



Forest and Range Evaluation Program Annual Continuous Improvement Workshop Meeting Summary

February 28 – March 1, 2023

The following is a summary of the annual FREP CI meeting session held on February 28-March 1, 2023, at the Radisson Vancouver Airport Hotel in Richmond BC. A description of each session is provided below, along with hyperlinks to the presentations and recordings, if applicable, for each session.

Tuesday, February 28, 2023

The objectives for this session are:

- To continue to build and strengthen our working relationships;
- To review and discuss our successes and challenges—looking for opportunities to improve all aspects of FREP;
- To review and discuss some of the monitoring and evaluation results from the past field season; and
- To provide an opportunity for all people involved in the program to contribute their voice to how the program continues to develop.
- AND...
- To nurture the sense of community amongst FREP'ers.
- To help everyone (including the virtual participants) feel included.
- To celebrate our successes.
- To have fun!

Welcome & Opening Activities – 8:30 – 9:15 AM (Chris Lohr, MC, & Jill Werk, Conference Chair)

- Welcome participants, including VIRTUAL participants.
- Thank you for taking the time to join us!
- Icebreaker exercise
- Territorial acknowledgement (Christine Galliazzo)
- Introduce the CI Planning Team
- Agenda review
- Supper plans
- Acknowledge the Parking Lot
- Data capturing over the next 2 days...to develop a “What We Heard” report and to summarize actions.

Opening Remarks – 9:15 – 9:30 AM (Leah Malkinson, Manager, Sustainable Resource Management – Forest Science, Planning and Practices Branch (FSPPB))

- FREP as vital, supports Indigenous partnerships.
- Why do we have the “FREP CI Conference” every year? We’ve had 2 years of virtual meetings, but the value of a F-2-F promotes a community of monitoring professionals.
- FREP information is used to help make sound decisions.
- The FREP CI conference is fun and demonstrates passion and dedication.
- Why do we keep FREP going? See the examples of how FREP is being used – on the posters. Another poster is waiting for you to fill in other opportunities.

- Will there be changes in regulation, based on FREP results? The FREP team has worked on suggesting regulatory amendments, and this will be Phase 4 of FRPA changes.
- In the FLP regime, there will be new opportunities for the FREP team (panel on this, later today). 8 new FLPs are planned for this year. Once confirmed, FREP and Indigenous Peoples can partner on how to use FREP data and how different values can be monitored.

FREP 3-Year Strategic Plan (Part 1) – 9:30 – 9:45 (Jill Werk, FREP Team Lead, FSPPB, & Conference Chair)

- The current FREP 3-Year Strategic Plan (2020-2023) expires this year.
- The current plan can be found on the FREP website here: [Forest and Range Evaluation Program \(FREP\) - Province of British Columbia \(gov.bc.ca\)](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/spe/frep/)
- The current plan contains 7 goals and 40 strategies to meet those goals.
- We are in the preliminary stages of reporting out on the current plan. Refer to the PDF of this PowerPoint presentation which provides a high-level overview of these goals and strategies and how we did as a program toward meeting those goals and strategies.
- As we turn our minds toward renewing the plan, we will be developing an engagement strategy for seeking input to the new plan. As a start, there is a “challenge wall” here at the FREP CI Session to start collecting this input. We look forward to your contributions to it. Virtual attendees can post their comments in the chat field of the MS Teams platform. The questions being asked are as follows:
 - What key drivers should be considered when renewing the plan?
 - How can we ensure that resource value monitoring remains relevant and responsive to current and emerging issues through both random and targeted sampling?

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FREP CI 2023 FREP Strategic Plan Presentation |
|---|

FREP Dashboard – 9:45 – 10:15 (Lianne Scott, Geomatics Specialist, Ministry of Water, Land and Resource Stewardship)

The timeline for posting FREP data to the dashboard is as follows:

- Summer – data is collected by FREP evaluators.
- Fall – deadline for submitting results / collected data.
- Winter – Quality control & quality assurance (QA). Final datasets (spreadsheets) for the most recent year of data collection are created.
- ARC GIS is used to prepare and stage the finalized data.
- Lastly, data is published to the FREP Dashboard.

Lianne presented the “mind-map” to display the complex relationships for the FREP Dashboard.

Limitations and FAQs:

- You can request a dataset from the Value lead.
- We learn from the data and make improvements to the protocols.
- You can look at how many “hits” we’ve had to the FREP Dashboard (to gauge use & other metrics).
- Lianne did a demo of the Dashboard – how to filter results (e.g., by stream classification for the Riparian Stream value). It is noted that data summaries do not include targeted samples (see widget), except for Cultural Heritage data that does include both random and targeted samples.

- Indigenous territories cannot be displayed as it is not public information. There are many requests from Indigenous for this, so they can see the data in their area. Upon request, we can provide this information.
 - Is there a way to provide this information on the Dashboard – but so it's not public?
 - If Indigenous partners were included as owners of the data, in the future, then improvements could be made. This is a great vision for the future. The Dashboard is by no means, "done" and so it can be improved.
 - Christine G noted that FREP IMS is accessible to Indigenous communities and contractors who have had the training. They need an IDIR in order to be able to enter data.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FREP CI - FREP Dashboard Presentation |
|---|

Emerging Initiatives for Natural Resource Monitoring in BC – Leah Malkinson, Moderator, 10:30 – 11:45

Leah Malkinson introduced this topic, which is a panel of different speakers. This panel discussion is intended to share information about emerging initiatives for monitoring natural resources in BC (rather than showcasing programs already underway province-wide).

Speaker #1: Alex Woods, Pathologist, North Area, introduced the "Stand Health & Growth Monitoring" protocol (SHAGM).

- The objective of the monitoring is to collect data on tree volume and Indigenous values, using a mid-rotation assessment.
- Currently undertaking these assessments in the Bulkley and Morrice TSAs.
- Target tree species for assessment are: Pli, then Sx, Bl. Seeing a lot of forest health damage on Pli.
- SHAGM take into consideration Indigenous values – E.g., Whether moose are using the site, whether any culturally important plants are present (e.g., Labrador tea, cow parsnip, devil's club).
- These assessments could answer questions about what species are regenerating and how quickly (compared to information from BEC).

Speaker #2: Taisa Brown, Silviculture Performance Assessment Specialist, FSPPB, presented the topic "Silviculture Monitoring."

- What is silviculture monitoring? Monitoring is to watch, to keep track of. Why do we need it? To look for implementation and compliance with provincial guidance and legislation.
- Monitoring can help answer questions like: If guidance is being implemented, then are we seeing improved results? Does the guidance need modification?
- We need post-free growing monitoring, to look at the effectiveness of stocking standards, and whether allowable brush thresholds are appropriate.
- Currently, we don't have a "silviculture monitoring" protocol. But we need data to see whether government objectives are being met.
- With Bill 23, we will be managing for other and new objectives, not just timber – therefore adaptive management will be needed. For e.g., we know that "status quo deforestation" leads to declines in grizzly bear populations. The goal is then to maintain grizzly bear populations, but still produce a 'crop' of timber. The answer may lie in strategically growing shade tolerate spp in clusters.
- Currently, we don't track implementation. This information is not in RESULTS. But we need implementation monitoring information.
- Another issue may be monitoring on a landscape level. For example, we manage grizzly bear on a 'stratum level', but how is the larger population affected? And are we still able to produce high-quality

wood? Currently our silviculture surveys for well-spaced, or free growing do not tell us about grizzly bear habitat.

- Using TASS could improve modelling. We could use drones also to help mapping (UAV RGB-based photogrammetry). This could be low-cost, large-scale monitoring.
- For a standardized protocol, we need resourcing and funding. RESULTS has data quality issues. We could use a “FREP Dashboard”!
- We could use “landscape-level” reforestation standards (multi-block standards) that will align with Forest Landscape Plans.
- At this time, without a formal, coordinated approach to silviculture monitoring, they’re doing free growing audits, cedar monitoring, and in the Cariboo region, post free growing audits. They hope for district participation in future monitoring initiatives.
- Alex Woods noted that the “Stand Development Monitoring” protocol that FREP used in the past did look at post free growing stands.
- This protocol has been replaced by the “Young stand monitoring” (YSM) under the Forest Analysis and Inventory Branch (FAIB).

Speaker #4: Dave Lishman, Values Coordinator, FSPPB, discussed Forest Landscape Plan (FLP) Monitoring for the Quesnel Pilot.

- There are government-to-government priorities to improve forest practices. There are multiple types of monitoring to explore, and currently there are technical working groups that are looking at this.
- E.g., Visual Quality Effectiveness Evaluations for the Quesnel TSA found that 61% of the visual quality objectives (VQOs) were met, and 39% were not met. This was mostly due to poor visual design, and they are working with Jason Yates on this.
- Therefore, they will have a planning guideline to help improve visual management.
- Within 2 years, the Chief Forester must report out on whether outcomes specified in the FLP were met. We will need effectiveness & implementation monitoring. We hope FREP will continue, but currently it is limited to a set number of Values. There will be an unlimited number of new Values to monitor.
- Please keep collecting FREP data – as it is essential for FLP development and future monitoring. FREP monitoring is essential to determining current condition and will play a significant part of the monitoring strategy under FLP.
- Watershed health, for example, is a key value and outcome in the Quesnel FLP. They have a specific watershed technical health working group working on a watershed risk protocol.

- [SHAGM Protocol 2023](#)
- [Silviculture Efficacy Monitoring Presentation](#)
- [FREP FLP Presentation](#)

ADM Address and Presentation of ADM Award – Shane Berg, Chief Forester, 11:45-12:15

- Shane expressed delight that the Office of the Chief Forester (OCF) “stole” the FREP program when the Ministry restructured, and so now the FREP team is part of the OCF.
- Referring to the Ministry Service Plan, Goal 2 relates to partnerships with Indigenous to encourage good forest practices. FREP gives us a chance to meet that goal.
- FREP also helps to strengthen relationships with licensees.
- The efforts of District staff do not go unnoticed!
- FLPs will be the next phase of truly collaborative forest management. There will be more monitoring. And FREP will be poised to give us those tools.

- Field data is so important – for example with TFL 8, the Chief Forester made a determination which looked at FREP watershed data. We require and depend on this field data.

The ADM Award goes to a district with excellence in stewardship: the award goes to the **Okanagan Shuswap Natural Resource District**. We recognize: Jody Bradwell, Kevin Derow, Kari Lee and Keith Boyes.

- [Photo of ADM Award Winners_DOS](#)

FREP Tech Topics – Daryl Flindt, Resource Monitoring Data and System Specialist 1:05-1:30pm

Mobile Device Tips:

- New Provincial COP email invite from Dan Sirk was forwarded by Daryl
- Purchasing and setting up iPads
- Avenza Update info
- iPad Cleanup
- Riparian Data Flow Diagram
- Upcoming FREP Tech topics and COP meetings with (topics and approximate dates)

- [Tech Talk Presentation](#)

Indigenous Engagement in FREP – Moderated by Christine Galliazzo, Cultural Heritage Stewardship Officer, 1:30-4:00pm

FREP Indigenous Engagement Overview:

- Total # of Nations that participated in FREP in 2022: 39
- Total # of person days of training and/or co-sampling: 202.5 days
- Approximate # of Indigenous participants in FREP training: 87
- These are double the person days and # of participants from 2021.
- Increase in Nations participating in 2022 by 14 from 2021.

FREP Special Projects Involving Indigenous groups:

1. Northern Secwépemc te qelmucw (NStQ) Collaborative Watershed Monitoring Project:
 - Collaboration between representatives from the Xatśūll, Williams Lake, Esk'etemc, and Stswecem'c Xget'tem First Nations and Ministry of Forests staff in the Cariboo Chilcotin District on the condition of selected watersheds.
 - Participation in project design, field sampling, data analysis and reporting.
 - Informing collaborative landscape planning.
 - Developing a mutual understanding of the condition of the watersheds being assessed
 - Improving trust and relationships.
2. Secwépemc Cultural Heritage Evaluation Project:
 - Collaboration to identify, monitor and preserve a way of life.
 - Engagement by the SRSS with 17 Secwépemc communities, to gather knowledge keepers, elders, hunters, gatherers, and story tellers and find a meaningful way to record, monitor and preserve their cultural traditions.

- Identification of mutual interests and expectations for monitoring Cultural Heritage Resources (CHR) within Secwépemc traditional territory to evaluate the effectiveness of forest practices in conserving and/or protecting CHR.

Indigenous Communities Invited to Showcase FREP Involvement:

1. Dallas Nikal, Wet'suwet'en

- a. Presented his involvement in the collaborative watershed assessments project in the Skeena Region with the Skeena Sustainability Assessment Forum (SSAF). This project involves routine watershed assessments, looking at road management and fish passage. So far, the project has identified the need for better protection on small streams.
- b. Q&A:

Q: Size of watershed? How to choose? FWA?

A: Culturally important, close proximity

Q: Sample points? How many samples?

A: Sampled once, 21 assessments total, mostly WQ

Q: At-risk polygons at upper end of catchments. Why were they at risk?

A: Zig-zagging roads, natural disturbance, historical logging, gradients could apply, lack of protection due to historical logging, some looked better, due to time that allowed for regrowth.

Q: In-stream water monitoring?

A: Tier 1 based. Routine watershed assessment was not a chemically assessed project.

Q: Concern about statistics? N = 21?

A: (Lisa) Strategic approach, systematic, no constraints to sub-catchments

Q: Future plans?

A: This could be a staple for fisheries/fisheries mgmt.

2. Monica Jeffrey, Gitksan, Chief Miluulak

- a. Presented her involvement in FREP CHR co-training and monitoring in the Skeena Region. Considerations for what else could be included in the FREP CHR protocol. Identified the need for larger buffers on culturally significant sites and signaled the importance of stewarding the land for seven generations.
- b. Q&A:

Q: Experience/policy dealing with CMTs post-846?

A: No policy, doesn't like using a 'date', pre or post doesn't matter, they have equal value, and they should all be kept.

Q: Reference to Devil's Club – what is cultural significance?

A: Several uses of many parts of the plant: bark, roots, "woody" part – have medicinal and protective values. Good example for cultural training possibilities.

Q: "Intellectual Property" (I.e., sharing a story)

A: Never give enough information to identify specific locations, names, etc. Need specific permission to share this kind of information.

Pertaining to stubbed trees – they are usually stubbed flat on top, but it's been shown that angled-top stubbed trees are better because birds of prey can grip it with their talons (more natural).

Report from last year's Strengthening Indigenous Partnerships in FREP Session

- The goal last year was “to identify and consider the specific ways in which the FREP program can better engage and collaborate with Indigenous people and be more responsive to their priorities for participation in monitoring”.
- What we heard in past CI Sessions as the main points:
 1. Improve communications to help build relationships with Indigenous communities
 2. More Indigenous knowledge and perspectives into all FREP values monitored
 3. Increased capacity to participate in FREP, and support consistent capacity through Guardians programs.
 4. Increase FREP monitoring in each Territory
 5. Improve sharing of FREP results with Indigenous communities

How do we put the recommendations from last year into action?

- Key recommendations from Indigenous participants last year were prioritized and presented as questions for discussion in an open forum:
 1. How can Indigenous perspectives and knowledge be incorporated into FREP monitoring protocols for all values?
 2. How can we expand the scope of FREP to assess the ecosystem's state/ecosystem resiliency and health?
 3. How can FREP better inform Forest Landscape Plans/ Forest Stewardship Plan approvals/ FRPA regulation improvements to reflect Indigenous values?
 4. How can Indigenous People be involved to collaborate on the selection of FREP CHR and Riparian (or other FREP value) targeted samples in each District?

However, only the 1st question was asked at this (2023) CI session, leaving the remaining 3 to be directed to the FREP Team to address in the coming year.

What we heard in response to Question 1 above:

- Wetlands:
 - Recording area – High Value Moose Habitat. There is no checkbox for something like this. E.g., grizzly habitat.
 - Recognize important wildlife areas
 - Suggest adding to all FREP value checklists to record any “High-value feature identified” with comment box to describe in more detail.
- Include a CHR feature section in every protocol evaluation
- Implement a requirement for licensees to pay a “fee-for-service” to Indigenous communities for pre-harvest assessments – allows Indigenous employment opportunities (especially in archaeology, environment, cultural heritage). Require a financial program; pool of funding to allow Indigenous reps to conduct their own CHR evaluations
- How do we “measure culture”? Indigenous communities must be involved to answer this question.
- Recommend that an Indigenous committee be established so that they can provide Indigenous input to FREP values.
- Include Indigenous perspectives and knowledge into pre-harvest processes.
- Include consideration for protection for wetlands as a cultural value.
- No new net roads: update/improved tracking of roads would improve protection of cultural values.
- Considerations of SAR in FRPA – especially for moose
- Increase biodiversity in tree species planted post-harvest (i.e., no more monoculture planting).
- Increase forested retention connectivity as it is related to cultural connectivity.

- Requirement for incorporation of Indigenous trainers.
- Protect ALL CHR values
- Provide training specifically for operators
- Opportunity for restoration initiatives that would improve cultural values
- Community engagement, as well as with Chief and Council or Hereditary Chiefs, on the incorporation of Indigenous perspectives and knowledge into all FREP values monitored.
- Question about pre-harvest surveys. Forests don't regenerate the way they used to – a concern that cultural values are declining. How to include holistic methods in the management of forests.
- FREPmap overhaul – add layers option
- Block level vs landscape level; Indigenous inventories of cultural heritage need to be provided an opportunity to assess outside the cutblock.
- Don't have to invent new protocols; able to adjust current protocols.
- Holistic watershed planning required.
- Using VRI (outdated) – should be using LIDAR
- Province should invest in new/updated technology
- Training own Indigenous community representatives to look at harvesting practices to put a holistic perspective on it.
- "Slow the train down": are these the right values for us to be looking at?
- How do we interpret what we're measuring in terms of Indigenous values?
- So much work is already being done by Indigenous people – we should be using this information and work that has already been done as our baseline rather than creating our own baseline from scratch.
- FREP doesn't look at the process's pre-harvest.
- The pre-harvest referral system is an issue, as there is a need for more respect by licensees for Indigenous concerns.
- Include the input to referrals from Indigenous communities into decision making.
- Appeal to university students/younger people to increase Indigenous involvement/employment in FREP monitoring.
- Promote the use of FREP evaluations for other non-forestry activities e.g., roads, oil & gas and Hydro, etc.
- Recommend the consideration for the idea of starting a new set of FREP data that includes the indigenous lens.

Links to the presentations on Indigenous Engagement and Guest Speakers Monica Jeffrey and Dallas Nikal can be found below:

- [Indigenous Engagement in FREP Presentation](#)
- [Monica Jeffrey PP Cultural Heritage Participation in Skeena](#)
- [Dallas Nikal PPT Collaborative Watershed Monitoring Skeena](#)

Stephanie Wilkie Award – Murray Estlin, Stewardship Forester (DNI), presenting award: 4:15pm – 4:30pm

- There were 3 nominations for this award, each very deserving.
- Background about this award: In 2011, Stephanie Wilkie was a "FREP 'per", but her life ended too early, due to natural causes. In her role with FREP, she demonstrated leadership, enthusiasm, environmental awareness, cheerfulness, dedication, and kindness. This award goes to a peer who demonstrates similar qualities as Stephanie Wilkie did.
- This year, we received nominations for Diane Millar, Selkirk Natural Resource District, Erica Reid, Haida Gwaii Natural Resource District, and Paul Inden, Stuart Nechako Resource District.
- The award this year goes to **Diane Millar**. Congratulations!

Day 2: March 1, 2023 - Value-Specific Sessions

Welcome & Opening Activities – Jill Werk, Conference Chair: 8:30 – 8:50 AM

- What stood out for participants, from yesterday's sessions? Some responses were:
 - The importance of FREP in the FLP process.
 - Recognizing that Todd Bresser should have been nominated also for the Stephanie Wilkie Award, for his involvement with Indigenous Partners.

District Engagement in FREP – Jill Werk, FREP Team Lead: 8:50 - 9:15 AM

- The FREP program would not exist without the people at the districts who do the evaluations – thank you for all your hard work!
- The relevant Corporate Performance Measure, from the 2021 FLNRORD document is:
 - % or # of FREP Assessments completed.
- FREP as the foundation, under the pillars of FRPA. FREP is an integral part of the effectiveness of forest and range practices under FRPA.
- The District Quarterly Reporting spreadsheet is used to track attainment of corporate performance measures. We then report to the Deputy Minister's Office quarterly on this.
- Reviewed the table on district involvement in FREP: Green means >80% of 30 samples over 5 years have been met. Trends and priorities for different districts were discussed.
- Review the "FREP data cycle": We still haven't received all of the 2022 data. It is important to see how delays in data submission affect the cycle.
- Last year, sampling was down 12%, based on what was originally planned by the districts. What contributed to these lower numbers? What were the barriers for district involvement in FREP? How do we address them, and how can we ensure continued support for the success of FREP? Some examples from the participants of barriers were:
 - Air quality affected VQEEs (from wildfire smoke)
 - Staff are busy with other legislated duties
 - Staff retirements. New staff not yet familiar with the FREP protocols. Training needed.
 - Focused on other monitoring initiatives (ESI) & targeted values such as moose & grizzly bear.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• District Engagement in FREP Presentation |
|--|

FREP 2022 in Review: Report out by FREP Value– 9:15 AM – 2:00 PM

Panel Presentations:

- **Water Quality- Dave Maloney (Forest Water Management Officer)**

Between 2008 and 2022 more than 9,700 water quality assessment have been completed in BC. In 2022 415 were completed. The 2022 number however identifies a 35% drop in assessments compared to previous years. Sediment scores for 2022 are in line with scores from previous years, approximately 75% in the Very Low & Low categories, 20% in the Moderate category, a 5% in the High category. It is important to note however, that the scores and the potential remediation activities for each Moderate and High score be viewed in terms of a road's operational life phase: Location, Design, Construction, Maintenance and Deactivation. When viewed through such a lens, it becomes clear that Location, Design and Construction account for approximately 52% of the issues and identified remediation recommendations. This suggests that 52% if the causes for fines sediment input into streams could have been resolved before and/or during the construction of a road. Only 28% of the issues related to fine sediment input to streams etc. related to road maintenance. Similarly, road de-activation accounted for

20% of the recommended remediation suggestions. The data highlights the importance of considering fine sediment management in the proper location, Design and Construction phases of a road's life.

All FREP WQ results are available via the FREP Dashboard. FREP WQ results have also resulted in the inclusion of a new chapter (Chapter 9) in the MoF Forest Resource Road Engineering Manual. And various ABCFP and Ministry publications and reports.

- [Water Quality Report Out Presentation Dave Maloney](#)

- **Riparian: Streams, Wetlands & Watersheds- Lisa Nordin (Aquatic Resources Stewardship Officer)**

Wetland protocol updates include changes to how heavy browse, bare ground, and compacted ground are described and evaluated. Filemaker app refinements include making certain entries more user friendly. The wetland protocol was developed in 2018 after receiving input from ESI workshop participants on the importance of wetlands and it was created in collaboration with indigenous partners. Trends in riparian data show that riparian management around S4 and S5 streams is getting better. S6 riparian management still needs work, and these findings should be used to improve planning and practices in the future (including in FLP). More random samples are needed to strengthen the support for better riparian management across the province, especially around small streams. Prepping for field sampling includes reading all protocols and related materials, taking the online self-directed training, taking stock of field supplies, and using FREP map to find qualifying sites and to help inform on potential causal factors. Don't forget to plan for an u/s WQ site at your riparian sample reach (usually within 100m) as these two assessments have related information. FREP routine watershed assessment is a GIS/field hybrid approach to assessing condition at a watershed scale. Branch staff can help with sampling design and provide guidance on methodology.

- [Riparian Report Out Presentation Lisa Nordin](#)

- **2022 Field Sampling Review (WQ, Rip, SLR)- Dean McGeough (Consultant)**

- Please be careful with cancellations – as this affects planned training sessions.
- Challenges from last year's training sessions & sampling:
 - Heat, pouring rain
 - Evaluators not having completed any prerequisite online training
 - Too sunny & bright to see the iPad screen
 - Getting higher demand than what forecasted in surveys
 - Long travel times to field sites.
- Other pointers, tips & reminders for field sampling were covered off. E.g.:
 - SLR: Recall that for an opening to be eligible for evaluation, it must be greater than 2 ha.
 - WQ: avoid measuring if not hydrologically connected

- [Training & Sampling Ponderings from 2022 Dean McGeough](#)

- **Stand-level Biodiversity- Doug Lewis (Landscape Ecologist)**

Understanding "Landscape Context" in the FREP Stand-Level Retention Protocol

- The previous Stand-Level Biodiversity focused on stand-level indicators.

- Now, the updated protocol uses landscape context – this is a condition of surrounding forest, using landscape unit and BEC. It is important for determining what is appropriate retention at the stand-level.
- The protocol has 8 questions, with 4 being in relation to landscape context (LC).
- LC is used to determine the minimum amount of retention.
- The Biodiversity Guidebook from 1995 does not have any updated “context” guidance.
- We know that very heavily disturbed landscapes need increased stand-level retention.
- The new protocol therefore considers the updated understanding.
- The LC rating – reflects the concern over the loss of mature forest. The more disturbance, the greater the concern.
- If we compare 1995 vs 2025 (30 years) - there is much more disturbance – caused by fire, insect, and logging.
- So the LC has changed! We went back to all previously evaluated blocks under FREP and applied the LC.
- We are starting to flip from a scenario where we have openings within a forest, to all openings.
- Using FREP IMS, click on layers to get all your LC info. Used Quesnel as an example. (*there will be more training on how to get this information, this year).
 - Adjacency layer – to see if block is part of a larger opening. Use “dash-distance”.
- LC really matters for the final rating, for each block evaluated. It’s half of the equation!
- The rating is: “how likely are retention practices meeting objectives”
- FREP evaluators can modify the rating.
- LC context summary tables will be made available for all candidate blocks.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR Report Out Presentation Doug Lewis |
|--|

- **Visual Quality- Jason Yates (Visual Resource Management Officer), Peter Rennie (VRM Consultant)**
 - Introduced myself as new VRM Officer, beginning the role in October of 2022.
 - Outline for my presentation (link provided to my slide deck (in pdf format) below) was to share some observation from myself about the 2022 season of Visual Quality Effectiveness Evaluation (VQEE) data collection.
 - Incorporated slides from consultant (and former VRM Coast Area specialist) Lloyd Davies, who attended virtually, on some of his observations of 2022 VQEE data collection and some more general VRM comments.
 - Peter Rennie, VRM consultant, and former VRM South Area specialist, also attended virtually and spoke to slides that he contributed to my slide deck.
 - Reminded audience that the purpose of FREP VQEEs are to assess how well we are managing and conserving views in designated scenic areas and are not intended to assess and report on compliance with legal requirements.
 - 2022 VQEE data was not compiled at the time of this session, primarily due to late submissions, acknowledged that District resources are strained.
 - As of this session, there were 43 completed / accepted VQEEs in 2022 , with approximately another 6 that are currently undergoing quality assurance, and 8 samples from another District that we expect to receive by the end of the fiscal year.
 - Peter Rennie delivered VQEE training in DOS, DRM, and DCC.
 - Jacques Marc (VRM consultant and former VRM Officer) co-delivered training with Jeremy Webb (Coastal VRM Specialist) in Haida Gwaii.

- Expressed appreciation for the hard work of District staff in collecting 2022 VQEE data, getting VRM eyes and boots on the ground, in addition to assessing how well we are managing Visual Quality in BC.
- Overall 71% of samples (since 2006 beginnings of VQEE collection) achieving VQOs, and 29% not achieving. We have room to improve!
- No or poor design is a key factor in those samples that did not achieve VQO.
- Referenced current VQEE protocol, 2008 version and acknowledged that some updates are needed.
- Referenced updated fillable VQEE form (pdf) and the importance of using this version which allows for more consistent entry and annual data compilation.
- See presentation for points raised by Lloyd Davies, including a reminder to complete sampling, if possible, in May-July to avoid wildfire smoke.
- 2022 season highlights from Peter Rennie include photo quality improving in recent years, good landform delineation, and good map quality.
- 2022 season challenges from Peter Rennie include:
 - a reminder that ALL alterations must be considered in the evaluation (not just the target opening),
 - the basic VQC rating must be consistent and accurate
- Peter posed some challenges and questions for discussion ~ to help frame the breakout sessions.
- Update on the 2023 random list (which was in the works at the time of this session and now delivered)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual Quality Report Out Presentation Jason Yates
--

- **Cultural Heritage Resources- Christine Galliazzo (Cultural Heritage Stewardship Officer)**
 - A summary of what's new in the CHR Protocol was provided
 - FREP CHR assessment reporting is available on the FREP Dashboard
 - An overview of the provincial 2022 CHR MRVA ratings was provided
 - A summarized list of recommendations for improving practices for protection/conservation of CHR was provided from the 2022 CHR FREP assessments:
 - Opportunity for Indigenous communities to Inventory CHR, and for Licensee and First Nations pre-harvest field visits strengthens understanding of requirements to protect cultural heritage
 - Clarification of definition of CHR under FPPR i.e. not just archaeology being managed in forestry
 - Site Plans with clear strategies for CHR management, and CHR mapping through to planting
 - Cultural awareness education for operational staff at all phases.
 - Provide sufficient buffer to prevent windthrow reaching the CHR
 - Recommendations to increase Indigenous participation in FREP
 - Develop relationships
 - Collaborate on candidate CHR samples
 - Increase CHR training
 - Increase CHR co-trainers
 - Increase funding support for participation in training and assessments

- Increase contracted CHR sampling
- Share FREP results to increase interest and value
- Continue to collaborate to develop regional approach to CHR protocol

- [Cultural Heritage Resources Report Out Presentation Christine Galliazzo](#)

- **Rangeland Health- Forage and Associated Plant Communities, Clayton Bradley (Rangeland Practices Specialist)**
- Mobile data was collected (“iPace”)
- We have 3 different evaluation forms: 1) uplands 2) streams and 3) wetland plants
- The evaluation is to determine whether the rangeland is properly functioning.
 - Wetlands: function to store precipitation and release water.
- Trends: 80% of grazing is on forested landscapes. Streams are magnets for grazing – they are food and water. Linear streams cause linear movement (up and downstream), causing impacts from compaction, defecation and widening of the channel.
- Licensee engagement and Indigenous participation is needed and hope it will increase in the future. Indigenous needs & values to be incorporated.
- There have been 3000 total assessments provincially, from 2013 to present. Uplands monitoring has shown that 2/3rds are at slight risk of not functioning.
- There are land uses beyond the control of the range user: e.g. logging & silviculture, roads, culverts, ditches. What is in control: livestock grazing, range structures (e.g. fences)

- [Rangeland Health Report Out Presentation Clayton Bradley](#)

- **Wildlife- Cliff Nietvelt (Wildlife Stewardship Officer)**
- The wildlife resource value team addresses the effectiveness of the *Forest & Range Practices Act* (FRPA) at maintaining wildlife habitat and species across their natural ranges and over time in British Columbia.
- The priority wildlife resource value evaluation question is:

"Do ungulate winter ranges and wildlife habitat areas maintain the habitats, structures and functions necessary to meet the goals of the area and is the amount, quality and distribution of these areas contributing effectively with the surrounding land base (including protected areas and managed land base) to ensure the survival of the species now and over time?"

- From 2009-2014 there have been some guidance and conceptual documents published on the FREP website that outline the general steps to be taken to design an effectiveness study for wildlife monitoring.
- Challenges with wildlife monitoring include the fact there is not a standard protocol for “wildlife” like other FREP values. While broadscale evaluations such as Stand Level Biodiversity cover many aspects of wildlife habitat, evaluations of wildlife are typically species specific. Protocols for each species will vary depending on the question, scale, ecotype, etc. Even with RISC standards in place for wildlife, regions are slow to use standards.
- Refer to the FREP website for pilot studies (2010-2012) on mountain goats, grassland nesting birds, northern goshawk, and badger.
- Plans are in place to publish UWR and WHA evaluation and sampling protocols for mountain goat, marbled murrelet, and coastal black-tailed deer.
- Cliff shares a diagram that shows how FREP wildlife monitoring data is integrated with Identified Wildlife Management Strategies, regionally important wildlife, SAR, and ungulate monitoring and research.
- A FREP Wildlife Monitoring Workshop is scheduled for March 28th (virtual).
- In summary:

- Protocols, be it RISC and FREP Wildlife, need to be followed for consistent results.
- This allows for much-needed trend analysis in terms of wildlife populations and habitat supply.
- This will allow us to answer key questions around the management of UWRs and WHAs and make for better decisions around wildlife and habitat management.
- The March 28th, 2023 Workshop is a key step forward in making consistency a reality.
- Opportunities with FLP monitoring, silviculture practices (e.g., grizzly bears), and FREP Wildlife need to be expanded as well as First Nations Engagement.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Monitoring Report Out Presentation Cliff Nietvelt |
|--|

Targeted vs. Random vs. Targeted Random Sampling – 2:00 – 2:15 PM

- This presentation was deferred to enable a longer Q&A period with the presenters listed above.
- The FREP Team at the FSPPB will be planning a separate session this spring to discuss FREP sampling design with FREP participants.

FREP Value Breakout Sessions (3 Rotations) – 2:15PM – 3:45 PM

- [Visual Quality](#)

Value Lead: Jason Yates

Subject matter experts: Lloyd Davies; Peter Rennie

Session 1 (18 attendees)

General Points from participants:

- Better access to training and experienced trainers is important.
- Program keeps profile of VQEE in the conversation even though it has been under-supported.
- Lloyd Davies: Visual Protocol was the first to be approved back in 2004. A long period of use means it has been well integrated and consistent. Stability is good, but change is now needed.
- Fillable PDFs are great, and easy to use. Consistency with coordinate systems.
- Annual updates on sampling procedures are greatly beneficial.
- Kamloops district sometimes struggles with dedicating resources for VQEE sampling looking at their 5-year plan.
- Good licensee buy-in with this program. VQEE has perhaps the best opportunity to make a difference on the land since relatively small amount of training can result in substantial improvement in outcomes.
- We've seen marked improvement in quality of sample submissions. 5 pieces of the package that go together are coming in completed; quality of photos is improving; and mapping quality is improving. Protocol and fillable pdf are straightforward and easy to use – though there are some potential improvements (e.g., partial cut section).

What is not working well?

- Form should be simplified to ease data transfer and eliminate human error
- Submission template should also be simplified and standardized (including auto-populations)

- Samples with openings that aren't visible aren't currently accepted. Perhaps these should be used since they are successes (**Mixed messaging on this**).
- Not all lakes are equal in terms of public visitation
- Replace "significant public viewpoint" to "viewpoint" to eliminate semantic debates.
- Educational materials like posters showing examples of VQEE would be beneficial to licensees.
- not enough samples to meaningfully tell us how things are going, by licensee or in a geographic area.
- greater licensee training / participation / debriefing necessary.
- some tweaking of the form is necessary (listing both the target sample block, as well as the block that caused the sample to fail if this occurs; proper ordering of design features)
- Viewpoints from mountain tops e.g., ski resorts can be tricky.
- I like the .pdf fillable form, but Visuals needs a dedicated application that can be uploaded to a database when the user has Wi-Fi, like WQEE and CHR.

Consensus that Filemaker pro app for visuals would be beneficial and streamline data collection.

Session 2 (11 attendees)

Clarification on assessing landforms with non-visible alterations.

- Difficult to evaluate visual designs when the design is not visible.
- Perhaps a checkbox for these situations would be beneficial.
- Need to balance crediting licensees for 'hiding' cutblocks from a particular viewpoint with

Lloyd's observations from last season:

- Identifying landforms is a skill not easily passed on. Need guidance in the form of guidebook or increased training. Recommends more emphasis on this in training.
- Partial cut is somewhat problematic that works best when the partial cut is over the entire landform. Recommends using your eyes instead of defaulting to the partial cut table
- Big miss in the protocol: the form wasn't developed to deal with immediate foreground or distant background. Roadside blocks go unsampled and an updated protocol should be able to evaluate these. Perhaps these need to be evaluated a bit differently (e.g., percent alteration may be hard to assess for foreground samples).

Peter on roadside mgmt.

- Anything we evaluate in the protocol must have some research and data to back up the evaluation. We would need to develop criteria that can be applied consistently based on research into roadside management. There has been some work on this, but the research not complete.

Open floor to wrap up

- Perhaps the protocol can be a bit subjective without more detailed training. Better and more detailed examples of VQEE assessment could help. Training! Training! Training!

Session 3

Roundtable:

- VQ is a societal choice – i.e. how do we manage the land base – so Indigenous voices are an important part of that conversation.
- Discussion around targeted vs random sampling – will have to be tabled for a future discussion.

- Sunshine Coast district is not receiving complaints from community members, First Nations – perhaps because they are performing well, or the complaints just aren't being filed. First Nations in his district are well integrated into Forestry practices and so this contributes to lack of complaints. # of viewpoints is very high in this region. In a highly populated area, drone-based film making is exposing more views to millions of people.
 - Recommend Survey 123 and Arc products over Filemaker (which is antiquated and difficult to maintain).
 - How do we get clear on what the visual quality objectives will look like with Indigenous led processes? Forums like this feel too rushed to properly contribute to these processes. Time must be made to properly include First Nations in objective planning processes.
 - Land Use Planning could be a vehicle for incorporating FN values on a G2G level – Darwyn expressed that those negotiations are not always easy for his Nation, and engagement on each value is not consistent. Darwyn expressed a need and interest in training opportunities for VQ.
 - Move beyond assessing whether we meet the objective, to whether the objectives are well designed in the first place, especially to include Indigenous perspectives.
- **Water Quality**
 - Concerns expressed from Indigenous community members about water quality as it relates to range practices.
 - Questions about whether pre-harvest water quality assessments could be carried out to compare to post-harvest monitoring results.
 - Request to assess water quality over longer periods of time. We currently don't revisit previously monitored sites.
 - **Riparian: Stream & Wetland**

The following is a summary of what we heard during the 3 break-out sessions for the Riparian value

 - Districts need more support for transportation costs to meet target numbers (4-5k is average)
 - There should be work for First Nations after training (not just training, then no opportunities). First Nation partners could help Districts meet their targets or sample in areas of concern.
 - Perhaps a provincial "team" of experienced field assessors by region or area that could assist districts in sampling OR to help with planning and requesting site plans from licensees.
 - Need more FTE to build capacity. Need someone designated at the district to ensure all data collected gets submitted to branch. Districts are running lean in the stewardship department.
 - Early training is more valuable than later in the season when conflicting priorities arise (silv, firefighting). If training can be completed in the spring, there is a better chance for completing sampling by end of season.
 - 10 Districts identified a need for training this year because of new staff. Most know about the online training modules but were not sure who to contact for field sampling. Districts were advised to connect with branch rather than the trainers themselves as most trainers are Ministry contractors with specific budgets based on the training needs survey.
 - **Stand-Level Retention**

The following is a summary of what we heard during the 3 break-out sessions for the Stand-Level Retention Protocol:

1st rotation:

- **FREP Dashboard – licensee widget** – should be for internal use only, and Indigenous use only.

- **Retention on Landscape Units (LUs)**- might not be adequate for current reality. Can we redo the LUs with tailored retention based on Indigenous territory? Indigenous People should input into this. (When can this happen?)
 - Disturbance, logging is continually increasing. How do we ensure protection of what is left?
 - Pre-harvest data is not always available (not cruised). We have benchmarks from other data (averaged), so we ask: “Is retention better than the average?”
 - Thinking about creating a dashboard with landscape context (LC) information by LU.
- Indigenous Peoples need a succinct snapshot to help frame
- There is a **Cumulative Effects (CEF) landscape level biodiversity protocol**
 - This can link to LC in the SLR protocol
- In Mackenzie District, the Chucho Forestry (Tsay Keh Dene territory) have **enhanced retention guidelines**.

2nd rotation:

- **Training:** Please go through each component on the charts for determining the rating.
- We’re looking for more online training next year.
- **Landscape Context:** Forest influence looks at distance & connectivity. Connected is weighted to move “positive” values. Dispersed retention.
- How often are WTRA moved or swapped? And how does this affect %’s? the WTRAs are supposed to last for a full rotation.
- FRPA Bulletin #15
- **SLR Evaluation:** In the SLR Evaluation, Dean emphasizes that you can estimate sizes / dbhs. If there is no decimal, we know it’s an estimate.
 - Note the “Nikon forest pro* - this is good for heights, distances
 - Some field work is time-consuming (e.g. when you have many small patches). The S.C. card is normally completed for each patch. Doug will look to look to streamline this. Doug to talk to Dean McGeough.
 - When judging success of the patch, e.g. due to size – 1 ha is too small for birds. Can this be considered?
 - Branch is working on an app to record SLR data. Would be great to auto-populate admin/ contextual data. Looking at building a database to later update into FREP IMS.
- **Fisher strategy / monitoring:** in DCC, can we use LC?
 - DCC does a GIS analysis for each block on the random list.
 - We do a GIS analysis for all the blocks on the random list, each year. We have 3 years’ worth, so Doug can look (check with Daryl where older data is). In FREP Map, likely it only shows the current year’s LC.
- **Landscape Context data** can be used for a “SLR Lite” evaluation (Doug)
 - Doug is working with Lianne Scott to put the GIS indicators used for LC onto the FREP Dashboard
 - THLB % - this is a challenge to use updated information. The number needs to deduct area-based tenures to First Nations, etc.

3rd rotation:

- **Landscape Context:** some of the indicators for the landscape-level protocol can be used for referrals (Doug)
 - **CWD in 2nd-growth stands (Haida Gwaii)** - unauthorized CWD being taken for shake & shingle industry.
 - **Cruise data uses:**
 - Want to add cruise data – what was harvested vs. What was retained. Example of moving WTRAs due to lower-quality WTRAs (sterile, low diversity)
 - Can cruise data be compiled in advance to auto-populate?
 - **Is understory recorded?** No, currently it would be a lot more work. It would be valuable though, to look at what's needed to maintain culturally important plants.
 - Opening the canopy will change the understory. There is a response from plants (Winners and losers). We could record this data, use it for research.
 - **What's being planted?** could get this data from FTS, RESULTS, YSM, SDM? (linkage to future forests: are culturally important spp being maintained?)
 - **Targeted sampling:**
 - could be used to address specifics, e.g. increased retention in DCS for Williams' sapsucker.
 - For post-wildfire SAR
 - Age-class 9 in a site series, e.g., can be a red or blue listed species, so could target this
 - See if prescribed fire may be warranted
 - Select a block on a license (if not otherwise represented on the random list), or old growth, or 2nd growth (stratified random sampling)
- **Cultural Heritage Resources:**

The following is a summary of what we heard during the 3 break-out sessions for the CHR value:

- Indigenous People recognize the landscape as a large umbrella over a mosaic of cultures and politics.
- Consider a process review that both guides where to sample, and how to assess any damage:
 - What does the development look like? Was it carried out as it was proposed?
 - Look at consequence of the various levels of damage
 - Windthrow assessments – require these assessments to avoid windthrow damage
 - Provide training for Ministry, Staff, FN re: windthrow assessments
 - Impact by wildfires and emergency response: provide Firefighters with arch training. People note there has been some improvements in this area
 - Process of preharvest info sharing and Forest Harvest Plans
 - Develop the protocol – put out a proposal/request for FREP CHR monitors to break down/develop and look at process separately. It may require a specific method or process.

- Can you measure “established” vs “maintained” areas? This may provide a better opportunity to require certain practices and force adherence to the Acts and Standards.
- Market conditions could change between when a block has been approved, and when the block is actually harvested, therefore, there should be a time limit set before a recheck/reflag of any CHR on the block prior to harvest. CHN has this as a condition of their program.
- Think about climate change, and the importance of protecting the land.
- Think about cumulative impacts, as CHR may be managed well today, but might be at high risk of future damage
- CHN sign off on the FREP CHR checklists before District submission to Branch
- If an arch assessment was done, were the nations involved?
- A features reserve zone should also not to be impacted
- HCA transformation project should consider the FREP CHR outcomes and follow up with Nations
- First Nations have developed own policies throughout the lower mainland
- Recommend concentrated effort for FN involvement in the FREP CHR assessments
- Provide support for First Nations participating in FREP
- Value of a cultural feature – assessing value - could be a multiple of values for one type of feature e.g., Pacific crabapple: food vs tool making. May change meaning and have a different value during its life. E.g. Food tree, later dead becomes suitable for tool, then later used for a component of a boat
- Numerical ratings for the values not suitable for CHR. Lose cultural value significance by assigning numerical ratings.
- Different utilizations within different family groups value can fluctuate depending on intention or type of use.
- Accessibility to those resource areas: Value is close to communities (now), before would have been other location.
- Consider purity, abundance, scarcity to develop use for CHR
- Adding a landscape view to CHR: concerns from Indigenous Groups tend to be a large picture and a landscape view.
- Monitoring must start with a baseline for comparison
- Cutting permit approval stage could be a shared decision with Nations
- Solutions table reviews to confirm First Nations participation
- How we choose features to sample – random vs targeted are there ideas for other approaches
 - e.g. Mackenzie - Tsay-kay-dene has an online database
 - Is the license managing for that traditional value?
 - limited to arch database, but these don't always contain CHR's that are not protected under the HCA
 - Develop management strategies for CHR's
- Culturally Sensitive Areas (CSA's) were recorded and protected 10-20 years ago in Cascades District. Once it became an issue for their protection, the CSA confidentiality became an issue, and FN's no longer sharing information.
- Ideas about what might be changed about protocol. Should we look at landscape level? Or stay block level?
- Question: Do you engage with communities directly? First Nations have the knowledge base – is there an agreement in place?
- The Nations want to see what the licensee's agreed to in the Info Sharing Reports for CP/RP's, to confirm plans, and want the province to be aware of all reports of CHR that were developed by First Nations. Reports need to have consent before cutting permit is issued
- Modelling of probable cultural sites – would this be helpful?

- PEM, TEM, plant data – opportunity with CHR value – not too much known on this
- What about reporting berry patches and plant resources? Bring back some of the natural resources and help reoccupy the important location.
- Impacts on CHR by livestock, industrial, recreation marked as low impact – a concern.
- What about recreation – impacts to lakes and other important areas- impacts/damages to trails; no room for FN to practice because it's filled with recreational users
- Consider the seasonal/cultural rounds (traplines too)
- Access to blocks damages the cultural landscape
- It's about guardianship
- Provincial variability – can't have a standard protocol
- Block level to facilitate relationship
- Difficult to do landscape-level field check
- Use Cumulative Effects decision report to give weight to a targeted location for CHR assessments
- Use landscape assessments similar to retention levels on the landscape under SLR, to overlay with known TUS/CHR/Archaeology to provide a landscape perspective to CHR assessments
- If the quality of cultural plants is being assessed, be aware that certain cultural plants have uses/qualities over their lifecycle, and even when dead may have a purpose for a cultural tool e.g., pacific crabapple.
- Traditional trails should be the key indicator of CHR along its path.
- Upfront processes from information sharing pre-harvest all the way through to FREP assessment results need better communications by all parties, including contractors.
- Consider risk and consequences of impacts to CHR, such as windthrow
- First Nations should be afforded an opportunity to assess every block post-harvest to confirm if traditional practices still available.
- In DHG, the practice is to have First Nations sign-off on CHR checklists before it's submitted to FREP IMS.
- The Nicola Cultural Survival Areas (CSA's) Strategy is in place to protect large enough areas for cultural/spiritual practices to continue. Strategies for management have been developed.
- Many CHR sites are in Rec Sites, especially in lakefront areas, and trails used by ATV's are often a factor in damaging CHR's.

Photo Contest – Daryl Flindt, presenting: 3:45 PM – 4:00 PM

There were more entries than ever before this year! 83 photos were submitted. The categories & winners were:

Category	Runner-up	Winner
<i>Action</i>	Fern Grenier "Biologist resting log"	Whitney Peters - "CWD Sampling"
<i>Landscape</i>	Chris Lohr "SLBD Kootenay Vista" Fern Grenier "Horsefly Lake Reflection"	Craig Fitzpatrick "Sunset over Williston"
<i>Nature</i>	Christine Galliazzo "Monumental Cedar witches' broom"	Erica Reid "FREP-ing in November"
<i>People</i>	Whitney Peters "Waiting on a heli"	Brenna Price "FREP Training"
<i>Wildlife</i>	Fern Grenier "Can you see it"	Aaron Benterud "Where's Goldilocks?"

Winners get a FREP photo calendar!

Strategic Plan (Part 2) & Closing Remarks – Jill Werk, FREP Team Lead 4:00 PM – 4:30 PM

Brief report out on Challenge wall:

Themed ideas:

1. An “Indigenous Steering Committee” / sub-committee. For real collaboration with Indigenous peoples. The current strategic plan has Indigenous engagement as Goal 4. Move us up in priority. Although the goals are not listed in a hierarchy, we will move it up, for optics!
2. How to improve the CHR Protocol:
 - a. Nations to develop their own for CHR
 - b. Land-use visioning with Nations
3. Range & CHR Protocols
 - a. How to link these?
 - b. Need more range monitoring
 - c. And more co-opportunities
4. Wildlife Protocol
 - a. Needs Indigenous collaboration, for caribou habitat
 - b. SAR and Indigenous identified species
5. Water / Riparian / Wetland / Water Quality
 - a. Are we just looking at sedimentation? What about pH, E. coli?
 - b. We need better buffers for wetlands
6. Soils & Roads (access issues)
7. OGMAs / ancient forests. Should have a protocol or integrate? How are we aligning FREP with OGMAs?
8. Indigenous input into VQEEs
9. Follow-through on Baselines
10. Indigenous Trainers in other values besides just CHR
11. A provincial FREP team to help with sampling throughout the province
12. Training for equipment operators
13. Reporting out: how well is the FREP Dashboard publicized?
 - a. MRVAs
 - b. Data should be made available for academic research
14. Targeted vs. Random sampling – reasons why we should move to targeted.
15. FREP input into FLPs
16. Evaluating values on private land (CHR applies to private land)
17. Silviculture diversity in planting
18. More retention

<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ FREP 3-Yr Strategic Plan Challenge Wall Report Out
--

Wrap-up- Jill Werk, FREP Team Lead

- What’s ahead?
 - 2022 data is still coming in!
 - 5-year rolling average for district sampling coming soon
 - Sampling plans can then be confirmed
 - Districts to submit information to FREP Team at the FSPPB re: district training needs and contract sampling needs.
- Are you interested in a field tour in your district? (“FREP-a-looza”?)

Poster “What are some other opportunities for using FREP data?”:

- FREP data can be used to increase protection e.g. on NCD’s/small streams, to stop FSP’s managing for minimums.
- One District reported that they used FREP Riparian data the summer they collected it, to inform the licensees of failures in one specific area: they then employed 3m buffers on upland streams in that area.
- FSW WQ Evaluations regularly
- SLR - % roaded by landscape unit/ by cutblock, and in areas that are deactivated/restored there is an opportunity to improve FREP ratings at same site (repeat monitoring).
- Encourage the use of FREP data as Open Data for Academic research projects.
- Use FREP data for recommendations for restoration projects.
- Use FREP data to inform selection of WHA’s for fish habitat.
- Recommend adding browse species into more FREP evaluations.
- Use SLR data to reflect WTR more accurately for TSR purposes.

Link to: [Poster “How FREP data informs natural resource management”](#)

Link to: [Poster “Karst Protocol Upcoming Changes”](#)