

**DRAFT Kamloops LRUP Notes, February 22, 2007**

The following is a summary of the Kamloops LRUP meeting held at the Best Western Forster's Convention Centre on February 22, 2007. The Open House commenced at 17:00, with about 15 govt. agency staff, 6 major licensee staff and 40 public attendees prior to the meeting. Meeting started at about 18:30 and ended at about 21:30. Minutes prepared by Kathryn Zacharatos and reviewed by Jason Ladyman.

**Attendees:**

Karen Raven, Kamloops Forest District, Range Agrologist. <i>Meeting co-chair</i>	Colin Saville, Paska Lake Cottage Association
Jason Ladyman, Weyerhaeuser, <i>Meeting co-chair</i>	Bert Parke, KLRMP
Kathryn Zacharatos, MOFR	Dick McMaster, WTA
John McQueen, MOFR, Stewardship Forester	Terry and June Benesk, Skitchine Lodge
Madeline Maley, MOFR, Operations Manager	Joan Best, Kamloops Naturalist Club
Norm Fennell, Forester, Tolko	Dave Low, Kamloops/District F&G Association
Jason Yates, BC Timber Sales	Lucille Dempsey, Frolek Cattle Co.
Larry Michaelsen, BC Timber Sales	Frances Vyse, Kamloops Naturalists
Jamie Skinner, Weyerhaeuser	Traci Deboer, BAR M Ranch
Dave Tremblay, Gilbert Smith Forest Products	Kathie Dunn, Backcountry Horsemen
Phil Youwe, Range Office, MOFR	Victor Piva, Lloyd Creek Ranch
Doug Lewis, Ministry of Environment	Ron Craig, Sundown Ranch
Leith McKenzie, MOFR, Stewardship Forester	Belinda Craig, Sundown Ranch
Steve Schell, Protection Branch, Kamloops Fire Zone	Jack Stuart, Criss Creek Stock and Deadman Creek Stock Association
Percy Folkard, MoFR	Peter Ayles, Chamber of Commerce
Jo-Ann Fox, Southern Interior Weed Committee	HC Flatt
Peter Holub, Range Agrologist, MoFR	Tony Brumeth
Rocky Chan, Forests For Tomorrow	Keith Ogilvie, Agriculture Canada
Edi Torrans, MOFR, Range Agrologist, MoFR	Mike Hanry, Kamloops Fish and Game Association
Ernie Maynard, ILMB	Ralph Riley, Kamloops Naturalist, Kamloops Fish and Game
Terry Green, Protection Branch	Jack L. Robinson, Kamloops Naturalist
Wally Huston, Willow Ranch	Bob Needham, Range Technician, MOFR
Fay Zilkowsky, Backcountry Horsemen	Harold Pennoyer, Logan Lake ATV Club
Brian Parke, KFC Farms	John Wilson
Greg Griffin, Wolf Ranch	Yvonne Prokopetz, Barnhartvale Horse and Hikers
Arne Raven, Wolf Ranch	Geoff Thomas, Millenium Forest
Jeff Denomey, Kamloops Snowmobile Club	John Frolek, Frolek Cattle
P. Callahan, Paska Lake Protection Association	Mike Lehman
Doug Geernaert, Geernaert Ranch	Jim and Andy Farmer, Gardens Creek Ranch
Kent Antoniak, KMA Consulting and GKMA	Rick Swift
Hank Karpuk, KDFGA	

## **Introductions and Expectations:**

Introductions for all attendees and stated expectations for the meeting (Note: Most expectations are addressed in licensee presentations below, the rest of the answers are at the end of the minutes):

- Weyerhaeuser/Domtar 5 year extension of pulpmill pollution permit – *contact Pulpmill directly.*
- Concern surrounding the % of land occupied by roads
- Concern about increased access adjacent to remote lakes
- Information on ground water pollution and over allocation of water licenses
- Is there a collaborative plan for dealing with roads/road deactivation?
- Increased harvesting, how is it affecting stand level biodiversity?
- Recreation regulations on crown land
- Grazing licenses/leases – funding?
- Pressure to increase Animal Unit Months (AUM's) – how will this affect parks and ecosystems?
- Animal Unit Months calculations, the effect on plan communities
- Changes to human/community as a result of increased beetle harvest – *Dick McMaster has information on funding available. For more information on funding communities in transition, call 828-1553.*
- Recreation program – where are resources located? Appears to be disconnect between land approval agencies and recreation interests.
- How is recreation information passed on to the operator (i.e. known trails)?
- Standards for logging inspections and dispute mechanisms?
- Baseline data regarding leave trees.
- Will present AAC uplift and economic enhancements to increase harvesting of other species in the future to maintain to maintain prosperity
- Increased independent run-of-the-river power projects
- Reforestation/grass seeding timelines
- Multi-species planting as it relates to different ecosystems

## **Operations Manager Presentation – Shift to FRPA – Madeline Maley**

*The following was inserted from the presentation*

- Vision of stewardship – finding the right balance based on 3 considerations
  - Sustainability of timber supply
  - Adequate conservation and protection of non-timber resources
  - Economic interests of tenure holders

A Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) is an operational Plan for forest agreement holders; sole document requiring approval under Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA); areas within which harvesting and road building may occur; must be approved before any cutting/road permits issued; may be approved for up to 5 years

- Map showing forest development units
- Results and or strategies
- Stocking standards and regeneration and free growing dates
- Signature of person required to prepare the plan
- Advertise the plan
- Make available for public review and comment

- Meet with First Nations
- Collect and consider written comments
- Minister conducts the approval process (ie: consult with FN, cutting permits and road permits already in effect are deemed approved, conducting approval tests, requesting information if required, approve or reject with rationale)
- Transition period to have FSPs in place extended to March 31, 2007
- Transition period for woodlot and range tenure holders has been extended one year, to Dec. 31, 2007.
- Forest industry is transitioning to the FRPA world
- Govt and industry have significantly different roles in the FRPA world vs Forest Practice Code
- How do the changing role impact these sessions
- Forest tenure holders are likely to find themselves interacting more with the public.

*Concern that harvesting methods are homogeneous across the landscape. Some harvesting is reflecting BEC zones and natural disturbance patterns but concern that harvesting not emulating fire return intervals – should harvesting be following a natural disturbance pattern/fire timing? With respect to FSPs, what results/strategies are in place to reflect biodiversity? Why aren't deciduous species allowed?*

Answer:

- Biodiversity is addressed at 2 levels in the FSPs – landscape level (Old Growth Management Areas (OGMAs)) and stand level (Wildlife Tree Patches (WTPs), Wildlife trees, Riparian reserve zones).
- Note that there are limits in regional stocking standards to allow for only certain percentages of deciduous species as excessive stand conversion would affect Timber Supply. Multi-species are planted on most blocks; most blocks are prescribed for planting species in conjunction with what was harvested from the site.

*Question regarding concern that 4% for biodiversity restricts ability to be flexible on the landscape. How do licensees calculate the 4% impact?*

Answer:

- 4% calculated through LRMP process. OGMAs are spatially locked, WTPs are within blocks, on edge of blocks.

*Concern about restrictions on greenup – how is this addressed in FRPA?*

Answer:

- FSPs address green-up and adjacency of cutblocks.

## **Licensee Presentations**

### **Jamie Skinner – Weyerhaeuser**

*The following was inserted from Jamie's presentation*

- Harvesting
  - o 90% of harvest activity has, and will continue to be, focused on the salvage of MPB/Spruce/Fir beetle stands.
  - o 2007 harvesting to occur in Dardanelles Lake, Community Lake, Cahilty Creek, Cicero, O'Connor Lake, Bonaparte Lake areas, on TFL and NRFL License area (Highland Valley)

- Forest Stewardship Plans
  - o Expect approval of FSP by March 31, 2007
  - o Although review and comment period has expired last September we will continue to communicate with First Nations, ranchers, other stakeholders regarding planned activities as this is currently a certification requirement
- Road Deactivation
  - o Plan extensive road deactivation starting in 2007
  - o Maps are available for review
  - o Legislatively required to maintain roads unless deactivated or District Manager releases us of maintenance obligations (could be taken over by other resource values)
  - o If you want a road to be “left open” must notify us by March 31, 2007
- Overlapping licenses
  - o Operations in an area could be completed by numerous licensees. At present, Non Replaceable Forest Licences’s (NRFL) Salvage NRFL’s, Pulpwood Agreement, Forest and Range Opportunity, Forest and Range Agreement, Small Scale Salvage, Community Forest may be operating on the same landscape. Communication is key

#### **Dave Tremblay – Gilbert Smith Forest Products**

- Pine beetle not as much of an issue for Gilbert Smith, focus is more on fir beetle.
- Proposal for continued operating in spite of mountain caribou species at risk.
- Run of the River: There are proposals to generate hydroelectric power but no further information was known at this time. *If you have questions about water allocation contact Matthew Simons at Integrated Land Management Bureau.*

*Question regarding whether the Species at Risk project with respect to Mountain Caribou will have an impact on other stakeholders? What are the economic impacts of the proposed moratorium?*

Answer: Yes, it will have an impact on all user groups. Unsure of economic impact has been completed and taken this into account at this time.

*Question regarding the impacts on Mountain Caribou, will direction follow what’s stated in the Kamloops TSA Canadian Standard Association – indicators that all licensees are presently reporting on annually?*

Answer: Kamloops licensee group along with public advisory group will need to discuss proposed changes and alter plan as necessary.

#### **Norm Fennell – Tolko**

*The following was inserted from Norm’s presentation*

- AAC: in 2002, AAC was 641,000m<sup>3</sup>; 2003 275,000m<sup>3</sup> traded to Weyerhaeuser; 2005 115,000m<sup>3</sup> to Bill 28 take-back; 2007 AAC now 250,000 m<sup>3</sup>.
- NRFLs: Tolko’s operating area overlapped with NRFL’s for beetle salvage.
  - o 300,000 m<sup>3</sup> transferred from Simpcw to Lower North Thompson Community Forest (LNTCF)
  - o 200,000 m<sup>3</sup> + 160,000 m<sup>3</sup>(?) Simpcw
  - o 272,000 m<sup>3</sup> Kamloops Indian Band
  - o 187,000 Adams Lake Indian Band

- Mountain Pine Beetle: All pine stands attacked to some level. Majority of pine in Tolko's operating area harvested, or being harvested.
  - o Darlington – Canfor
  - o Thuya – Canfor, Simpcw, LNTCF
  - o Nehalliston – Tolko, Simpcw, Canfor
  - o Leonie, Dixon, Haggard – Tolko
  - o Newhhykulston – LNTCF
- Fir beetle – seeing attack ratios up to 10:1
- Spruce beetle – Taweel Lake
- Trap tree program this spring in Dixon, Bottrel, East Lake
- Discussed 2007 harvest plans
- FSP – submit for approval by March 31, 2007. Same CP referral process as FDP.

*Question regarding the long term timber availability for forest licensees?*

Answer:

- The Kamloops TSA has approximately 60 years of wood at the current harvest levels. Approximately 25% is pine. Timber supply has pine gone/unusable at 2014 and harvest levels will likely decrease in the next pending longevity of salvage volume. Tolko currently targets pine, spruce and fir.

*Question regarding CSA certification, indicators for species at risk and Mountain Caribou – how do licensees meet targets? Concern primarily with GSFP, because so much of their operating area is within the caribou habitat – how do they meet the targets?*

Answer:

- Government is looking at a recovery plan right now. Managing habitat, looking at predator/prey relationships. Licensees are also involved in this. As more species at risk are identified, they are filtered into CSA transition. Still a lot of work to determine how to manage for this.

*Baseline data regarding leave trees, is this area based calculation? Concern that the allowable % for roads is 7% whereas biodiversity is 4%.*

Answer:

- 4% biodiversity, in FSPs wildlife tree patches, reserves, leave trees etc account for this. This is an area based calculation.
- Road deactivation will increase over time. Contact licensees with concerns. There is more onus on the stakeholder in the FRPA world.

### **Larry Michaelsen, Jason Yates – BC Timber Sales**

- BCTS created to set market pricing
- Takeback – BCTS has all areas, harvesting at 400,000m<sup>3</sup>/yr, 200,000m<sup>3</sup>/yr for MPB uplift wood.
- Harvest is currently following the beetle.
- Found spruce beetle in the Mow Creek area. Douglas-fir beetle in Sabiston area.
- >90% of blocks exceed required amount of tree retention in terms of biodiversity. Planting prescriptions are based on what was harvested.
- At free growing, 73% of stands had 3 or more species. The majority of other stands were in the dry Douglas-fir belt, and had one or 2 species present.
- FSP approved effective January 1, 2007. Can be found on the web at:  
[http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/BCTS/areas/TKA/TKA\\_FSP.htm](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/BCTS/areas/TKA/TKA_FSP.htm)

- Review and comment period is passed but BCTS still open for if you'd like a concern raised.

*Question regarding whether stocking is reflecting for the possibility of effects of global warming.*

Answer

- There is a team looking at changing the standards to address global warming
- Conifers are still most economical species in BC.
- MOFR will continue to explore impacts of changing climate and to more deciduous in AAC, but this will take time.

*Concern expressed regarding forest encroachment into the grasslands issues.? Worry expressed that areas are being planted which were historically grassland. If you look back to 1920s, look at how much was grassland and are now pine stands.*

Answer

- Not a lot of harvesting occurring on the edge of grasslands. Planting is only occurring in areas where harvesting occurred.

### **Phil Youwe – Range Officer**

*The following was taken from Phil's presentation notes:*

- Ministry of Forests and Range Act amended to include:
  - "Encourage a vigorous, efficient and world competitive ranching sector in BC"
- In addition to "Encourage maximum productivity of range resources"
- Will be reviewing and extending approx. 20% of RUPS every year
- MoFR Consulting on RUPs with First Nations within 60 days
- Transitory forest sites, range sites and ROW's affect forage supply. Assessing potential options.
- Range Staff will inspect range areas and develop a plan to address Forage Supply.
- A District Plan will cover:
  - Reviewing Forage Supply by Range Areas,
  - Reviewing forest practices that may impact forage supply and also livestock management and discuss options for improvement
  - Identifying a range of options that will maintain and improve forage supply and also forage quality (fences, trails, salting, riding etc.)
  - Identifying funding requirements
  - Grass seeding as a livestock management tool
- Funding for grass seeding may become an option in the future.
- Large Breached boundaries resulting in changes to grazing schedules and impact to resources:
  - Riparian
  - Cutblocks
  - Public Safety ( Roads)
  - Wildlife Habitat Reduced
- Fencing Only Where Practical (distance, topography, fence maintenance costs & difficult construction, other options (riding & herding, brush fencing, BCCA – MPB fund).
- Pilot Project “ Monte Hills/ Westwold MPB Riding Project”
  - Joint project with Livestock Association/ MOFR/ Timber Industry
  - Full Time Riders ( June- Oct)
  - Minimize Drift

- Insure Meet RUP requirements
- Data Collection Readiness/ Utilization/ Riparian/ Cutblock
- Reporting Function
- At End of Project, Agreement Holder Will Assume Riding Priority
- Objectives of the Project
  - Mitigate Breach Barrier
  - Used by Revenue Branch to Establish Rider Costs for Appraisal System
  - Post MPB Research on Effects of Riding on Resources
  - Model to Show an Alternative to Fencing of Breached Barriers
- Re- establish Grassland Attributes in Grassland – Upper Grassland/ Lower Ponderosa Pine Zones:
- District Involvement to date:
  - Assessment of potential burn sites
  - Hat Creek burn
  - Dewdrop burn
- Range Branch assistance

*Questions about range tenures/forage supply.*

Answer:

- Looking at plan to deal with forage supply. Range program looking at grass seeding funding.
- Using things like debris to manage fences in some cases. Range Impact Assessment Forms – available to fill out for discussion with licensees.

*Question regarding requirements for range tourism operators versus ranchers (ie: horses).*

Answer:

- Guide outfitters are issued a licence to have cattle. Allowed specific number of AUMs.

*Concern with AUMs and overlap of range permits into park areas. How are these managed?*

Answer: Control is through Range Use Plans. These areas are identified and management strategies are outlined in the plans.

### **Percy Folkard – Range Branch**

- Invasive plant program
- FRPA now requires measures to be put in place to prevent the spread of invasive plants.
- Political pressure brought the invasive plant program back.
- Knapweed was the main focus in the past. Have seen some successes with knapweed. (biological controls)
- Now more of a focus on biological control agents.
- Working with Jo-Ann Fox to come up with a collaborative process to establish strategies to help contain the spread of invasive plants.
- New online application: [http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/invasive/IAP\\_01.htm](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/invasive/IAP_01.htm)
- Data available for download from the Land and Resources Data Warehouse website: <http://www.lrdw.ca/>
- Hogweeds spreading from the north and coast, found in increased elevation sites.

*Question: In terms of biological control, does it work best when you have increased noxious weeds present – when the weeds are gone, how do you manage to ensure they don't come back?*

*Note that there are most problems with roads.*

Answer:

- Go back year after year with chemicals to ensure they don't come back.
- With biological control, release the insects and monitor over time (sustaining).

### **Doug Lewis, MoE**

*The following were taken from Doug's presentation notes:*

- The three-legged approach:
  - Used to describe the components that must be balanced for sustainable use of resources to provide community stability.
  - Must be 'balanced' - one leg too short or too long will cause it fall over.
  - Economic
    - Consequence:
      - Loss of consistent timber supply – short term benefit- possible mid to long term
      - Response – Accelerated salvage harvest to capture economic value from stands
  - Social
    - Consequence - Falling trees or increase fuel loads threaten human safety and infrastructure in communities, along roads, near buildings or fences or in Parks.
    - Response: Removal of trees that endanger human safety and infrastructure.
  - Environmental
    - Consequence - minimal ecological impact from MPB infestation alone.
    - Response – Let forests recover and regenerate naturally.
  - Hydrologic Impacts
    - Trees die and lose needles slowly – dead pine trees contribute to intercept snow and provide shade during snowmelt to mitigate effects.
    - Non pine overstory trees, understory trees, intact ground cover (shrubs, plants and moss) continue to intercept snow.
  - Plant Diversity
    - Loss of overstory trees allows more sunlight to the ground – within several years will have greater plant diversity (Dykstra and Braumandl 2006, Forest Practices Board 2007).
    - Pine dominated forests are replaced with a mixed stand of other conifer or deciduous species.
    - Increased structural diversity – standing dead and downed trees.
  - Wildlife Impacts
    - Few wildlife species dependent on pine-dominated forests (Bunell et al. 2004)
    - Some species “win” and others “lose”, most indifferent.
    - Often old-forest structural components (snags- downed dead wood, shrubs) continue to provide habitat for mature forest species.
  - Fire Hazard
    - Many dead pine stands will never burn – must have weather and ignition source.

- Greatest risk is in first few years after death of trees while “fine fuels” (dead needles) are present in on the trees.
- Over time, loss of needles, growth of non-pine trees and shrubs, fallen trees absorb water requires drought periods to produce fire hazard
- Under severe fire weather conditions –likely no additional risk

#### Risks to Environmental Values:

- Initial observations often incorrect 1) lack of experience 2) scale of the disturbance, and 3) Lack of information – result in a tendency to exaggerate negative impacts of the infestation.
- Greatest risks to environmental values are due to the cumulative impacts of human response to the MPB infestation - salvage harvest and tree removals.
- If our responses are not well thought out and carefully planned these actions can adversely impact economic and social values now and into the future.
- Loss of ecosystem resiliency – ability to absorb future natural disturbances – fires, other insect outbreaks without excessive habitat degradation other economic and social impacts.
- Simplification of the landscape – conversion to plantations - loss of habitat – increased risk of loss of forest investments to natural disturbances.
- Unforeseen impacts of habitat alteration on wildlife populations - local extirpations and loss of some hunted and trapped species.
- Elevated hydrologic impacts – potential increased risk to fish habitat, infrastructure and water quality due to flooding, sedimentation, elevated spring run-offs.

#### What is Ministry of Environment doing? - Parks

- Tree removal in Provincial Parks to reduce hazard of falling trees near campsites and near infrastructure ( buildings, trails, fences)
- Modifying trees to remove safety hazards but maintain wildlife values where possible
- Let Natural Processes occur and monitor these changes over time
- Assessing risks to environmental values due to habitat loss and alteration.
- Providing decision-making agencies (MoFR), licensees and the general public with information on risks of salvage harvesting on environmental values.
- Monitoring changes on the landbase to ensure salvage is meeting biodiversity objectives.
- Working with other agencies, licensees, First Nations and other groups to identify, assess and conduct treatments that restore ecological processes and minimize risks ecological values.
- Assessing the impacts of increased road access to small lakes fisheries due to MPB salvage harvest.
- Restoring historic access.
- Preventing increased access.

*Question: There is a lot of focus on research for lodgepole pine. How about ponderosa pine – is there research in terms of impacts to ecosystems?*

#### Answer:

- MoE is monitoring sites in ponderosa pine stands.
- They are currently getting hit heavily by beetle.
- Ecosystem restoration programs.
- Some under-burning completed 5-6 years ago to decrease encroachment. Eliminated understory and left the mature pine. However, these trees are now attacked by Mountain Pine Beetle and western pine beetle and will die.

- Some work with TRU on ponderosa pine, mountain pine beetle and wildlife.

### **Leith McKenzie – Forest Health**

- Spruce budworm an increasing issue – visible from the Coquihalla.
- Douglas fir beetle associated with spruce budworm after progressive years.
- Western pine beetle an increasing issues – 45,537ha affected.
- Approximately 2000 ha spruce beetle attack, mostly in the Cahilty area.

*Question: A few years back there was a tussock moth outbreak, what is the chance of this happening again?*

Answer:

- The tussock moth is a cyclic pest and we periodically have outbreaks in and around the Kamloops area. The last notable outbreak was in the early 1990's. We will have another outbreak in the next  $\pm 5$  years most likely.
- Contact Lorraine MacLauchlan at the Southern Interior Regional office for more information.
- Visit the following site for more information on the tussock moth.  
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi/ForestHealth/PDF/2006Overviewpublication.pdf>

### **John McQueen – Timber Supply Review**

*The following were taken from John's presentation notes.*

#### **Process**

- Kamloops TSA, which includes both the Kamloops and Headwaters Forest Districts, is in the midst of Timber Supply Review (TSR4);
- TSR3 effective Jan 01, 2004 and planned for an approx. 3 year duration;
- TSR4 is actively being planned;
  - o The preparation and release of the Data package and PDP is expected for March
- This is the first TSR provincially that is looking at the impacts of an area that has had an AAC uplift due to the pine beetle infestation;

#### **TSR4 Main objectives**

- identify the amount of IBM affected that is able to be harvested to help determine the initial harvest level
- have a sustainable long run harvest level that reflects managed stand yields

#### **TSR4 Highlights**

- The base run model will run out to 400 years to look at all the factors
- The 670,000 m<sup>3</sup>/year uplift will disappear as most/all of the 2003 firestorm harvesting is completed,
- We appear to be at the peak of the pine beetle population as per the Marvin Eng model version #3,
- 1.4 million m<sup>3</sup> non-pine harvest as per 2006 harvest billing;
- % roads in TSA: % over whole TSA is approximately 0.8%. Over the THLB, 24,000ha of roads, roughly 4% of the THLB in roads.
- This number is increasing slowly as harvesting expands to previously undeveloped areas.
- IBS and IBD – discussions with district and regional staff have provided this TSR with the direction to assume that the losses will be minor based on current trends of the beetle populations and harvesting priorities by the major licensees and SSS program;

- More information on public discussion paper can be found at:  
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hts/>

*Concern that TSR is not sustainable in the long term.* This was acknowledged and the TSR will focus mostly on the short/midterm (ie: 5-50 years) as opposed to 400 years.

### **Steve Schell – Protection**

- Moving towards managing fire, rather than racing out to extinguish it.
- *Wildfire Act* changed in 2005
- In 2006: 24 research prescribed burn blocks completed near Isobel Lake in spring.
- Over 140 person days of fire warden patrols completed through the Kamloops Fire Zone
- 20 fixed wing air patrols over the same geographic area
- Approx. 110 ha treated within MPB areas identified within community wildfire prevention plans (CWPPs), funded through UBC Mountain Pine Beetle program.
- Summer fire crews extended to March 31<sup>st</sup> for Fuels Management Projects.

*Question regarding concerns about taking action on remote fires with respect to mountain caribou habitat. What is protection branch doing to protect/manage for this?*

Answer:

- Looking at higher level plans. If it is in a “let-burn area” or if within a park, then zone responsible for area may write a fire analysis and monitor the fire over time.

*Are there differences between fire behaviour in green vs. red forests? Concerns in Logan Lake with respect to interface.*

Answer:

- There is some data available.
- Vanderhoof has a lot of homogenous pine stands and are conducting trials in that area.
- Community Wildlife Protection Plans will address interface issues.

### **Darren Bennett, Front Counter BC**

*The following was taken from Darren’s presentation:*

#### **A Single Point of Contact**

- Negates clients need to personally engage numerous agencies on one project
- Cost savings (gov’t and client) through a coordinated, effective, and **seamless** client service, especially when multiple permits are required

#### **A Centre of Excellence**

- Performs as a consistent and integrated information provider to the public
- **Citizen-Centric services** are a key deliverable of government
- provide a single point of contact store-front
- guide the client through application process
- provide in-person technical/professional assistance to interpret information
- liaise between ministries, agencies and other levels of government, coordinate referral process
- follow-up and monitor the application; inform client
- exploration of alternatives if the answer is not in the client’s favour
- Some full adjudication such as MOFR and MOT authorizations
- Work to identify, and market, local economic opportunities

### **Front Counter BC**

A corporate, integrated vehicle fully capable of providing the client services necessary to make the permitting and authorisation process **simpler**

- Went over some examples of authorizations provided by Front Counter.

Contact Front Counter BC for more Information: Kamloops office 372-2127.

**Noelle Kekula – Ministry of Tourism, Sports and the Arts (MoTSA)**

- *Concern about disconnect between Recreation and other ministries.* MoTSA is still Ministry of Forests offices. Still manage recreation on crown land. There is the same amount of work, covered by a ½ time position. Noelle is still at Kamloops Forest District office.
- *How is site specific recreation information passed onto operators/licensees?* Specific information on a block by block basis. Information is pulled from provincial database and is the licensees responsibility to retrieve and provide to operators.
- *What are recreation regulations on crown land?* FRPA recreation regulations only apply on established recreation trails/sites.

-