

**Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group
Draft Summary of March 5, 2009 Meeting
Village Inn, Vanderhoof**

For approval at next meeting in October/November, 2009

1. In Attendance

1.1 Public

Dan Brooks	John DeGagne
Randall Springer	Ray Bradner
Ginny Springer	Ron Stephen
Gerd Erasmus	

1.2 Licensee Team

Janine Gervais	Bruce Middleton
Stuart Sinclair	Dave Watt

1.3 Facilitation and Support

Gail Wallin	Heather Davis
-------------	---------------

1.4 Observers

Bruce Bradley	Cathy Middleton
---------------	-----------------

1.5 Guests

Ross Mabee	Greg Blackburn
Kevin Hoekstra	

2. PAG Members Not in Attendance

2.1 Absent with Regrets

Dean Toll	Gary Holte
Leonard Ratcliffe	John Martens
Steve Little	

3. Documents Distributed

- Draft Agenda – Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan PAG March 5, 2009
- Canfor Internal and External Audit Update
- Riparian Sensitive Species Monitoring and Management Strategies in the Vanderhoof Forest District presentation slides – DWB Forestry Ltd.
- Lakeshore Management Discussions slides; March 13, 2008 Riparian and Lakeshore Management presentation slides (recap)
- Vanderhoof SFM Plan PAG Questionnaire (Satisfaction Survey)
- Current Development Matrix (from March 13, 2008) – as requested

4. Welcome and Introduction

The meeting commenced at 4:05 pm. For those members not able to attend the last meeting, Janine Gervais clarified her position as the new chair for the License Working Group. Three guests were introduced as registered professional biologists who were giving presentations at this meeting: Ross Mabee, Greg Blackburn and Kevin Hoekstra. Ross Mabee is a biologist with Avison Management Services Ltd. and was asked to provide an overview perspective of Lakeshore Management with respect to water quality and fisheries. Greg Blackburn and Kevin Hoekstra are biologists with DWB Forestry Services, and were presenting their research results for riparian sensitive species monitoring and management strategies. Gail Wallin went through the agenda, and proposed that the Lakeshore Management discussion take place before the discussion on the Development Matrix. This change to the agenda was approved.

5. Meeting Summary and Action Items Review

There were no corrections to the November 27 meeting summary. A report against each of the Action Items was provided by the Licensee Team. Gail Wallin proposed that reference numbers and names be put beside action items. This was approved.

Action #1: Include names with reference numbers beside action items.

- 5.1 **Action #1: Revise Annual Report with respect to Coarse Woody Debris – Done.**
- 5.2 **Action #2: (1-2.10) Develop Management Strategies for Riparian Sensitive Species - revise target date to March 31, 2010 and present Phase 2 to the PAG - Presentation tonight, no management strategies yet to be presented (remains open).**
- 5.3 **Action #3: (1-3.1) Effectiveness Monitoring Plans for Indicator Species – revise target date to March 31, 2011, and provide annual updates to PAG. Done, see Annual Report for update (to be picked up at Avison).**
- 5.4 **Action #4: (4-2.5, 6-1.5, 9-5.1) Support Opportunities in the DFA - Increase variance to 25 – Done, changes reflected in updated Development Plan Matrix.**
- 5.5 **Action #5: (4-3.1) Business Opportunities with First Nations - Revise target to ≥ 20 , with a variance of 10 – Done, changes reflected in updated Development Plan Matrix.**
- 5.6 **Action #6: (4-5.1, 9-4.3) DFA Managed Under a Fire Preparedness Plan - Replace “Fire Preparedness Plan” with “Emergency Preparedness Plan” or “Emergency Response Plan” – Done, changes reflected in updated Development Plan Matrix.**
- 5.7 **Action #7: (1-2.11, 1-4.2) Stream Crossing Density - Target would be reported out every 5 years – Done, changes reflected in updated Development Plan Matrix.**
- 5.8 **Action #8: Send letter to City Council requesting replacement for Brian Frenkel, membership reviewed at future meeting. Done. Steve Little to replace Brian Frenkel. Steve was unable to attend March 5, 2009 meeting. Next membership review to be done at fall 2009 meeting (remains open).**

6. Canfor Update: 2008 Internal and External Audits

Janine Gervais reported on the Canfor 2008 Audits. Vanderhoof was recommended for re-certification for their Environmental Management System (EMS), their Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and their Chain of Custody (CoC). There were no major or minor non-conformances in the internal audit. In the external audit, 2 minor non-conformances from 2005 were identified and were addressed. All Canfor divisions will be under a single certificate. This would provide some cost savings to Canfor. If one division loses its certification, then only that division is removed from the certificate.

7. Riparian Sensitive Species Project Presentation – DWB Forestry Services Ltd.

Greg Blackburn presented the PowerPoint presentation. Questions were fielded by Kevin Hoekstra. A handout of the slides was given.

The goal of the study was to see if the diversity and abundance of indicator species was greatest in wetlands with the largest riparian reserve. There were 6 sites where 4 different types of retention were measured. It was very difficult to find enough sites with the right criteria within the DFA. The researchers found that there was little to no difference with respect to species diversity and abundance between the four retention types. Their recommendation was to continue with current harvest management strategies. They also recommended continuing to replicate the study every 10 years to monitor diversity, as the retention areas will change over time, along with the species diversity and abundance. A final report on the study will be available at end of the month.

Action #2: Circulate print or email copies of the final Riparian Sensitive Species Project research report, based on the sign up sheet distributed.

A discussion followed the presentation, with clarification being asked for some of the more technical aspects of the study. A point was made that a species of interest was the beaver, yet no beaver were tracked in the study. The researchers stated that there were not enough sites with the required habitat for beaver in the DFA to make a statistically significant sample size. A question about whether harvest practices should stay the same (one of the recommendations) was raised; the response was that the scope of the study was not really large enough to say definitively either way, but that the different levels of retention left after logging did not appear to have an impact on the presence or absence of the indicator species studied. If a larger sample size could be found, the abundance of the indicator species could be studied, which would probably tell more about the impacts of the harvest practices.

Action #3: LT to come back to PAG with recommendations on next step with respect to Riparian Sensitive Species study.

8. Satisfaction Survey (filled out at dinner)

The facilitator asked PAG members to fill out the Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire over dinner and to hand it in at the end of the meeting.

Action #4: PAG members to fill out Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire, return completed questionnaire by the end of the meeting. Results to be reported back to the PAG.

9. Lakeshore Management Discussion

Group agreed to start presentation on Lakeshore Management before dinner. An overview from past meetings was presented by Janine Gervais. This discussion was a follow-up to PAG concerns that there appears to be an “inconsistent approach” to lakeshore management between the district licensees. It was clarified that there are different management approaches, and the licensees are following the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA) and their Forest Stewardship Plans (FSP), while considering the Draft Lakeshore Management Plan (DLMP). Some of the licensees had chosen to adopt the FRPA defaults for lakeshore riparian management, instead of adopting those in the draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan. This in particular was of significant concern to one PAG member. The facilitator reminded the group that their role is to provide advice at a strategic level, not an operational level.

Ross Mabee presented information regarding the integrity of the lakeshore from a biological and environmental point of view (water quality and fisheries). He stated that it was important to remember that these types of plans were developed in a world where forests were healthy. His professional opinion is that the riparian reserve zone (RRZ) has very little impact on a lake and on fish and fish habitat, except near the shore. He said that riparian areas are very important for other factors, including wildlife habitat, visual quality and recreation opportunities. He clarified that riparian management zones (RMZ) serve to buffer the riparian reserve zone from windthrow incidence. Ross mentioned that RMZ retention is generally site specific (i.e. how wide the zones actually are) and reflects operational and silvicultural activities within those zones. Ross stated that in order to keep lake water and lake habitats healthy, it is important to keep the associated streams healthy; streams provide nutrient inputs, temperature fluctuations and sediment transport. Ross had a concern that the dead pine in the RRZs could fall into lakes, which may contribute to a lack of oxygen (anoxia), which could ultimately negatively impact trout populations.

Break for Dinner at 5:47pm.

The discussion around Lakeshore Management continued after dinner. A general question was asked, not directly related to the topic at hand: several members felt that it is very hard to get their input heard by licensees when blocks are proposed in their interest areas. The LT replied that there is a measure in the SFMP related to providing stakeholders and the public an opportunity to provide input into planning activities (reported annually). This specific topic was proposed as a future agenda item.

Action #5: Consider a future agenda topic regarding: Communication processes on planning and different ways of communicating between licensees and tenure holders.

A concern was raised that the FRPA lakeshore defaults do not appear to address values other than biology, pursuant to a discussion about the flexible way that licensees deal with windthrow in riparian areas. The LT stated that different interest groups and users is what land use planning is all about and that blanket legislation does not work for all lakeshores, flexibility is needed.

- The facilitator asked John DeGagne to explain the linkage between the LRMP and the draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan. John said that the Vanderhoof LRMP directs creation of the plan, while the Lakeshore Classification Guidebook provides guidelines on the actual lakeshore classifications. The plan is not a legal plan, in the sense it was prepared in 1997 and was not made known under the Forest Practices Code and was not grandparented into FRPA. A suggestion was put forth that the specifics in the plan may not apply in the post-mountain pine

beetle world. Further discussion followed, with concerns over what guiding documents are used by licensees to establish riparian buffers around lakes. Concerns were expressed over the relationship between the FRPA defaults and the draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan. One member suggested that visual quality concerns (a factor of lakeshore classification) around lakes were only addressed for those operators who participated at the LRMP table.

10. PAG Input on Development Matrix – part 1

The PAG discussed changes to the Development Matrix. Three measures were brought forth for discussion:

- a measure around lakeshore classification;
- changes to access management measures;
- a measure to reflect LRMP social values.

Following dinner, the facilitator asked the PAG for recommendations to the licensees for a measure to reflect Lakeshore Management. A recommendation was put forth that the licensees abide by the Draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan. After some discussion, it was determined that there was a lack of comfort across the PAG with plan and they were not willing to accept the measure. Some members did not understand the plan and felt they couldn't make any decisions as a group at this time. The facilitator made several efforts to move this forward, suggesting that the licensees report annually on Lakeshore Management and in those cases where management does not follow the plan, how values such as recreation opportunity, wildlife, visual quality and biodiversity are considered.

Action #6: LT to provide further information on the Draft Lakeshore Management plan (provide copies to members - sign-up list for copies passed around).

Action #7: Licensees to bring a draft measure to the next meeting that could reflect: "Report on lakeshore management activities that vary from the draft Vanderhoof Lakeshore Classification Plan and address how values such as recreation opportunity, wildlife, visual quality, and biodiversity have been considered".

The facilitator suggested tabling the discussions on the two other measures (access management and the LRMP) in the interest of time. The group agreed.

Action #8: Future agenda items to include: Access Management with respect to Development Matrix and LRMP with respect to Development Matrix.

11. Sinclar Group Update

Dave Watt, the senior manager for Sinclar Enterprises, let the group know that the Sinclar Group (L&M Lumber Ltd., Lakeland Mills Ltd., Apollo and Winton Global) will be switching from CSA certification to SFI (Sustainable Forestry Initiative) certification, and that they will be withdrawing from the PAG after this meeting. This decision was a business decision for the Sinclar Group. Some discussion followed over why they chose SFI certification over CSA; some of their reasons included: significant cost savings, a larger management area, more "user-friendly" certification for the four companies, CSA certification is not as important (as once was) for its customers, as long as the company is certified, and there is no requirement for a public advisory group under SFI. There was concern that this would change the PAG significantly,

and that the other licensees would be following the same path. Members were concerned over amount of time they had invested in this process and it was coming down to economics regardless. Canfor and BCTS both assured that PAG that, for now, they would be continuing with CSA certification, while looking at ways to streamline the process. In this case, there are two changes to deal with: 1. There will be a change to the DFA because of the Sinclair Group leaving, and 2. There is a new CSA Standard to be written into the SFMP. Janine and Bruce indicated that incorporating new standard was good opportunity to revise, condense and streamline the plan.

Action #9: Licensees to provide an update on the next agenda, with respect to what they think is coming (i.e. indicator changes, dropping/revising measures, changes to DFA etc).

12. Feedback on Meeting

A general debrief was held to seek feedback on the meeting. Following are the comments:

- Put Sinclair announcement at the beginning (no - otherwise would have destroyed the meeting).
- Sinclair announcement could have been done by email – Dave wanted to do face-to-face.
- Gerd was late, and missed what he thought was the most important part, which was report on measure he had fought for.
- Ross and DWB's presentations were good additions to the meeting; they gave good, understandable information; the information was needed.
- The group dwelled on lakeshore management more than needed, but probably because they were not ready for it.
- PAG to undergo another iteration
- Dealing with same issues in consecutive meetings hard on the PAG members, important to come to conclusions/consensus and move forward.
- Recognition for Stuart and Dave's contributions.

13. Next Meeting

The date for the next meeting will likely be in late fall (November). The Licensee Team will send out proposed dates. The draft agenda could include:

- Membership review
- Communication processes on planning and different ways of listening between licensees and tenure holders.
- Finalizing discussion on Lakeshore Management (review info forwarded).
- Licensees to come forward with draft measure to report annually with respect to lakeshore management and consideration of values like recreation opportunity, wildlife, visual quality and biodiversity.
- Discuss changes to development matrix with respect to access management, and the LRMP.
- Pellet Plant Tour
- Carbon Project Presentation