

**Agenda**  
**Okanagan Shuswap Forest District**  
**DDM Information Sharing Meeting**  
**February 28, 2006, 08:30 Okanagan/Shuswap Room**

Objective:  
Facilitator: Bernie Kaplun  
Bring: Admin Guide

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Comments/Action Item</b>
<b>Part A. Introduction Information</b>			
1) Introductions	Bernie	(Round table introductions)	
2) Scope for the Day	Bernie	<p>Joint licensee overview and information sharing meeting to streamline and make more effective the FSP process by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informing how the approval of the proposed FSP will be undertaken</li> <li>• Providing information relevant to the preparation of an FSP and</li> <li>• Responding to requests for information and/or questions</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Likely will not be able to cover off everything for all licensees and all questions. Will record questions and provide answers. Also anticipate licensees will request additional meetings specific to their plans.</li> <li>• This is new territory for all, there may be a few bumps in the road as we progress, however, with open communication and cooperation, we will all reach the goal.</li> </ul>	
3). Meeting	Bernie	(record on flip charts/white board)	Common understanding – roles, areas, transition;

Expectations			questions; timelines; objectives – legal R/S; C&E role; schedules; combined submissions; info gathering/sources; provide clarity or path to clarity; grandparenting; LRMP; plan approved by year end; speed bumps; goal posts – approval tests; clarity on weeds/barriers; small licenses and NRFLs
4). DDM Overview	Ron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide higher level overview of process, information and considerations. Specific details will be addressed in other presentations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Link to Prof. Rel and cultural shift.</b> The further you deviate the more you rationalise. Talk up front, but it is licensees plan.</p> <p><b>LRMP</b> – consensus document, signal of commonly acceptable practices – safe to follow.</p> <p><b>Processing timelines</b> – submission in Oct will not give you approval for Jan 07. Work with DOS to set up a submission schedule. DOS will make a commitment for addressing when FSP is submitted and will vary for each plan depending on many factors. DOS is resourced to deal with submissions.</p> <p><b>Consistency</b> – each tenures forester will be consistent with the other.</p> <p><b>What will be approved and not</b> – staff will work with you upfront (communication). Know the norm. Offer open rationale for deviations.</p> <p><b>Measurability/verifiability</b> – we are not interested in a “weasel word” plan.</p>
5) FSP Update	Dave McBeth	What’s new and happening in the FSP world.	16 plans approved in the province. Expect 350. Issues: timelines for approval more than anticipated. (Bulletin #3) Additional content (ie legal caveats). Try to resolve issues upfront if deviating.
6) Other	Ross	ILMB Update on Land Use Objectives and timeframes	<b>LRMP</b> – elements brought forward as LUOs.

Agencies	Porcheron		Intent is to have the order effective July 1, 2006 with compliance by July 1, 2007. <b>GAR and LUOs</b> – Working to ensure consistency between them <b>OGO</b> – Have 8 draft letters in place by March 30
		Update on GAR (MOE)	
	Brian Roberts on	MOE observer. Grant Furness info source for WHA's GAR (wildlife) and Section 7 notices	Contact Grant Furness for questions. Dave McBeth - Can use draft WHAs to meet section 7 notices, or amend in later.
<b>Part B. Information Relevant to FSP Review and Approval Process</b>			
1). Process (flow chart)	Eric  Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of CI process and products (Flowchart and timelines [caveat on complexity and vacation periods])</li> <li>• Identify Multi District Process,</li> <li>• Decide on method or process for storing information of different agreement holders' plans for FDU and FSPs. Lead MoFR district capture digital data to track. (Reserve areas, overlaps, NRFLs [Provincial process being worked on according to Dave McBeth] )</li> </ul>	Eric briefly outlined process – contact Eric for copy or more info. Bernie stressed that upfront communication will make this a more efficient process. Licensees to confirm multi-district FSPs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCTS (DOS/Columbia), WY(DOS/Arrow with different FDUs), Tolko(DOS/Arrow with different FDUs)</li> <li>• DDM will be specified upfront</li> </ul> <b>ACTION:</b> Agreement between districts will be formalized by Bernie. <b>ACTION:</b> Bernie to discuss with Ted and licensees about a: List of special data that supports..... updated FDU, UWR, etc boundaries all in central area, available to all licensees.

2). Identify Communications Contacts	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delegated Decision Maker (vacation schedule?)</li> <li>• MoFR Review and Approval Coordinator [To be assigned]</li> <li>• Ministry FSP Review Team by Topic Area</li> <li>• Licensee Communication Contact(s)</li> <li>• Other Gov't Agency Contacts</li> <li>• Others</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> Bernie to discuss review teams, and schedules at next District Ops Team meeting</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Licensees to provide Bernie with FSP communication contact</p>
3). Review and Approval Tools	Eric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checklists (Outlined in Admin Guide)</li> <li>• Bulletins (PFIT Site, MoE site)</li> <li>• Policy (DM Policies, LRMP)</li> <li>• Guidance (DDM Workshop Fall 2005, Guidebooks)</li> <li>• Other (Admin Guide, Principles of Administrative Law [covered in Admin Guide], Commonly Accepted Practices, local studies, relevant IWAPs, Traditional Use, Studies etc)</li> </ul>	
4). Plan Preparation	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature and extent of MoFR staff involvement with licensee during plan preparation process (dialogue between professionals versus review comments)</li> </ul>	<p>Focus on dialogue, questions, communication to help speed things up.</p> <p>Prof. Rel. Commitment to working with licensees, licensees will have full ownership of their plan.</p>
5). Submission Standards	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MoFR not reviewing draft plans. Preparer is responsible for preparing a plan suitable for approval when submitted to DDM</li> <li>• Number of copies of FSP and who they would likely be distributed to during public review and comment period at final submission [<b>3 paper copies of text in Word format, 2 copies of maps, plus electronic maps</b>]</li> <li>• When will copy be submitted to district? Start or completion of advertising. [Opportunity to assemble appropriate team, expert opinion etc]</li> <li>• Format (paper, electronic or both)</li> <li>• Multi Agreement-Holder Submissions</li> <li>• Multi-district submissions [1 paper copy, maps &amp; electronic]</li> <li>• Time lags between information requests and delivery [adds to</li> </ul>	<p>Submission to district – communication will help identify timelines, show stopper issues, personnel planning and FN consultation.</p> <p>Additional info may stop review clock.</p> <p>Bulletin #3 outlines advertising requirements and issues.</p> <p>Licensees can bounce changes and deviations off of interested parties to help minimize risk.</p>

		<p>review time. May stop “clock”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District and licensee discuss nature of differences, if any, between what is presented to public and final submission</li> <li>• Other?</li> </ul>	
6) Submission Schedule	Rick Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensees to provide intended timelines for review and comment period and final submissions</li> </ul>	<p>No commitment yet from majors that have not yet provided estimated dates.  Monte Lk will not partner with Gorman.  <b>ACTION:</b> Provide Rick with dates if haven’t already</p>
7). Review and Approval Schedule	Rick Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Bulge of submissions, time (summer vacation), complexity, workload etc may cause extended review period).</li> <li>• District and Licensee discussions re “FSP status update process” at regular intervals during review and approval process</li> </ul>	
8) First Nations Information Sharing and Consultation	Paul Knowles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Districts identify timeline and issues associated with FN consultation</li> <li>• Districts identify which FN groups will be consulted about the FSP proposal once licensee identifies area covered by plan</li> <li>• Discuss nature and extent of Ministry Involvement in licensee meetings with FN groups</li> <li>• Districts provide results of previous FN consultation efforts</li> <li>• FRPA Bulletin #1 June 10, 2005. Forest Stewardship Planning: First Nations Information Sharing Bulletin</li> </ul>	<p>Licensee leads the process.  Use bulletin #1 to help with understanding process.  Confirm whom you should consult with, use matrix  Review FRAs in FSP area  Seek examples of cultural heritage resource results and strategies. DOS may provide with permission by the author.  Legal obligation to make a reasonable effort to meet with FN. Advice for Lic to contact FN prior to writing results and strats. DOS will conduct FRPA workshops with FN. Advice is to layout process of FN consultation and involvement – this will avoid consultation at CP level.  Lic / FN meetings, Lic shall document, DOS can participate but Lic is lead. If no meeting then Lic to document what they did.  Lic can ask about and address FN interest which</p>

			<p>may make consultation more efficient. Westbank asks that all meetings take place at their Forest Council meetings. Lic. to write a notification letter to FN when FSP is submitted. Archaeology is not addressed in FRPA, but cultural heritage is. Suggestion: do not need to write arch results and strats but can overlap into cultural heritage.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> FN Liaison to make maps of traditional territory available to licensees for referral/consultation purposes</p>
9) Determination Process	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss nature and extent of rationale that will be provided with determination.</li> <li>• Examples are provided on PFIT website (approval)</li> <li>• Extent depends on complexity and issues</li> <li>• If licensee provides good rationale in supporting documentation, DDM can incorporate into rationale.</li> </ul>	
<b>Part C. Information Relevant to Preparation of the FSP</b>			
1). Identify Objectives Related to the FSP Plan Area	Eric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location where objective matrix can be found <a href="http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rco/pfit/index.htm">http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rco/pfit/index.htm</a></li> <li>• Objective Matrix Disclaimer</li> <li>• District Licensee and other government agency staff review</li> </ul>	HLP for Rose Swanson (contact Ted for copy) and OGO, seeking clarity for rec sites Matrix is best effort to capture all and to simplify

		<p>Objective Matrix and supporting documentation to clarify which objectives will apply to plan area. (Detailed look specific to individual licensee's FSP areas may best be done in a separate meeting.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-district submissions. Other district's matrix and information</li> <li>• Identify differences in interpretation of what objectives cover the proposed plan area and develop action plan to resolve</li> <li>• Encourage licensee to contact agencies with authority to set objectives early in the FSP development process</li> </ul>	Licensee and DOS to communicate on what is required / will be measured against and what is not
2). Public Review And Comment			
2.1)Notice:			
a). Providing Notice	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee must make plan available for review and comment. Publish in newspapers circulating in areas covered by plan. FPPR definition includes ones that are free and do not have subscribers.</li> <li>• Venue for public viewing and business hours. Need to provide for reasonable public review and comment. Community meetings, libraries, web-site, consultant offices?</li> </ul>	Good guidance in: "Tips for your first FSP"
b) Period of Review	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review period is 60 days unless extended or shortened by DDM (FPPR sec 20(2)(b) or (c). At this point, district does not see the need to extend or shorten review period for FSP.</li> <li>• Shortened review period may be considered for NRFLs, if infested or endangered timber.</li> <li>• Licensee may request under FPPR20(2)(d), however this would be more likely for amendments. Note FN consultation must still occur.</li> </ul>	
2.2)Review and Comment			
a). Referral to	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss nature and extent (if any) MoFR review and comment of</li> </ul>	MOE, ILMB has not yet asked for any referral and

agency of government FPPR 21(a)		<p>FSP during public review and comment period. [Officially no, however, this gives a heads up and helps to assemble appropriate teams for review]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise licensee of any requirement to refer a copy of the FSP to agencies of government (provincial/federal). [Not anticipated at this point, however copy to BCTS]</li> <li>• If unable to determine referral requirements, will advise at later date.</li> </ul>	<p>is not anticipated. Advice is to continue with typical FDP referral groups.</p>
b). Persons who are interested, have rights and FN groups	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Referrals should be consistent with lists licensees currently use for FDP referrals.</b> District may provide generic list, and may have updated list of contacts with existing MoFR licence holders and FN groups. The list may not be exhaustive and ultimately it is the licensee's responsibility to identify these persons.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> Tenures to compile list, with current addresses of MoFR tenure holders (Bernie to assign) <b>ACTION:</b> Vic to provide updated list of range tenure holders</p>
<b>3. Review and Approval Process</b>			
Content Review			
a). Map (FRPA 5(1)(a)(i))	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DDM direction regarding scale and format. Scale of overview map (1:500,000 or 1:1,000,000)</li> <li>• Detailed map. 1:20,000 to 1:50,000 (FDUs. Declared areas and areas to which results/strategies apply etc.) Note there may be larger scale maps to show level of detail required for consistency, resource information etc. Note this may be necessary for portions of FDU where the resource information applies.</li> <li>• Trim Base, contours, roads, streams etc.</li> <li>• Electronic and 2 sets paper copies</li> <li>• Note additional map information to lend clarity. (Not specified in legislation, refer top page 33, 34 of admin guide.)</li> <li>• Does licensee intend to certify this element of the FSP?</li> </ul>	<p>Scale of map will be determined by level of detail for each area. Electronic map info means a plot file, just so that MOFR staff can print copies. Arc file may be more appropriate for linework collection, etc No input from lic. on whether map will be certified or not</p>



b). Submitting Information FRPA 16(2.1)	Dave Don	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional information in respect to results/strategies the DM may reasonably require to approve plan (refer to p.66 admin guide)</li> <li>• outline what is measurable(quantitative)/verifiable(qualitative).(p 63,64 admin guide) Must also specify situation and circumstances and be consistent with objective(s)</li> </ul>	<p>There are limitations on what the DM can ask for insofar as supporting info. Non-default limitations are not as strong.</p> <p>C&amp;E will look at results and strats to see if they are measurable/verifyable. Handout outlines tests for meas/ver. Good examples of wording in DDM workshop 3. If there is a radically new way of measuring things C&amp;E would like some advance notice.</p>
c). Exemption from R/S where more than one objective exists	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee and district to identify any circumstance where 2 or more objectives are applicable to a common area and the same of similar subject matter.</li> <li>• Licensees to submit copy of approved exemptions as part of supporting documentation.</li> </ul>	<p>May not be an issue in DOS Will be done with hierarchy if applicable</p>
d). Exemption from R/S where it is not practicable	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee to advise district, apply for exemption and provide rationale</li> <li>• Licensee to submit exemption in supporting documentation</li> </ul> <p>[note, this situation not likely, except perhaps for very small NRFLs]</p>	
e). Proportional Targets. FPPR 19	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District to advise if/where proportional targets have been set.</li> <li>• Licensees to request proportional targets as soon as possible. NOTE: DM expects licensees to deal with this among each other and only request if deadlocked.</li> </ul>	<p>Not an issue in DOS at this time.</p>
<b>Results or Strategies and Stocking Standards</b>			

a) Exemption FPPR 12.1	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertaking given for compliance with specified regulations.</li> <li>• Invoking this section does not allow the licensee to propose exemptions, modifications, variances or other changes to specified regulations to be proposed or approved in FSP</li> </ul>	Used to be defaults, now called undertakings to comply, thus becomes an exemption. Examples in bulletin #3.
b). Consistency of R/S with established objectives FPPR 25(3)	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee to include copy of any exemption granted under authority of section 25(2) of the FPPR in the supporting documentation</li> </ul>	
c). Consistency of intended R/S with objectives FPPR 25.1(1) and (2)	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee to open early dialogue between parties if and where intended R/S may not be fully consistent with a legal objective because of practicable limitations. E.g. beetle issues, cannot meet VQOs</li> </ul>	Provide what you would normally do to be consistent and then an alternative R/S for exemption events (ie beetle) Also provide rationale as to why the normal practice may not be feasible in certain instances.
d) Which established objectives meet conditions in FPPR 25.1(2)	Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District and Licensee should identify which established objectives meet the conditions described in FPPR 25.1(2)</li> </ul>	Rose Swanson and OGO only, in DOS right now.
<b>Part D. FSP Determination</b>			
1). Certification of Content FRPA 16(1.01) and FPPR 22.1	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee to provide early indication of what elements of the FSP will be certified as authorized in legislation [Visuals, measures, maps, minimum FG height]</li> <li>• Licensee encouraged to use certificate format available on ABCFP web site.</li> </ul>	
2). Minister's	Bernie/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee to provide sufficient rationale with FSP submission to</li> </ul>	Contact lead reviewer to begin discussions on SS

consideration of stocking standards FFPR 26(5)	Dave	determine whether or not the stocking standards can be approved under condition listed FPPR 26(5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPPR 26(4) Minister must approve</li> <li>• FPPR 26(5) Not consistent with TSR analysis</li> </ul>	development.
3) Balancing Objectives FPPR 27	Bernie/ Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensee to provide early indication of whether the FSP submission will include a request to balance objectives, results or strategies or other plan content</li> <li>• Licensee to ensure any proposal to balance the FSP submission be sufficiently clear and contain sufficient information to assist the DM in understanding the nature of the balancing request</li> </ul>	•
<b>Part E. Technical Discussion</b>		Discussions may need to be referred to smaller working groups for resolution at later date.	
a) Measures (Range)	Harold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District provide information regarding measures for invasive plants and range barriers.</li> </ul>	Handout – Draft Invasive Plant Prevention Guidelines, Natural range barriers Some ideas about what may be approval considerations for invasive plant measures, invasive plants treatment agreement Defn of natural barriers, triggers for potential breaching of nb, Bulletin #3 Q 17 and 18, Draft MPB Outline, option to use retention plans to identify barriers to reduce fencing, form for use for discussions around natural barriers.  <b>ACTION:</b> All to Provide feedback to Harold on info provided
b) Stocking Standards	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions, issues re stocking standards and evaluation process or Chief Forester</li> </ul>	

c) Other Technical Issues	Bernie / Kerry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exotic species – low risk in forest dev. – with no identified habitat location, can licensees propose WHAs or what do they do? Is it enough in R/S to just say that we’ll address with a qualified prof at time of discovery of species or should we have R/S already in place for these uncommon events?</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOE would prefer if licensee did something on their own, outside of WHA process and would work with lic. It should be reasonable to address once event occurs and work with MOE and professional. Licensee can also recommend WHAs.</li> </ul>
d) Time Saving and Effort	Bernie	<p>Early on in the process the licensee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies any unusual, complex or untried R/S, stocking standards or measures that are being contemplated</li> <li>Identifies any new science that will be used to support proposed R/S, stocking standards or measures</li> <li>Identifies any MOU’s or other agreements between interested parties or other that may influence the DDM’s determination.</li> </ul>	
<b>Part F. Wrap Up</b>	Bernie		
a).General Q&A	Bernie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource Feature – what do we do when we know that we have existing? Ie Permanent Sample Plots</li> <li>Comment: Keep review and comment piece out of FSP part of package to keep process clean.</li> <li>Declared areas – should we show these areas on FSP maps?</li> <li>Scenic areas – we have established VQOs, correct?</li> <li>LMZ?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do what you think is right on the ground. Prof. Rel.</li> <li></li> <li>They need to be identified somehow, lic. to decide. (table or map or both)</li> <li>Yes, Harold Waters would like a copy.</li> <li>GAR not completed but lic can choose to include in riparian objective. Reg can also be amended to include LMZs.</li> </ul>
b).Review Expectations	Bernie		
c).Schedule Individual or Next Joint Meeting	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Licensees to determine and host</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION:</b> Standing topic at steering committee meeting to discuss FSP related issues and/questions.

			Lead reviewer and individual licensees will hold separate meetings.