

Sunshine Coast Forest District FMLT

Active Rolling Action Items Schedule

Current to: September 22, 2011

<u>Subject</u>	Lead	Due	Status/Actions/Outcome
FMLT Terms of Reference	All		Decision to adopt revised TOR that includes wording on consensus
District FN information sharing/ consultation procedures	Dave M	January 11, 2011	Dave M, Brian Kukulies and Hugo Sloos to review, assess and provide recommendations on the January 21, 2010 procedures – completed Actions arising from Nov. 30th, 2010 meeting <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Brian H to send out the January 21, 2010 procedures to FMLT members - completed Dave M to provide FMLT a written summary of the discussion between Brian K, Hugo referenced above. Dave M has completed. Concern that government letter on consultation not being sent as early as needed in some cases. Hugo Sloos to attend Sept 2011 meeting to review process with FMLT. – Done. Hugo attended and explained process. Request from licensees to obtain copy of letters sent by government. Hugo to speak to this request at Sept meeting. – Done. Hugo explained why licensees don't see

Subject	Lead	Due	Status/Actions/Outcome
			<p>letters – confidentiality requirements.</p> <p>Sept 22, 2011</p> <p>5. Hugo to now inform licensees of dates correspondence is sent to FN.</p> <p>6. All parties to increase communication during consultation process.</p>
FN land use plans – TSR impact potential – sensitivity analysis to be provided to MARR	Dave M	January 31, 2010	<p>Ongoing – Dave to request, Brian to send info to MARR</p> <p>Sept 22, 2011</p> <p>Action: Mark to follow-up to verify that the information has been sent.</p>
<p>Scaling – use of tags instead of hammers.</p> <p>Land – Western to apply to district for procedures</p> <p>Water – Western to investigate alternative tags</p>	<p>Land – Stuart</p> <p>Water - Stuart</p>	February meeting	<p>Western applied for approval to use tags on a trial basis. Approval granted. Subject completed.</p>
Scaling at the mill -	Jeff	January 11, 2011	<p>Jeff reported that scanner operational at Acorn mill. But approval is required by Canada Weights and Measures. There are indications that approval may occur much earlier than previously reported. Subject pending.</p> <p>Sept 22, 2011</p> <p>Update: still awaiting approval. Testing and verification continues.</p>
Scaling methods – Accuracy requirement of cruise based CP's	Brian	January 11, 2011	<p>Alan Rudson reported that low value/low quality</p>

Subject	Lead	Due	Status/Actions/Outcome
difficult to achieve. What is the status of cruise based CP's on the coast?			being considered for policy change. Change may be a year away, but there is a joint industry/government group working on it. Subject closed.
VQO's – possible amendments	Brian Kyle	March 31, 2011	<p>Russ to email licensees to identify areas of concern. Objective is to assess the scale of task.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Russ to take individual areas of concern and assess whether inventory needs updating 2. Russ to investigate possible VQO amendments and the associated process <p>Sept. 22, 2011</p> <p>Discussion of topic determined that further research is required to determine if the inventory needs updated or if the existing inventory can be used to re-evaluate the existing VQO's in the areas of concern.</p> <p>Action Item: Brian to arrange a meeting of applicable licence holders to take a closer look at the areas of concern and if it is felt a new inventory is required or not.</p>
OGMA amendments – What's the process, flexibility for minor amendments, old vs. new plans	Stuart		<p>Stuart to get an update from Bob Craven or Jeff Hoyt on progress elsewhere – completed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stuart to review approved new plans to identify the best wording to use

Subject	Lead	Due	Status/Actions/Outcome
			<p>2. Brian to update Blake and Frank on the suggested best wording</p> <p>Sept. 22, 2011</p> <p>Stuart provided copies of draft SC order and latest VI approved order. Language is significantly different. Three action items resulted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dave M to write a letter requesting that licensees need the opportunity to review and provide input into the draft SC orders. 2. Stuart to request an update to the existing SC Orders using the language in the latest VI approved order. 3. Mark to follow-up in reasons for discrepancy between the VI and draft SC orders.
<p>Elk damage –1. Provide input on elk management plan.</p> <p>2. Professional reliance question on what constitutes reasonable re planting</p>	Dave		<p>Team established. Lead by Dave. Includes Brian Kyle, Rudy van Zwaaij and Robert van der Zalm</p> <p>Dave reported out June16. Elk Management Plan will be reviewed by CRIT. Licensees to be invited to a meeting to provide input into the plan. Local issues can be addressed by FMLT.</p> <p>Sept 22. 2011.</p> <p>Dave M provided an update. CRIT website has latest document. MoE to update Elk Mangement Plan – hunting etc. Licensees will be involved.</p>

Subject	Lead	Due	Status/Actions/Outcome
Road deactivation – risk management – be allowed to retain permanent structures if low risk	Al Shaw	June meeting	<p>Al to track down who's looking into this on behalf of government. Al reported out on June 16 that this issue is no longer being investigated.</p> <p>However, the possible Resource Road Act is the avenue to provide input on the topic. Item closed.</p> <p>Sept 22, 2011</p> <p>Mark to provide update once information is released. Currently only have powerpoint overview.</p>
Pricing and professional reliance		A future topic	<p>No action to date, but team may investigate options in the future.</p>