

## District Breakouts

---

### Intent of the breakout session

The intent of this session is to provide a voice for District staff to indicate what is working and what concerns or issues that they may have with the FREP program.

To ensure a timely presentation of issues, the session has been broken into seven subgroups or tables, each with a specific issue or topic. The task is for the participants at each table to discuss the issue/topic and to provide comments and suggestions to the FREP group. The format allows for 30 minutes of discussion with approximately 7 minutes to present per table.

Each table has a sheet with the specific topic area along with Key Aspects and Identified District Concerns and a list of participants for that table.

*The Identified District Concerns are direct quotes taken from District staff during the data gathering phase of this exercise. These issues are not meant as a full listing of issues, but are meant to begin the conversation and provide examples for moving the issue forward.*

The intent is for all issues, concerns and suggestions to be recorded and addressed by the appropriate group or team (e.g., vision team...). Action items will be created and feedback on the action will be provided back via the team leads.

NOTE: Each table needs to choose a note taker and a presentation person.

## **Table 1 - FREP Vision – clarifying it at the District level**

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

***Issue: Ensure Management and district staff understand and support program goals and strategic plan.***

***Key Aspects:***

- FREP as a “core” business.
- 3 – 5 Year commitment from senior management

***Identified district concerns:***

- Need 3-5 year commitment; where are we going? Where do we want to be?
- Need to get FREP program into core business and not just an add on.

***Discussion and Potential Solutions***

*What do you see needed to be done to ensure that FREP is recognized as a “core” business? Who needs to do it? What are the next steps?*

## Table 2 FREP Resources:

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

**Issue: Commitment to staff and resource the program as it expands.**

### **Key Aspects:**

- Workload
- Staffing up – regular and auxiliaries
- Training – new staff and refreshers
- Expanding program
- Support from other districts

### **Identified district concerns:**

- There is confusion over future monitoring efforts. Is it or is it not a requirement to continue to do 15 streams and 15 biodiversity per district per year? Should the number be lowered for the next two years until FRPA blocks come on line? Who decides to lower the mandatory number of surveys (performance measures)?
- For all the mandatory monitoring efforts in 2008-2009, how many surveys are excepted for each protocol or value? There needs to be a plan to meet resource capacity issues.
- If the number of days for field implementation of all FREP monitoring is expected to increase significantly in the years to come, senior district managers need to be encouraged to free up resources in other program areas to assist with this data collection. An example of this would be to utilize some C&E field inspection time for riparian or biodiversity monitoring. This would also provide exposure for district staff to professional dialogue with licensee foresters outside of a legislative regime.
- There is a potential for accountability issues when the workload is split between programs or agencies and in general spreads the work out too thin. Consistency and accuracy problems develop.
- Foresee problem with staffing and training as program expands next year.
  - Inadequate staffing to carry out more mandatory evaluations.
  - Ramping up to deal with and expanding list of mandatory assessments.
  - Limited human resources. Balancing RSM field work with other work duties - how should we be prioritising?
- We have a very big district and it takes us a long time to access each block. The average time spent on access to our blocks last year was 6 hours (3 hours drive, or drive/quad each way to each block). The

challenge for us is getting field staff willing to work longer days or to stay in camp.

- We have 6 people trained to do FREP but they are all swamped with their regular workload. This makes it difficult to recruit a crew of 2 or 4 people at one time. I think our management is going to hire an intern to help out with FREP this summer.
- Is there a way to share district resources in a timely fashion, a suggested approach is to have a notice board of who needs resources and who has free time to provide them.
  - Streamlining assistance/resources from other districts/programs: Is there some way that we can streamline communications/resources so that districts that need help in getting their work done get it in a timely manner? I think back to Fort Nelson's need for help with the field work last fall, but how the request came quite late in the year. At the same time, it seems to me that QCI district were already talking about starting the field work on their blocks for the next year, because they can essentially work year-round. It seems to me that the QCI staff could have been better used in a district like Fort Nelson, especially since they complete their field work earlier than the rest of us. Perhaps some efficiency in staff resources can be had when the coastal field season is completed earlier, and there is a need for help in the north? On a similar note, I also think about how our own district struggled a bit last summer. We got the work done, but I was out on 85-90% of the blocks because our other Stewardship staff were busy with their other work and our FREP "team" was basically me with a revolving helper. As a result, my own non-FREP work suffered badly. FREP is seriously becoming a full time job, and this becomes really apparent from April to November. Furthermore, we were not successful in getting the help from outside programs as promised, despite the fact that we have other staff that have had the FREP training. Is there any strategic level planning we can do amongst programs/districts to work more efficiently? Is this something for Region to consider?

## **Discussion and Potential solutions**

*Overall think about what's working well in providing resources for the program? What are the challenging parts? What solutions or suggestions do you have for the challenges?*

## Table 3 FREP Pilots:

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

***Issue: Need clarity on development and implementation of resource pilots.***

### **Key Aspects:**

- Expectations
- Participation

### **Identified district concerns:**

- There is a lack of information sharing from the provincial team leads regarding development and implementation of Protocol's to be implemented at the district level. How do we volunteer, how many samples are expected and what are the samples being used for? For the resource values that other Ministries are implementing who is doing this work and when will it be starting?
- Looking for a better process to get involved and know what is expected by when.

### **Discussion and Potential solutions**

*What's working well with the pilot program? What are the challenging parts?  
What solutions or suggestions do you have for the challenges?*

## **Table 4 FREP Training, Mentoring, Coaching, Data Consistency and Quality Assurance:**

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

***Issue: Need to improve the process to get training, support/advice and improve data collection process to ensure consistency in assessments.***

### **Key Issues:**

- Knowledge transfer
- Timing of training
- Expert support
- Data consistency
- Timing of QA
- Improvements

### **Identified district concerns:**

- Need to share knowledge, help out other districts and maintain/improve QA aspect.
- Need to re-familiarize crew members with the protocol each year. The one day refresher is nice but we need to think of some incentives to have staff take time out of their busy schedules to reread the protocol each season. We just don't have the time to send each person to the full training each year.
- More visits from FREP leads or other districts to help improve efficiency and ID improvements
- This topic was discussed amongst the FREP training working group and changes will be made to the training this year to address the consistency issue. However, perhaps it would be good to discuss with the other staff at the CI Session and maybe get some fresh ideas? I am interested in how other districts manage to maintain consistency (or not) when they are using staff from other programs and/or auxiliaries.
- Getting consistency in measuring moss and fines during sampling.

### **Discussion and Potential solutions**

*What's working well for training staff and providing support/advice? What's working well to ensure consistency in assessing values? What are the challenging parts? What solutions or suggestions do you have for the challenges?*

## **Table 5 Site Selection, Survey and Sampling Methods:**

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

**Issue: Better clarity on survey and sampling procedures.**

### **Key Aspects:**

- District sampling level
- Record multiple values on one site
- Site suitability

### **Identified district concerns:**

- The last issue (related to number 2) At what point do we stop trying to find a certain number of blocks for each value? I.E., we would like to have a set of blocks to survey, and have a number of values to evaluate on each block, rather than searching for blocks to fit the evaluation.
- Water Quality was confusing on road systems without stream crossings.
- Sampling scattered residual trees, where there are too many for total count but not enough to pick up with plots.
- We need to discuss the level of sampling in each district as the program expands. Does each district need to sample all mandatory values, or do we sample at the regional or provincial level?
- Sampling issues (assessing more values on same site; duplication in measurements eg. CWD soils and SLB etc)
- Discussion of small streams re: naturally-occurring features that score low on the checklist (i.e. high sediment levels, lack of substrate for moss/benthic invertebrates)
- Difficult to determine if external WTP is associated with a block; SP's not always available; hectares don't match.
- Difficulty in identifying increasers and noxious weeds for invasive plants; better field guide is needed.
- Water Quality site selection was not clear. The site selection criteria for the water quality protocol are a bit confusing and there's room for improvement. Mostly related to the identification of the water feature that is assessed and start and end point for assessment.
- Riparian Stream Classification: A great deal of time is spent determining if a block has riparian with in it, and often the streams are misclassified in the SP's resulting in wasted field time. Is there a better way to determine riparian blocks for evaluation, or even should we be spending so much time hunting down 15 blocks? Can GIS be used to find the blocks?

### **Discussion and Potential solutions**

*What's working well to provide clarity on sampling and survey procedures? What are the challenging parts? What solutions or suggestions do you have for the challenges?*

## Table 6 Topic: FREP Protocols – Riparian & Water Quality:

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

**Issue: Better clarity on Protocols.**

**Key Aspects:**

- **Make protocols more “user friendly”**
- **Mapping accuracy**
- **Specific aspects of each value**

**Identified district concerns:**

- Provide a standardized mapping product/procedure in the protocols. Map quality varies between individuals and how accurate do they need to be and what are they used for?
- Biodiversity Monitoring: We would like to see an indicator rating system included in the evaluation. Similarly to the Riparian evaluation, we would like to be able to have a systematic method of determining whether a block is good, bad or other with respect to biodiversity, rather than the opinion portion of the evaluation. I think this is important as a district, and for communication with licensees.
- When a specific question arises, it is hard to find it quickly in the document (e.g. try to find quickly where it says "trees greater than 12.5 cm DBH!). An index of key words would help.
- Aspects of specific protocols that could be discussed, Riparian/Fish reach, Partial cutting or the Range protocols for example.
- Provide a standardized mapping product/procedure in the protocols. Map quality varies between individuals and how accurate do they need to be and what are they used for?
- Biodiversity Monitoring: We would like to see an indicator rating system included in the evaluation. Similarly to the Riparian evaluation, we would like to be able to have a systematic method of determining whether a block is good, bad or other with respect to biodiversity, rather than the opinion portion of the evaluation. I think this is important as a district, and for communication with licensees.
- When a specific question arises, it is hard to find it quickly in the document (e.g. try to find quickly where it says "trees greater than 12.5 cm DBH!). An index of key words would help.
- Aspects of specific protocols that could be discussed, Riparian/Fish reach, Partial cutting or the Range protocols for example.

**Discussion and Potential solutions**

*What's working well to provide clarity in the protocols? What are the challenging parts? What solutions or suggestions do you have for the challenges?*

## Table 7 Topic: FREP Protocols – Biodiversity & Soils:

---

*You have 30 minutes to discuss and 7 minutes to present.*

**Issue: Better clarity on Protocols.**

**Key Aspects:**

- **Make protocols more “user friendly”**
- **Mapping accuracy**
- **Specific aspects of each value**

**Identified district concerns:**

- Provide a standardized mapping product/procedure in the protocols. Map quality varies between individuals and how accurate do they need to be and what are they used for?
- Biodiversity Monitoring: We would like to see an indicator rating system included in the evaluation. Similarly to the Riparian evaluation, we would like to be able to have a systematic method of determining whether a block is good, bad or other with respect to biodiversity, rather than the opinion portion of the evaluation. I think this is important as a district, and for communication with licensees.
- When a specific question arises, it is hard to find it quickly in the document (e.g. try to find quickly where it says "trees greater than 12.5 cm DBH!). An index of key words would help.
- Aspects of specific protocols that could be discussed, Riparian/Fish reach, Partial cutting or the Range protocols for example.
- Provide a standardized mapping product/procedure in the protocols. Map quality varies between individuals and how accurate do they need to be and what are they used for?
- Biodiversity Monitoring: We would like to see an indicator rating system included in the evaluation. Similarly to the Riparian evaluation, we would like to be able to have a systematic method of determining whether a block is good, bad or other with respect to biodiversity, rather than the opinion portion of the evaluation. I think this is important as a district, and for communication with licensees.
- When a specific question arises, it is hard to find it quickly in the document (e.g. try to find quickly where it says "trees greater than 12.5 cm DBH!). An index of key words would help.
- Aspects of specific protocols that could be discussed, Riparian/Fish reach, Partial cutting or the Range protocols for example.

### **Discussion and Potential solutions**

*What's working well to provide clarity in the protocols? What are the challenging parts? What solutions or suggestions do you have for the challenges?*