

Prince George SFMP Access PAG Subcommittee Meeting

5:30 – 9:00 PM, February 8, 2007

Civic Centre (Room 202-3), Prince George, BC

MINUTES

In Attendance:

Public & First Nations:

Betty Abbs

Chris Andreschefski

Gerald Bird

Pirie Elliot

Dave King

Sandra Kinsey

Anne Migvar

Esther Perry

Ken Pickering

Lee Sexsmith

Len Shankel

Steering Committee:

Chair: Shane Neukomm – Carrier

David Jewesson - Winton Global

Kerry Deschamps - Canfor

Tim Sproule - BCTS

Advisors & Observers:

Troy Atyeo - Winton Global

Romona Blackwell - ILMB

Daniel Burri - MoFR

Jeff Burrows - MoFR

Shannon Carson - ILMB

Ralph Hausot - Winton Global

Mike Peterson - MoE

Facilitator: Dwight Scott Wolfe (Roxanne Yanishewski & Associates)

Scribe: Gretchen Prystawik (Roxanne Yanishewski & Associates)

1. Welcome & Introductions
 - a. Welcome by Shane Neukomm of Steering Committee.
2. Reviewed Agenda
3. PAG Access Management Subcommittee Objective – Shane Neukomm
 - a. During the PAG meetings the topic of access management was raised so it was agreed by PAG members that a subcommittee meeting be held to draw out PAG members' access issues / concerns in the DFA.

4. Presentations on Access Management Responsibilities
 - a. Licensee Responsibilities - David Jewesson, Troy Atyeo, & Ralph Hausot
 - Description of road categories and responsibilities
 - Rationale for deactivation
 - Environmental liability and risk ranking
 - b. Ministry of Forests and Range Responsibilities- Jeff Burrows (presentation provided)
 - Roles and responsibilities
 - Legislative requirements
5. Group discussion to identify access issues or concerns of the PAG. Concerns have been classified as strategic (S), policy (P), or operational (O) issues.
 1. Private tenure-holders (range and trapping) should have same rights as forest licensees. (S)
 2. Tenure holders should have access into the areas covered by their tenures, and paid for by their licensing fees. (P)
 3. Damage of existing roads by other tenure holders (i.e., woodlot licensees) and maintenance responsibilities. (P)
 4. Prince George Forest District should have and should develop access management plan where all interests can be considered, prioritized, and managed – as in Vanderhoof Forest District under LRMP. (S)
 5. Comprehensive and coordinated access management planning required is to address timber supply fall down. (S/P)
 6. Public's lack of involvement in planning deactivation and access management. (O/P)
 7. Consideration of other interests in deactivation planning (i.e., recreation). (S)
 8. Lack of coordination between road users and lack of "big picture." Coordinated access management planning with all stakeholders and tenure holders, not just PAG and licensees/BCTS under the SFMP. (O)
 9. Should distinguish between forest tenures during access discussions (i.e., area vs. volume based). (P)
 10. Research/education (UNBC) should be represented during PAG and access discussions. (S)
 11. Notification and consultation of other tenure holders (range, trappers, guide/outfitters) during road construction and deactivation. (P)

12. Lack of standards and planning requirements on roads and associated safety concerns. (O)
13. Safety aspects of road use and maintenance for public and forest workers. (O)
14. Conflicting and overlapping agencies and jurisdictions of roads and maintenance, and effects on safety. (P/S)
15. Improved and more specific standards/guidelines for road use and maintenance. (P)
16. Legislation to prevent access on young (green) roads to prevent damage until they have settled and are appropriate for traffic. (P)
17. Clear standards of deactivation are required and should be variable depending on objectives. (P)
18. Seed road right of way to control erosion and provide benefits to grazers (especially in grazing license areas). (O)
19. Lack of access to areas available in the past due to road deactivation (i.e., for recreation). (O/S)
20. Inadequate deactivation and closures of specific areas, especially newer areas that have not yet been impacted as heavily as those areas with longer access histories. Deactivation based on pattern of use. (S)
21. Deactivation for water and environmental protection objectives instead of access prevention. (O)
22. Road deactivation should be for the “right interests” (i.e., water quality, wildlife habitat, etc) and by the “right means” (i.e., maintaining spirit of certification). (P/S/O)
23. In past, licensees had budget for recreation mandate to allow for access to recreational areas. Budgets don’t seem to exist anymore and access has been eliminated. In the past, licensees had flexibility in writing off some of the expenses of managing other forest values, such as access. (S)
24. Recreation under jurisdiction of MoTSA and access under MoFR. Do protocols exist between the two ministries to deal with responsibilities and budgets for recreation access. (P)
25. Too much transfer of liability and responsibilities for roads. Split/fractured jurisdiction and responsibilities of road and access management. (P)
26. All roads should have assigned responsibility (i.e., no more non-status roads should be created). (P)

6. Wrap-up: - Shane Neukomm

- a. The PAG members were thanked for the high quality of the participation.
- b. Next steps include:
 1. Categorizing of issues by Steering Committee and presentation to PAG for ranking.
 2. Any other ideas should be passed to PGPAG@tesera.com

7. Actions

ID#	ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE	STATUS
Feb -8 - 01	Pass other access issues or concerns to PGPAG@tesera.com	PAG	ASAP	Completed
Feb - 8 - 02	Categorize issues and present to PAG for ranking	Steering Committee	March 1, 2007	To be presented at PAG meeting on March 1, 2007