

Prince George SFMP PAG Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, January 13, 2011

Civic Centre, Prince George, BC

MEETING Summary

In Attendance:

<p><u>Public & First Nations:</u> Betty Abbs – Local Government Chris Andreschefski - Private Landowners Doug Beckett – Public Interest Shannon Carson – Public Interest (alternate) Mark Clark- Small Timber Tenures Teena Demeulemeester - West Moberly First Nation Ray Hourie – Small Business Michelle Hourie – Tourism and Recreation, Commercial, Motorized Dave King – Recreation, non-motorized Melanie Karjala – Research & Education Sandra Kinsey – Naturalists Jeff Mohr – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized (alternate) Patience Rakochy – Non Timber Forest Products Laura Ryser – Research & Education (alternate) Lee Sexsmith – Recreation, non-commercial, motorized Don Wilkins – Commercial Wildlife Interests Ian Wilson – Hunting and Fishing</p>	<p><u>Steering Committee:</u> Chair: Sara Cotter - Canfor Lee Evans – BCTS</p>
<p><u>Facilitator & Scribe:</u> Dwight Scott Wolfe (Tesera Systems Inc.) Loni Spletzer</p>	<p><u>Advisors & Observers:</u> Greg Yeomans – Planning Forester Canfor Jim McCormack – Planning Coordinator, Canfor Ralph Hausot – Planning Forester, Canfor Jerry Noakes – Aleza Lake</p>

1. Welcome & Introductions – Sara Cotter

- a. Introduction of members and guests. Regrets received from Esther Perry, Virginia Karr, Anne Migvar, Jo Graber, Tan Calhoun, Dave Kim that they are unable to attend

tonight's meeting. PAG members informed that Gerald Bird has made the decision to step down as Métis representative.

- b. Meeting Evaluation results from the November 30, 2010 PG PAG meeting were posted. Comments reviewed. All items above target.

2. Reviewed Agenda

- a. Accepted as written

3. Reviewed Minutes of November 30, 2010 PAG Meeting

- a. Section 1. Welcome & Introductions item b. clarify that Laura is Research Manager for UNBC Community Development Institute
- b. Minutes accepted as revised

4. Quorum Requirement for PAG Meetings

- a. Reviewed Terms of Reference: currently quorum is 50% + 1 of interest sectors, Licensees would like to remove quorum requirement based on history of good attendance (average of 9 or more over the last 2 years).
- b. Discussion:
 - PAG member feels that since there is good attendance history and there are alternates for most interest sectors so most times there should be someone in attendance
 - PAG member would like to leave the quorum as is since then there is discussion with everyone, not just one or two sectors
 - PAG member would like to see some sort of minimum threshold even though may not be 50%
 - PAG member asked if any business can be done without quorum if it is in Terms of Reference. Facilitator said nothing can be voted on, but there could be "housekeeping" items taken care of (ie. Presentations, etc).
 - PAG member stated that "world is ran by those that show up" – has no problem dropping quorum requirements.
 - PAG not comfortable with dropping quorum requirement altogether and suggest reducing the quorum requirement to 33% + 1 which would be approx 8 PAG representatives.
- c. General agreement with three dissensions to reduce quorum requirement to 33% + 1.
 - a. Reason for dissensions: The 3 PAG members do not think this is the best choice and would prefer to leave quorum at 50% + 1.

5. Discussion Items and Indicator Revisions (SFM Element 3.2 Water Quality and Quantity)

- a. Reviewed Handouts
 - a. Powerpoint presentation on Water Quality and Quantity.

- i. Reviewed historical context of Watershed Management (pre Forest Practices Code prior to 1995 and Forest Practices Code (1995 – 2004))
 1. There is one community watershed near Pritchard Creek near Sinclair Mills - Canfor Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) states that the FSP holders will not conduct harvesting or road building activities for the term of the FSP, in the community watershed.
 2. PAG member asked how this area got this exclusion. Licensees said they could dig up some info and provide PAG member with this.
- ii. Reviewed Riparian Management Classification
 1. Reviewed Riparian Management Strategies – Forest and Range Practices Act (2004-present) which include 11 core values, penalties, monitoring, CSA Standard Indicator
 2. PAG member asked about dead Mountain Pine Beetle stands impacting water quality in watersheds. LSC explained that the understory contributes. LSC not sure how it will impact and there is some literature out, but it needs to be reviewed.
 3. PAG member asked if there will be a “reassessment” of how these dead stands impact watershed water quality. LSC will be presenting tools on management and data collection.
 4. PAG member was previously involved with 2 provincial hydrologists who used new science to develop an approach which incorporates mortality into calculating the Equivalent Clear Cut Area (ECA) for a watershed. The PAG member showed the criteria for calculating ECA’s from this approach. The PAG member indicated that even more recent science suggests extra consideration should be given prior to harvesting in watersheds with an ECA greater than 30% using this approach.
 5. Guest noted that dead stands do not go back to zero, small diameter trees still contribute.
- iii. Definition of Watershed and what constitutes a Healthy Watershed were reviewed
 1. Characteristics of a Healthy Watershed includes 1) Land Condition, 2) Chemical/Physical parameters and 3)Hydrology.
 2. PAG member asked how frequently sedimentation assessments are conducted. LSC explained there is monitoring around areas of bridges, stream crossings and road construction that may cause sedimentation during harvesting and any areas that require attention are addressed immediately. Guest specified that each area is “risk assessed” and given a rating. This is an Environmental Management System (EMS) commitment and is audited. PAG member said that in his experience the road construction was not the issue but that right – of – way clearing caused more issues.

- iv. Reviewed slides of Stable Sites showing various methods of minimizing disturbances and looked at diagram of “The Ideal Stream Crossing”.
 1. PAG member asked about the size of stone riprap zones on each side of bridge. LSC explained that it varies based on bridge design.
 - v. Reviewed Watershed Assessment as developed by Dobson Engineering and used by Canfor and BCTS to assess watersheds
 1. Reviewed Dobson approach (3 step process) 1) Watershed Sensitivity, 2) Peak Flow Index Risk Rating Procedure, 3) Hydrologic Risk Rating Assessment.
 2. Reviewed definitions for Peak Flow Buffering, Terrain Stability, Watershed Relief, Channel Pattern, and Channel Stability
 3. PAG member asked about Peak Flow and that despite lakes and wetlands it seems that many streams and rivers seem to be higher than in past years and wonders about where the historical information can be referenced.
 - vi. Reviewed a support tool (3-step spreadsheet which captures data including Watershed Sensitivity Rating, Equivalent Clear-cut Area Calcifications, and Peak Flow Index (PFI))
 1. PAG member concurred that the most recent science shows that a Q100 rating for drainage structures is not enough.
 2. PAG member asked what triggers a risk assessment. – is it the ranking? LSC said it would be up to the hydrologist to determine what should be done in light of the ranking.
 3. PAG member asked what range of ECA’s occurs by Dobson risk category? PAG member expressed concern that it is not clear whether Dobson Approach triggers extra consideration to be given prior to harvesting when ECA (incorporating mortality) is around 30% and is very concerned with the effects of mortality being ignored. LSC commented that this Approach (which does not factor in mortality) is provided to them by a professional hydrologist. PAG member requested copies of the Dobson Approach which would be given to other hydrologists to review. PAG member asked that decisions regarding this indicator be delayed until after this review.
- b. Core Indicator 3.2.1 Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand replacing disturbance.
- a. LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #56, PG Indicator # 57 and TFL30 Indicator #26 with new Proposed wording of Core indicator 3.2.1a.
 - b. Existing PG Indicator #56: The percent of active watersheds with PFI greater than the minimum threshold that have had a watershed risk evaluation completed. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%
 - c. Existing PG Indicator # 57: The percent of active high risk watersheds that are assessed by a qualified professional. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%

- d. Existing TFL30 Indicator #26: Peak flow index (PFI) for each watershed within the DFA. Target: Target #1: Each year, 100% of the watersheds will be below the baseline target in Table 12. Variance #1: -10%. Target #2: Each year, all watersheds that exceed the baseline target will have a watershed review completed wherever new harvesting is planned. Variance #2: 0%.
- e. New Indicator 3.2.1a: The percentage of watersheds with active operations that have had a watershed assessment completed. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%.
- f. Discussion:
 - i. PAG member noted that he has seen changes in climate (ie. Rainfall) after clear cuts and wondered about climate monitoring in watersheds. LSC said that it would be difficult to capture and/or predict this kind of thing.
 - ii. PAG member wondered about adding the “Dobson Approach” to the indicator statement. The LSC said this detail will be included in the SFM plan
- g. General Agreement with 2 dissensions on replacing PG Indicator #56, PG Indicator # 57 and TFL30 Indicator #26 with new Proposed wording of Core indicator 3.2.1a: *The percentage of watersheds with active operations that have had a watershed assessment completed. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%*
 - i. Reasons for dissention: Both PAG members want time to compare the Dobson Approach with other approaches and are not comfortable with the “science” until they have a chance to explore further.
- h. LSC Recommendation: replace PG Indicator #58 with new Proposed wording of Core indicator 3.2.1b.
- i. Existing PG Indicator #58: Identical wording to proposed New Indicator 3.2.1b.
- j. New Indicator 3.2.1b: The percentage of active operations within high-risk watersheds that are consistent with recommendations of hydrologic assessments. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%.
- k. Discussion:
 - i. PAG suggested changing the wording of the indicator statement to “*the percentage of active operations within high-risk watersheds that implement the recommendations of a hydrologic assessment*”.
 - ii. PAG member asked about fish sensitive areas in the DFA. Currently there are 3 watersheds in the DFA that have been proposed for Fisheries Sensitive Watershed designation.– Canfor and BCTS are not active in 2 of the watersheds, Canfor has harvested some permitted blocks in the 3rd watershed.
 - iii. PAG member would like to see some discussion around sensitive fish areas and where it would apply in the future.
 - iv. PAG member would prefer to see hydrological assessments completed on watersheds with moderate risk as well. LSC cannot commit to anything more than high risk at this time.

- v. PAG member not comfortable adopting the Dobson Approach – does not think this is the most current science.
- l. General Agreement with 4 dissensions on replacing PG Indicator #58, with revised Proposed wording of Core indicator 3.2.1b: *The percentage of active operations within high-risk watersheds that implement the recommendations of a hydrologic assessment. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%*
 - i. Reasons for dissention:
 - 1. Two PAG members want time to compare the Dobson Approach with other approaches and are not comfortable with the “science” until they have a chance to explore further.
 - 2. PAG member wants to see an indicator statement around protecting fish (this indicator statement seems to lack anything around fisheries habitat).
 - 3. PAG member feels that moderate risk assessment should trigger hydrological assessment.
 - m. LSC Recommendation: replace TFL 30 Indicator #24 with new proposed wording of Core indicator 3.2.1c.
 - n. Existing TFL 30 Indicator #24: Stream Crossing Quality Index (SCQI) for each watershed within the DFA. Target: 100% of Sub-basins to have <10% SCQI “high index” concerns. Variance: -25%.
 - o. New Indicator 3.2.1c: Percentage of high hazard drainage structures in high risk watersheds with identified water quality concerns that have mitigation strategies implemented. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%.
 - p. Discussion:
 - i. PAG member would like to strike “high risk” so that it would read: *“Percentage of high hazard drainage structures in watersheds with identified water quality concerns that have mitigation strategies implemented”*. LSC is fine with the suggested change to the wording.
 - ii. PAG member asked for clarification on “high hazard drainage”. Guest clarified that high hazard is a standard operating procedure ranking (ie. Silty soil would be part of high hazard – water quality is imbedded in the high hazard drainage ranking).
 - q. PAG Consensus on replacing TFL 30 Indicator #24 with revised proposed wording of Core indicator 3.2.1c: *Percentage of high hazard drainage structures in watersheds with identified water quality concerns that have mitigation strategies implemented. Target: 100%, Variance: 0%*

7. CSA Element: 3.1: Soil Quality and Quantity

- a. Due to time constraints, this discussion is deferred to the next meeting.

8. Evaluation Forms requested and collected

9. Next Meetings:

- a. February 10, 2011 Prince George Civic Center 5:30 – 9: 00 pm

- b. February 24, 2011 Prince George Civic Center 5:30 – 9: 00 pm
- c. March 17, 2011 Prince George Civic Center 5:30 – 9: 00 pm

Actions- update

PRINCE GEORGE PAG				
ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Nov 2 - 03	Provide updates on attempts to recruit representation for Non-Renewable Resource Extraction.	Steering Committee	Dec 2006	In progress: positive responses received from Enbridge, PMG, and BC Hydro.
Nov 30 - 01	Provide work plan on CWD	Steering Committee	Next Meeting	