

**Fort St. John Results Based Pilot Project
Public Advisory Group Meeting #26**

**October 19, 2006
6:00 pm to 9:20 pm**

FSJ Cultural Center

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email or Postal Address</u>
<i>Participants</i>			
Andrew Tyrrell	Canfor	787-3665	Andrew.Tyrrell@canfor.com
David Menzies	Canfor	787-3613	Dave.Menzies@canfor.com
Jeff Beale	Canfor	787-3651	Jeff.Beale@canfor.com
Wes Neumeier	Canfor	787.3645	Wes.Neumeier@canfor.com
Jennifer Nickel	Canfor	787-3695	Jennifer.Nickel@canfor.com
Paul Albu	BC Timber Sales	262-3339	Paul.Albu@gov.bc.ca
Brian Farwell	BC Timber Sales	262-3337	Brian.farwell@gov.bc.ca
Walter Fister	BC Timber Sales	262-3328	Walter.Fister@gov.bc.ca
Andrew Moore	Cameron River Logging	789-3621	Andrew@taylordunnage.ca
 <i>PAG Interest Representatives and Alternates</i>			
Budd Phillips	Non-Commercial Rec – Hunting Fishing	785-1283	Budd.Phillips@worksafebc.com
Stanley Gladysz	Non-commercial Rec- Non- consumptive	785-2596	sgladysz@pris.ca
Ron Wagner	Labour	787-0172	rojwagner@telus.net
Roy Lube	Non-Commercial Rec- non consumptive	787-7619	Rlube1@telus.net
Darren Thiel	Non-Commercial Rec- fishing/hunting	785-1461	backcountry@telus.net
Dale Johnson	Range	262-3260	FAX: 262-3260
Duanne Salmond	Trapping	785-2571	Box142, Charlie Lake BC
Larry Houley	Rural Communities	263-7752	FAX: 787-2279
Vicki Allen	Trapping	785-5597	Box 2367 Fort St. John V1J-4H8
Orland Wilkerson	Urban Communities	787-6243	wilkerse@unbc.ca
 <i>Advisors</i>			
Mark vanTassel	Ministry of Forests	784-1209	Mark.vantassel@gov.bc.ca
Elizabeth Hunt	Ministry of Forests	784-1242	Elizabeth.Hunt@gov.bc.ca
Winn Hays-Byl	Ministry of Forests	784-1203	Winn.haysbyl@gov.bc.ca
Joelle Scheck	Ministry of Environment	787-3393	Joelle.scheck@gov.bc.ca
 <i>Observers</i>			
Roger St. Jean	Oil and Gas Commission	787-3234	Roger.stjean@gov.bc.ca
Sharon Chang	University of British Columbia	604-578-4857	changkmh@interchange.ubc.ca
 <i>Facilitator</i>			
Gail Wallin		305-1003	Gwallin@wlake.com

1. Welcome

- Facilitator welcomed all members to the meeting.
- Meeting opened at 6:30pm.
- Roundtable introductions were made. Those people attending introduced themselves and specified what interest group they represent.

2. Review of Meeting Agenda

- Draft Agenda for the night's meeting was reviewed; no changes were recommended, agenda was accepted.
- Facilitator provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting.
- Meeting focus was identified as review of the Annual Report and most recent CSA/ISO Audits.

3. Review of Meeting Summary (March 30, 2006)

Review of Minutes

- PAG reviewed draft meeting summary notes from the March 30, 2006 meeting. One error was identified on the summary:
 - Wayne Sawchuk was listed as an advisor when he is actually a representative.

ACTION 1: Revise attendance list on Meeting Summary #25 (March 30, 2006) to show Wayne Sawchuk as a participant not an advisor.

- None of the meeting attendants require a copy of the revised meeting summary #25.

Review of Actions

- PAG reviewed action items from meeting #25 summary notes. Most Actions were accepted by the PAG as complete and the following 2 action items are to be carried forward to the next meeting:

ACTION 2: Update on status of RCMP trail only if it becomes a heritage trail

ACTION 3: Prepare a presentation on the Heritage Act and Trails for a future PAG meeting.

- One Additional Action was identified:

ACTION 4: Send a copy of the TOR to Trappers Association and Labour representative.

- One on-going action was identified:

ACTION 5: Send a copy of the meeting summary to members of the PAG once complete.

4. Update from Participants

Andrew Moore-CRL

- Everything is running similar to previous report, although markets are presenting challenges.

Brian Farwell-BCTS

- 14 timber sales put up last year. 13 were sold and 1 had no bids. The unsold timber sale was carried forward to this year and was eventually sold.
- The Fort St. John business unit of BC Timber Sales was the subject of a Forest Practices Board Field Audit in September. The only issues that concerned auditors were the coordinated access with oil and gas and the road tendering process. The final audit report has not been finished yet.

Jeff Beale-Canfor/LP OSB

- Mill producing at 80+%. A big improvement from the last meeting when it was running at 70%
- A small log lift was added and the cranes have been repaired. These changes are improving production.
- 6 Nations Ventures still working in the log yard.
- Approx 4,000ha/yr are being logged (approximately 25% of that is private property).

Question from PAG: Is the large number of fires in the mill a reason for concern?

Response (J. Beale): The fires are mainly caused by material getting jammed in pipes and with the heat build-up behind the material, fires result. The fires have impacted production but they have not had fires in the last little while. Things are improving as time goes on.

Question from PAG: Is the rate of logging sustainable?

Response (J. Beale): Yes, but in a few years we will be looking for alternate supplies of wood (deciduous). In 30+ years we will be more reliant on the wood supply from private land because of the age class distribution in those areas.

David Menzies-Canfor Sawmill

- Sawmill is still running on 2 shifts.
- Major wildfires this spring impacted approximately 21 of Canfor's cutblocks. It will cost about \$1,000,000 to get the cutblocks back to the state they were prior to the fires. There were also losses to mature timber. The plan is to salvage approximately 100,000m³ of the burned timber this year.
- High stumpage has negatively impacted operations.

Comment/Question from PAG: It seems that every bit of forest out there is being impacted by industry. The virgin timber you are working in supports wildlife. It seems like the more small contractors going to work out there, the more that come up here to work.

Response (G. Wallin): This comment relates also to impact from other industries like oil and gas and is therefore beyond the scope of the meeting.

Question from PAG: What is being done about the beetle?

Response (D. Menzies): The beetle is on our radar; it is on the list of topics that will be discussed later in the meeting.

Question from PAG: What is going on with the waste issue that was brought up at the last meeting?

Response (D. Menzies): Changes to log grades have made leaving waste on the blocks more expensive. Because of the new OSB mill overall utilization of fiber has improved.

PAG comment: It has seemed that waste has decreased in blocks in the last while and it is good. It is much easier to travel across blocks.

5. Review Report on KPMG Audit

Presentation:

- Jeff Beale summarized the results of the CSA re-certification audit and ISO surveillance audit that occurred in 2006.
- The presentation identified the two non-conformances (FMS documents and SLP implementation) and seven opportunities for improvement (debris piles, mapping, SLP's inconsistent etc.).
- Jeff explained the difference between non-conformances, which must have action plans approved by auditors, and opportunities for improvement (OFI's), which may be actioned at the discretion of the participants.
- Auditors contacted one PAG member during the audit process.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG Who makes decisions on how the debris piles are made and where they are put? Debris piles and stubs are critical habitat. Trappers should be consulted on this issue.

Response (J. Beale): Measures to meet wildlife objectives are prescribed by qualified professionals in SLP's, depending on site specific information, and previous consultation at the FOS with stakeholders, including trappers.

Question from PAG: What is being done with the wildlife corridors?

Response (G. Wallin): Gail explained that wildlife corridors are not in the Matrix and so it was not assessed in the audit.

Question from PAG: Why is there auditor discretion involved in audit findings (referring to the terminology used in the presentation when explaining 'opportunities for improvement'. He was concerned the Canfor would not have to act upon an opportunity for improvement when there could be benefits from doing so e.g. mapping)?

Response (D. Menzies): Explained more thoroughly the opportunities for improvement.

Followup from PAG: Could be beneficial for Canfor to improve upon mapping.

Question from Advisor: Is there some sort of action plan associated with non-conformances and opportunities for improvement from the audit? Do they get approved? What is the timeline for approval and implementation of the action plans? Can they be discussed at the PAG?

Response (J. Beale, G. Wallin): Action plans, the 'signing-off' of action plans, the timeline (1 month) associated with developing an action plan, and having it approved by the auditor were all explained to The PAG. The PAG meets 2 times per year so they can't be discussed with the PAG prior to being signed off. There is a possibility the action plans can be reviewed at a PAG meeting.

ACTION 6: Participants to review options for providing actions plan information to PAG.

6. Review Annual Report

Sections for Discussion:

- Gail asked the attendants if there were any specific sections they wanted to discuss and review.
 - One section was identified for review: 3.42: 'Damage to Range Improvements'.

Presentation:

- Dave Menzies showed a power point presentation that summarized the significant points of the 2005-2006 Annual Report. Highlights of the presentation:
 - Deciduous harvest on Forest Licences started to support OSB plant opening.
 - Mixedwood Reforestation Strategy was completed.
 - Species at Risk stand level management guidelines implemented.
 - Requirement to harvest a portion of the small pine timber resource was met.
 - Met allowable area objectives for permanent access structures (roads)
 - Participants were consistent with 58 of 61 indicators.
 - 7 minor contraventions reported to government
 - 3,335 ha harvested
 - 4,057 ha planted
- As there is considerable overlap in requirements, rather than produce 2 separate reports as done in 2004-2005, this report combines both the legal reporting requirements from the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation, and the CSA reporting requirements. Red font was used to differentiate the legal requirements from the non-legal.

Proposed Changes to the Matrix:

- Indicator # 16: Minor wording changes from 'Objectives' to 'General Wildlife Measures' to be consistent with wording in legislation.

Question from the PAG: Are there any other implications of this change other than wording?

Response (J. Scheck): Joelle explained that the GWM are more results-based. Objectives used to be more specific but the result is the same.

The PAG accepted this change.

Discussion/Questions

Question from PAG: Wanted confirmation that the mixedwood strategy is not part of the annual report.

Response: It's not included in the annual report but development of a Mixedwood strategy was required to address a CSA non-conformance from a previous audit.

Question from the PAG Where can we get a copy of the mixed wood strategy?

Response/Comment: The participants could consider including the mixedwood strategy in the annual report as an appendix, or find some other way to make the strategy available to the general public.

ACTION 7: Participants to explore options to make the mixedwood section of the Landscape Level Reforestation Strategy available to PAG members for review.

Question from PAG: When you compare the areas harvested to areas reforested, there is more ground seemingly being logged than planted. As well, Louisiana-Pacific is not involved in any harvesting.

Response: The reason LP is not showing any reforestation is that the logging just started in the deciduous areas, so it does not show in this annual report. The reason for the discrepancies in planting vs. logging are the deciduous blocks are left to regenerate naturally, so there is no planting involved on these sites.

PAG Comment: This is confusing to the public eye.

ACTION 8: Clarify in the Annual Report why there is no reporting on reforestation in LP deciduous stands, and determine how reforestation in deciduous blocks will be summarized in future reports.

Question from PAG: (In reference to the proposed working changes to indicator #16) Are these Wildlife Habitat Area's only in the Muskwa- Kechika Management Area?

Response: WHA's will be explained in next presentation on wildlife.

Question from PAG: Is the Tembec Licence a conifer Licence?

Response: Yes, it's Tembec's conifer licence in the FSJ Timber Supply Area.

Comment from PAG: The Report is better than last year's.

Review of Section #3. 42

Comment/Question: Dale Johnson wanted clarification to this section. The annual report shows 2 damaged fences but still listed the participants as being in 100% conformance with this indicator.

Response: There is an acceptable variance written into this indicator, which allows short-term damage to range improvements (e.g. cutting a fence to put a road through), in consultation with the range tenure holder, provided that the damage is repaired in a timely manner. If the range structure is damaged and repaired within the acceptable time listed in the indicator, it is not a non-conformance.

ACTION 9: Re-write the 'current status' for this indicator in the Annual Report to clarify that the activity is consistent with the variance.

7. Presentation to the Public Advisory Group-Wildlife Habitat Areas and Ungulate Winter Ranges.

Presentation:

- Joelle Scheck gave a Power Point presentation on Wildlife Habitat Areas and Ungulate Winter Ranges and associated General Wildlife Measures (GWM) in the Fort St. John TSA. She described some of the specific herds in the Peace area, their characteristics and threats to populations. She told the PAG about what types of areas are being proposed as WHA's and UWR's, their locations, and the restrictions on activities that may apply to these areas.

Discussion/Questions:

Question from PAG: What is the source of the Chinchaga caribou herd's calf mortality that has occurred in the last couple years?

Response (J. Scheck): Predation by wolves is the biggest problem for calves in most all herds. There is also some predation by black bears.

Question from PAG: There have been a lot of studies done in the South on Mountain Caribou. Can we apply those studies to the caribou up here?

Response (J. Scheck): Yes, D. Seip has been looking to those studies for guidance. Behavioral differences in the herds up here prevent the studies from being fully relied upon.

Question from PAG: Are UWR/WHA's going to impact fire and forest health protection and mitigation strategies? Which management plan will supercede?

Response (J. Scheck): Licensees can request variance against GWM's within these areas. This will be important in areas where beetles are impacting.

Question from Participant: Have there been any fires in WHA/UWR elsewhere in the province? Is there a precedent here?

Response (J. Scheck): There is no precedent. Fire would be welcomed in a lot of these areas to promote production of lichen that the herds rely upon.

Question from Advisor: Have you considered how global warming will impact these plans?

Response (J. Scheck): Global warming will impact Snowpack. Studies say caribou will react the same despite the lack of snow.

Clarification from Advisor: I was meaning the impact of global warming on management plans more than animals. The MOE should be considering the impact of global warming and beetle populations in their approach to management plans.

Question from PAG Is there anything being done with the mountain goats in Sikanni/Buckinghorse area?

Response (J. Scheck): There are WHA's approved for goats in that area.

Comment from PAG: Oil and gas should get all this information.

Response (J. Scheck): They have been informed but unfortunately these WHA/UWR/GWM's do not apply to oil and gas activity.

Response (R. St. Jean): Just because the law doesn't apply to the oil and gas industry does not mean the Oil and Gas Commission is not considering these regulations in their reviews.

8. Update on Mountain Pine Beetle Status in Fort St. John

Presentation:

- Andrew Tyrrell talked about how the Mountain Pine beetle (MPB) is being managed in Fort St. John and the history of the beetle in our area and how to identify it. Some highlights of the update:
 - Beetles arrived in July
 - Travel long distances transported by strong winds
 - Large areas in the south part of the FSJ Timber Supply Area have been the subject of recent aerial overviews, and possible beetle infection centers have been identified.
 - Ground-based examination of the potentially infected areas ("probing") will begin soon.
 - Fall and burn will be starting this winter
 - The North Peace area is thought to be less susceptible to huge MPB outbreaks than other areas of the Interior.
 - Cold weather will impact beetle populations.

Questions/Discussion:

Question from PAG: We have current population numbers. Will there be additional monitoring to keep an eye on future populations?

Response: There will be ongoing monitoring. We need to address current sites by fall and burn. There is no guarantee that we identified 100% of the sites on our aerial recce so monitoring is important.

Question from PAG: Are there any chemical control options?

Response: We are no longer allowed to use MSMA as a pesticide, but pheromone baiting and verminol are options.

Question from PAG: Fall and burn has not worked in the past so why are we doing it?

Response: Fall and burn has had some effect in the south but the weather patterns increased populations, so the impact of the fall and burn seemed minimal. Because of the dry weather we were able to spot our infection sites early so we are ahead of the game.

Question from PAG: Can we use beetle wood as firewood when we come across it in the bush?

Response (MOFR): Yes, but it is important to make sure it is infected with MPB and tell us where you found it. There will be a brochure distributed in the Peace on how to identify Mountain Pine beetle. The beetle is behaving a little different here than in other areas of the province. The beetle population up here has 2 and 3-year life cycles.

Question from PAG: If there is beetle on private land, will Canfor come in to take care of it?

Response: Fall and burn can only occur on Crown land but there is a federal program in place for private land.

Question from PAG: Why are we not harvesting pine as fast as we can?

Response (MOF): That has been the approach in the South Peace.

Question from PAG: Is there a beetle that kills the MPB?

Response: Not that anyone is aware of.

Question from PAG: Is there mitigation during transport of beetle-killed timber?

Response: Yes, we are in the process of developing a strategy of marking, timing, storing and milling beetle wood.

9. PAG Membership

Inactive members were reviewed.

- Chad Dalke, the Oil and Gas industry representative, was identified as inactive. A request for suggestions for an alternate for the Oil and Gas industry was made and there were no suggestions. Roger St. Jean, an observer from the Oil and Gas Commission, was asked for suggestions. Roger agreed to provide suggestions to Jeff Beale.

ACTION 10: Determine alternate representative from the oil and gas industry.

Alternate members were reviewed.

- Range, Commercial Recreation, and Trapping were all identified as having no alternate member.
- The range representative expressed the need for an alternate. The PAG was asked for any suggestions for range alternate. Jeff Beale suggested Jack Trask as a range alternate. The representative agreed to look for additional names to sit as an alternate.

ACTION 11: Determine alternate member for Range.

- There was no representative from Commercial Recreation at the meeting. The group was asked for any suggestions for an alternate for this group. No suggestions were received. The PAG was asked to forward any suggestions for an alternate for Commercial Recreation to Jeff Beale.

ACTION 12: Determine alternate member for Commercial Recreation.

- There is no designated alternate for Trapping. Gail instructed the trapper in attendance (D. Salmond) to work out the designation within the Trappers association and communicate it to the PAG.

ACTION 13: Confirm representative and determine alternate member for Trapping.

- The alternate representative for Urban Communities was found to be inactive. The PAG was asked for any suggestions for a new Urban Communities alternate. No suggestions were received. Orland Wilkerson was asked for suggestions. No suggestions were received.

ACTION 14: Determine alternate member for Urban Communities.

Authorization to Publish PAG member's names

- PAG members were asked to grant participants permission to publish their names in the newspaper as part of an advertisement requirement under the Fort St. John Pilot Project Regulation. All members attending agreed to have their names published.

ACTION 15: Contact members not in attendance to get permission to publish their names in the newspaper for the purpose of an advertisement.

Comment from PAG: Will there be contact information in the advertisement? How will the public get in contact with PAG members if they have an issue they want brought up at a meeting?

Response: We can post the website address on the advertisement. If the public wants to get in touch with a PAG member, we can put them in contact with the member via the website or provide an alternate contact on the website.

ACTION 16: Confirm and implement the means by which public can get in touch with PAG member for the purpose of raising an issue at a meeting on their behalf.

10. Public Presentations

- There were no public presentations.

11. Next Meeting

Topics for Next Meeting

- Matrix 2006/07. The 2005/06 Matrix was distributed by Gail. The PAG members were asked to review the 2005/06 Matrix and make note of things they may want to change/add/remove for the new matrix.
- Field Trip. The PAG members were asked to think about whether they wanted to do another field trip and what possible topics they may want to discuss or look at.
- Mountain Pine Beetle. There was discussion on making MPB a standard update at PAG meetings.
- Heritage Trail Presentation
- Forest Practices Board Audit Findings (BCTS)-report the results at the next PAG meeting.

ACTION 17: Organize presentations for next PAG meeting.

Annual Report Discussion:

- D. Menzies told the PAG members that the Annual Report they have copies of is in draft form. Changes will be made to the draft based on the comments provided at this meeting. If all members agreed, the final draft will not be mailed out but would be available on the website within one month after the final submission. Members were asked if everyone was comfortable with not receiving a paper copy of the final draft. All members in attendance agreed.

Next Meeting Date:

- After some discussion, the PAG agreed the highest attendance would be found at a meeting scheduled for a Monday or Thursday evening in early April.
- It was identified that having a March meeting aligned well with the Annual Reporting period set out in the FSJ Pilot Project Regulation