

**Vanderhoof Sustainable Forest Management Plan Public Advisory Group**  
**Draft Summary of November 27, 2008 Meeting**  
**Village Inn, Vanderhoof**

*For approval at next meeting in March, 2009*

---

**1. In Attendance**

**1.1 Public**

Dan Brooks	John DeGagne
Gerd Erasmus	Ron Stephen
Dean Toll	

**1.2 Licensee Team**

Janine Gervais	Bruce Middleton
Stuart Sinclair	

**1.3 Facilitation and Support**

Howie Hershaw	Gail Wallin
---------------	-------------

**1.4 Observers**

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

**2. PAG Members Not in Attendance**

**2.1 Absent with Regrets**

Ray Brandner	Brian Frenkel
Andy Motherwell	John Martens (no response)
Gary Holte (no response)	Lenoard Radcliffe (no response)
Randy Springer (no response)	Ginny Springer (no response)

**3. Documents Distributed**

- SFMP Annual Report Apr 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008 (Updated from email distribution)
- Indicator Trend Spreadsheet (2004/05 to 2007/08)
- Current Development Matrix (from March 13, 2008)
- Howie Hershaw – Public Opinion Survey Presentation (Powerpoint only with website address for PAG access)
- Stream Crossing Analysis Update

**4. Welcome and Introduction**

The meeting commenced at 4:05 pm. Janine Gervais was introduced as the Canfor replacement for Terry Lazaruk. Janine is a Planning Forester in Vanderhoof and will assume the role of chair from Terry (Canfor Strategic Planner), who was absent with regrets. Gail Wallin went through the agenda, which was approved. Stuart relayed to the PAG that Brian Frenkel has resigned (see New Member discussion).

## 5. Meeting Summary and Action Items Review

There were no corrections to the March 13 meeting summary. A report against each of the Action Items was provided by the Licensee Team.

- 5.1 **Action #1: Lakeshore Management** – Terry had prepared a presentation for the PAG, but since he was unable to attend this meeting, the action item will be deferred to the next meeting (remains open).
- 5.2 **Action #2 and 3: Membership Review** – Reviewed interest categories and no changes were proposed. Chair will solicit town council for replacement to Brian Frenkel. Attendance from Endako Mines (mining interest) was expected at this meeting, LT is to follow-up with proposed contact. PAG members asked to forward any potential members to chair (remains open).
- 5.3 **Action #4: Field trip** Had been organized by the LT for Fall, 2008 but was cancelled due to lack of interest (closed).
- 5.4 **Action #5: Public Opinion Survey Presentation** – to be completed at this meeting (closed).

## 6. Public Opinion Survey Presentation – Howie Hershaw

Howie Hershaw, UBC provided an overview of the findings from the public opinion survey that was completed over a year ago. The results were relatively consistent across all of the sampling areas, although there some key characteristics that emerged for each area. The presentation provided an overview of the input from the Vanderhoof area. There was some discussion around the fact that most of the respondents in this area were older men.

Presentations and detailed report can be found at the following website:

<http://www.sfm-pos.ca/>

## 7. SFMP Annual Report Review (April 1/07 – March 31/08)

The PAG was asked to review the draft 2007/08 SFM Plan to identify those measures they would like to review in detail. The LT (LT) would also be proposing revisions to certain measures. PAG members proceeded to identify specific measures they wished to discuss along with the Licensee Team. Of the current 63 indicators, the LT reported that three were not achieved in the reporting period, and that each of these would be reviewed and discussed with the PAG.

Stuart Sinclair also indicated that some of the measures in the current draft report, had since been revised from the initial distribution version and Stuart highlighted these changes as the group reviewed the Annual Report.

The following summarizes the key areas of discussion during the meeting:

- **(1-1.1, 1-5.3) Distinct Habitat Types** – discussed the progress around this measure and clarified how ecosystem grouping were being refined. Bruce Bradley (Canfor – FIA) described current project and timelines, including input/discussions with the Regional Ecologist. The 2010 reporting timeline as previously agreed by the PAG was clarified.

- **(1-2.2, 5-1.2) Snags & Live Trees Retained** – discussed why such a large variance from target (149 stems/ha vs > 8 stems/ha). The LT clarified that they utilized dumped retention, which included wildlife tree patches. Some concern was raised regarding the potential of double counting with two measures relating to stand level retention and the tree sizes being reported (i.e. everything including saplings). The LT explained the tree attributes being tallied, which are essentially the mature layer (generally stems that would be tallied in cruise  $\geq 10\text{cm}$ ). After discussion regarding dispersed versus dumped retention, the LT will give more review to a more standardized data collection method.
- **(5-1.11, 9-2.1) (% of Site Plans in Scenic Areas Meeting Visual Quality Objectives)** - Discussed reason the LT did not meet target was that population included two blocks that were approved prior to designation of scenic area (old FDP blocks). Thus a visual impact assessment was not undertaken, however blocks were small and located within scenic area with VQO of modification.
- **(1-2.2, 5-1.1) Amount of Coarse Woody Debris/Ha** – PAG members requested clarification as to what was considered Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) and the objectives of this measure. The annual report seemed to indicate that CWD was restricted to debris on the ground but in reality, it included elevated logs. The PAG stressed that is important to be clear as there is value in both types of CWD.

**Action #1:** The Annual Report will be revised to better reflect what is included in Coarse Woody Debris (as per the actual SFMP document).

- **(1-2.10) Develop Management Strategies for Riparian Sensitive Species** – The progress on this measure was outlined. Bruce Bradley described the field sampling and need for further plot establishment and sampling due to statistical analysis. Interim results of Phase 2 will be presented to the PAG. The PAG understood the complexity of the project and agreed to the revised target date of March 31, 2010.

**Action #2:** For (1-2.10) Develop Management Strategies for Riparian Sensitive Species, revise the target date to March 31, 2010 and to present Phase 2 to the PAG.

- **(1-3.1) Effectiveness Monitoring Plans for Indicator Species** – The progress associated with this measure was discussed. Bruce Bradley described the work underway with Fred Bunnell, UBC, in consultation with the regional ecologist. The PAG discussed the process of building a species accounting list within the DFA and the complexity of multi-step process. Due to this, the PAG agreed with revised target date of March 31, 2011 and requested annual updates on the project.

**Action #3:** For (1-3.1) Effectiveness Monitoring Plans for Indicator Species, revise the target date to March 31, 2011 and provide annual updates to the PAG.

- **(4-2.5, 6-1.5, 9-5.1) Support Opportunities in the DFA** – The LT reviewed the types of support opportunities and the reason for the substantial change in opportunities since last year. The current economic and market conditions had definitely had their impact. The Team indicated that the significant drop was likely due to reduction in the number of cash donations. Substantial discussion

occurred as to whether the target should be lowered but agreed to leave it stand. Instead, the PAG agreed to larger variance, with the target left as is (i.e. > 100, with variance of 25).

**Action 4:** The PAG agreed with increasing the variance to 25.

- **(4-3.1) Business Opportunities with First Nations** – The Team discussed the specific nature of First Nation opportunities and that not all SFMP signatory members could participate to the same degree. For example, the mandate for BCTS mandate requires open competition rather than direct awarding.

**Action #5:** The PAG agreed to revise target to  $\geq 20$  with variance of 10.

- **(4-5.1, 9-4.3) – DFA Managed Under a Fire Preparedness Plan.** The LT clarified that a fire preparedness plan is no longer required and would like to replace this with a current equivalent required under various certification initiatives.

**Action #6:** The PAG accepted replace fire preparedness plan with Emergency Preparedness Plan or Emergency Response Plan.

- **(4-1.2, 4-4.2) Total Projected Long Term Timber Supply** – The PAG requested clarification on the relationship of this measure to the Timber Supply Review (TSR) process. The LT clarified that this was the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) base case that has been previously discussed and presented by Forest Ecosystem Solutions. This analysis and similar modelling done for the TSR were made available to TSR group.
- **(7-1.6) Opportunities for Proactive Public Involvement in Planning Process** – As requested previously by the PAG, Stuart reported that additional information relating to the rate of response to different opportunities has been added. The LT had focused the open house event at the Vanderhoof Trade Show where there were thousands of attendees. Future informal reporting would focus on open house type responses.
- **(1-2.11, 1-4.2) Stream Crossing Density** – Bruce provided an update and handout on the analysis pertaining to this measure. New dataset indicated deficiencies in the original target and the need to establish a new target based on current baseline information. There was discussion within PAG whether this measure should be in the SFMP. This was deferred to later date when revisions/additions to development matrix were proposed by the PAG. PAG agreed with proposed revisions to the current target as suggested by the Licensee Team.

**Action #7:** The PAG agreed with the proposed revisions to the target and that it would be reported out every 5 years.

## 8. Annual Report Review

The PAG discussed effective ways of reviewing the Annual Report to ensure effective input. Following are comments for next year's process:

### Recommendation For Future Reviews:

- Target two week in advance of meeting for getting draft annual report to the PAG

- Highlight (in document) any changes between draft distribution report and report reviewed at the meeting, if there are any changes. Ideally, aim to send the same document out as will be used in the meeting.
- Send out final annual report to the PAG digitally (no paper copy unless requested).

## 9. PAG Terms of Reference and Membership

The facilitator asked PAG members whether anyone would like to review or revise the Terms of Reference which are to be done every 2 years, or earlier if desired. No PAG member requested a review. The only vacancy on the PAG is due to the departure of Brian Frenkel. The PAG reviewed the current membership and would like to seek a replacement for Brian Frenkel.

**Action #8:** The PAG recommended that a letter be sent to City Council requesting a replacement for Brian Frenkel, and that membership be reviewed at a future meeting.

## 9. Access Management Plan

Stuart Sinclair provided the following update:

- Government, BCTS and Licensees continue to work on “Implementation Plan”
- To date there have been 2 meetings with an additional meeting planned for January.
- Access Mgmt feedback webpage available to provide issues and comments regarding the plan. These issues/comments are emailed to John DeGagne.
- Will provide implementation plan updates at future meetings

## 10. Next Meeting

The Chair will send out proposed dates in the new year. The date for the next meeting will likely be in early spring. The LT will send out proposed dates early in the new year. The draft agenda could include:

- PAG proposed revisions/additions to the development matrix
- Lakeshore Management presentation
- Riparian Sensitive Species Update
- Access Management Plan Update
- Canfor Internal and External 2008 Audit Results

**Proposed Meeting Time - Thursday - March 5, 2009 (alternative date March 12, 2009)**

## 11. Feedback on Meeting

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

- Many PAG members found the **Public Opinion Survey Presentation** very interesting. They would like to discuss the follow-up and linkage to the SFMP.
- Need to move forward, not re-visit old issues, because attendance lacking.
- Would like to see more PAG members out for the meetings. Perhaps a couple of dates should be proposed for all meeting dates.