

# MINISTRY OF FORESTS, LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCE OPERATIONS

## INFORMATION NOTE

Date: June 27, 2013

File: 280-20

CLIFF #: 198768

**PREPARED FOR:** Honourable Steve Thomson, Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations

**ISSUE:** Meeting on July 08, 2013 with the Land Title and Survey Authority (LTSA) executive; Godfrey Archbold, Chief Executive Officer, Leslie Hildebrandt, Vice President of Corporate Affairs, and Geoff Plant, Q.C., Chair, Board of Directors, to present the LTSA's 2012/13 Annual Report and discuss other priority issues.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The LTSA was established in January 2005 as an independent not-for-profit corporation, with its mandate and responsibilities set out in the *Land Title and Survey Authority Act* and a 60-year Operating Agreement with the province. The LTSA manages private and Crown cadastral survey systems and provides for the registration of all property ownership throughout British Columbia.

Semi-annual meetings are held between the minister responsible for the LTSA and the chairperson of LTSA's Board of Directors. The meeting is intended to provide an opportunity for the LTSA and the province to advise of key initiatives. The chair also typically provides the minister with high-level information on the LTSA's strategic direction and financial and operational performance at these meetings.

s.13

LTSA executive has asked that the following items be discussed at the upcoming meeting:

- LTSA's Annual Report (Appendix A) and Financial Report (Appendix B) for the 2012/2013 fiscal year;
- LTSA's progress concerning various key initiatives, including ParcelMapBC (PM-BC; previously referred to as the 'Consolidated Parcel Fabric') and the Integrated Customer Portal (to be called 'myLTSA');
- An outline of the 2013 International Land Title Conference to be hosted by the LTSA;
- Provincial input towards the LTSA's Board of Directors 2014 nomination process; and
- 

s.13, s.17

An agenda will be distributed in advance of the meeting.

### **DISCUSSION:**

s.13

Pages 2 through 3 redacted for the following reasons:

-----

S. 13

S.13

**MINISTRY OF FORESTS, LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCE OPERATIONS  
INFORMATION NOTE**

Date: July 22, 2013  
Date of previous note: N/A  
File: N/A  
CLIFF/tracking #: 200411

**PREPARED FOR: Honourable Steve Thomson, Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations**

**ISSUE: HEADS-UP REGARDING POTENTIAL COMPLAINTS FROM INDEPENDENT POWER PRODUCERS**

**BACKGROUND:**

- A policy framework for *Land Act* investigative licenses (IL) for waterpower (run-of-river) projects was introduced in 2010. Prior to that date, there was no requirement under the Waterpower Policy (similar to the Windpower and Ocean Energy) mandating proponents to diligently investigate their project during the application process.
- In late 2011, as part of backlog reduction, Regional Executive Directors approved a provincial initiative to review outstanding *Land Act* applications for proposed (early stage) waterpower projects with the intent to determine should the project review continue under the issuance of a *Land Act* investigative license with associated diligent use requirements or be disallowed.
- A template letter was developed and used provincially. The clients had to confirm if they wished to pursue their waterpower application and, if yes, they had to submit an Investigative Plan consistent with the provincial template which was provided with the letter.
- Provincially, there were a few hundred outstanding waterpower applications that needed to be addressed. The Thompson Okanagan Region had 43 outstanding applications.

**DISCUSSION:**

Page 5 redacted for the following reason:

-----

s.13

**MINISTRY OF FORESTS, LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCE OPERATIONS  
INFORMATION NOTE**

Date: Oct. 22, 2013  
CLIFF #: 201613

**PREPARED FOR:** Honourable Steve Thomson, Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations

**ISSUE:** Meeting with FPInnovations and industry (Kruger, Canfor, West Fraser) on October 28 regarding cellulose filament research and demonstration plant initiative

**BACKGROUND:**

FPInnovations (FPI) and various industry partners have been working to enable a Cellulose Filaments (CF) demonstration plant to be built in Canada. CF is an emerging technology that is expected to create significant challenges for the BC and Canadian pulp sector but also provide significant new opportunities. CF can be used to strengthen pulp and paper and act, for example, as a barrier layer in food packaging, bioplastics and engineered materials and composites. The product provides many opportunities from cost savings in paper production to lighter, stronger or new, novel products.

Due to the exclusive information and intellectual property rights FPI has, Canada is in a leading position globally to take an advantage of CF opportunity. FPI and its industry partners want to position themselves at the forefront of CF development, enabling them to capitalize on, or lead, this change in the pulp and paper sector.

**DISCUSSION:**

Pages 7 through 8 redacted for the following reasons:

-----

s.13



## ISSUE NOTE

### Issue:

- The Wildf  
Request f

s.13, s.21

s.13, s.21

### Background:

- On November 6, 2013, the evaluation panel identified s.21 as the  
frontrunner in the RFP.
- This conclusion was reached after five days of propos

s.14

s.14

•

•

•

s.13, s.21

•

•

•

•

s.17

•

## Issue Note: RFP Frontrunner Amphibious Airtanker Services

- s.21

- s.13

- s.14

- The RFP was conducted following a fair, transparent and inclusive methodology (see appendix 2 for proposal evaluation criteria).

### **Recommandation:**

- 
- s.13

Pages 11 through 12 redacted for the following reasons:

-----

s.14

Issue Note: RFP Frontrunner Amphibious Airtanker Services  
December 4, 2013

**Appendix 2: RFP Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

Part C: Attachments



Ministry of  
Forests, Lands and  
Natural Resource Operations

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**Proposal Evaluation**

PROPOSAL EVALUATION										
PROJECT			CONTRACTOR IDENTIFICATION							
PROJECT NAME: _____			A							
PROJECT NUMBER: _____			B							
CONTRACT NUMBER: _____			C							
NATURE OF WORK: _____			D							
LOCATED AT: _____			E							
OPENING AND COMPLIANCE			A	B	C	D	E			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Late, Withdrawn, Unsolicited</li> <li>All Mandatories Submitted with Proposal</li> </ul>										
<b>ACCEPTED FOR EVALUATION (Yes/No)</b> <small>Attach details regarding reasons for rejecting any proposal.</small>										
PROPOSALS OPENED AT _____ A.M./P.M. ON THE _____ DAY OF _____ 20____.										
WITNESSES: _____ PRESIDING OFFICIAL: _____										
PROPOSAL EVALUATION			ONLY ACCEPTED PROPOSALS CONSIDERED							
			Rating = Evaluation "Decimal" Scale on following page Score = Rating x Maximum Points							
			Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score
MANAGEMENT	Max Points		A	B	C	D	E			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrated understanding and commitment</li> </ul>	2									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizational Experience</li> </ul>	6									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Past performance</li> </ul>	2									
<b>Sub total (1)</b>	<b>10</b>									
TECHNICAL	Max Points		A	B	C	D	E			
<b>Aircraft and Equipment</b>										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Airtanker and equipment meets basic requirements</li> </ul>	10									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Birdog Aircraft and equipment meets basic requirements</li> </ul>	5									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unique features and enhancements beyond basic requirements</li> </ul>	6									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aircraft serviceability and back up aircraft</li> </ul>	2									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Innovation</li> </ul>	2									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Airtanker efficiency based on sample missions</li> </ul>	10									
<b>Sub total (2)</b>	<b>35</b>									

### Part C: Attachments



<b>AWARD</b>		SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED EXPENSE AUTHORITY:	DATE:
PROPOSAL _____ ACCEPTED (A, B, or C, etc.)			

Issue Note: RFP Frontrunner Amphibious Airtanker Services  
December 4, 2013

Part C: Attachments



Ministry of  
Forests, Lands and  
Natural Resource Operations

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**Proposal Evaluation**

MANAGEMENT EVALUATION	
Term	The award of evaluation points is based upon the degree to which the proposal:
Demonstrated understanding and commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity of proposal</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of respective roles and responsibilities in firefighting activities</li> <li>• Similar commitment</li> </ul>
Organizational Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that the company has delivered services similar to those in the RFP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates an experienced management team</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Demonstrates that the proponent has been in business for a reasonable period of time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimizes legal, financial, and project risk to the Province</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Demonstrates the proponent is financially stable and able to finance the carrying costs of the equipment and services.</li> <li>• Demonstrates that the proponent has a satisfactory previous work record with the ministry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates ability to recruit and retain a qualified staff</li> <li>• Supports a solid aviation culture</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Past Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides client references which can confirm the proponent's abilities have been demonstrated on similar assignments</li> <li>• Innovative and responsive culture</li> </ul>
TECHNICAL EVALUATION	
Term	The award of evaluation points is based upon the degree to which the proposal:
Airtanker - Aircraft and equipment meets basic requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full description to meet requirements</li> <li>• Limited risk on availability specific aircraft</li> </ul>
Birdog- Aircraft and equipment meets basic requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full description to meet requirements</li> <li>• Limited risk on availability specific aircraft</li> </ul>
Unique features and enhancements beyond basic requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Described with discussion of merits, appropriateness to role, value to the Province</li> </ul>
Aircraft serviceability and back up aircraft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft make/model serviceability record meets or exceed expectations</li> <li>• Description of back up aircraft or arrangements if needed, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability to the service expectations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a progressive approach, willingness to explore and work together <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Airtanker efficiency based on sample missions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total volume delivered</li> <li>• Mission fuel burn and time to fire</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational availability</li> <li>• Maintain continuous service and ability to handle and meet extraordinary demand</li> <li>• Continued availability in a highly mobile role</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of situations and role</li> <li>• Demonstrates organizational depth, flexibility, approach and co-operation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back capabilities and contingency strategies to met goals</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Description of maintenance organization and program to meet readiness requirements, use of progressive maintenance program</li> <li>• Provides necessary equipment, personnel, support services to fully operate in a mobile role</li> </ul>
Remote operations to water source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of requirements</li> <li>• Appropriate arrangements (i.e. fuel, maintenance, support) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited risk to the Province</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Air crew and maintenance crew meet minimum requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As provided to meet requirements</li> </ul>
Experience with the proposed aircraft and/or similar roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific experience in firefighting role with Ministry and/or similar organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience with proposed aircraft</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Service Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated commitment, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Quality Assurance program</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Commitment to safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description that demonstrates an up-to-date approach and strong commitment.</li> </ul>
Environmental safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated commitment and understanding of role</li> </ul>

Issue Note: RFP Frontrunner Amphibious Airtanker Services  
December 4, 2013

Part C: Attachments



Ministry of  
Forests, Lands and  
Natural Resource Operations

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**Proposal Evaluation**

**MINIMUM EVALUATION POINTS REQUIREMENTS**

Proposals must achieve the specified minimum evaluation points in each of the management, technical, and presentation/interview (if required) evaluations to be considered further in the evaluation and award process. Proposals that meet or exceed all minimum values are classified as "short listed" proposals.

**PRICE EVALUATION**

The selection of either of the following price evaluation methods is indicated in the Price Evaluation section above.

<b>Lowest Price Per Point Method</b>	The total evaluation points of the technical, management, and presentation/interview sections of each shortlisted proposal are divided into the proposal price to obtain a price per point. The contract is awarded to the proponent having the proposal with the lowest price per point.
<b>Lowest Qualified Price Method</b>	The contract is awarded to the proponent having the lowest-priced shortlisted proposal.

- If the lowest price per point method is used, and two proposals are identically scored having the same price per point, the contract will be awarded based on the lower price. If the lowest qualified price method is used, and two qualified proposals have the same low price, the contract will be awarded based on the higher evaluation score.
- If, after either of the above alternatives are exercised and both proposals are still equal, then the contract may be awarded based on further evaluation criteria as determined by the ministry.

**EVALUATION DECIMAL SCALE**

Rating		Description
1.0	Excellent	Exceeds the requirements of the criterion in superlative beneficial ways; very desirable.
0.9	Very Good	Exceeds the requirements of the criterion in ways that are beneficial to the ministry's needs.
0.8	Good	Exceeds the requirements of the criterion, but in a manner that is not particularly beneficial to the ministry's needs.
0.7		Fully meets all requirements of the criterion.
0.6	Average	Adequately meets most of the requirements of the criterion. May be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
0.5		Barely meets most of the requirements of the criterion to a minimum level. May be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
0.4	Poor	Addresses most, but not all, of the requirements of a criterion to the minimum level. Lacking in critical areas.
0.3		Poor to very poor.
0.2	Very Poor	Minimally addresses some, but not all, of the requirements of the criterion. Lacking in critical areas.
0.1		Very Poor to unsatisfactory.
0.0	Unsatisfactory	Does not satisfy the requirements of the criterion in any manner.

**MINISTRY OF FORESTS, LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCE OPERATIONS  
INFORMATION NOTE**

Date: December 23, 2013  
Date of previous note: N/A  
File:  
CLIFF/tracking #: 203227

**PREPARED FOR:** Bill Bennett, MLA Kootenay East, Minister, Energy & Mines;  
Steve Thomson, Minister, FLNRO.

**ISSUE:** Proposed Grizzly Bear hunting regulation amendments for 2014, Kootenay Boundary and Cariboo Regions.

**BACKGROUND:**

Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (FLNRO) Fish, Wildlife, and Habitat Management Branch completes a comprehensive hunting regulation review process every two years.

s.13

s.13

s.13

Public opposition to the grizzly bear harvest in BC has increased following recent publications questioning grizzly bear population estimates in BC. In November 2013, researchers from Simon Fraser University and Raincoast Conservation Society published a paper (Artelle et al. 2013) suggesting management of grizzly bears in BC was risky due to uncertainty in population estimates and how uncertainty is factored into harvest management decisions. FLNRO responded in defence of its conservative grizzly bear harvest management procedures. In December 2013, FLNRO biologists (Mowat et al. 2013) published updated population estimates and identified underlying knowledge gaps.

**DISCUSSION:**

s.13

Pages 18 through 19 redacted for the following reasons:

-----

s.13