soil disturbance”, why don’t you just say “to limit soil disturbance”
- Working group is proposing to drop the indicator; number of hectares of landslides resulting from forestry practices
- PAG agrees to drop indicator
- Working group is proposing no change to the indicator; permanent access structures (%) within cut blocks
- PAG accepts no change on this indicator
- Working group proposes no change to the indicator; average CWD volume/ha on blocks logged in the DFA
- PAG accepts no change on this indicator
- **Question from PAG-** How are you measuring a non-conformance?
- **Response-** When we’re laying out blocks, there is an assessment made to the sensitivity of the soils to disturbance, and depending on what that sensitivity is, dictates the amount of disturbance that the soil can absorb without having detrimental affects. There are 2 levels; high compaction hazard, and you would have a lower limit, and that would be 5%, and more resilient soils would have 10%. Roadside areas have 25% disturbance threshold applied, and those are consistent with the forest practices code act. The harvesting supervisors monitor that during harvesting. It is recorded whether or not this block was in compliance or non-compliance with the soil disturbance limit. If it was out of compliance it would be entered into our tracking system, and we would be looking for a root cause.
- **Question from PAG-** I’m just thinking about the 5%. Is there some criteria for what would be measured
- **Response-** For this, the 5% would not include the roads, so this is just on your dispersed harvest area
- **Comment from MOF-** The soil disturbance limits are actually in the harvesting area. It is disturbance caused by logging.
- **Comment from working group-** Canfor, C&E, and auditors all do checks on soil disturbance
- **Question from PAG-** the 25% disturbance at the roadside work area, is that stratified out of the block?

- **Response-** It is not purely stratified, but when you are doing an assessment you take that into account
- **Question from PAG-** Does the disturbance at the roadside count towards the disturbance of the over all block?
- **Response-** yes
- **Question from PAG-** When I look at the feedback I got from the audit results, they talk about major and minor. You say in here, no non-conformances. Where does it fall?
- **Response-** In this incidence, a non-conformance would be a non-conformance to our plan, so if our plan said we were only going to have 5%, anything over that is a non-conformance and recorded. If an auditor came out and found just one incident over 50 blocks it would probably be a minor, but if it was in multiple blocks and multiple situations it would be a major non-conformance from an auditing perspective
- **Question from PAG-** Can we tie herbicide use to soil disturbance and how many times its applied to one block?

Action # 6: Herbicide impacts will be reviewed as part of mandatory discussion item in Criterion 1 (Biological Diversity)

- **Question from PAG-** I have a much harder time linking the new proposed indicator, level of soil disturbance, back to the value of soil productivity. Is there any follow up to monitor this?
- **Response-** So basically the levels of disturbance are better, and are the same as the rest of the regulatory environment in BC
- **Question from PAG-** You are taking out a CWD indicator. Is this indicator captured somewhere else?
- **Response-** yes, we propose removing site index and keeping CWD
- **Comment from MOF-** going back to the strategy for a minute, it does specify disturbance caused by harvesting. Should it include silviculture operations as well?

Action # 7: Review the soil management strategy considering these comments

- **Question from PAG-** I don't understand why we are dropping site index?
- **Response-** It is not necessarily a direct correlation back to our practices. Nothing in site index really measures productivity itself directly. It is only a relative measure, not an absolute measure. You also have a 15 year wait before you can get an answer.
- **Question from PAG-** before site index was a good indicator, so why is it not a good indicator now
- **Response-** We are trying to have a plan that is efficient for us to implement. It is also a work load issue
- **Comment from PAG-** we thought that site index was good enough last time
- **Question from PAG-** if we lose the site index indicator here, is there somewhere else in the matrix where it is used at all?
- **Response-** yes, the information would still be collected, but not necessarily monitored as part of the plan. It won't be captured in the matrix, but entered into genus.

- **Comment from PAG-** I understand that site index is onerous at the beginning, but if you don't have to do anything with it for 15 years, then that 15 year interim isn't increasing your workload
 - **Question from PAG-** 5%, is that the actual road, or ditch line to ditch line, because there is a big difference between the actual road and ditch line to ditch line
 - **Response-** . It's the ditch line to ditch line –the area eliminated for the Net Area to be Reforested. Noted that a definition of 'Permanent Access Structures' is included in the glossary of the SFMP.
-
- **Comment from PAG-** The indicator says down woody debris, and we are referring to it as coarse woody debris.
 - **Response:** Our interpretation is that while there is a difference in wording, the intended meaning is the same.
-
- **Water quality and quantity discussion- (Andrew Tyrrell)**
 - Water quality in watersheds supplying domestic water
 - Healthy watersheds
 - Management practices and regulatory requirements that protect water quality and quantity
 - **Question from PAG-** Do you use water quality monitoring stations to get your base line data to know the quality of it?
 - **Response-** That would tell you your base-line data for a particular stream
 - The biggest affect on watersheds here is forest cover
 - **Question from PAG-** There is no mention of increase water temperature in streams. Salmon for example are very susceptible to temperature increases. If enough vegetation is removed, solar radiation will heat up the stream
 - **Response-** Water temperature is certainly an important aspect for aquatic organisms, and stream side vegetation has a moderating influence. I'm talking more about watersheds than streams, so it could be forest cover that is nowhere near a stream. On a watershed scale, most of the forest cover is not within the riparian area of streams.
 - **Question from PAG-** I don't see a reference here. Did CSA give us that?
 - **Response-** yes, CSA did. 'Healthy Watersheds' is one of the mandatory discussion points.
 - **Comment from PAG-** Maybe we have to define what watersheds we are talking about.
 - **Response –** The current SFMP has a list of watersheds for the DFA, that are based on the BC Watershed Atlas. We could certainly produce a map of them.

Action Item #8- Obtain a visual map of the watershed areas in the Fort St. John Pilot Project area.

- **Question from PAG-** When you say “domestic” are you meaning beyond the broad scale of municipality?
- **Response-** Yes. “Domestic purpose” is defined in the Water Act. Examples may be ranchers who want to water their cattle, and people wanting water for drinking water. It is conditional and it’s a small volume
- **Comment from working group-** There are no ‘community watersheds’ in the Peace. A ‘community water shed’ is a legally defined thing
- **Question from PAG-** You say there are no community watersheds now, is there potential for some?
- **Response-** Yes
- **Comment-** The Kiskatinaw River watershed is too large to be a community watershed

Due to time constraints, the following items will have to be addressed at the next meeting:

- Review matrix value and objective
- Riparian management strategy
- CSA matrix water indicators

7. Update from Participants

- Canfor is undergoing lots of changes, but they don’t directly impact what we are doing here. Canfor is indefinitely closing 3 southern sawmills. Certification and PAG will be business as usual here for the foreseeable future.

8. Review PAG membership

- Proposing for commercial recreation, replace Ray Jackson with Darren Thiel. Review this decision with Ray before it is finalized
- Agreed by PAG

9. No Public Presentations

10. Next meeting date

- Tentatively June 22, and/or July 9

11. Feed Back on Meeting

- Only got half of the work done, but got lots of good discussion in
- Lots of topics covered fairly well
- More context and background of how it fits in
- Did not get as much accomplished
- Range Users want grass loss issue brought up (loss of grazing under aspen due to logging)
- **Response:** Yes, there is a place for that in the discussion on the Range and Forage strategy.
- Important to take the time to understand
- This is a better location for meetings, quieter

