Page 1 MOE-2011-00231

Non – Native Notification Letters

(trappers, guides, outfitters, range holders, etc.)

and affiliated companies Canadian Forest Products Ltd. Dear. The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the above noted A new Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions. Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP) November 08, 2010 This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) covers Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts. Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division by appointment with Dean The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia VOJ 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Copies c locations in Prince George by appointment with Dale Likes. The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include aerial and ground based. Marshall. 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417 the publication of this notice. A person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, relevant to the development of the PMP, may send copies of the information to the applicants at the addresss above within 30 days of This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period(2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE). Weed-Master Vantage Forestry, Name Herbicide Trade Vision, Vision Max s.22 s.22 Active Ingredient glyphosate Application Usage common Aerial yes Ground yes Products Act # Pesticide Control 19899, 27736 26884, 29009 CANFOR

Page 2 MOE-2011-00231

Page MOE

Page 3 MOE-2011-00231

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

5.

As per Canfor, Prince George Woodlands previous Pest Management Plan 124-0351-06/11, we will send annual notification to your attention.

Yours truly,

Dean Marshall, R.P.F. Silviculture Coordinator

11

:

Dale Likes, R.P.F. Silviculture Forester Yours truly,

.

•

×

•

Attachment: PMP Scope Map



Page 4 MOE-2011-00231

Summary List of letters sent - November 17, 2010 (map included with all letters (see next page)

Range

Siegmund Finke

Lester & Judy Dayman

Kirk Childress Stephen Brandner William Blackburn Brian Armstrong Trapper Mark Werner Dennis D. Smith **Roy Pattison** Ralph Maida Mark Irvine Michael Erickson Veda Gail Elder Chico (Gale) Crossland Ben H. Cook Henry Colebank Maureen Clark Sam Chingee Ron Buchi Milton Eric Balon Karl Prinz Donald McCaulder David J. Latham Helmut Kock Art Julian Frederick Inyallie Peter Hohn **Clifford Griffin** Joseph M. Gagne **Richard Tallman** Oscar Sweder Gordon Smith Kathleen P. Richards **Richard Purdue Betsy Pius** Michael Andrew Monroe William Miller Glen D. McRae Rita McKinnon **Greg Loring** lack DuBois Leo Denis Grant Towers Leonard Shankel Lorne Schreiner William Saari James Prince

> Shirley Lawlor Peter van der Merwe Dwight & Glenda Smith Ken Pickering Allan Patchett Lee Migvar Anders Hagberg Archie Everall

Darryl Toll **Dirk Schuirmann** J. Scott Pichette Bernard McKay Gordon Jeck Harry Chingee Larry Erickson

Guide

Albert & Jacqueline Tosoff Lena & Cyril Schultz Denyse Pellerin Braden O'Meare Tammy Mead Jack Katona

Walter M. Doern Grace Apps

Ronald J. Clark **Charles** Chingee Byron Cannon Frederick Buchi Brian Becker Mark Aubrey Robert G. Dubois **Robert Denis** Vernon Cunningham Gary Cooper Walter Colk Wesley Chingee John C. Botham Bryan Everett Monroe Frank Meersman Patrick R. Madden Robert P. Learie Lars Kornmacher Joanne Kirkland Eugene Isadore Glen Hooker **Richard Gunther** Andrew Glennen Franke Everhard Don Ellis Wayne Wilson Ervin J. Voelk John E. Tereshuk Blaine Tallman Hans Stever Wayne Sharpe Robert E. Schwartz Larry Sagalon Joe Roy Rose **Gilbert Rand** Richard Prince Jr. Oliver J. Prather Wayne Nedoborski Angus K. McKirdy Robert G. McCoy

> Gerald M. Pattison Guy & Jan Norton **Robert Allen Leroy McKelvie** Catherine & Ross Harris Garth Everall Owen Thompson Charles & Lynn Poole

23

Juergen Krebs Wayne Mueller Eric Hanson Tim A. Cushman Paul Trepus Arnold Schwartz Leonard Pickering

22

Gordon Colebank Ken Christopher Lyle Carty **Rick Buchi Regina Aubrey** George & Virginia Jalava Kenneth W. Hooker Claude Hill **Roger Gratton** Walter Everhard Earl Erickson **Brad Eakin** Robert Dondale Charles B. Davidson Gerald David Craig Charles W. Colville **Jim Chingee** Arthur Bracey Kenneth Bergestad Neal Michael Widell Ed Stewart **Bergliot Smedley** John Schweizer Fred & Lonnie Schermerhorn Roy D. Rose **Delbert Richards** Randy Purdue Emma Prince Garry L. Ollinger George Douglas Monroe Anne Migvar Warren McLennon Murray & Lucille McCulloch William L. Markland Anthony Joseph Lebrun Ron Lancour Cornelius & Carol Klassen Ernest A. Tallman Kenneth Thibault

119

Don Wilkins

No letter sent

Guide List

Trapper List

Greg Fournier Mike Hawkridge Albert Huble Chris Pharness Irene Smith Dwayne Nikkels

Michael E. Schwartz Richard Sharpe Dale Stephens Judy Stephens Monika Grundmann Mike Hawkridge Karen Briker Justin Chingee Ivan Lizotte Elsie Martin Chuck McNaughton **Nina Venables** Dean Prince Mervin (Rip) Kitchen G.W. Kirkland John Julian Albert Huble Wayne Egberg **Robert Deleteer** Darren Bleich Ken Russel Allan H. Purdue **Bill Kirkland Greg Fournier** Tom Dobrowski George & Phyllis Davidson **Rick Collum** Guy Boudreau Frederick Booker

> No current address on file No info in COPI

No current address on file No current address on file

No current address on file No current address on file No current address on file No info in COPI No info in COPI No info in COPI

No current address on file No current address on file No current address on file No info in COPI

No current address on file No current address on file

4	Plant North	Last Name/ Organization (Search
adAt	FIISE Wallie	Field)
3,T	Colonel	Anderson .
lange	Mark and Fred	Anderson
lange	Guy	Bambauer
lange	Roland and Rosemarie	Beier
(1)	John	Blackwell
3, T	Daniel	Brooks
~	Vivian & Estelle	Buchanan
~	Corsa Contracting - Doug & Stan Weaver	C4 Ranching
~	James	Chadwell
[77?	Darrell	Ophus
	George & Phyllis	Davidson
~		Dykam Ranch & Woodlot Ltd.
S '-	Wayne & Corrine Koftinoff	Finger Lake Wilderness Resort
r, s	Roger	Gratton
3, R	David & Maureen	Harrington
~	John & Joyce	Helweg
NL	Norm	Holt
(1)	Mark	Irvine
Г	Ernest (Ernie)	John & Co.
Г,R	Cornelius & Carol	Klassen
Γ,	Ron	Lancour
Γ	Rosalind	Macintosh
	Barry	Mills
R	Orest	Monegat
R	John & Alice	Musil
L, S	Doerig's	Nechako Lodge & Aviation
	Denis & June Woods	Nechako Retreat
Τ	Bob	Neilson
T	James	Prince
T	Delbert	Richards
R	James Brophy	Rim Rock Ranch Ltd.
T	Ken	Russel
Т	John	Schulz
?	Barry	Skye
T	Irv	Stadel
G, R	John A.	Steiner
	Ken & Debbie Still	Tatuk Lake Resort
G	Darryl	Toll
2	FN#6	Tsilhqot'in National Government
R	John	Vala Jr.
T	Alfred	Vossen
R	Dan	Weaver ⁻
R	Jack & Nell	Welch

10

Page 7 MOE-2011-00231

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Upper Nechako Wilderness Council

Decemb er 18 – receive email from Denis and June Wood Nechako Retreat

etc and discussed forestry issues in general. Committed to providing annual notification for January 18, 2011 - Met with Denis and June Wood at their house. Presented PMP, Herbicides anything being treated on the Kenny Dam, and Lucas/Crystal areas

the Upper Nechako Wilderness Committee Gave June and Denis extra copies of the plan so that they could distribute to other members of

January 21, 2011 – Received letter from Upper Nechako Wilderness Committee with broad concerns - attached.

members wanted to discuss specific areas to let me know. February 17, 2011 – Replied with own letter to UNWC – explicitly asked if any concerned

Communication Result:

Nothing received. Nothing further

Marshall, Dean	
From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject:	Denis and June Wood, Nechako Retreat [info@nechako-retreat.ca] Saturday, December 18, 2010 4:34 PM Marshall, Dean Crystal Lake Resort Your letter Dec. 13 re IPMP
Follow Up Flag: Due By: Flag Status:	Follow up Tuesday, January 04, 2011 5:00 PM Completed
Dear Dean.	
We live out on the Nechal labelled "D" of your map a	ko River, about 60 kms from town on the Kenney Dam Road. This places us in the blue part attached to the above letter.
What is the significance o Are you planning to deal v area?	f the blue colour and the letter "D"? What vegetation are you planning to attempt to control? with the orange and yellow hawk weed and Canada thistle that has become very prevalent in the
Looking forward to hearin	g further. Thanks
Regards	
Denis	
C/C Dan Brooks, Chair, L	pper Nechako Wilderness Council
Denis and June Wood, Nechako Retreat, P.O. Box 293, Vanderhoof, B.C. Canada V0J 3A0 604 484 9185	
I am using the Free ver SPAMfighter has remo	sion of <u>SPAMfighter</u> . ved 328 of my spam emails to date.
Do you have a slow PC	22 Try free scan!

Page 9 MOE-2011-00231

-

o sum	o o o o o o	To sum o o Again, Sincer
 For any planned (chemical) treatments, in a given year – Canfor will provide you with maps of the int treatment areas that fall within your interest area. The areas of concern have been previously provid Canfor, and roughly encompass a corridor along the Kenney Dam Road from your property to the dan corridor from the dam to your cabin at +/- 508 km. We will try to dig up the original letter on file. 	 For any planned (chemical) treatments, in a given year – Canfor will provide you with maps of the int treatment areas that fall within your interest area. The areas of concern have been previously provid Canfor, and roughly encompass a corridor along the Kenney Dam Road from your property to the day corridor from the dam to your cabin at +/- 508 km. We will try to dig up the original letter on file. Scope of proposed annual treatment area: For every hectare that gets logged in Vanderhoof by Canfor approximately 15% of the area will require a brush control treatment – predominantly for Aspen con 15% would fall into both manual and chemical methods based on some of the site factors we discuss 	 For any planned (chemical) treatments, in a given year – Canfor will provide you with maps of the int treatment areas that fall within your interest area. The areas of concern have been previously provid Canfor, and roughly encompass a corridor along the Kenney Dam Road from your property to the dat corridor from the dam to your cabin at +/- 508 km. We will try to dig up the original letter on file. Scope of proposed annual treatment area: For every hectare that gets logged in Vanderhoof by Canfor approximately 15% of the area will require a brush control treatment – predominantly for Aspen con 15% would fall into both manual and chemical methods based on some of the site factors we discuss ain, if you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact me. anks for your time – you have a <u>beautiful</u> home.
 For any planned (chemical) treatments, in a given year – Canfor will provide you with maps of the into treatment areas that fall within your interest area. The areas of concern have been previously provide Canfor, and roughly encompass a corridor along the Kenney Dam Road from your property to the dar corridor from the dam to your cabin at +/- 508 km. We will try to dig up the original letter on file. 	 For any planned (chemical) treatments, in a given year – Canfor will provide you with maps of the into treatment areas that fall within your interest area. The areas of concern have been previously provide Canfor, and roughly encompass a corridor along the Kenney Dam Road from your property to the dar corridor from the dam to your cabin at +/- 508 km. We will try to dig up the original letter on file. Scope of proposed annual treatment area: For every hectare that gets logged in Vanderhoof by Canfo approximately 15% of the area will require a brush control treatment – predominantly for Aspen con 15% would fall into both manual and chemical methods based on some of the site factors we discussion 	 For any planned (chemical) treatments, in a given year – Canfor will provide you with maps of the intertreatment areas that fall within your interest area. The areas of concern have been previously provide Canfor, and roughly encompass a corridor along the Kenney Dam Road from your property to the dar corridor from the dam to your cabin at +/- 508 km. We will try to dig up the original letter on file. Scope of proposed annual treatment area: For every hectare that gets logged in Vanderhoof by Canfor approximately 15% of the area will require a brush control treatment – predominantly for Aspen cont15% would fall into both manual and chemical methods based on some of the site factors we discuss Again, if you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks for your time – you have a <u>beautiful</u> home.
	 Scope of proposed annual treatment area: For every hectare that gets logged in Vanderhoof by Canfo approximately 15% of the area will require a brush control treatment – predominantly for Aspen cont 15% would fall into both manual and chemical methods based on some of the site factors we discusse 	 Scope of proposed annual treatment area: For every hectare that gets logged in Vanderhoof by Canfo approximately 15% of the area will require a brush control treatment – predominantly for Aspen cont 15% would fall into both manual and chemical methods based on some of the site factors we discusse Again, if you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks for your time – you have a <u>beautiful</u> home. Sincerely,

Page 10 MOE-2011-00231

2 7

6ig River Councry (Upper Necholso Wildernes: Council) 190, Box 619, Vanderhoof, BC VOL \$70

Telephone 604-629-9036 www.BigRiverCountry.co

January 21, 2011

Canfor Forest Products Plateau 1399 Bearhead Road Vanderhoof, B. C. V0J 3A2

Attn: Dean Marshall

Re: Use of herbicides in the Vanderhoof Forest District

Dear Dean,

presentation of your information on the use of herbicides, I was asked to write this letter to you. The Upper Nechako Wilderness Council (UNWC) met on January 19th and as a result of my

UNWC members' concerns, questions and recommendations are outlined as follows:

- 0 poplar and other deciduous trees targeted by the treatments with glyphosate. This There is concern regarding the collateral damage to leafy plant species, other than the species of birds. species affected i.e. browse for moose and berries that provide food for bear and many collateral damage results in secondary damage to animals dependent on those plant
- habitat within a given area. Treatment of 15% of Canfor's cut-blocks may represent a very high percentage of moose
- spraying, to produce a monoculture of primarily pine is, in our opinion, not good forestry The uniform killing of all broadleaf vegetation, as is the case with broadcast aerial The vegetation in areas under consideration for treatment represents an ecosystem type.
- years? will the entire 15% be treated in one season or will treatment be spread out over several What is the time-frame for application of glyphosate to 15% of your logged areas? i.e.

0

0

0

aspects of the blocks within their areas of interest. and that members of the UNWC be visited on an individual basis to discuss the spacial Members ask that site-specific maps be provided when Jill has completed her inventory

0

Marshall, Dean
From: Denis and June Wood, Nechako Retreat [info@nechako-retreat.ca] Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2011 11:33 AM To: Marshall, Dean Re: UNWC Letter
Thanks, Dean. I was asked to write the letter voicing the group's concerns since I was the one who presented the information. Denis did clarify a few points and add to what I had to say.
Original Message From: <u>Marshall, Dean</u> To: <u>Denis and June Wood, Nechako Retreat</u> Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 8:12 AM Subject: UNWC Letter
Hi June.
I was working in Prince George most of last week, so I didn't get your letter until this morning.
Just wanted to let you know that I had received your letter and was going to consider the information submitted and formulate a response later this week.
Thanks for your time.
Sincerely,
R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Products Forest Management Group East/West 250.567.8335 - office 250.567.7765 - mobile
I am using the Free version of <u>SPAMfighter</u> . SPAMfighter has removed 332 of my spam emails to date.
Do you have a <u>slow PC?</u> Try free scan!

Page 12 MOE-2011-00231

Marshall, Dean

Cc: Subject: Attachments: From: Sent: To:

Hello June.

Management Plan for the area. Please find attached to this letter a response to your correspondence to Canfor, regarding our proposed Pest

Sincerely, Dean

R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Products Forest Management Group East/West 250.567.8335 - office 250.567.7765 - mobile

1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

Page 14 MOE-2011-00231

using only manual brushing methods – and also represents a very high percentage of moose habitats. Under our chemical). Under Canfor's legislated silviculture obligations, this same percentage of area is currently being treated The 15% figure was provided to you in order to quantify the area requiring any kind of brush treatment (not just plan, we are proposing to use a mix of both manual and chemical brush control methods.

0

given area.

Treatment of 15% of Canfor's cut blocks may represent a very high percentage of moose habitat within a

Dear June Wood and UNWC Council Members Re: Development of a Pest Management Plan for Canadian Forest Products Ltd. V0J 3A0

Vanderhoof, BC P.O. Box 619, **Big River Country** Upper Nechako Wilderness Council

Thursday, February 17th, 2011

Management Plan. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your thoughtful letter pertaining to Canfor's proposed Pest

In response to your concerns, questions and recommendations, I have enumerated your points (in italics) and have inserted Canfor's response to your concerns below each point.

deciduous trees targeted by the treatments with glyphosate. This collateral damage results in secondary damage to animals dependent on those species affected.... There is concern regarding the collateral damage to leafy plant species, other than the poplar and other

0

reaching the forest floor. Again, in the majority of the cases, the treatments will target only a portion of an opening, thus leaving species diversity on the land and maintaining browse opportunities in the remainder of the opening closure. This type of aspen stand has limited understory growth of leafy herbaceous species due to lack of sunlight limited in nature. The aspen clones that will be targeted are generally taller and have well established crown incidental damage to leafy plant species located in the immediate vicinity of any target vegetation, it will be very As mentioned, in the vast majority of cases, Trembling Aspen will be the targeted species. Although there will be

ANFOR

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

Plateau

members to contact me directly so that I might get their information into our system and begin sharing information with them.

0 licensees regarding free to grow further address our concerns, we will be writing to government regarding the policy requirements for areas, we will be asking for an exemption from the free to grow criteria on certain site specific blocks. To While we understand that Canfor has a legal requirement to produce free growing stands on its logged

We understand your concerns regarding this, and we have also spoken to Wayne Salewski of the BC Wildlife Federation. Your position has been made clear. I also understand that you have spoken to the Pesticide Management Officer in Prince George (Manuel Mariotto). If you wish to discuss stocking standards and free growing requirements, I would be happy to do so at anytime.

0 Plan (2006 – 2011) and noticed that there is a Nazko Pest Management Protocol. Is it possible that a protocol such as this would address some of the concerns of the Upper Nechako Wilderness Council? Since our meeting with you and with the UNWC, I have read Canfor's Forest Vegetation Pest Management

possible, to make adjustments to our plan. meeting, it is our intention to understand stakeholder concerns through this information sharing process and, if It is our duty to consult with stakeholders who live/operate on the timber harvesting landbase. As mentioned at our

Again, I would recommend that if any of the members of the Upper Nechako Wilderness Council have individual (site/area specific) concerns, that they contact me directly so that we might understand and/or address them.

(from 100% manual to a mix of manual and chemical treatments) In summary, Canfor is proposing to change the treatment method by which it manages competing vegetation issues

I trust that the foregoing answers some of your questions, and likely has created more. Please call me directly if you wish to discuss this matter further

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Canfor – Forest Management Group 250.567.8335 dean.marshall@canfor.com

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: BC Wildlife Federation

concerns around brush control February 10 - Wayne Salewski, President of BC Wildlife Federation called me to express some

February 21- Wayne Salewski, President of BC Wildlife Federation emailed me a letter

concerned members wanted to discuss specific areas to let me know. February 22, 2011 - Replied with own letter to Wayne Salewski - explicitly asked if any

Communication Result:

Nothing received. Nothing further

Marshall, Dean	
From:	wayne salewski .22
Sent:	Monday, February 21, 201 ⁹ 8:34 PM
To:	Marshall, Dean
Cc:	dale.likes@canfo.com
Subject:	Canfor Pest Management Plan - Herbicides 2011
Attachments:	FRPA Stocking Standard Tests.docx; Canfor-Herbicide 2011 001.jpg; Canfor-Herbicide 2011
HI Dean	
I have attached my lette	r of concern on the use of herbicides to meet Free to grow standards for the Province. The letter
scanned as two separat	2 documents (sorry) and you can see the FRPA stocking standards I refer to as a separate
document. The BC Wild	Ife Federation feels strongly about the usage of Herbicides and will address this issue with the
Minister of MoNRO	

One question that I did not ask in the letter is that of meeting your obligations under ISO 14001. In reviewing this policy I see that all companies commit to and I quote ".. to provide a framework for a holistic, strategic approach to the organization's and this certification was the stamp that said it all. environmental policy, plans and actions" I guess my disappointment is that I thought we were past this usage of herbicides WINISTER OF WOWKO.

Wayne Salewski President region 7A BC Wildlife Federation

-

Dean Marshall / Dale Likes

Canfor Forest Products LTD.,

Vanderhoof and Prince George BC

Dean and Dale:

remarks cover off the same region as my role with the BC Wildlife Federation does. your Pest Management Plan (PMP). I have included Dale as the PG representative for Canfor as my Thank you Dean for the conversation last week on your companies plans for using Herbicide as part of

concerns with the Ministry under separate cover. disagree with the use of herbicides as a needed treatment in a healthy forest, we will address those and regulations with the Ministry of Forests and Range and although the BC Wildlife Federation I understand that your obligations to reach and meet Free to Grow standards are mandated by policy

Having stated that we would ask your assurance that all other issues are considered in making the decision to use herbicides to meet this standard including;

- P A recognition that the Mountain Pine Beetle (MBP) epidemic has created enormous pressure on as part of the critical habitat when making the decision. these zones. We would ask that important food sources adjacent to these zones be considered riparian zones and studies under FRPA are indicating there are concerns for the very health of
- N I have concern about your slide presentation and in particular the third slide after the slide titled under PMP" " Protection of Ecological Values" this slide talks about "which resource features are protected
- You make no mention of fur bearers and these are a key species in a healthy forest.
 You state that Food Plants are protected which is the very species that all forest animals
- 0 would be consuming including ungulates. Recent studies have even tied the demise of the honey bees to the broader use of herbicides.
- 0 needs, your slides showing large areas of treatment while highlighting the protection of Although I understand your usage of herbicides to be small and based on selective as this slide demonstrates a much larger usage then we discussed. riparian zones. I am hoping that this slide is from past practices and simple out of date
- ŝ The following slide tells us that you use professional Foresters or Biologists to assess needs. This is important but the BCWF has concerns with the lack of Government oversight in this new world order and we want to be assured that this information is recorded for future reference.
- -That all tools be considered prior to applying herbicides including consideration and allowances considered first. for aspen as a species of choice and that choices allowed for under FRPA (attached) are

grow over the landscape unit which would further reduce the need to herbicide. We strongly believe that there is an appetite for a change on this subject including re-defining free to

Page 19 MOE-2011-00231 In summary we would like to see both Industry and MoNRO move us towards growing healthy forests for today and then see how society dictates its usage in 100 years.

We all see that adaptation to climate change must be considered in managing our forests today and we need to understand how to adapt our current practices to meet these changes.

Yours truly

WRaQ. ٠

Wayne Salewski

President, Region 7A

BC Wildlife Federation

FRPA Stocking Standard Tests

Test 1 – Initial High Level Test – A high level review of all the proposed stocking standards to ensure there are no obvious omissions or issues that will not allow for approval. This test is not intended to replace the tests that follow.

is considered the starting point for this test Test 2 – Ecological Suitability Test – The Reference credible new and emerging information. Guide to FDP Stocking Standards (MFR, 2007) Licensees can also use appropriately applied and

this test should be species acceptability based on known forest health factors. Test 3 – Forest Health Test – The key criteria for

future values, the assumption is that maintaining products and values. While this test acknowledges reasonable strategy. or enhancing a mix of species is considered a the difficulties associated with assessing these potential risk with respect to future options for based on the proposed species and the associated commercial timber – Focuses on value (not volume) Test 4 – Economically valuable supply of

Test 5 – Consistency with Timber Supply Review - To facilitate good forest management, stocking standards should be linked to local assumptions

Page 20 MOE-2011-00231

	R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest P Forest Managemer 250,567,8335 - off 250,567,7765 - mc	Thanks	Thanks for your I I have tried to ac Please let me kn not sure whom y	Hi Wayne.	From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:	Marshall, Dea
*	roducts It Group East/West Ice bile		etter. Idress your concerns. ow if you require a copy o ou got it from and not su		Marshall, Dea Tuesday, Feb wayne salews PMP Commur response_way	m
			of the PMP Document – Ire what other materials		in ruary 22, 2011 10:02 AN ki nication yne_salewski_feb_22.pd	
		4	in your letter you make you received.			
			reference to a prese			
			ntation –			

.

Page 21 MOE-2011-00231

H

anadian Forest Products Ltd.	CANFOR
ไลteaw	
uesday, February 22, 2011	
C Wildlife Federation /ayne Salewski, resident egion 7A	
e: Development of a Pest Management Plan for Canadian Forest Products Ltd. (via electronic mail)
ear Wayne Salewski.	
would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your letter pertaining to Canf lan.	or's proposed Pest Management
response to your concerns, questions and recommendations, I have enumerate serted Canfor's response to your concerns below each point.	d your points (in italics) and have
 A recognition that the MPB epidemic has created enormous pressure on FRPA are indicating there are concerns for the very health of these zones food sources adjacent to these zones be considered as part of the critica decision 	rlparian zones and studies under . We would ask that important habitat when making the
iparian features, depending on their classification, may require different manage uilding and harvesting, riparian features will be managed during silviculture activ rarrants it. I can forward you a copy of the draft plan so that you might see how t rotected through the implementation of the plan.	ment strategies. As is done in road ities if their riparian classification he various riparian features will be
Yanderhoof, Trembling Aspen is typically the main targeted species. Although the safy plant species located in the immediate vicinity of any target vegetation, it wispen clones that will be targeted are generally taller and have well established created has limited understory growth of leafy herbaceous species due to lack of sugain, in the majority of the cases, the treatments will target only portions of an of versity on the land and maintaining browse opportunities.	here will be incidental damage to II be very limited in nature. The own closure. This type of aspen nlight reaching the forest floor. pening thus leaving species
2. You make no mention of fur bearers and these are a key species in a hea	Ithy forest.
ou are correct – fur bearers are not mentioned in the slide and this is likely an ov hould infer that other protection measures currently existing under the Forest ar	

Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

Page 22 MOE-2011-00231

		5
want to be assured that this information is recorded for future reference.	important but the BCWF has concerns with lack of Government oversight in this new world order and we	The following slide tells us that you use professional foresters or biologists to assess needs. This is

the implementation of forestry planning and forestry practices. The meaning of this statement is unclear. We can only surmise that BCWF has concerns with Professional Reliance in

6. as a species of choice and that choices allowed under FRPA are considered first. That all tools are considered prior to applying herbicides including consideration and allowances for aspen

stipulates that all site variables be considered when contemplating a particular treatment method. The implementation of a Pest Management Plan, under the auspices of the Integrated Pest Management Act

Treatment decisions are made on a site by site basis, and sites are evaluated on their need for treatment. As mentioned above, current legislation allows for the retention of a proportion broadleaf species. On many sites, a chemical treatment may be the best treatment option - on others it may not be the method of choice due to other values.

vegetation issues (from 100% manual to a mix of manual and chemical treatments). It should be noted that Canfor is proposing to change the treatment method by which it manages competing

intention to understand stakeholder concerns through this information sharing process and, if possible, to make adjustments to our plan. It is our duty to consult with stakeholders who live/operate on the timber harvesting land base and it is our

might understand and/or address them. Again, I would recommend that if you have any specific (site/area) concerns, that you contact me directly so that we

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF / Silviculture Coordinator Canfor – Forest Management Group 250.567.8335 dean.marshall@canfor.com

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFØR

and affiliated companies

November 08, 2010

Opatcho Lake Guide Outfitters 12105 Wilan Road Prince George, B.C. V2N 5A6

Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear Ken;

Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions. new Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the above noted locations in Prince George by appointment with Dale Likes.

The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Copies c Marshall. proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division by appointment with Dean E-mail Dean.Marshall@canfor.com. Copies of the

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) covers Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts.

Application methods will include aerial and ground based The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control

Herbicide Trade	Asting Installant	Application	a		Pesticide Control
Name	ACIIVE INGLEUIEIII	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry,	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period(2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

A person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, relevant to the development of the PMP, may send copies of the information to the applicants at the addresss above within 30 days of the publication of this notice.

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Page 25 MOE-2011-00231 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Dale Likes, R.P.F. Silviculture Forester · · ·

Yours truly,

..

Yours truly,

*:

As per Canfor, Prince George Woodlands previous Pest Management Plan 124-0351-06/11, we will send annual notification to your attention.

1

• • •

Dean Marshall, R.P.F. Silviculture Coordinator

De

Attachment: PMP Scope Map



Nov. 27, 2010

Canfor Forest Products Ltd. 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Rd. PO Box 9000 Prince George, B.C V2L 4W2 Fax 250-962-3217 ph 250-962-3425

Re: Development of a new Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear Dale Likes,

Thanks for the letter outlining Canfor's development of a new pest management plan

discussions on this matter in the past. I appreciate the opportunity to make some of my feelings known, even though we have had

My guide area, south east of Prince George, lies in four of Canfor's operating areas. These areas are Stoney, Purden, Government, and Aimes.

after treatment. "Herbicide induced changes to ungulate forage habitat in Western Alberta, moose winter forage, as well as summer ell forage have been reduced by 48% up to five years I guess what I am most concerned about, is the reduction of moose forage and would like to see alternate methods to reduce competing vegetation. There are studies out, which show that Canada".1

would do the most good for moose, as the nutritional values of the browse changes depending on when it was cut. "The impact and timing of brush management on the nutritional value of I would like to see more manual brushing, which not only reduces competing vegetation, but also creates foraging opportunities for moose. I would like to see this strategy timed when it woody browse for moose".2

forage. I propose Canfor consider manual brushing treatments on all harvested openings that are within a one kilometer radius of all W1 and W5 wetlands. This will ensure these valuable wetland areas contain sufficient browse species for ungulates. feel that alder is as important to moose and it might even compete with other, more important I am most interested in promoting moose forage in willow, birch, and aspen stands. I don't

manner. I am looking forward to working with you and Canfor in the future Dale I understand that Canfor needs to complete silviculture obligations and do so in a viable

Regards,

Ken Watsor

To confirm you have received my comments, please email me at

s.22

1 W.L Strong, C.C Gates

² Roy V. REA and Michael P. Gillingham, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, B.C.-Journal of Applied Ecology 38, 710-719.

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.



and affiliated companies

November 30, 2010

Opatcho Lake Guide Outfitters 12105 Wilan Road Prince George, B.C. V2N 5A6

Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear Ken Watson;

To begin, I would like to thank you for your response to Canfor's letter, dated November 08, 2010.

through annual notification Your comments are well received and, as always, we will try to address them on a block by block basis

As you are aware, our aerial application techniques are mainly pilot discretion within your area of interest, targeting, for the most part, clumps / concentrations of Trembling aspen and not broadcasting entire areas. As we have done in the past, we will endeavor to employ manual brushing techniques on important moose browse species such as willow and birch.

In order for Canfor to continue to be a good environmental steward and meet the objectives of sustainable forest management by ensuring healthy, vigorous plantations that meet our regulatory obligations within reasonable timeframes, we offer the following points:

- a We will recognize that herbicides are one of the necessary tools in meeting our Silviculture obligations;
- 9 We will judiciously use herbicides as a vegetation management tool and seek a balance between social, economic and environmental values;
- c) We will use herbicides in a biologically and ecologically appropriate manner, with treatment strategies based on sound science;
- d) We will base treatment decisions on sound, operationally specific frameworks in order to provide consistency in prescribing the use of herbicides;
- 0) We will provide information to communities through informational exchange and consider input into our vegetation management programs;
- 5 We will be consistent with Canfor's Forestry Principals, Environmental Policy, Mission Statement and other policies;

Yours truly;

round court,

Dale Likes Silviculture Forester

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

and affiliated companies

January 24, 2006

McLeod Lake Indian Band General Delivery, McLeod Lake, B.C. V0J 2G0

Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear Sir;

A draft Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Prince George Woodlands, located at 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the above noted location by appointment with Dale Likes.

This proposed PMP covers Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George Forest District and may include openings treated under the Forest Initiatives Account. The Pest Management Plan also covers Forest Licence A20009 and managed silviculture obligations within the Quesnel Forest District.

The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include aerial and ground based

Herbicide Trade	Antiwa Ingendiant	Application			Pesticide Control	-
Name	Active Ingredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #	_
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884,	

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2006-2011) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

notice. A person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, relevant to the development of the PMP, may send copies of the information to the applicant at the addresss above within 30 days of the publication of this

Yours truly

Dale Likes, R.P.F. Silviculture Forester

Attachments: Draft Pest Management Plan

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Canadian Ferent Hoducts. First Nation: Vall.er Chilcoph Tribal Council

Contact Person: Dean Malsha Contact Person: Shawnee

Palmantier-administrator

Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

7 Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

- vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the
- including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.
- 1 Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

5 Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation See a Hack &

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

DRAFT-March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests. Shawnee - stated that indir. bands Should be consulted. Palman her

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 30 MOE-2011-00231

Memorandum

12

Commences and

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Carrier Chilcotin Tribal Council

Council The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Carrier Chilcotin Tribal

28 January, 2011

s.16

Confirmed – affected member bands have all been sent package.

Result:

No further communication

Page 31 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Contact Person: alu. Res Contact Person; 2 First Nation:

F Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

0 Fill in all or part as applicable.

- 0 as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- 0 Complete a separate summary for each First Nation

1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species.

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the wonneed activity within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities

consultation process. Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no) Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and Finder Yes.)

Nation err 00

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

Page 32 MOE-2011-00231

5

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no; describe why not. des-W

- 5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.
- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) ______ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

1	R
-	NFOR

Internal Memorandum

To:

CSTC: Terry Teegee (250.562.6279)	Date:	Jan. 17, 2011
¢.	From:	Dale Likes
90	Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George
PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New Pest	File:	CSTC
Notification :		

Subject:

Spoke with Terry Teegee in regards to the Canfor: FMG, P.G. - Vanderhoof Proposed Pest Management Plan Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to CSTC's attention @ the Prince George office and asked Terry if he had any questions, concerns or input.

Terry indicated that I should info. share with the appropriate bands.

Dale Likes

DRAFT – March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit.

Contact Person:	Proponent:
Dean	Cana
Marshall	adian Forestilod
Contact Person:	First Nation:
James	Jaoslatta 1
Ratochy	Currier FN

Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

0 vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

- including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.
- 5 Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

- 3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)
- Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

PNo. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

17

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

N

Some els.

6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.

6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7 What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.
Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Cheslatta Carrier First Nation

nation The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Cheslatta Carrier First

January 28, 2011

Chief Corrina Leewen. Left a message for James Rakochy, Natural Resources Manager. If I don't hear back from him, will call

February 4th, 2011

Left a message for James Rakochy. Chief Leewen was not in either.

February 23, 2011

Left another telephone message for James Rakochy.

Also sent an email: Good afternoon James

Well it certainly has been a long time!

I hope you are keeping well (and warm) this winter.

specific or otherwise) pertaining to our proposed Pest Management Plan. James, I am writing to you today in order to follow up as to whether CCFN has any comments (site

details as well as an accompanying map. A registered letter was sent to your office, on or about January 15th, the letter contained the plan

Please give me a call if you wish to discuss further.

Thanks for your time.

Communication Result:

Nothing received. Nothing further

ų,	000 R.	The summaries and the second second second	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 2 8 A A	8 B B		1	14444 (S. 14	e a i
and the second se					Thanks for your time. R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Product: Forest Management Grou 250.567.7765 - mobile	A registered letter was accompanying map. Please give me a call if	Good afternoon James Well it certainly has be I hope you are keeping James, I am writing to pertaining to our propu	From: Sent: To: Subject:	Marshall, Dean
					s ıp East/West	sent to your office, on or abo you wish to discuss further.	en a long time! ; well (and warm) this winter. ; wel today in order to follow u osed Pest Management Plan.	Marshall, Dean Wednesday, February 23 Cantor ษณษ์	
		-				ut January 15 th , the lette	p as to whether CCFN ha	, 2011 2:52 PM	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
						r contained the plan o	is any comments (site		
	Page 38 MOE-2011-00231					details as well as an	specific or otherwise)		
					142 - 11 - 1423320				

and the second second

24

Canadian Fo	rest Produ	icts Ltd.	-			
Plateau						
January 14th, 2010	ľ					
Cheslatta Carrier Na Chief Corrina Lewee PO Box 909 Burns Lake, BC V0J 1E0	n n					
Re: Development of	an Integrated P	est Managen	nent Plan (I	PMP) for V	egetation Control	
Dear Chief Corrina I	Leween:					
Please be advised th Products Ltd., Forest	at an Integrated Management Gr	^o est Manager oup, Prince G	nent Plan (II eorge and \	PMP) is bei /anderhoof	ing jointly proposed by Divisions.	Canadian Forest
The Vanderhoof add Telephone 250-567-6	d <mark>ress is:</mark> 1399 B 3335, Fax 250-56	earhead Road 7-3911 E-m	l, Vanderho ail <u>Dean.Ma</u>	of, British C rshall@can	olumbia V0J 3A2 <u>for.com</u> .	
Copies of the propos Division (Plateau Off	ed Pest Manager ice) by appointm	nent Plan anc nt with Dean	d accompan Marshall, R	ying maps I PF.	may be examined @ th	le Vanderhoof
The Prince George Columbia, V2L 4W2 Dale.Likes@canfor.c	address is: 5162 or Telephone nu <u>om</u> .	Northwood F mber: (250) 9	⁹ ulpmill Roa 162-3425, Fa	d, Post Offi ax number(ice Box 9000, Prince Gi 250) 962-3217, email	eorge, British
Copies of the propos Likes, RPF	ed PMP and map	is may be exa	amined at th	e above no	ted locations by appoin	
This proposed Pest I George, Vanderhoof The herbicides listed methods will include	Management Pla and Quesnel Fo below are propo both aerial and g	1 (PMP) enco est Districts <i>a</i> sed for use w round based.	mpasses Ca as outlined o ithin the cor	anfor's man in the accou	naged silviculture obliga mpanying map. PMP for vegetation cor	ntment with Dale
Herbicide Trade Name	Active Ingredient	Application Usage	1 Aerial	Ground		ntment with Dale
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	Pesticide Control Products Act #	ntment with Dale
This proposed PMP has been confirmed	shall be in force by the BC Minist	or a five year y Environmer	period (201 nt (MOE).	1 ×	Pesticide Control Products Act # 19899, 27736, 26884, 29009	ntment with Dale
		14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 -		1-2016) fro	Pesticide Control Products Act # 19899, 27736, 26884, 29009 m the date that the Pes	ntment with Dale
				1-2016) fro	Pesticide Control Products Act # 19899, 27736, 26884, 29009 m the date that the Pes	ntment with Dale
				1-2016) fro	Pesticide Control Products Act # 19899, 27736, 26884, 29009 m the date that the Pes	ntment with Dale

.1

CANFOR

Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

Page 39 MOE-2011-00231

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested stakeholders.

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

..

First Nations Notification / Information Sharing in Support of the MOE Consultation Process

Proposed Pest Management Plan 2011-2016: Canfor – FMG Prince George & Vanderhoof

West Moberly

Lheidli' T'enneh

Lhtako

Fort Nelson First Nation

McLeod Lake Indian Band

CSTC

Halfway River First Nation

Saulteau

Nazko

Xats'ull First Nation Saik'uz First Nation Lhooskuz Dene Nation Skin Tyee Nation Ulkatcho First Nation Cheslatta Carrier Nation

Page 41 MOE-2011-00231

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: and in 60 2 First Nation: 9

9 Contact Person: Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit) Red Contact Person:

□ Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

0 as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records

Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation 2 aur

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

Page 42 MOE-2011-00231

17

- 4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes
- No. If no, describe why not.

8..

- 5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.
- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no). _____No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6.(b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

7.

	0	in a
1	[]	1
	P	F.
	S	1
1	2PA	1
3	0	1-1

Internal Memorandum

S

Spoke with Fort Nelson First Nation -- Lands Department representative in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Council's attention @ the Fort Nelson First Nation office and asked her to call back if she had any questions or concerns.

Dale Likes

Page 45 MOE-2011-00231 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOR

and affiliated companies

To: Fort Nelson First Nation – Lana Lowe, Lands Department (250,774.6313)

February 24, 2011

Date:

From: Dale Likes

Location FMG, CAC Prince George

Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New Pest File: Wanagement Plan Development 2011-2016 Notification : File: Fort Nelson First Nation – Lands Department

Spoke with Fort Nelson First Nation – Lands Department representative, Lana Lowe in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Plan Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Council's attention @ the Fort Nelson First Nation office and asked her to call back if she had any questions or concerns. Lana indicated that our plan fell outside of their traditional area.

Dale Likes

12

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Frogonent: 2 First Nation:

Ø

Contact Person: Vale Likes Contact Person;

Depre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

- 0 as required Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities

consultation process. Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. Nation If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

17

Page 46 MOE-2011-00231

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

9 4

2-

1 day

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)
 _____ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6.(b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 47 MOE-2011-00231

CANFØR

Internal Memorandum

To:	Chief Ed Whitford (250.772.5058)	Date:	Jan. 17, 2011
Copy To:		From:	Dale Likes
		Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George
Subject:	PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New	File:	Halfway River First Nation
-	2016 Notification :		A Contract of the second secon

Spoke with Chief Ed Whitford in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Council's attention @ the Halfway River First Nation office and asked Ed to call back if he had any questions or concerns.

Dale Likes

Page 48 MOE-2011-00231

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

and affiliated companies



¢	Subject:		Copy To:	To:	
Development 2011-2016 Notification :	Canfor: FMG - PG & Vanderhoof		5	Chief Ed Whitford (250.772.5058)	
	File:	Location :	From:	Date:	
	Halfway River First Nation	FMG, CAC Prince George	Dale Likes	Feb. 25, 2011	

Left a message for Chief Ed Whitford in regards to Canfor: FMG, P.G. - Vanderhoof Proposed Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Council's attention @ the Halfway River First Nation office and asked. Ed to call back if he had any questions or concerns.

Dale Likes

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: June Prove First Nation: There

Contact Person: Ken Contact Person:

Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence of a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

- 0 as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

consultation process. Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Nation es. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First

8 ģ.

Lead

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

····',

- 4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes
- No. If no, describe why not.
- 5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.
- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6.(b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 51 MOE-2011-00231

1	1		
1	ſ	כ	
	-		
1	-		
		/	\mathbf{a}

Internal Memorandum

To:	Jackie Brown	Date:	November 26. 2010
Copy To:		From:	Dale Likes
		Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George
Subject:	Canfor New Pest Management	File:	Lheidi_T'enneh First Nation
	Development 2011-2016 Notification :		

Spoke with Jackie Brown, in person, in regards to the Canfor Pest Management Development 2011-2016 explaining that the scope and content concerning the Lheidi_T'enneh First Nation has not changed.

Dale Likes

Page 52 MOE-2011-00231

CANFØR

Internal Memorandum

To:	Jackie Brown	Date:	February 25, 2011	
Copy To:		From:	Dale Likes	
		Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George	
Subject:	Canfor New Pest Management	File:	Lheidi_T'enneh First Nation	
	Development 2011-2016 Notification :			

No issues with plan as it is very similar to the last existing PMP 124-0351-06/11. Spoke with Jackie Brown in person in regards to the Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

Dale Likes

Page 53 MOE-2011-00231

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Canadian torest Products First Nation: hoostuz (Kluskus) Dene

Contact Person: Bea Marshel Contact Person:

iliane

Squinass

DCFre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

consultation process Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

ZNo. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

Page 54 MOE-2011-00231

Curd

25

- 4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes
- No. If no, describe why not,
- 5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.
- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) X No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

202

anne

- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 55 MOE-2011-00231

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Lhooskuz Dene (Kluskus) First Nation

Alushus

*

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Saikkuz First Nation

February 4th, 2011

server. Sent email to Jon Erickson asking for any feedback. Saved email in my PMP email folder on the

February 22nd, 2011

band. Has a meeting scheduled within the next 2 weeks. Spoke to Jon Erickson (Canfor Quesnel). Has not had an opportunity to bring it up with the

Communication Result:

Still waiting for any kind of comment or response. D Page 56 MOE-2011-00231

	Det II	al la
Varshall, Dean		
rom: Sent: O: Subject:	Marshall, Dean Friday, January 28, 2011 2:19 PM Erickson, Jon Canfor Vanderhoof and Prince George Pest Manaç	gement Plan -Lhoosk'uz Dene Referral
Good afternoon Jon.		
te: Canfor Pest Manageme	ent Plan – Vanderhoof and Prince George	
on, you should by now hav orest Products Ltd. regard pperating areas.	ve received a letter sent to the Lhoosk'uz Dene Firs ling our proposed Pest Management Plan covering	it Nation on January 15 th from Canadian the Prince George and Vanderhoof
lease call or email me, at y he application.	your convenience if the Lhoosk'uz Dene First Natio	n has any concerns or comments related to
can be reached via teleph	one, at the office in Vanderhoof 250.567.8335 or b	y email: <u>dean.marshall@canfor.com</u> .
hanks for your time.	,	
incerely, Dean Marshall		20
Silviculture Coordinator Canfor Forest Managemen	t Group	
8		
r.		

2

Page 57 MOE-2011-00231

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Copies of the proposed Pest Management Plan and accompanying maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division (Plateau Office) by appointment with Dean Marshall, RPF. The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia VOJ 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Please be advised that an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is being jointly proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions. Dear Liliane Squinas: Re: Development of an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Vegetation Control Plateau Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined at the above noted locations by appointment with Dale Likes, RPF Canadian This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE). The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include both aerial and ground based. This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) encompasses Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts as outlined on the accompanying map. Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Weed-Master Vantage Forestry, Herbicide Trade January 15, 2010 Vision, Vision Max Name Attention: Planning Forester 1920 Brown Miller Road c/o Canadian Forest Products VOJ 6S1 Quesnel, BC Liliane Squinas Lhoosk'uz Dene Government Administration Forest Products Ingredient Active glyphosate Usage common Application Ltol. Aerial yes Ground yes Pesticide Control Products Act # 19899, 27736 26884, 29009 CANFOR

1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@ca E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

> Page 58 MOE-2011-00231

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

stakeholders. Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

.

1.

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Froponent: 9 , a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit 2 First Nation:

Contact Person: Res Contact Person: à

P Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

0 Fill in all or part as applicable.

- 0 as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply)

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation þ

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response Lar

17

Page 60 MOE-2011-00231

3

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) _____Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) ______ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.

6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

CANFOR

Internal Memorandum

H 2			
10:	Diana Boyd (250.747.2900)	Date:	January 20, 2011
		From:	Dale Likes
		Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George
Subject:	PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011- 2016 Notification :	File:	Lhtako Dene Nation (Quesnel)

Left a telephone message with Diana, in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

plan. I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Councils' attention @ the Lhtako Dene Nation (Quesnel) office and asked if there were any questions or concerns in regards to the

Asked to have my call returned @ 250.962.3425.

Dale Likes

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOF

and affiliated companies

Subject:	,	Copy To:	To:	
PG & Vandert Proposed Pes Development Notification :			C. Buchan	
100f FMG Canfor st Management 2011-2016		×.	s.22	
-	_	-		
ille:	ocation:	rom:)ate:	
Lhtako Dene	FMG, CAC Prince George	Dale Likes	February 22, 2011	

Spoke with C. Buchan in regards to the Canfor, FMG: Vanderhoof - P.G. Proposed Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to his attention @ the Lhtako Dene office and asked him to call back if he had any questions or concerns.

Mr. Buchan indicated that he received \sim 30 referrals / day and hadn't looked @ Canfor's package yet. He asked that I email him the most southerly coordinates in that he didn't think the scope of our plan fell within their traditional area.

Dale Likes

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Page 63 MOE-2011-00231

Likes, Dale	
From: Craig Buchan Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 7:31 AM To: Likes, Dale RE: Canfor: FMG Prince George - Vanerhoof Proposed Pest Managemer	ent Plan Development
Thank you for the phone call yesterday to discuss Canfor's Plan. The Lhtako [Dene Nation has
no issues with your plan.	
Craig Buchan Band Manager Lhtako Dene Nation	
Original Message From: Likes, Dale <u>[mailto:Dale.Likes@canfor.com]</u> Sent: February-22-11 8:42 AM	2
io; craig buchan Subject: Canfor: FMG Prince George - Vanerhoof Proposed Pest Management Plan [ı Development
As per our telephone conversation today, the most southerly point of our Pest	t Management
	÷
Dale Likes, RPF ciluiniting Engeter	

Dale Likes, RPF Silviculture Forester Forest Management Group, Prince George Canadian Forest Products Limited <u>Dale.Likes@canfor.com</u> (250) 962-3425: office (250) 962-3217: fax

.

1

Page 64 MOE-2011-00231 -

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit.

Proponent: 5 First Nation:

Contact Person: Red Contact Person:

Depre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in If no written notice was sent, describe why.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities

consultation process. Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

Page 65 MOE-2011-00231

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

14 2

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)
- _ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response. 12 are
- 6.(b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 66 MOE-2011-00231

CANFOR

Internal Memorandum

To:	Ryan Bichon	s.22	Date:	January 20, 2011
Copy To:			From:	Dale Likes
			Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George
Subject:	PG & Vanderhoot Pest Managemen 2016 Notification	FFWG Canfor New t Development 2011- :	File:	McLeod Lake Indian Band

Left a telephone message for Ryan Bichon in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to his attention @ the McLeod Lake Indian Band office and asked him to call back if he had any questions or concerns.

Dale Likes

Page 67 MOE-2011-00231

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

and affiliated companies



To: Ryan Bichon (22 Date: Copy From: To: Location:

Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FWG Canfor File: Proposed Pest Management Development 2011-2016 Notification :

: February 22, 2011 : Dale Likes tion: FMG, CAC Prince George McLeod Lake Indian Band

Left a telephone message for Ryan Bichon in regards to the Canfor, FMG: Vanderhoof-P.G. proposed Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

questions or concerns. I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to his attention @ the McLeod Lake Indian Band office and asked him to call back if he had any

Dale Likes

0 6 101

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, Brillsh Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Page 68 MOE-2011-00231

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance with a pest management plan , a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit.

	roponent:
	Net States to
	Cantor
	First Nation;
•	Nadleh
. 1 . 1.1	Whylen

Contact Person: Dean Marshall Contact Person: Lally Noosk

Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

□ Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

- 0 Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records as required.
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in If no written notice was sent, describe why.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

7 Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

✓ A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding

A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

5 Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

- Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)
 Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First
- Nation . So aHachec ۱ geogla 3 pesticide ciso.

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

Stated " why bother it you are going to the fact of the stated " why bother it you are going to do , 5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests. 68 have we a meeting

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) _____No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 70 MOE-2011-00231

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Nadleh Band

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Nadleh Whuten

January 28, 2011

of the information but appeared to understand what it was we were trying to achieve Spoke directly with Chief Larry Nooski (understands forestry). I told Larry that I would follow up with a telephone call next week. S22 Larry had not had time to consider any

February 4th, 2011.

Spoke directly with Chief Larry Nooski. Larry was too busy and told me to telephone back on Tuesday the 8th. I said I would.

February 23, 2011

Spoke directly with Chief Larry Nooski on his mobile phone. Chief Nooski indicated that Nautley Band was opposed to any herbicide use.

s.16

annual NIT and map as per our requirements. Email: I thanked him and followed up with an email stating that we would provide the band with an

Hi Larry.

Thanks for speaking with me earlier.

You have made your position clear to me.

the application of any herbicides As part of our plan, we will provide you with an annual treatment notification and map prior to

Thanks for your time.

Communication Result:

Hello R. Dean

make every effort to balance the protection of the Traditional Lands and safety of not only our much passion, however I do this for a reason and that is as an elected Chief of my community I members but those of the general public use of those lands. I appreciate and thank for your follow up on this particular issue. At times I may speak with too s.22

s.16

Thank you

Larry Nooski Chief

Page 72 MOE-2011-00231
Marshall, Dean

From: Sent: To: Subject: Marshall, Dean Wednesday. Februarv 23, 2011 1:19 PM

Hi Larry.

Thanks for speaking with me earlier. You have made your position clear to me.

herbicides. As part of our plan, we will provide you with an annual treatment notification and map prior to the application of any

Thanks for your time.

R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Products Forest Management Group East/West 250.567,8335 - office 250.567,7765 - mobile

Page 73 MOE-2011-00231

Marshall, Dean

Re: Canfor Pest Management Plan	Subject:
Marshall, Dean	To:
Wednesday, February 23, 2011 2:55 PM	Sent:
Larry Nooski 22	From:

Hello R. Dean

I do this for a reason and that is as an elected Chief of my community I make every effort to balance the protection of the Traditional Lands and safety of not only our members but those of the general public use of those lands. $\frac{6}{3}$ I appreciate and thank for your follow up on this particular issue. At times I may speak with too much passion, however

s.16

Thank you

Larry Nooski Chief

On 11-02-23 1:19 PM, "Marshall, Dean" < Dean.Marshall@canfor.com > wrote:

Hi Larry.

Thanks for speaking with me earlier.

You have made your position clear to me.

herbicides. As part of our plan, we will provide you with an annual treatment notification and map prior to the application of any

Thanks for your time.

R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Products Forest Management Group East/West 250,567.8335 - office 250,567.7765 - mobile

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Contact Person: B 4 9 First Nation: Contact Person:

Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

13

- 4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes
- No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

- 5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)
- _ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

18

1		1
Ę	2	
UN-C		
ピス		
	52467	CANFOR

Internal Memorandum

	Copy To:	To: Laurel Crocker	
Location:	From:	Date:	
FMG, CAC Prince George	Dale Likes	Jan. 4, 2011	
	Location: FMG, CAC Prince George	Copy To: From: Dale Likes Location: FMG, CAC Prince George	To: Laurel Crocker Date: Jan. 4, 2011 Copy To: From: Dale Likes Location: FMG, CAC Prince George

Left a telephone message with Laurel Crocker in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to her attention @ the Nazko office in Quesnel and asked her to call back if she had any questions or concerns.

Page 78 MOE-2011-00231 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, Brillish Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOR

ŝ

and affiliated companies

: Proposed Pest Ma Development 201	Subject PG & Vanderhoof		Copy To:	To: Laurel Crocker	
Inagement	FMG Canfor			S22	*
	File:	Location:	From:	Date:	
	Nazko Indian Band	FMG, CAC Prince George	Dale Likes	February 22, 2011	

Left a telephone message with Laurel Crocker in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

concerns. I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to her attention @ the Nazko office in Quesnel and asked her to call back if she had any questions or

Page 79 MOE-2011-00231 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOR

and affiliated companies

•

To:	Dale Likes	Date:	Feb. 23, 2011
Copy To:		From:	Nazko Indian Band Rece
		Location	FMG, CAC Prince Georg
Subject:	PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016 Notification :	File:	Nazko Indian Band

Received a telephone message from Nazko reception, informing me that all correspondence regarding our Proposed PMP had been forwarded on to Gerry Powell.



Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOF

and affiliated companies

November 08, 2010

Perry Bros. Contracting Box 579 Prince George, B.C. V2L 4S8

Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear Esther;

A new Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the above noted locations in Prince George by appointment with Dale Likes.

proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division by appointment with Dean Marshall. The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Copies of the

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) covers Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts.

Application methods will include aerial and ground based The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control

NameActive ingredientUsageAerialGroundProducts Act #Vision, Vision MaxVantage Forestry,glyphosatecommonyes19899, 27736, 26884, 29009Weed-MasterWeed-Mastervantage Forestryglyphosatecommonyes26884, 29009	Herbicide Trade	Antino Instantiont	Application			Pesticide Control
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, glyphosate common yes yes 26884, 29009	Name	ACTIVE INGLEDIEUT	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
	Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period(2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

the publication of this notice A person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, relevant to the development of the PMP, may send copies of the information to the applicants at the addresss above within 30 days of 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

As per Canfor, Prince George Woodlands previous Pest Management Plan 124-0351-06/11, we will send annual notification to your attention.

Yours truly,

Yours truly,

Dean Marshall, R.P.F. Silviculture Coordinator

Dale Likes, R.P.F. Silviculture Forester

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOR

and affiliated companies

November 08, 2010

s.22

Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear

s.22

A new Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the above noted locations in Prince George by appointment with Dale Likes

Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division by appointment with Dean Marshall. The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) covers Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts.

The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control Application methods will include aerial and ground based.

Herbicide Trade	Antino Incondinat	Application			Pesticide Control
Name	Active Ingredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period(2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

A person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, relevant to the development of the PMP, may send copies of the information to the applicants at the addresss above within 30 days of the publication of this notice.

As per Canfor, Prince George Woodlands previous Pest Management Plan 124-0351-06/11, we will send annual notification to your attention.

Yours truly,

Yours truly,

Dean Marshall, R.P.F. Silviculture Coordinator

Dale Likes, R.P.F. Silviculture Forester

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANF®



November 08, 2010

s.22

Re: Development of a New Pest Management Plan (PMP)

Dear s.22

A new Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the above noted locations in Prince George by appointment with Dale Likes.

Marshall. proposed PMP and maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division by appointment with Dean The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. Copies of the

Prince George, This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) covers Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts

Application methods will include aerial and ground based The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control

Herbicide Trade	Antium Improving	Application			Pesticide Control
Name	ACTIVE THISTERIE	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period(2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

the publication of this notice. of the PMP, may send copies of the information to the applicants at the addresss above within 30 days of A person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, relevant to the development 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Yours truly,

Yours truly,

As per Canfor, Prince George Woodlands previous Pest Management Plan 124-0351-06/11, we will send annual notification to your attention.

Dean Marshall, R.P.F. Silviculture Coordinator

Dale Likes, R.P.F. Silviculture Forester

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

PUN and Attachments Non-Native Not Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 7:54 AM To: Mullan, Jonathan M ENV:EX Subject: PUN and Attachments: Non-Native Noti Attachments: template_pmp_2010_10_15.doc; pest_management_plan_scope_map_2010.pdf; canfor_fmg_prince_george_vanderhoof_proposed_pmp_201 native_notification_consultation_2011_03_21.pdf; pmp_development_stakeholder_notification (not 1st nations)_perry_registered_2010_oct.doc; pmp_development_stakeholder_notification (not 1st nations)_schneider_registered_2010_oct.doc; pmp_development_stakeholder_notification (not 1st nations)_steidle_registered_2010_oct.doc; As you are pro Vanderhoof are (confirmation Hello Jon; probably aware, Canfo are developing a new ion # 124-0351-06/11) canfor, or, Forest Management Group Pest Management Plan. The expires this April. Noti Notification.txt 2011 1 2016_non_ cation current I Prince George

also The scope of the p areas south plan not only includes of vanderhoof. areas 'n and around Prince George but

one

and

I mailed the PUN package associated advertisements the amount of \$2000.00 today and a (March 21, 2011) cheque payable) along to the with tear Minister c of Finance of e in

I will send all the (first email: Non-Na First Nations Consu 11 the attachments in two separate emails
Non-Native notification and proposed PMP,
Consultation / Notification). to your, second attention email:

If you should have any Dale.Likes@canfor.com. questions, please call me 0 250.962-3425 or email me 0

Forest Management Group, I Canadian Forest Products I Dale.Likes@canfor.com (250) 962-3425: office (250) 962-3217: fax Dale Likes, RPF Silviculture Forester Prince George Limited

Page P

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Canadian high Hoduets First Nation: Sarkuz First Nation

Contact Person: Chief Jackie Thomas Contact Person: Jean

Der Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

0

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

✓ Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public

petification process? (Check yes or no) FYes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

2000

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)

No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

A

"Myes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, Nation response. location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 89 MOE-2011-00231

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Saikuz First Nation

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Saik'uz First Nation

February 4th, 2011

received my letter. She indicated that she had and was in the process of formulating a Spoke directly with Chief Jackie Thomas (re elected chief). Asked Chief Thomas if she had response.

February 22nd, 2011

Emailed Chief Jackie Thomas:

"Good afternoon Chief Thomas.

indicated to me that you were preparing a response in the form of written comment. At that time I was calling to solicit input on our proposed Pest Management Plan. You had any input or required any further information. To date, I have not seen any comments, so I am writing in order to follow up and see if you had You and I spoke on February 4th. It was a busy time for you, right after the election.

Please contact me at your convenience.

Friday March 4th, 2011

Brian Inwood received a letter- attached.

s.16

s. This was in response to the Quesnel PMP.

Tuesday March 8th, 2011

in their area, and it might be in their interest to help provide some comment. No commitment was the plan. I offered to meet with her concerning the PMP, given that the VHF plan was right Vanderhoof for the VHF/PG PMP as she sent to Brian Inwood in Quesnel. She indicated that this Called Chief Jaquie Thomas. Asked her if she was planning on sending the same letter to was made for a date

Page 90 MOE-2011-00231

Page 91 MOE-2011-00231 Wednesday, March 09, 2011

Sent letter via mail.

Communication Result:

•

s.16



Saik'uz First Nation 135 Joseph Street Vanderhoof, BC V0J 3A1 Phone: (250) 567-9293 Fax: (250) 567-2998

February 3, 2011

Brian Inwood, RPF Canadian Forest Products Ltd. 1920 Brownmiller Road Quesnel, BC V2J 6S1 Fax: 250-992-8520

DATE: Registered letter dated Jan. 20, 2011

Dear Mr. Inwood:

management plan (2011-2016) within the traditional territories of the Saik'uz First Nation. We have received your letter dated above regarding the application for proposed pest

the right to choose to what uses the land can be put (Delgamuukw at para 168). consent of our First Nation is an unjustifiable infringement of our constitutionally This proposed development is subject to Aboriginal rights and title protected under the protected rights. sale or development of any land subject to Aboriginal title, without the expressed Canadian Constitution Act, 1982. Case law indicates that Aboriginal title encompasses The

ministry/agency to adopt this standard and to go above and beyond mere consultation. development is proposed. It is in the best interests of the proponent and your for the free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous peoples on whose land Moreover, the recently adopted United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Rights calls

impacts on our rights and title. However, we do not have the capacity to provide a assessment of this referral, we propose one of two options: detailed assessment, as you have requested. In order to carry out a detailed We are very interested in learning more about the proposed development and its specific

s.16

Page 93 MOE-2011-00231

Sincerely, Saik'uz First Națion

Chief Jacqueline Thomas

cc Ministry of Environment



Sailk²uz First Nation 135 Joseph Street Vanderhoof, BC V0J 3A1 Phone: (250) 567-9293 Fax: (250) 567-2998

February 3, 2011

Brian Inwood, Canfor Quesnel, BC

Dear Mr. Inwood:

Yours sincerely, Chief Jacqueline Thomas SAIK'UZ FIRST NATION

Page 94 MOE-2011-00231 RE: Referral # PMP 2011-2016

s.16

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

DANE



Tuesday, March 7th, 2011

Dear Chief Jaqueline Thomas;

Re: Request for funding for information sharing

Canfor welcomes input into our plans advertised for review and comment. We strive to find mutually satisfying solutions to concerns expressed by modifying, where possible, our intended activities. Your information assists us in that process

community, and understand why many people do not provide us with feedback. We also recognize that reviewing and commenting on our activities may be a low priority for an individual or important to provide opportunity for review and comment regardless of the feedback we may or may not receive. Nonetheless, we believe it is

We are also aware that the courts have determined that the honour of the Crown requires that it consult with First the courts have identified obligations that exist for the Crown and for First Nations Nations prior to making any decisions that may potentially infringe on Aboriginal rights and/or interests. We know that

We at Canfor have agreed to assist the government in meeting one of its obligations by providing our proposed plans to you to assist you in determining how they might potentially impact on your Aboriginal rights and/or interests. We remain willing to meet with you, your staff, and/or your band members to review these plans and examine how they might be modified to avoid any potential infringement by the Crown.

We appreciate that reviewing our plans to determine their potential impact requires time and effort of your staff and band members. We recognize that many First Nations have a limited capacity to review the many plans that may be the Crown, we are willing to support your efforts in dealing with your capacity issues by forwarding your request to the Crown for its consideration. If there is any other way that we can assist you in addressing your capacity issues with the Crown, please do not hesitate to ask provided to them. Given that this information sharing process is part of the larger consultation procedure required of

Sincerely yours;

R. Dean Marshall Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group East and West Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

Cc: Manuel Mariotto, Senior Pesticide Management Officer, Ministry of Environment

Cc: Prince George/Vanderhoof; Quesnel PMP Information Sharing File

5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W2 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3582 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

CANFOR

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

Plateau

January 15th, 2010

Saik'uz First Nation Chief Jackie Thomas 135 Joseph Street Vanderhoof, BC V0J 3A1

Re: Development of an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Vegetation Control

Dear Chief Jackie Thomas:

Please be advised that an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is being jointly proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia VOJ 3A2 E-mail Dean.Marshall@canfor.com.

Copies of the proposed Pest Management Plan and accompanying maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division (Plateau Office) by appointment with Dean Marshall, RPF.

Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British

Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined at the above noted locations by appointment with Dale Likes, RPF

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) encompasses Canfor's managed silviculture obligations George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts as outlined on the accompanying map. in the Prince

The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include both aerial and ground based.

Herbicide Trade A	ctive	Application	2		Pesticide Control
Name In	gredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested stakeholders.

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

Page 97 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT-Mercis 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit.

Contact Person: Froponent: à. un 62 Kert Contact Person: 2 First Nation: BAL lau ers

7 Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

- 0 Fill in all or part as applicable.
- 0 as required Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- 0 Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no) Yes. If yes, describe ontcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First

Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation-to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) + Nes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) la

mail

No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not . *Postule of the second second to the second of the second of the second of the second of the proposed activity or activities.* es, ande.

- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

7.

Page 99 MOE-2011-00231

	201	-		60
Sold States	1	1		
		A	-	1
Contract of		4	1	THE R
	-		-	
100	N	2	1	5

Internal Memorandum

To: Rick Publicover, Forestry Manager Date: Jan. 14, 2011 (250.788.3955) From: Dale Likes Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FWG Canfor New File: Saulteau First Nation (Chelwynd Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FWG Canfor New File: Saulteau First Nation (Chelwynd				
From: Dale Likes Location: FMG, CAC Prince George Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FWG Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-	To:	Rick Publicover, Forestry Manager (250.788.3955)	Date:	Jan. 14, 2011
Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FWG Canfor New File: Saulteau First Nation (Chetwynd Pest Management Development 2011-			From:	Dale Likes
Subject: PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New File: Saulteau First Nation (Chetwynd Pest Management Development 2011-			Location:	FMG, CAC Prince George
2016 Notification :	Subject:	PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011- 2016 Notification :	File:	Saulteau First Nation (Chetwynd

-

Talked to Rick Publicover, Saulteau Forestry Manager, in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Councils' attention @ the Saulteau Band office and asked him if he had any questions or concerns in regards to the plan.

Rick indicated that he hadn't looked @ the propsed plan yet.

Likes, Dale
To: Naomi Owens Subject: RE: Saulleau First Nations Response Letter to Canfor PMP Attachments: glyphosate_presentation_2009_05.ppt
Hello Naomi;
Thank you for your letter dated February 3, 2011.
From your letter I understand that the Saulteau First Nations conduct various traditional activities throughout the lands described as per the PMP scope map in addition to burial grounds and sacred sites located throughout the SFN Treaty area.
As you are probably aware, Canfor does not provide funding to complete Cultural Traditional Studies. In your letter, you make reference to Encana (section 1.0, second paragraph). Please understand that all of our correspondence is specific to Canfor and not to Encana.
Your views are noted, but unless you can described specifics in regards to location and use type, Canfor cannot act upon general comments. Please understand that glyphosate applications are based on science and applied judiciously, as per label instructions.
If you would still like to meet please call or email me.
For your information, I have attached a presentation on glyphosate. Hopefully this will help enlighten facts and usage in regards to glyphosate.
In addition to the above, we will gladly send annual notification as to where we propose glyphosate treatments.
Dale Likes, RPF Silviculture Forester Forest Management Group, Prince George Canadian Forest Products Limited <u>Dale.Likes@canfor.com</u> (250) 962-3217: fax
From: Naomi Owens 22 Senf: Thursday, February 03, 2011 12:27 PM To: Likes, Dale 22
Subject: Saulteau First Nations Response Letter to Canfor PMP
Attached is a letter from Saulteau First Nations in regards to Canfor's development of a New Pest Management Plan.

I-lease doi Juniterus. est Management Plan.

2

Mussi,

Page 104 MOE-2011-00231

Naomi Owens (B.Sc., B.I.T.)

DRAFT-March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance with a pest management plan , a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit.

Proponent: Canadian forest Products First Nation: Skin Vee Z

Contact Person: Dan **Uanshall** Contact Person: Robert Skin

Q. Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

Fill in all or part as applicable.

0

- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

17

Page 106 MOE-2011-00231

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) V Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not N 222 à Inse

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities. 3 6 4 9 6

- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6(b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

5	
2	
0	
5	
2	
-	
õ	
g	
5	

Re: Canfor Proposed Pest Management Plan for Vanderhoof	Subject:
Marshall, Dean	To:
Wednesday, February 23, 2011 3:36 PM	Sent:
Robert Skin 22	From:

Sorry Dean but

s.22

Will be in after march 1st.

Sent from my iPhone

Robert Skin Chief Skin Tyee First Nation Box 131 Southbank BC V0J 2P0

On 2011-02-23, at 2:17 PM, "Marshall, Dean" < Dean.Marshall@canfor.com> wrote:

Dear Chief Robert Skin.

I have left you a couple of telephone messages over the last few weeks.

17th Prince George. The details of the plan were sent to you via registered mail on or about January I wanted to solicit your input (if any) to our proposed Pest Management Plan for Vanderhoof and

If you have any comments or wish to know more, please give me a call.

Thank you for your time.

R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Products Forest Management Group East/West 250.567.8335 - office 250.567.7765 - mobile

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Skin Tyee First Nation

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Skin tyee First Nation

January 28, 2011

left a message Phoned band office s.22 S22 to call me if any concerns with proposed plan. no answer. Phoned Chief Robert Skin on his cell phone and

February 4th, 2011

Phoned band office and left a message for Chief Skin to give me a telephone call. Should follow up with an email.

February 22nd, 2011

Emailed Chief Robert Skin.

email: Dear Chief Robert Skin.

I have left you a couple of telephone messages over the last few weeks.

January 17th. and Prince George. The details of the plan were sent to you via registered mail on or about I wanted to solicit your input (if any) to our proposed Pest Management Plan for Vanderhoof

Thank you for your time. If you have any comments or wish to know more, please give me a call

Communication Result:

Chief emailed me back and said he'd be in the office after March 1st

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

LANE



January 14th, 2011

Skin Tyee Nation PO Box 131 Southbank , BC V0J 2P0

Re: Development of an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Vegetation Control

Dear Chief Skin:

Please be advised that an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is being jointly proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia VOJ 3A2 E-mail Dean.Marshall@canfor.com.

Copies of the proposed Pest Management Plan and accompanying maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division (Plateau Office) by appointment with Dean Marshall, RPF.

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com

Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined at the above noted locations by appointment with Dale Likes, RPF

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) encompasses Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts as outlined on the accompanying map.

The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include both aerial and ground based.

Herbicide Trade	Active	Applicatic	n		Pesticide Control
Name	Ingredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).
Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested stakeholders.

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

Page 111 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Canadia Forest Pladuels First Nation: tellaten

Contact Person: Dear Marshall Contact Person: Eddison ohnson.

DVPre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

0

0

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- 0 Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in If no written notice was sent, describe why

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply)

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

- . A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species.
- A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.
- Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

7

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

5

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no) Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation K attached

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) ~Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

Col 51

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)

_ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

as per attachments

6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none-was received, describe the First Nation response. none icu ea 2

6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

18

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 9, 2011 Subject: Stellaten First Nation

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Stellaten First Nation

January 28, 2011

Left a message for Chief Reginald Louis to call me back.

February 4th, 2011

give me a call at his convenience Left a message for Chief Louis - told receptionist the purpose of my call and asked her to get the Chief to

February 22, 2011

I have done. Eddison. Chief Louis was not in or was not taking calls. Spoke with Eddison Lee Johnson who helps look after natural resources portfolio. Eddison was not aware of our plan. He asked me to send him a copy. Which

It was good to speak to you earlier.

FL A72920 Silviculture

you through in detail. As discussed, we should try for a meeting in early March. silviculture obligations. I have all of the opening files, treatment records and prescriptions and can walk with the above forest license. I look forward to speaking with you about the hand off of these As mentioned, Canfor has fulfilled its obligations (for regeneration) on many of the blocks associated

Canfor Pest Management Plan

by registered mail on January 15th. Please provide any comment that the band may have at your earliest convenience. plan. To date I have not heard from him. As discussed, I am enclosing a copy of the letter and map sent As mentioned, I have left a few messages for the chief pertaining to our proposed pest management

Thank you for your time

From: Eddison Johnson [mailto Sent: Friday, February 25, 2011 8:49 AM To: Marshall, Dean Subject: RE: As discussed

Dear Dean,

This is to acknowledge receipt of the referrals you re-sent to SFN.

following queries: Could you please send me a map of the Canfor proposed integrated Pest management Plan with the

Land and water features .

Roads

Legend

2011. to discuss the plan at Stellat'en. Please let me know if you are available for the week of March 7 - 11, Also forward me a copy of the integrated land management plan. After reviewing it, we will need to meet

Looking forward to hearing from you. Eddison

From: Marshall, Dean [<u>mailto:Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>] Sent: Friday, February 25, 2011 9:24 AM To: Eddison Johnson Subject: RE: As discussed

my original letter was not received? I'll get you a better map and a copy of our Pest Management Plan. Okay Eddison. Because you are responding to my email re-sending the information, does this mean that

information- at your convenience As for a meeting, I would be more than happy to meet with you at the Canfor office to present our

Sincerely,

Dean Marshall

From: Eddison Johnson [<u>mailto</u> Sent: Friday, February 25, 2011 9:22 AM To: Marshall, Dean Subject: RE: As discussed

S22

requested. Also, we did not receive the Pest Management Plan. The original letter we received have a map that does not have a legend on it as well as the queries I

have been used by Stellat'en for travel and other activities, it is the responsibility of the proponent Since Canfor and other proponents/clients do not provide cost for consultation to Stellat'en, which would (including Canfor) to meet with SFN in their office.

me know you preference. If you prefer I meet you at Canfor Office, it will be the responsibility of Canfor to meet the travel cost. Let

Sincerely, Eddison

Dean Marshall Thanks your office located? To clarify Eddison. Good morning. 1 see my comments below, in blue. We'll see you tomorrow where is

-----Original Message-----From: Eddison Johnson <u>[mailto</u>: Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2011 9:30 AM To: Marshall, Dean Subject: Wednesday meeting request

S22

Dear Dean,

concerning the Pest We will like you to Management referral discussions: please come along with the following information

PDF Overview of map showing all sites. showing land and water features). Please print a 1:50,000 scaled map I will bring the same map I sent to you by

area. of the plan - should they be required. Individual treatment sites will be provided on an annual basis in the form of a Notification. This stage is dealing sites have not been identified through this process. with the overall plan only. a document, 2. All individual site maps with land and water features. Your input at this stage will allow us to make changes to the overall scope similar to a FSP that allows us to treat areas within the larger Plan The Pest Management Plan is Individual treatment

3. Survey showing plants species on the proposed blocks. Same as above - we hav not identified specific blocks through this process. Target vegetation for the vast majority of the sites will be trembling aspen, where it prevents us from meeting our legislated Free Growing obligations. we have

Potential disease/pest areas.

Sincerely,

Natural Resource Director Stellat'en First Nation Fraser Lake BC V0J 1S0 Phone: 22 Cell: 25 s

Page 117 MOE-2011-00231 Meeting Summary Stellaten / Canfor (Proposed Pest Management Plan)

Who: Eddison Lee Johnson, S. Dean Marshall

Where: Stellaten Office

Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2011 10:30 am.

- 1 Reviewed general presentation on herbicides. Canfor not proposing to spray everything, we are looking to replace some of our costly manual treatments with more cost effective ones in order to meet our legislated obligations.
- Stellaten Key Concerns with proposed chemical use:
- 2 Chemicals Used: provided some background on Glyphosate. Safe, proven chemical. Will provide more information to Eddison regarding efficacy and toxicity.
- b environmental protection (buffers to be observed) and treatment parameters. specifically to Section 4 of the Pest Management Plan document. Section 4 details further information on environmental protection under the Plan, please refer, Pesticide Free Zones and Buffers: are maintained along the majority of waterbodies. For

s.16

s.16

Next Steps:

- 1. Dean to send bibliography on glyphosate to Eddison Lee Johnson.
- 2. Eddison Lee Johnson to provide summary to Chief and Council who are expected to provide written comment to the effect of the above points.
- ω Dean Marshall to complete information sharing summary for inclusion into the package from Ministry of Environment.

s.16

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOR

Plateau

January 14th, 2011

Stellat'en First Nation Chief Reginald Louis PO Box 760 Fraser Lake, BC V0J 1S0 c/o Eddison Less Johson

Re: Development of an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Vegetation Control

Dear Chief Reginald Louis:

Please be advised that an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is being jointly proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail Dean.Marshall@canfor.com.

Copies of the proposed Pest Management Plan and accompanying maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division (Plateau Office) by appointment with Dean Marshall, RPF.

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email <u>Dale.Likes@canfor.com</u>.

Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined at the above noted locations by appointment with Dale Likes, RPF

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) encompasses Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts as outlined on the accompanying map.

methods will include both aerial and ground based. The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application

Herbicide Trade	Active	Application	1	学生になるとの言語	Pesticide Control
Name	Ingredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max					10200 97726
Vantage Forestry,	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	J2227, 21100,
Weed-Master				3	20004, 2000

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

stakeholders. Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: 品 Conschan Folgsfildebstrinst Nation: Tlethingox Government Office (Anateim)

Contact Person: Dean Marshall Contact Person: Chief Joe Alphonse

4 Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

0

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- 0 as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- 0 Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no) Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

Nation

17

Page 121 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT-Murch 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

met

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)

- _ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not
- Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.
- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 122 MOE-2011-00231

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Tletingox National Government

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Tletinqox

January 28, 2011

Government (Chief Joe Alphonse). Need to investigate this further. No Contact - the contact information for this band is the same as for Tsilhqot'in National

February 4th, 2011

Left message for Chief Alphonse. See Tsiqhot'in Communication

Communication Result:

Nothing received. Nothing further

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

ALT

E Contraction

Plateau

January 15, 2010

Tl'etinqox-T'in Government Office Joe Alphonse PO Box 168 Alexis Creek, BC V0L 1C0

Re: Development of an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Vegetation Control

Dear Joe Alphonse:

Please be advised that an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is being jointly proposed by Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions.

The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>.

Copies of the proposed Pest Management Plan and accompanying maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division (Plateau Office) by appointment with Dean Marshall, RPF.

The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email Dale.Likes@canfor.com

Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined at the above noted locations by appointment with Dale Likes, RPF

George, This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) encompasses Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts as outlined on the accompanying map.

The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include both aerial and ground based.

Herbicide Trade	Active	Applicatio	n		Pesticide Control
Name	Ingredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vision, Vision Max			-		10200 97726
Vantage Forestry,	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	12022, 21120,
Weed-Master	The second s	1			20004, 2000

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested stakeholders.

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

Page 125 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT – March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Canadian horest Products First Nation: 200 ndian

Contact Person: Dean Marshall Contact Person: Chief

lanci

(Francis

Lacesse

Band

7 Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

0

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species.

5 A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

N phone Calls-See attacka

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

3

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) ____Yes

X No. If no, describe why not. Phone calls not returned.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)

b) Were meetings neuri (circus j = 0 and j = 0). Were meeting was held, describe why not \mathcal{P} No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not \mathcal{P} 0 A 0 0

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

6(a) Describe the information received from the Fust Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.

6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Toosey Indian Band

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Toosey Indian Band

28 January, 2011

contact me if any concerns with proposed plan. Dean Marshall left message in Chief and Council's General Voice Mail Box S22 đ

4 February, 2011:

call and asked her to pass along my message to the chief. Spoke to Toosey Receptionist. Chief Lacesse was not in . I told receptionist the reason for my

Result:

No response was received.

Page 128 MOE-2011-00231

CANFØR

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

Plateau

January 15, 2011

Toosey First Nation PO Box 80 Riske Creek, BC VOL 1TO

Re: Development of an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Vegetation Control

Dear Sir / Madam:

Products Ltd., Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof Divisions Please be advised that an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is being jointly proposed by Canadian Forest

The Vanderhoof address is: 1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-8335, Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail <u>Dean.Marshall@canfor.com</u>. E-mail Dean.Marshall@canfor.com

Copies of the proposed Pest Management Plan and accompanying maps may be examined @ the Vanderhoof Division (Plateau Office) by appointment with Dean Marshall, RPF.

Dale.Likes@canfor.com. Columbia, V2L 4W2 or Telephone number: (250) 962-3425, Fax number(250) 962-3217, email The Prince George address is: 5162 Northwood Pulpmill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British

Copies of the proposed PMP and maps may be examined at the above noted locations by appointment with Dale Likes, RPF

This proposed Pest Management Plan (PMP) encompasses Canfor's managed silviculture obligations in the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Quesnel Forest Districts as outlined on the accompanying map.

The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for vegetation control. Application methods will include both aerial and ground based.

Name Ingredient Usage Aerial Ground Products Act # Vision, Vision Max glyphosate common yes 19899, 27736, 26000	Herbicide Trade	Active	Applicatic	'n		Pesticide Control
Vision, Vision Max glyphosate common yes yes 19899, 27736,	Name	Ingredient	Usage	Aerial	Ground	Products Act #
Vantage Forestry, glyphosate common yes yes once	Vision, Vision Max				-	10000 07726
	Vantage Forestry,	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	12022, 211.00,

This proposed PMP shall be in force for a five year period (2011-2016) from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry Environment (MOE).

1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

Page 129 MOE-2011-00231

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

ţ,

Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested stakeholders.

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: (anadian Contact Person: Chief torest be Alphonse Contact Person: Dain Products First Nation: Isithq of in Harsh Matinel Gart.

R Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance **Issuance Number:**

Instructions:

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- ۰ Complete a separate summary for each First Nation

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity Han

relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

7

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public

notification process? (Check yes or no) Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First

Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

-28 February -January -Phone messale -Phone messaje chiet Chief Joe I be Alphon SQ Alphonse

DRAFT-March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not.

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no)

No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.

6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Memorandum

TO: PMP FILE FROM: Dean Marshall Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Tsilqhot'in National Government Communication Summary

Government: The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Tsilqhot'in National

28 January, 2011

contact Dean Marshall with any concerns or comments pertaining to the proposed plan Dean Marshall left message for chief Joe Alphonse at telephone number s.22 . Please

4 February, 2011:

concerns or comments relating to the proposed plan. Dean Marshall left message for Chief Joe Alphonse s.22 to contact me with any

Result:

No response was received.

Page 133 MOE-2011-00231

Canadian Fo	rest Prod	ucts Ltd				CANFØR
Plateau						
January 15 th , 2011			11 × 1			
Tsilhqot'in Nationa	ll Government					
Mr. Joe Alphonse 253 Fourth Avenue Williams Lake, Britis V2G 4T4	h Columbia			- 25		
Re: Development of	Fan Integrated F	Dest Manare	ment Plan (I	IPMP) for V	erretation Control	
Mr. Joe Alphonse	÷					
Please be advised th Products Ltd., Forest	at an Integrated Management G	Pest Manage roup, Prince (ment Plan (I George and	PMP) is bei Vanderhoof	ng jointly proposed by Divisions.	[,] Canadian Forest
The Vanderhoof adu Telephone 250-567-0	dress is: 1399 E 8335, Fax 250-5(earhead Roa 57-3911 E-m	d, Vanderho 1ail <u>Dean.Ma</u>	of, British C arshall@can	olumbia V0J 3A2 <u>for.com</u> .	
Copies of the propos Division (Plateau Off	ed Pest Manage ice) by appointm	ment Plan an ent with Dear	d accompan ı Marshall, R	iying maps r RPF.	nay be examined @ th	he Vanderhoof
The Prince George Columbia, V2L 4W2 Dale.Likes@canfor.c	address is: 516 or Telephone nu <u>xom</u> .	2 Northwood Jmber: (250) (Pulpmill Roa 962-3425, Fa	ad, Post Offi ax number(2	ce Box 9000, Prince G 50) 962-3217, email	seorge, British
Copies of the propos Likes, RPF	ed PMP and ma	ps may be ex	amined at th	ne above not	led locations by appoir	ntment with Dale
This proposed Pest I George, Vanderhoof	Management Pla and Quesnel Fc	in (PMP) enco rest Districts	ompasses Ca as outlined c	anfor's mana on the accor	aged silviculture obligan panying map.	ations in the Prince
The herbicides listed methods will include	below are proportion both aerial and	osed for use v ground based	vithin the cor	ntext of this	PMP for vegetation co	ontrol. Application
Herbicide Trade Name	Active Ingredient	Applicatio Usage	n Aerial	Ground	Pesticide Control Products Act #	
Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	glyphosate	common	yes	yes	19899, 27736, 26884, 29009	
This proposed PMP has been confirmed	shall be in force by the BC Minist	for a five yeau ry Environme	r period (201 int (MOE).	1-2016) from	n the date that the Pe	sticide Use Notice

1399 Bearhead Road, Vanderhoof, British Columbia V0J 3A2 Telephone 250-567-4725 Fax 250-567-3911 E-mail info@canfor.ca www.canfor.com

Page 134 MOE-2011-00231

1

Any person wishing to contribute information about a proposed treatment site, or information relevant to the development of the Integrated Pest Management Plan, may send copies of the request to the applicants at the address(es) above within 30 days of the publication of a notice to be published in the local newspapers. The notice shall be published sometime in January, 2011.

Please take note that you are receiving this notice, given that your name appears on Canfor's list of interested stakeholders.

Sincerely,

R. Dean Marshall, RPF Silviculture Coordinator Forest Management Group (FMG)

Attachment: PMP Scope Map

DRAFT – March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit. Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Proponent: Copadian Folost Hoduck First Nation; Ulkatcho FN

Contact Person: Dean Marshull Contact Person: chief Allan Louie

Ģ Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance **Issuance Number:**

Instructions:

- Fill in all or part as applicable
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

N If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply)

 \checkmark Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

5 A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

7 Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

 Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)
Yes. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First Nation

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

Asked ¢. Mole information

DRAFT - Murch 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

2 No. If no, describe why not. - FN asked for every and plan and map. See smails - did not request 5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests. à đ not request a mbg opp of the

Al Wara mastinne hald? (Chark use or not

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

- 6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.
- 6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?
- 7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Memorandum

Date: March 3, 2011 Subject: Ulkatcho First Nation FROM: Dean Marshall TO: PMP FILE

The following summarizes attempts made at communication with the Ulkatcho First Nation

January 28, 2011

the letter, asked me to resend them - which I did via email to Spoke with Chief Allan Louie to follow up next week. S22 He did not have time to fully read and understand S22 He asked me

February 4th, 2011

the Chief Louie from the previous week and that could he please telephone me back. Left message with receptionist. Told her that I was following up on a conversation I had with

February 23, 2011

call me back if he had any concerns or comments in regards to the PMP. Left another message on Chief Alan Louie's voice mail. Stating the reason for my call and could he please

Also sent an email:

Chief Louie.

Vanderhoof and Prince George areas. I was hoping to follow up with you pertaining to Canfor's proposed Pest Management Plan for the

PMP Letter to Ulkatcho and Proposed Map showing area under the Plan. We spoke by telephone on January 28th, at which time you asked me to resend you the information

Please call if you have any comment regarding details of the proposed plan

Thanks for your time.

Communication Result:

Nothing received. Nothing further

Marshall, Dean

2	
T 110ay, valualy 20, 2011 2,00 F M	Dell
Eriday January 38 2011 3.56 DM	
Ividi Sildil, Dedil	- TOTAL

Chief Louie,

I would like to thank you for taking the time to speak with me this afternoon.

I have attached a copy of the letter as well as the map of the proposed area. Again, we are in the preliminary stages of developing our Pest Management Plan, which has yet to be approved.

plan. I will follow up with a call next week, at which time we can discuss any concerns that you might have with the proposed

Thanks and have a good weekend.

Sincerely, Dean Marshall



A LO

Copy of pest_management_ p_letter_vhf_Ulkatcl plan.pdf





CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS LTD.

Forest Management Group, Prince George and Vanderhoof **Operating Areas**

Forest Vegetation Pest Management Plan

2011 - 2016

Confirmation Number: Canfor, FMG. Prince George and Vanderhoof Operating Areas 2011 - 2016

Prepared by

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

October 28, 2010

Table of Contents

23	4.7.1 Aerial Herbicide Equipment	4. /
77	Weather Monitoring and Strategies	4. 0 1
27	4.5./ Silviculture 1 continues and Preventative Measures	2
2 1 1	4.5.0 RUGUALCESS	
1 C	1.5.6 Double Avenue 1.5.6 Double Avenue	
ン i ン i	1.55 Tempor Deferrels	
ン i ン i	4.5.4 Wildlife Values (Elors and Fauna)	
22	4.5.3 Wildlife Trees Wildlife Tree Patches or Wildlife Habitat	
21	4.5.2 Cultural Heritage Resources	
21	4.5.1 Aboriginal Trails	
21	Strategies to Meet the Nazko Pest Management Protocol	4.5
21	Pre-Treatment Inspection Procedures For Identifying Treatment Area Boundaries	4.4
21	Strategies to Prevent Herbicide Treatment of Food Intended for Human Consumption	4.3
20	4.2.5 Species at Risk	
20	4.2.4 Riparian Areas	
20	4.2.3 Wildlife Habitat Features	
19	4.2.2 Pesticide Free Zones (PFZ)	
18	4.2.1 Definitions	
18	Strategies to Protect Fish and Wildlife, Riparian Areas, And Wildlife Habitat	4.2
17	Strategies to Protect community Watersheds and Other Domestic Water Sources	4.1
17	CTION 4 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION STRATEGIES AND PROCEDURES	SEC
i U	Procedures For Kesponding to Herbicide Spiils	
		ט ג 4 ח
	I loccuules I of safety Mixing, Loading, and Applying refuences and United Darkisidae	
л - Л -	Procedures for Safely Mixing Loading and Applying Harbidides	u i u i
1	Procedures For Safely Storing Herbicides	י נ נ
<u> </u> 4	Procedures For Safely Transnorting Herbicides	<u>.</u>
14	CTION 3: OPERATIONAL INFORMATION	SEC
11	2.3.6 Selection of Treatment Method	
11	2.3.5.6 Mechanical Site Preparation	
11	2.3.5.5 Ground-Based Non-Herbicide Methods – Livestock	
10	2.3.5.4 Ground-Based Non-Herbicide Methods – Hand Tools	
10	2.3.5.3 Ground-Based Non-Herbicide Methods – Small Engine	
. 9	2.3.5.2 Ground-Based Herbicide Methods	
. 9	2.3.5.1 Aerial-Based Herbicide Methods	
: 9	2.3.5 Treatment Options and Selection Criteria	
6	2.3.4 Injury Thresholds and Treatment Decisions	
: 6	2.3.3 Monitoring and Post Treatment Evaluation	
: 5	2.3.2 Pest Identification	
: 4	2.3.1 Prevention	
: 4	Integrated Vegetation Management (IVM) Process	2.3
: 4	Objectives of Cantor's integrated vegetation Management Program	2.2
: 4	Introduction.	2.1
4	CTION 2: IN LEGRATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT.	DEC
: • •	Kole and Lerm of Lnis PMP	
。 、 、	rest Management Flan Legislation	
: > N	Responsibility For Vegetation Management	1.5
: ^ N	Geographic Boundaries of This Pest Management Plan	1.2
: 2	Canfor's Pest Management Plan For Silviculture Obligations	; 1.1
2	CTION 1: INTRODUCTION	SEC



Appendix 2: St	Appendix 1: P	4.7.2 G SECTION 5: F
trategies to meet the Nazko 'Pest'' Management Protocol	rince George and Plateau Pest Management Plan Area Map	round Herbicide Equipment

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 CANFOR'S PEST MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR SILVICULTURE OBLIGATIONS

management plan commitments. considering the obligations of the Forest Stewardship Plan and other applicable forest contractors when assessing and conducting vegetation management treatments, while Environmental Management System. process used by Canadian Forest Products Ltd. (Canfor) in relation to its silviculture obligations. The PMP is consistent with Canfor's Environmental Policy and This Pest Management Plan (PMP) describes the integrated vegetation management The PMP is to be used by Canfor staff and

and as permitted by this PMP. legal requirements to produce Free Growing stands on its harvested obligations, and sites' well-stocked stands of ecologically suited commercial tree species that recognize the environmental, and social concerns. A silviculture regimen that involves the potential use of herbicides considers economic, Canfor's vegetation management strategy includes using herbicides where appropriate growth potential. Vegetation management is an integral part of meeting Canfor's Canfor's silviculture goal is to establish healthy,

1.2 GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF THIS PEST MANAGEMENT PLAN

contained within the areas identified on the Prince George and Vanderhoof Division Quesnel Forest Districts. This area includes any of Canfor's managed openings that are and Southern Interior Forest Regions and within the Prince George, Vanderhoof and Divisions have or manage within the Prince George Timber Supply Area of the Northern Integrated Vegetation Management Plan Area Map (Appendix 1). This PMP applies to the various licences that Canfor, Prince George & Vanderhoof

1.3 RESPONSIBILITY FOR VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

principal contacts for information relating to this Pest Management Plan (PMP) are Dale Likes RPF, Forestry Supervisor @ (250) 962-3425 and/or Dean Marshall. RPF, Silviculture Coordinator @ (250) 567-8335. Within Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Prince George and Vanderhoof Division, the

1.4 PEST MANAGEMENT PLAN LEGISLATION

A PMP is a plan that describes:

- vegetation, based on integrated vegetation management; and, A program for managing vegetation populations or reducing damage caused by
- The methods of handling, preparing, mixing, applying and otherwise using herbicides within the program.

Pest Management (IPM), which requires the development of a PMP and the use of pesticides in accordance with the terms and conditions of the PMP. Regulation (IPMR) require pesticides to be used pursuant to the principles of Integrated The Integrated Pest Management Act (IPMA) and the Integrated Pest Management



1.5 ROLE AND TERM OF THIS PMP

This PMP shall be in force for a five-year period from the date that the Pesticide Use Notice has been confirmed by the BC Ministry of Environment (MoE).

The PMP ensures the following:

- federal, provincial and regional legislation; Legal accountability with the provisions of the IPMA, as well as all applicable
- The incorporation and use of the principles of IPM; and,
- . Public awareness of Canadian Forest Products Ltd., Prince George and Plateau Division vegetation management program.

SECTION 2: INTEGRATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

2.1 INTRODUCTION

sedges, forbs, vines, ferns, brush, deciduous trees, and coniferous trees. Management. be used to describe In the context of this document the term Integrated Vegetation Management (IVM) will Vegetation refers to all plant life including, without limitation, grasses, vegetation management using the principles of Integrated Pest

2.2 OBJECTIVES OF CANFOR'S INTEGRATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

vegetation from causing injury or death, or having an unacceptable negative impact on: Canfor's integrated vegetation management objective is to prevent competing pest

- sites scheduled for planting or fillplanting,
- newly planted seedlings,
- juvenile, commercially valuable coniferous trees,

vigorous plantations, Canfor will use herbicides: While meeting the objectives of sustainable forest management by ensuring healthy and

- appropriately as a vegetation management tool and seek a balance between social, economic, and environmental values; and,
- based on sound science. in a biologically and ecologically appropriate manner, with treatment strategies

2.3 INTEGRATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (IVM) PROCESS

The elements of Canfor's IPM program are:

- 1. Prevention
- 2. Pest Identification
- 3. Monitoring and Post-Treatment Evaluations
- 4. Injury Thresholds and Treatment Decisions
- 5. Treatment Options and Selection Criteria

management program and are discussed in detail below Each of the above IPM elements form an integral part of Canfor's vegetation

2.3.1 Prevention

problems: Canfor employs the following preventative measures to avoid competitive vegetation

- Early scheduled. identified in the pre-harvest inspections, and appropriate treatment regimes are Classification zones and site series known to have high brush hazards are Identification ofBrush Prone Sites Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem
- used to grow seedlings for planting and fillplanting activities. Use of Improved Seed - Seed of the highest genetic worth available for the area is from improved seed show faster growth than those grown from wild Seedlings grown seed,
providing these seedlings with an improved ability to compete with encroaching vegetation.

- Selection of Appropriate Species The selection of species to be grown on a site classification will provide guidelines for species selection to maximize seedling must be ecologically suited to the site. performance and minimize the need for brushing treatments. Pre- and post-harvest ecological
- appropriate for use on sites with a low competition hazard or other limiting Selection of Appropriate Stock Type - The physiological characteristics that competition hazard. factors, while larger stock types may be appropriate on sites with high capacity to compete against encroaching vegetation. seedlings possess have a significant impact on seedling establishment and Small stock types may be
- Minimizing Regeneration Delay - Seedlings that are quickly established are more prone sites, seedlings should be planted as soon as possible following harvesting. likely to compete successfully with problematic vegetation. Especially on brush-
- microsites should be followed during planting activities. stock handling to avoid seedling damage and optimizing the quality of planting Maximizing Seedling Performance more likely to compete successfully with problematic vegetation. Guidelines on microsite possible and that remain undamaged during the planting process are Seedlings that are planted in the best
- slash, ameliorating adverse forest floor, soil, above and below ground vegetation structure, or other site biotic factors. improve microsites for newly established seedlings by reducing or rearranging Site Preparation -Site preparation will be conducted, where appropriate, to

2.3.2 Pest Identification

seedling crop tree from establishing and/or reaching free growing status. While this could include many kinds of organisms, the focus of this PMP is on plant species. A pest, in the context of this PMP, is an organism that limits or eliminates the ability of a

competing vegetation. prediction helps plan the most appropriate reforestation strategies that may help to control sound ecosystem classification from which vegetation species can be predicted. This vegetation that has the potential for negatively impacting crop trees. The first step is A fundamental activity in managing competing vegetation is the timely identification of

monitoring program described below. competition, soil temperature and stability. Pest identification will also occur in limiting carried out in order to prescribe silviculture treatments. The next step in prompt pest identification is a post harvest site assessment, which is factors including frost, drought, aeration, saturation, heavy The site is assessed for site vegetation

PMP area include The chief references for the identification of vegetation pests commonly found within the

- Plants of Northern British Columbia (Mackinnon, Pojar, and Coupe)
- Plants of Southern Interior British Columbia (Parish, Coupe, and Lloyd)



- Trees, Shrubs, Flowers (Lyons)
- Autecology of Common Plants (Haeussler, Coates, and Mather) in British Columbia: A Literature Review

2.3.3 Monitoring and Post Treatment Evaluation

Canfor monitors and assesses sites using a combination of the following methods. Post-harvest treatments are implemented and monitored on a formal and informal basis.

Monitoring Method and Data Collected	Frequency
<i>Walkthrough - Post Harvest</i> – Walkthrough survey used to confirm ecology classification on the block, and to identify areas where vegetation is expected to become a concern. Results of the walkthrough will guide planting timing, species and stocktype selection, need for site preparation, and scheduling of future treatments and assessments.	Once – after harvesting, prior to planting
Survey - Regeneration Performance – This more intensive type of survey is used on the more heterogeneous sites where it may be difficult to evaluate the performance of planted and natural stock and recommend brushing treatments. Required data collection must be adequate to determine if thresholds are exceeded for brush problems.	Once - 2 or 3 growing seasons after planting
<i>Walkthrough</i> - <i>Regeneration Performance</i> – Informal walkthroughs on more homogenous sites where seedling performance and competition hazard are easier to evaluate. Required data collection must be adequate to determine if thresholds are exceeded for brush problems.	May be scheduled when more information is required for a treatment decision.
<i>Walkthrough - Free Growing Recce</i> - Walkthrough survey used to confirm that block, or specific strata, will meet standards for Free Growing before a Free Growing Survey is undertaken. Data appropriate to determine if thresholds are exceeded for brush problem (if one exists) is collected.	Once – 5-10 growing seasons after planting. Scheduled as needed as survey regime progresses.
<i>Aerial Recce</i> - A site visit from the air and is mainly used to assess crop tree height, density and distribution, as well as brush competition and distribution.	May be scheduled when more information is required for a treatment decision.
<i>Survey - Free Growing</i> - The purpose of the Free Growing Survey is to gather data required to provide confidence and reliance that a free growing stand has been established. Data will be collected to produce a Free Growing report. Data appropriate to determine if thresholds are exceeded for brush problem (if one exists) is collected.	Once - 5 to 15 growing seasons after planting.
 Post Treatment Audit – Ground or aerial inspection which collects the following: Effectiveness of the brushing treatment in controlling the target vegetation. Effects on any non-target vegetation. Need for follow-up treatments. For chemically brushed areas, any impact of herbicide application on "no treatment zones". 	Once per treatment year within 12 months of treatment.

2.3.4 Injury Thresholds and Treatment Decisions

Decision Thresholds and Action Levels

whether or not treatment is required, there are three scenarios to address: With respect to a development and implementation of a decision protocol for determining

- Obvious Herbaceous Vegetation levels are well developed, and crop trees have seedling attributes. been established long enough that a response can be assessed with respect to
- \mathbb{N} not been established long enough that response can be assessed with respect to expressed, and/or crop trees have not been established (prior to planting), or have seedling attributes. Predictive Herbaceous - Current vegetation levels may or may not be fully
- $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Obvious Deciduous Vegetation Competition - Expressed deciduous competition results in imminent or measurable negative crop tree impact.



Decision thresholds will be different for each of these generalized scenarios, treatment objectives. as will

Scenario 1: Obvious Herbaceous

provides indicators of both seedling impacts and vegetation indices, and their associated long enough that crop trees are able to recover from injury, and that crop trees can generate adequate growth to keep ahead of recovering brush levels. The table below respect to seedling attributes. decisions. thresholds based on past experience and historical data to be factored into IPM treatment been established long enough (1-2 growing seasons) that response can be assessed with In this scenario, herbaceous vegetation levels are well developed, and crop trees have . Treatment objectives are to control competing vegetation

* $Sx = Interior hy$	4. Crop Tree Status	3.Vegetation Index: Comeau's Index**	2. Vigour	1. Sturdiness Ratio / Height- to-Diameter Ratio (HDR)	Indicators of Injury
brid spruce, Fdi = Interior douglas-fir, Pli = Lodgepole pine, Bl = Su	Status of a crop tree with respect to height and density of competing vegetation will impact the degree with which the seedling is being affected.	A commonly used vegetation index is Comeau's Index, which is a measure of total density of vegetation multiplied by vegetation height divided by crop tree height.	Seedlings will react to competition for light in ways that can be visually categorized into seedling vigor classes. Thresholds indicated are derived from past experience and monitoring.	Seedlings will react to competition for light by emphasizing height growth rather than putting growth resources into an even balance between height and diameter growth. This will result in high height to diameter ratios, and a tree susceptible to vegetation and snow press. These thresholds are derived from past experience and monitoring.	How the Thresholds were Chosen
ubalpine fir	 Overtopped Threatened Above Brush 	sum (% cover of brush species x height) <i>divided by</i> (tree height)	1 - Poor 2 - Fair 3 - Good	Seedling Height (cm) <i>divided by</i> Root Collar Diameter (cm)	Measure
	All Species – > 50% of trees in 1 or 2	> 80	All Species: > 50% in Class 1 or 2	Sx, Fdi > 50 Pl, Bl > 40* > 50% of stems exceeding HDR	Threshold Beyond Which Treatment will be Applied

a CI=150, seedlings receive 30% of the full sunlight in midsummer and would achieve approximately 45% of potential growth as CI increases from 0 to 100. At CI=100, growth is approximately 60% of that of a seedling growing free from competition. At rates (Comeau, 1993). crop-seedling height. CI shows that growth declines with increases in competition index. There is a very rapid decline in growth the sum of the products of cover and height for all non-crop species within a 1.26 meter radius around a crop tree, divided by **Comeau's Index (CI) is a simple index that measures the competition for sunlight with regards to crop trees. CI is calculated as

Scenario 2: Predictive Herbaceous

seedlings and cause injury. This is a predictive scenario, whereby observed data from sites where (if left untreated) we forecast that vegetation competition will overtop objectives focus on maintaining current seedling vigor prior to injury; specifically on established (prior to planting or fill planting), or established long enough. Treatment because current vegetation levels are not fully expressed, seedlings have hazard ratings for forest vegetation establishment. tree injury occurs. In general terms, ecological classification forms a starting point for past treatments and site ecology are integrated to make treatment decisions before crop In this scenario, the response cannot be assessed with respect to seedling attributes not been



applicable to the Prince George and Plateau areas as follows: Brush hazard ratings associated with biogeoclimatic ecosystem classification (BEC)

crop trees do not have to first recover from injury. These proactive treatments result in this scenario prior to injury; therefore, shorter-term brush control is often acceptable, as described in the following table: lower injury thresholds, avoiding repetitive silvicultural treatments. The thresholds are knowledge of treatment responses and site-specific attributes. Treatment is conducted in predictive herbaceous scenario. The ecology classification is then combined with local Ecology classed as moderate, high, or very high may need treatment based on the

			**•
Presence of Thimble Twinberry, Lady fern, Br Elderberry, Raspberry, Al	Visual	Prediction of vegetation development potential is aided by consideration of species present at the time of assessment. Presence/absence of a narrow list of species in early brush development provides an indication of likelihood that brushing will be required.	3. Indicator Species
> 80	sum (% cover of brush x height) / (tree height)	See Comeau's Index description under Scenario 1. For a site preparation decision where no tree data exists, use 26 cm (target height for Sx 512 2+0).	2. Vegetation Index (Comeau's)
Moderate, High to Very I hazard rating	See Table above	Based on local knowledge of treatment responses, observed data from surveys, and Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification (BEC), we are able to predict which site types have likelihood of requiring brushing treatments. This is combined with the indicators below to prescribe treatment.	1. Brush Hazard by BEC Association
Threshold	Measure	Cause	Indicators

manual or herbicide treatments to these species. I his list identifies the primary indicator species and should not be considered exhaustive or limiting

Scenario 3: Obvious Deciduous Vegetation Competition

Cottonwood, Alders, Willows, Maples, and Birches For the purpose of this scenario, "deciduous vegetation" refers б Trembling aspen,



difficult to prescribe and must be measured against legal silviculture obligations. may be deleterious. Specific thresholds with respect to treatment of deciduous are densities and distributions of deciduous may not be harmful to the stand, whereas others deciduous species. Definition of thresholds is more difficult for this scenario as some following threshold provides a guide: Treatment objectives for this scenario are the release of crop trees from competition of The

the relative height rule (that is, the deciduous species is encroaching upon the distribution of deciduous species results in a stand > 1.0 contiguous hectare effective growing space of the crop tree). Without treatment, Free Growing with less than the prescribed minimum well-spaced stocking standard due to obligations will not be met. Without treatment, Free Growing obligations will not be met because the

stems, this PMP's thresholds will be adjusted accordingly. growing definition should change to accommodate a different proportion of deciduous described in stocking standards found in the current Forest Stewardship Plan. If the free practices as per the obligations and definitions pertaining to a "Free Growing Tree" as effective growing space has been subject to much discussion, and includes the extent to which deciduous competition is considered to be *deleterious*. The impact that deciduous trees have upon the crop tree when it encroaches with the This PMP uses current

2.3.5 Treatment Options and Selection Criteria

2.3.5.1 Aerial-Based Herbicide Methods

Herbicide - Helicopter Methods

Helicopter Discretionary - Non-continuous, discretionary application of herbicide across portions of areas within a cutblock. Equipment includes a helicopter with low-pressure boom with conventional or high volume nozzles. Varying glyphosate application rates possible

Helicopter Broadcast - Continuous application of herbicide across all or a portion of areas within a cut block. Equipment includes a helicopter with low-pressure boom with conventional or high volume nozzles. Varying glyphosate application rates possible

	Benefits		Limitations
V	Highly effective control over a number of years	٧	Less selective than other methods.
V	Little to no contact of herbicide to workers	V	Stringent application constraints
V	Lowest cost brushing method	V	High public profile
V	Able to treat slashy, steep ground more safely than a	V	Intensive preparation and follow up
	ground treatment.	V	Mature leave trees limit use of this method.
		V	Visual quality affected for a number of years
		V	Technically demanding

Rationale for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP –We have not found a more effective, cost efficient method for vegetation control, and we have found this method to be the safest in regards to workers on the ground.

2.3.5.2 Ground-Based Herbicide Methods

Herbicide - Backpack Methods

Backpack Discretionary - Non-continuous, discretionary application of herbicide across portions of areas within a cutblock. Equipment includes low-pressure backpack sprayer with adjustable nozzles. Varying glyphosate application rates possible

ğ Backpack Broadcast - Continuous application of herbicide across all or a portion of areas within a cut block. Equipment includes low-pressure backpack sprayer with adjustable nozzles. Varying glyphosate application rates

Benefits	ssible.	
Limitations		



method is a key tool, and is especially useful in areas in	<i>Kationate for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP</i> – 1 his have lots of leave trees and herbaceous brush.
rough terrain.	
\rightarrow Safety concerns with wearing heavy equipment of	➤ Little or no buffer zone required protecting PFZ.
\rightarrow Higher potential of worker exposure to herbicide.	be more "selective" than a helicopter.
\rightarrow Needs a very high level of supervision and layout.	\succ Can be applied with more precision, and applicator can
\rightarrow Effectiveness diminishes as height of brush increases	trees.
\rightarrow Intensive preparation and follow up	> Can treat on blocks with lots of mature standing leave
 Stringent application constraints 	➤ Effective control over a number of years.

Cut Stump - Non-continuous, discretionary application of herbicide onto cut surfaces of target vegetation only. Equipment generally includes a brushsaw with a user-controlled herbicide attachment that applies herbicide beneath the surface of the cutting blade. Varying glyphosate application rates possible but are much lower rates than Aerial and Backmark methods **Herbicide - Brushsaw Methods**

Rationale for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP – This metho	application rate)	➤ Very little herbicide exposure to workers. ➤ Uses less herbicide on a given area (reduced)	➤ Little or no buffer zone required protecting PFZ.	treatment methods.	\gg Much bigger treatment window versus other herbicide \gg	sprouting of target vegetation.	\geq Effective control over a number of years preventing re-	Benefits	Backpack methods.
od is a good tool for blocks that have high numbers of		Expensive equipment required.	rough terrain.	Safety concerns with wearing heavy equipment on	Needs a very high level of supervision and layout.	Intensive preparation and follow up	Stringent application constraints	Limitations	

2.3.5.3 Ground-Based Non-Herbicide Methods -Small Engine

re-sprouting of aspen

INOU-HELDICIDE – I	SFUSIISAW IVIELIIOU
Manual Brushing - Worker cuts target vegetation with a br	ushsaw or chainsaw.
Benefits	Limitations
➢ No herbicide use.	> Re-sprouting of target species, may require re-
➤ Public acceptance	treatment
➤ Can be applied selectively	➤ Safety hazards associated with saws, exhaust fumes,
➤ Can be used in riparian areas or pesticide free zones	and repetitive motion injuries.
	➢ High treatment cost. Expensive equipment required.
	➤ Relative short window for treatment (after leaf out to
	end of July).
	➢ Not effective on herbaceous brush.
Rationale for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP - Can I	be effective if crop trees are taller and not suppressed (but
will not make "Free Growing")	

2.3.5.4 Ground-Based Non-Herbicide Methods – Hand Tools

Non-Herbicide – Girdle

ventually (2-3 years) killing the trees.	Manual Girdling – Worker uses hand-girdling tool and removes a continuous strip of bark around individual stem
--	--

Benefits	Limitations
➤ No herbicide use.	➢ Re-sprouting, may require multiple treatments.
➤ Public acceptance.	➤ High treatment cost due to low productivity.
➤ Can be applied selectively.	➤ Cannot use for herbaceous.
➤ Low cost hand tools so workforce can gear up easily.	➤ Repetitive strain injuries common.
Rationale for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP - Can	be effective if crop trees are taller and not suppressed (but
will not make "Free Growing")	



onale for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP - Only other re	> Ris	are	> Pot	➤ Ris	ıd,,	> Net	no	➤ Car	pro	➤ Car	× Hig	ot constrained by weather conditions. (esp	o herbicide use.	Benefits	station.	ep Grazing - 1-3 shepherds guide a herd of sheep (1,000 -	Non-Herbicide –
ealistic option to herbaceous treatment if herbicide	sk of predation.	as from herd.	tential damage to pesticide free zones and riparian	sk of disease spread to wild ungulate populations.	ogram".	ed a group of blocks in close proximity to make a	slash.	n only use on good access, flat blocks with low to	vides a couple months of control.	n only use for certain herbaceous species and only	gh treatment cost.	pecially Pli and Fdi and any species in June)	oderate to high amounts of damage to crop trees	Limitations		- 1,500 head) through areas where they eat target	Sheep

2.3.5.5 Ground-Based Non-Herbicide Methods – Livestock

cannot be used

2.3.5.6 Mechanical Site Preparation

Non-Herbicide – Mech	anical Site Preparation
Mechanical Site Prep - Creating improved microsites	for reforestation where site limiting factors might inhibit
seedling performance, for example soil temperature, soil	moisture, competing vegetation, or physical barrier (slash
loading)	
Benefits	Limitations
➤ No herbicide use.	➤ Temporary brush control
> Public accentance	V Evnenciue

Benefits	Limitations
➤ No herbicide use.	➤ Temporary brush control
➤ Public acceptance.	➤ Expensive
Increased soil temperature	➤ Access limitations
	Possible soil compaction and rutting
	➤ Potential for surface erosion
	➤ High visual impact
	\triangleright Site constraints – slone slash duff laver denth

contro Rationale for Selecting Treatment Method in PMP - Creates favourable microsites and achieves temporary brush

2.3.6**Selection of Treatment Method**

efficacy, treatment cost, physical constraints, legal constraints, political constraints and Treatment method selection is complicated by a number of factors including treatment concerns from other users of the land and resources.

residual trees, wildlife and water concerns. of the site (e.g. 15% slope vs. 60% slope), and other site constraints such as slash loading. such as access to the site (e.g. road access with truck vs. quad vs. helicopter), geography addressing the target species and is cost effective. Where a treatment is warranted, it is important that the chosen strategy is effective in This is complicated by constraints

processes, and Land and Resource Management Plan processes. avenues, for example public consultation, regulatory agencies, Forest Stewardship Plan be addressed and accommodated within all strategies. Political constraints may come from a number of sources. These constraints may be identified through a number of Legal and political constraints will influence treatment selection. Legal constraints must



through the site preparation and planting stages and is acted upon through monitoring and vegetation. The integrated pest management strategy starts prior to harvest, is carried methods would likely be the leading treatment choice. constraints were to be the leading indicators of a treatment decision matrix, herbicide extraneous constraints upon a treatment decision. not attempt to create a treatment decision matrix that may exclude or that may apply vegetation treatment strategies. principles of integrated pest management minimizes the requirement to treat problem Due to the complexity of issues that may influence a treatment decision, this PMP does If efficacy, cost, and operational However, employing the

the actual treatment choice may be different than below with a stated rationale. Canfor, Prince George and Plateau operating areas. This process is greatly simplified and The flowchart below describes the process guideline for selecting a brushing method in



Brushing Method Selection Model

Use this model to select the most suitable brushing method. Circle the final choice. Add any coments to rationalize treatment choice.



Limitations to using herbicide on the block may include: specific SP requirements, wildlife habitats (i.e. nests, dens identified on block), ungulate winter ranges, stakeholder limitations, pesticide free zones, old growth management areas, and other limitations specified in higher level plans.

NOTE: This model is a guide to help determine brushing treatments; factors such as block location, size of treatment area, terrain issues (i.e. slope, slash levels), and cost should also be considered when reaching a final brushing treatment decision.

	Comments		

SECTION 3: OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

3.1 PROCEDURES FOR SAFELY TRANSPORTING HERBICIDES

may include some herbicides. Management Act regulate the transportation and handling of poisonous substances, which The federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act (TDGA) and the Integrated Pest

The following procedures will be followed while transporting herbicides for application under this PMP:

- Limited amounts of herbicide concentrate will be carried in any one vehicle. The quantity will be no more than what is necessary for each project
- compartment. Herbicide concentrate will only be carried in a secure lockable, signed
- Herbicide concentrate will only be transported in original labeled containers
- water, safety gear, and people. Herbicide concentrate will always be carried separately from food and drinking
- transport and use. herbicides but in close proximity to the herbicide on each vehicle during herbicide Spill containment and clean up equipment will be carried separately from
- . (MSDS) will be carried in each vehicle during herbicide transport and use Appropriate documents such as operations records and material safety data sheets

3.2 PROCEDURES FOR SAFELY STORING HERBICIDES

Applicators". In summary, the storage area must: Herbicides will be stored in accordance with the Integrated Pest Management Act and Regulations and the WorksafeBC document "Standard Practices for Pesticide

- be ventilated to the outside atmosphere;
- be locked when left unattended;
- restrict access to authorized persons;
- herbicides are stored bearing, in block letters that are clearly visible, the words "WARNING CHEMICAL STORAGE AUTHORIZED PERSONS ONLY". be placarded on the outside of each door leading into the facility in which the

department of the presence of herbicides on the premises. In addition, the person responsible for the storage area shall notify the appropriate fire

unit. Persons responsible for the herbicide storage shall ensure that all herbicides are performing herbicide treatments for Canfor. The vehicle is considered a mobile storage protective equipment. stored in a locked canopy, or similar arrangement, separate from the driver and personal Some contractors may store herbicides for extended periods of time in vehicles when

ω ω PROCEDURES FOR SAFELY MIXING, LOADING, AND APPLYING HERBICIDES

pesticide applicators in the appropriate category of certification. General procedures and precautions include: All mixing, loading and application of herbicides shall be carried out by certified

- Mixing of herbicides must always be conducted in a safe manner
- Safety spill kits, spill response plans and first aid supplies shall be present on or near the treatment site.
- product labels shall be available on or near the treatment site. Eye wash station(s) and protective clothing as recommended on the respective
- consistent with label rates. treatment site to ensure that quantities of herbicides being mixed and used are Product labels and Material Safety Data Sheets will be available on or near the
- . and Range Practices Act and non classified waterbodies). environmental features (i.e. riparian management areas as described in the Forest There shall be no mixing or loading of herbicides within 15 metres of sensitive
- calibrated to conform to the application rates on the pesticide label. Ensure that the application equipment is in good working order and, if required, is
- Implement precautions to prevent unprotected human exposure to pesticides
- ۲ intended use. sources and soil used for agricultural crop production are protected for their Implement precautions to ensure that domestic water sources, agricultural water
- . mixing tank. into the natural source by an "air gap" or "reservoir" between the source and the streams or ponds. The intake of water for mixing will be protected from backflow herbicide(s) will not be used to pick up water from natural sources such as Ensure that, to prevent treatment of watercourses, the suction hoses used for

3.4 PROCEDURES FOR THE SAFE DISPOSAL OF EMPTY HERBICIDE CONTAINERS AND **UNUSED HERBICIDES**

as noted on the product label or provincial instructions and Empty containers shall be disposed of in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions Applicators and Dispensers (1995). As a minimum, empty herbicide containers shall be: detailed in the BC Ministry of Environment document Handbook for Pesticide recommendations that are

- returned to the herbicide distributor as part of their recycling program; or,
- triple rinsed or pressure rinsed, then altered so they cannot be reused; and
- disposed of in a permitted sanitary landfill or other approval disposal site.
- AWSA approved facilities. unused herbicides will be stored (a) the herbicide distributors warehouse or

3.5 PROCEDURES FOR RESPONDING TO HERBICIDE SPILLS

and loading sites, and it shall include the at least following: Spill treatment equipment shall be at or near storage (including mobile storage) mixing



- Personal protective equipment
- coarse clay, kitty litter or commercial absorbent Absorbent material such as sawdust, sand, activated charcoal, vermiculite, dry
- Neutralizing material such as lime, chlorine bleach or washing soda
- Long handled broom, shovel, and waste-receiving container with lid

If contractors that work under this PMP have their own spill response plan, it must meet Response Plan, generally described below: or exceed the personnel working on a project involving herbicides should be familiar with its contents. A copy of an approved spill response plan shall be at or near each work site. All requirements as described in Canfor's Emergency Preparedness and

- protective clothing and safety gear; All personnel shall be protected from herbicide exposure by wearing appropriate
- spill; Any person exposed to a herbicide shall be moved away from the place of the
- First aid should be administered, if required;
- The source of the spill should be stopped;
- The spilled material should be stopped from spreading by creating a dam or ridge;
- and the source is repaired; The project supervisor shall ensure operations cease until the spill is contained
- liquid; Absorbent material shall be spread over the spill, if applicable, to absorb any
- contents clearly marked; The absorbent material shall be collected in garbage bags or containers with the
- in garbage bags or containers; Contaminated soil or other material will be removed from the spill site and placed
- Canfor for shipping instructions and disposal requirements; The person responsible for the project shall contact an approved representative of
- the and an approved representative of Canfor will be notified of the details related to where that is impractical, to the local police or nearest detachment of the RCMP report it to the Provincial Emergency Program by telephoning 1-800-663-3456 or, amount into a waterbody, the person responsible for the project will immediately When more than five kilograms of product of herbicide is spilled on land, or any spill as soon as1Spractical by the Contractor project supervisor

SECTION 4 STRATEGIES AND PROCEDURES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

measures designed to protect the following: All vegetation management activities intended for use within this PMP will incorporate

- Strategies to protect community watersheds, and other domestic water sources
- Strategies to protect fish and wildlife, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat
- Strategies to prevent herbicide treatment of food intended for human consumption
- Pre-treatment inspection procedures for identifying treatment area boundaries
- Procedures for maintaining and calibrating herbicide application equipment
- herbicide application methods for different weather conditions and Procedures for monitoring weather conditions and strategies for modifying
- heritage resources, road access and flora and fauna for sustenance Nazko pest management ptotocol with respect to aboriginal trails, cultural

In this PMP, Canfor based the size of its pesticide-free zones (PFZ) and no treatment and Regulations. zones (NTZ) on the standards currently contained in the Integrated Pest Management Act

4.1 STRATEGIES TO PROTECT COMMUNITY WATERSHEDS AND OTHER DOMESTIC WATER SOURCES

No herbicide will be used within the Pritchard Creek Community Watershed One Community Watershed falls within the Canfor Prince George operating area.

the section 8.2 of the FPPR, the results/strategies that apply to the Canadian building within the Pritchard Creek watershed during the term of this FSP. Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) will not carry out any new harvesting or road Farm Licence 30 Forest Development Unit (FDU) are that the holders of this Forest Products Ltd., Prince George and Fort St. James Forest Districts and Tree In relation to the objective set by government for community watershed set out in

of the watershed is maintained. The area of the PFZ will comply with the standards set at watersheds that may be developed during the term of this PMP to ensure that the integrity that time A Pesticide Free Zone (PFZ) will be established around any other established community

domestic or agricultural purposes, including water for livestock or for irrigation of crops. treatment zone will be implemented around any water supply intake or wells used for Pursuant to section 71 of the Integrated Pest Management Regulation, a 30 m no-

Due to the location of Canfor's tenure (Crown land located away from private land), Canfor's tenure. there are no water supply intakes or wells used for domestic or agricultural purposes on

42 STRATEGIES TO PROTECT FISH AND WILDLIFE, RIPARIAN AREAS, AND WILDLIFE HABITAT

4.2.1 Definitions

Forest Planning and Practices Regulation, the Regulations for further information. Wildlife Act, and/or the Government Actions Regulation. Refer to these Acts and The following definitions are taken from the Integrated Pest Management Regulation, the Forest and Range Practices Act, the

water. "Body of water" does not include a human-made, self-contained body of or structure for

or bridging vegetation or soil mats, that contains water on a perennial or seasonal basis, is scoured by water or contains observable deposits of mineral alluvium, and that "Stream" means a watercourse, including a watercourse that is obscured by overhanging

a) has a continuous channel bed that is 100m or more in length, or

- b) flows directly into
- i. a fish stream or a fish-bearing lake or wetland, or
- ii. a licensed waterworks

"Wetland" means a swamp, marsh, bog, or other similar area that supports natural vegetation, that is distinct from adjacent upland areas

Regulation section 48(1) and (2)"Classified wetland" means a wetland as described in the Forest Planning and Practices

"Fish stream" means a watercourse that

- a) is frequented by any of the following species of fish:
- iii. anadromous salmonids;
- 1V. rainbow trout, cutthroat trout, brown trout, bull trout, Dolly Varden char, mountain whitefish, lake whitefish, arctic grayling, burbot, white sturgeon, black crappie, yellow perch, walleye or northern pike; lake trout, brook trout, kokanee, largemouth bass, smallmouth bass,
- v. a species identified as a species at risk
- vi. a species identified as regionally important wildlife, or
- b) has a slope gradient of less than 20% unless the watercourse
- V11. does not contain any of the species of fish referred to in paragraph (a).
- V111. the barrier are simultaneously dry at any time during the year, or is located upstream of a barrier to fish passage and all reaches upstream of
- IX. is located upstream of a barrier to fish passage and no perennial fish habitat exists upstream of the barrier

"Wildlife" means

- a) vertebrates that are mammals, birds, reptiles, or amphibians and are prescribed as wildlife under the Wildlife Act,
- b) fish from or in the non-tidal waters of BC, including
- vertebrates of the order Petromyzoniformes (lampreys) or class Osteichthyes (bony fishes), or

- Ξ. invertebrates of the subphylum Crustacea (crustaceans) or phylum Mollusca (mollusks), and
- C invertebrates or plants listed by the minister responsible for the administration of the Wildlife Act as endangered, threatened, or vulnerable species,

and includes the eggs and juvenile stages of these vertebrates, invertebrates, and plants

life processes the environment on which wildlife depend directly or indirectly in order to carry out their "habitat" or "wildlife habitat" means the air, soil, water, food, and cover components of

"wildlife habitat feature" may be identified by the minister responsible for the Wildlife management that has not otherwise been provided for under regulation: Act as habitat of with the following characteristics and is considered to require special

- a) a fisheries sensitive feature
- b) a marine sensitive featurec) a significant mineral lick or wallow
- d) a nest of
- i. a bald eagle,
- ii. an osprey,
- iii. a great blue heron, or
- iv. a category of species at risk that is limited to birds
- e any other localized feature that the minister responsible for the Wildlife Act considers to be a wildlife habitat feature

4.2.2 Pesticide Free Zones (PFZ)

must be protected from pesticide moving into it. "Pesticide Free Zone" means an area of land that must not be treated with pesticide and

contractors conduct a treatment area reconnaissance to identify water bodies post-harvest. Silviculture Prescriptions, Site/Exemption Plans, or Site Level Plans. Herbicide layout Water bodies are identified, pre-harvest, in conjunction with the development of

wetlands, except: A 10m PFZ will be maintained along all water bodies, dry streams and classified

- Glyphosate may be applied up to 2 m from the high water mark, if:
- Ξ the body of water or classified wetland is not fish bearing at any time of the year and
- Ē selective application (cut stump or hack and squirt, not backpack methods) are used between 2m and 10m above the high water mark
- ۲ Glyphosate may be applied up to but not below the high water mark, if the body of water is:
- (i) a temporary free-standing body of water,
- (ii) not a classified wetland or wildlife habitat feature, and
- (iii) not fish bearing and does not drain into a fish bearing body of water within 100m
- Glyphosate may be applied to a temporary free standing body of water if the body of water is:

.

- (i) either smaller than 25 m^2 or not a wetland,
- (ii) not a wildlife habitat feature, and
- not fish bearing and does not drain into a fish bearing body of water within 100 m.

habitat feature and not fish-bearing when wet. Glyphosate may be applied to a dry S-5 or S-6 stream if the dry stream is not a wildlife

maintained through the establishment of a no-treatment zone of a sufficient distance to ensure the maintenance of the RRZ. Riparian Reserve zones will be treated as Pesticide Free Zones and their integrity will be

4.2.3 Wildlife Habitat Features

Plateau operating areas include: Management Plans. Wildlife Habitat Features found in the Canfor, Prince George and Silviculture Prescriptions, Site Plans, Forest Stewardship Plans, and/or Sustainable Forest Wildlife Habitat features are identified pre-harvest and are managed through approved

- Mule Deer Ungulate Winter Range,
- Caribou Ungulate Winter Range

reported those operational plans. Observation of wildlife habitat features post-harvest will be measures may be implemented. The application of herbicides will be consistent with the protection measures stated in to Canfor representatives, and where necessary, site-specific protection

4.2.4 Riparian Areas

measures stated in those operational plans. Silviculture Prescriptions, Site Plans, Forest Stewardship Plans, and/or Sustainable Forest Management Plans. The application of herbicides will be consistent with the protection Riparian features are identified pre-harvest and are managed through approved

4.2.5 Species at Risk

herbicides under this PMP will be consistent with the protection measures stated in our Sustainable Forest Management Plan. Canfor is certified under several forestry certification brands, and the application of

areas. Observation of species at risk post-harvest will be reported to Canfor representatives, and where necessary, the observations will be reported to the Ministry of identification of at risk species and plant communities found within Canfor's operating Environment and site-specific protection measures may be implemented. Canfor has developed annual training for staff and contractors for assistance in proper

plan. To date, no "Species at Risk" have been identified in any postharvest areas under this

43 STRATEGIES TO PREVENT HERBICIDE TREATMENT OF FOOD INTENDED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Management Regulations). treatment site to meet regulatory requirements (as per Sec 64(1) of the Integrated Pest chemical methods of vegetation management. Signs will be posted at all entrances to the around these areas during herbicide applications, timing applications, or using nontreatment of these areas. Such precautions may include providing increased buffer zones and take the appropriate precautions during vegetation management operations to avoid Canfor shall attempt to locate areas where there is food grown for human consumption

Herbicide will not be stored or transported in the same compartments as human food

44 PRE-TREATMENT INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING TREATMENT AREA BOUNDARIES

layout map. instructed to follow the bagging/flagging requirements as depicted on the treatment such as bodies of water and no treatment zones are noted on maps. The contractor is and/or Canfor supervisor to identify treatment area boundaries and the presence of the general public, grazing wildlife and livestock. During this inspection, sensitive areas A pre-treatment inspection will be completed on all treatment sites by the contractor

procedures for applications and handling of the herbicide. bagging/flagging requirements and precautions, and review the methodology During the pre-work discussion, contractor representatives shall be instructed in the and

and there is no visible grazing wildlife or livestock in the treatment area. No treatment is to proceed until it is confirmed there is no presence of the general public

<u>4</u>5 STRATEGIES TO MEET THE NAZKO PEST MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL

Requirements - PMP Referrals" of the Nazko Pest Management Protocol): and Notification of Intent to Treat (NIT) issues. To meet the protocol, all vegetation management activities intended for use within this PMP will incorporate measures communications between Canfor, the Nazko Band and Ministry of Environment on PMP The designed to Nazko Pest Management Protocol provides an opportunity for transparent protect the following (taken from section 6.0 "Band Information

4.5.1 Aboriginal Trails

(within the Nazko Band's Traditional Territory) will be managed as identified in the NIT tabular summary submitted to the Nazko Band on an annual basis prior to treatment. Nazko Trail Management Protocol. These treatment areas will also be identified in the Aboriginal Trails within, adjacent to or in close proximity to proposed treatment areas

4.5.2 Cultural Heritage Resources

Plans. Silviculture Prescriptions, Site Plans, Forest Development Plans, or Forest Stewardship Cultural Heritage resources are identified pre-harvest and are managed through approved The application of herbicides will be consistent with the protection measures

stated in those operational plans. annual basis prior to treatment. Notification of Intent to Treat (NIT) tabular summary submitted to the Nazko Band on an These treatment areas will also be identified in the

4.5.3 Wildlife Trees, Wildlife Tree Patches or Wildlife Habitat

Habitat Refer to section 4.2, Strategies to Protect Fish and Wildlife, Riparian Areas, and Wildlife

4.5.4 Wildlife Values (Flora and Fauna)

Human Consumption Refer to section 4.3, Strategies to Prevent Herbicide Treatment of Food Intended for

4.5.5 Trapper Referrals

within the Nazko Band's Traditional Territory through annual NIT referrals. Canfor will ensure that appropriate referrals will be made to Band member trappers

4.5.6 Road Access

required to access sites, however they will be removed after treatment. prior to treatment. status of the road accessing proposed treatment areas will remain in the state they are Road access within the Nazko Band's Traditional Territory will remain undisturbed. The There may be occasions when temporary bridges or culverts may be

4.5.7 Silviculture Techniques and Preventative Measures

Refer to section 2.3.1, Prevention Program

4.6 WEATHER MONITORING AND STRATEGIES

conditions. The following items will be recorded for foliar treatment methods: treatment and in between treatment if there has been a change in site or weather Measurements will be made to record weather conditions prior to treatment, at the end of

Wind speed and direction
 Relative Humidity (RH)

Presence of frost or dew

- on Precipitation) • Temperature
- Sky conditions (clear, overcast, cloudy, partly cloudy)

The following table describes strategies for modifying application according to changing weather conditions:

Backpack,	Aerial Foliar (low drift)	Aerial Foliar (conventional)	
>26.5 C No Spray	>30 C No Spray	>26.5 C No Spray	Temp.
No Spray	No Spray	No Spray	Thick Dew or Frost on Leaves
>10 No Spray	>8 No Spray	>8 No Spray	Wind Speed (km/hour)
<40 No Spray	<35 No Spray	<40 No Spray	Relative Humidity (%)
No Spray	No Spray	No Spray	Rain, Inversion, Fog
No Spray	No Spray	No Spray	Freezing Conditions



Cutstump	
ap	
No plication if raining	
No Application	

47 **PROCEDURES FOR MAINTAINING AND CALIBRATING HERBICIDE APPLICATION** EQUIPMENT

applied. order and, if required, is calibrated to conform to the application rates on the pesticide label. Proper calibration is very important to ensure herbicide is not under or over The application contractor shall ensure that the application equipment is in good working

4.7.1 Aerial Herbicide Equipment

of this calibration for aerial applications and the swath kit analysis shall be kept by the All equipment shall be calibrated prior to commencing operations for that season. treatment contractor for at least 2 years. Proof

equipment conforms, at all times, to the manufacturer's standards. Maintenance of the spray equipment is the responsibility of the application contractor. The contractor shall have qualified personnel on each spray site who will ensure the

4.7.2 Ground Herbicide Equipment

The application contractor shall calibrate equipment used for backpack applications Equipment should be calibrated:

- for each individual applicator using hand-held or backpack equipment
- at the beginning of each season
- at the start of each treatment job
- any time the application equipment is changed
- for each change in size or type of nozzle
- any time the herbicide or formulation of a herbicide is changed

manufacturer's specifications. operation and repair of the equipment. The equipment operation must conform to the maintenance \triangleright maintenance and repairs. person, designated by the application contractor, must conduct The maintenance person must be knowledgeable in the

minimum of 2 years. Records will be kept by contractors for each piece of calibrated equipment for മ



SECTION 5: FORESTRY HERBICIDES PROPOSED FOR **USE UNDER THIS PMP**

according to the instructions outlined on their labels. under the Pesticide Control Products Act. They have been deemed safe when applied Herbicides proposed for use within the scope of this PMP are registered for forestry use

vegetation control. The herbicides listed below are proposed for use within the context of this PMP for

Vision, Vision Max Vantage Forestry, Weed-Master	Herbicide Trade Name
glyphosate	ive Ingredient
common	Usage
yes	Application Aerial
yes	Ground
19899, 27736, 26884, 29009	Pesticide Control Products Act #

significant damage to coniferous trees. relatively low rates, it effectively manages competing forest vegetation species without toxicity and high efficacy in treating competing forest vegetation. The most common herbicide used in forestry is glyphosate. It is selected for its low When applied at

Appendix 1: Management Plan Area Map Prince George and Plateau Division Pest

a pdf of this map can be found @: <u>\\pgmapplot2\plot_submitter\Area_Maps\Pest_Management_Plan_Area\PG_Woodlands_Pest_M</u> <u>anagement_Plan_Area_Map_17x11.pdf</u>



Appendix 2: Strategies to meet the Nazko 'Pest' **Management** Protocol

PMP will incorporate measures designed to protect the following (taken from section 6.0 communications between Canfor, the Nazko Band and MELP on PMP and NIT issues. The Nazko 'Pest' Management Protocol provides an opportunity for transparent Protocol): "Band Information Requirements - PMP Referrals" of the Nazko 'Pest' Management To meet the protocol, all vegetation management activities intended for use within this

Aboriginal Trails

annual basis prior to treatment. Notification of Intent to Treat (NIT) tabular summary submitted to the Nazko Band on an Nazko Trail Management Protocol. These treatment areas will also be identified in the (within the Nazko Band's Traditional Territory) will be managed as identified in the Aboriginal Trails within, adjacent to or in close proximity to proposed treatment areas

Cultural Heritage Resources

Plans. stated in those operational plans. These treatment areas will also be identified in the annual basis prior to treatment. Notification of Intent to Treat (NIT) tabular summary submitted to the Nazko Band on an Silviculture Prescriptions, Site Plans, Forest Development Plans, or Forest Stewardship Cultural Heritage resources are identified pre-harvest and are managed through approved The application of herbicides will be consistent with the protection measures

Wildlife Trees, Wildlife Tree Patches or Wildlife Habitat

Refer to section 4.2.2: Strategies to Protect Fish and Wildlife

Wildlife Values (Flora and Fauna)

Human Consumption Refer to section 4.5: Strategies to Prevent Herbicide Treatment of Food Intended for

Trapper Referrals

within the Nazko Band's Traditional Territory through annual NIT referrals Canfor will ensure that appropriate referrals will be made to Band member trappers

Road Access

required to access sites, however they will be removed after treatment. prior to treatment. There may be occasions when temporary bridges or culverts may be status of the road accessing proposed treatment areas will remain in the state they are Road access within the Nazko Band's Traditional Territory will remain undisturbed. The R. Dean Marshall Canadian Forest Products Forest Management Group East/West 250.567.8335 - office 250.567.7765 - mobile Ulkatcho and Proposed Map showing area under the Plan. Sent: Please call if you have any comment regarding details of the proposed plan. We spoke by telephone on January 28th, at which time you asked me to resend you the information - PMP Letter to I was hoping to follow up with you pertaining to Canfor's proposed Pest Management Plan for the Vanderhoof and From: Thanks for your time. Prince George areas. Chief Louie. Subject: To: Marshall, Dean Marshall, Dean Wednesday, February 23, 2011 2:27 PM 'alouie@ulkatcho.ca' Follow up Canfor Pest Management Plan

Page 169 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT-Warch 27, 2006

12

1.

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Contact Person: Proponent: with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit Contact Per 2 First Nation: 1 2

P Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Econce or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- 0 as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why.

N If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Nation les. If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and Fi mar

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response Oefeed

17

Page 170 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no)

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests Yes No. If no, describe why not. m 222 6 M

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities. 4

Dece

6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.

6.(b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Page 171 MOE-2011-00231

Internal Memorandum

CANFO



Left a message for Tina D., Forestry Contact, in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

2016 Notification :

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Council's attention @ the West Moberly First Nation office and asked her to call back if there were any questions, concerns or input.

Dale Likes

Technical Research.

Page 173 MOE-2011-00231 1

farmers to spray the herbicide liberally to kill weeds while the crop is growing. large monocultures sprayed from airplanes regularly. RR soy is engineered to tolerate Roundup, allowing rural areas of Argentina where Monsanto's genetically modified "Roundup Ready" (RR) soybeans are grown in Carrasco was led to research the embryonic effects of glyphosate by reports of high rates of birth defects in

exposed to glyphosate during pregnancy." Reporting of such problems started in 2002, two years after large scale introduction of RR soybeans in Argentina. The experimental animals share similar developmental toxicity classification of glyphosate is too low. In some cases this can be a powerful poison." from human offspring in populations exposed to Roundup in agricultural fields." Carrasco added, "I suspect the mechanisms with humans. The authors concluded that the results raise "concerns about the clinical findings Brussels Carrasco said, "The findings in the lab are compatible with malformations observed in humans At a press conference during the 6th European Conference of GMO Free Regions in the European Parliament in

increased 200-fold from 0.1 mg/kg to 20 mg/kg in 1997 after GM RR soy was commercialized in Europe. Carrasco found malformations in embryos injected with 2.03 mg/kg glyphosate. Soybeans can contain glyphosate residues of up to 17mg/kg. The maximum residue level (MRL) allowed for glyphosate in soy in the EU is 20 mg/kg. The level was

agro-industry figures in the attack. to hear Carrasco talk about his research in the town of La Leonesa, Chaco province. Witnesses implicated local In August 2010 Amnesty International reported that an organized mob violently attacked people who gathered

health and environmental impacts of GM RR soy and Roundup. group of international scientists. The report documents a bulk of evidence in scientific studies on the harmful Carrasco is also the co-author of a report, "GM Soy: Sustainable? Responsible?" released on September 16 by a

in a regional court ban on the spraying of Roundup and other agrochemicals near houses Roundup spraying from planes flying near her home. Peralta and other residents launched a lawsuit that resulted Peralta, a housewife from San Jorge, Santa Fe, Argentina was hospitalized together with her baby after This report is released together with the testimonies of people who have suffered from such spraying. Viviana

ENDS

produce teratogenic effects on vertebrates by impairing retinoic acid signalling. Chem. Res. Toxicol., August 9 (1) Paganelli, A., Gnazzo, V., Acosta, H., López, S.L., Caurasco, A.E. 2010. Glyphosate-based herbicides http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/tx1001749

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/tx1001749>

international scientists; (2) GM Soy: Sustainable? Responsible?" is released on September 16 by Andrés Carrasco and eight other

regions.org/conference2010/press.html> http://www.gmo-free-regions.org/conference2010/press.html http://www.gmo-free-

Edmonton Small Press Association (ESPA) P.O. Box 75086 RPO Edmonton, Alberta T6E 6K1 Canada 780-434-9236 <u>http://www.edmontonsmallpress.org</u>

ESPA is the 2010 Recipient of the Edmonton Social Planning Council's "Award of Merit for Advocacy for Social Instice". The 2009 "North of Nowhere Expo: Festival of Independent Media & Underground Art" concluded Oct. 31. See the archived site at http://www.edmontonsmallpress.ca/non2009b/ http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=18332213920 - End of Forwarded Message S Page 175 MOE-2011-00231

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

and affiliated companies



Response to Article contained in Teena Demeulemeester's Email (January 27, 2011)

enforced by the Ministry of Environment. Columbia, we are bound by the Integrated Pest Management Act and Regulation (IPMA & R) as Although I can't speak directly about the emailed article, I can say that here, in British

referenced in the article (Argentina). The regulation I refer to seems to be very constraining as compared to other jurisdictions

article you emailed me. proposed to have "glyphosate" applied regularly as compared to applications referenced in the The forest plantations contained within the scope of our draft Pest Management Plan are not

intakes We do not propose to apply glyphosate around houses, private dwellings or domestic water

Management Plan Pesticide Free Zones and appropriate buffer zones are required around waterbodies. Safeguards in regards to the application of glyphosate are required as per the IPMA & R in that Appropriate weather parameters are also required, as contained within our draft Pest

Signage is also required at entrance points to proposed application areas in order to alert people of such activity.

anything, it can have adverse effects. It is important to remember that the "dose makes the poison", in that if you ingest too much of

We apply glyphosate as per label directions

If you should have any specific concerns, please contact me.

5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, British Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Page 176 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

Appendix E

Template for Preparing a First Nations Consultation Report

(See Section 2.7)

Report on consultation with a First Nation in relation to pest management activities proposed in accordance

Pyoponent; with a pest management plan, a pesticide use licence, or a pesticide use permit First Nation:

Contact Person: Oalle Liles Contact Person: A

Pre-Issuance (of a Pesticide Use Notice Confirmation, a Licence or a Permit)

Post-Issuance Issuance Number:

Instructions:

- Fill in all or part as applicable.
- as required. Attach answers to the questions that require written answers and attach copies of relevant records
- Complete a separate summary for each First Nation.

question and offering an opportunity to respond? If no written notice was sent, describe why. 1. Was a written notice sent by the proponent to the First Nation describing the activity or activities in

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, has the First Nation been provided with the following in writing? (Check the following that apply).

Information about the location (including maps), nature and extent of the proposed activity

vicinity of the proposed activity area, typical access requirements and information regarding relationship between traditional activities and supply of preferred species. A request for information about traditional use activities, detail about traditional activities in the

within the area that may be affected by the proposed activity. including significant areas, preferred areas, historical traplines, and species typically relied upon A request for a meeting to discuss specific information concerning the nature of traditional activities

Notice that all communications from the proponent are being made as part of the Crown's consultation process.

Copy of notice attached as Appendix 1

3. Did the First Nation respond to the opportunity provided in question 1 or in response to the public notification process? (Check yes or no)

Yes. Nation If yes, describe outcome (including what information was provided by the proponent and First

No. If no, describe efforts made to obtain a response

1. 28,

Page 177 MOE-2011-00231

DRAFT - March 27, 2006

4. Following up on the responses from the First Nation, did the proponent offer to meet with the First Nation to ensure that the proposed activities and First Nation concerns are understood? (Check yes or no) Yes

No. If no, describe why not

5 (a) If the answer to 4 was yes, describe response of First Nation to meeting requests.

5 (b) Were meetings held? (Check yes or no) ______ No, if answer to 4 was yes, but no meeting was held, describe why not

Yes. If yes, describe how the information and maps were explained to ensure full understanding of "on the ground" impacts of the proposed activity or activities.

6(a) Describe the information received from the First Nation or other sources concerning the history, location, type and importance of traditional use activities? If none was received, describe the First Nation response.

6 (b) What changes, if any, did the First Nation request to the proponent's proposed pest management activity?

7. What final, if any, revisions were proposed to the activity or activities in order to address the concerns raised by the First Nation? Describe the First Nation response to those revisions, if any.

Internal Memorandum



Subject:			To:	
PG & Vanderhoof FMG Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011- 2016 Notification :			Xats'ull Representative(250.989.2323)	
File:	Location:	From:	Date:	
Xats'ull First Nation (Soda Creek Band, Williams Lake)	FMG, CAC Prince George	Dale Likes	Jan. 14, 2011	

Talked to Xats'ull Representative, in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Canfor New Pest Management Development 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mail to Chief and Council's attention @ the Xats'ull First Nation Band office and asked her if she had any questions or concerns in regards to the plan.

She indicated that she had just passed the package off to Chief and Council.

Dale Likes

Page 180 MOE-2011-00231 5162 Northwood Pulp Mill Road, Post Office Box 9000, Prince George, Brilish Columbia V2L 4W3 Telephone 250-962-3500 Fax 250-962-3417

Canadian Forest Products Ltd.

CANFOR

and affiliated companies

Subject Ca Pro			To: Xa Phi	
nfor: FMG PG & Vanderhoof oposed Pest Management Plan			t'sull Band Administrator: Rhonda illips (250.989.2323)	1) 1)
2011-			i	
File:	Location :	From:	Date:	
Xat'sull First Nation (Soda Creek Band Williams Lake)	FMG, CAC Prince George	Dale Likes	Feb. 25, 2011	

Left a telephone message with Xat'sull Band Administrator, Rhonda Phillips, in regards to the PG, Vanderhoof Proposed Pest Management Plan 2011-2016.

I indicated that I had sent a copy of the plan and map via registered mall to Chief and Council's attention @ the Xats'ull First Nation Band office and asked her if she had any questions or concerns in regards to the plan.

Dale Likes

Page 181 MOE-2011-00231 Page 1

From:Likes, Dale [Dale.Likes@canfor.com]Sent:Monday, March 21, 2011 2:26 PMTo:Mullan, Jonathan M ENV:EXSubject:1st Nations Consult: Canfor PG & VanderhoofAttachments:skin_tyee_nation_correspondence.pdf;stellaten_first_nation_correspondence.pdf;tl'etinqox_t'in_government_office_correspondence.pdf Vanderhoof.txt

.