

## Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

### *Meeting #8 Minutes: Society's Responsibilities*

January 30, 2007

#### 1. Call to order

Ron Frank, Fraser PAG Facilitator, called the 8th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 4:35 p.m. on January 30, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC.

#### 2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

**The following members were present:**

Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery	Garry Davidson, Seabird Island Indian Band	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation	

**Members Absent:**

Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation	Gurdev Sidhu, Agriculture
Earl Graham, United Steel Workers	Kerry Grozier, District Manager, MOFR	Steve Harvey, Hope Machine Shop.
Ken Webb, Agriculture	Gordon Sherwood, Cacus Point Resident	Brian Taylor, May Trucking
Mark Bond, Reo Rafting	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident	John Pichugin, Teal

**Others Present:**

April Choquette, Teal	Keith Chapman, Teal	
Brian Jones, Economic Development Manager, Seabird Island Band	Kevin Stanczyk, Teal	Jason Zimmermann, Zimmermann Forest Products Ltd. (Observer)
Ed McWaters, May Trucking	Ron Frank, Facilitator	

### **3. Documents Distributed to Members:**

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #8 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #7 Agenda – Replacement page for Meeting #7
3. Fraser PAG Information Tracking System – List of Completed Tasks
4. Fraser PAG Information Tracking System – List of Outstanding Tasks
5. Fraser PAG Meeting #7 Minutes
6. FPAG Meeting #7 Power Point slide notes handout
7. FPAG Meeting Calendar – updated Jan 19, 2007
8. FPAG Soil and Water Presentation (Jan 9, 2007) handout (Drew Brayshaw, Madrone)
9. Excerpt from Teal's Forest Stewardship Plan (Section 7.2.7)
10. Excerpt from Teal's FSP Supporting information (Section 7.2.7)

### **4. Health and Safety**

Ron Frank reviewed health and safety items and asked members for any health and safety issues.

### **5. Introductions of new faces at the table**

Ron Frank asked the table to introduce themselves. Members introduced themselves. New faces: Brian Jones, Economic Development Manager, Seabird Island Band, Jason Zimmermann (Keith Chapman's boss – Observing), April Choquette, Teal-Jones Group – Observer and Representative.

### **6. Review Agenda for Meeting #7 / Adapt / Ratify**

Ron Frank asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #8. Chief Andy Alex informed the Table that the Union Bar First Nation is working with the Seabird Island Band. No new agenda items were presented. No additional agenda items were presented prior to the meeting. Ron Frank asked for the table to ratify the agenda. Motion Sharie Conroy, Garry Davidson 2<sup>nd</sup>, majority in favour - none opposed. The Agenda was ratified.

### **7. Previous Meeting Minutes: Review for ratification**

Ron Frank asked members to quickly review the minutes from the last meeting. **Ron reminded members that they would like them to review the minutes prior to the meeting and present changes before the meeting in order to save time.** He reminded members that it is more important to get the intent of what was said as opposed to the exact wording.

Ron asked Keith Chapman about the Fraser PAG website if it was up and running. Keith said it is up and running and a link was sent via email to members. Ron suggested that the link be sent again and that it could be listed with the meeting minutes. Keith commented that the Fraser PAG documents (Agenda, Meeting Minutes, and Background documents) are listed on the site periodically and after the meetings. Members will receive all documents at the meeting or they

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

will be mailed out after the meeting. Don Harris commented that he had trouble with the website. Keith Chapman said that he had looked at the site earlier and it was working so it may have been temporarily out of service. Keith will check to ensure that the site is working properly.

**Action Item 8A:** Check the Fraser PAG web pages for availability and distribute web link to the Fraser PAG area of Teal's website (email and with Meeting Minutes).

**Environment Dept: Due Date: February 7, 2007**

Teal Jones Group Website: <http://www.tealjones.com/>

Teal Jones's Certification (South Island and Fraser Operations):

<http://www.tealjones.com/Certification.htm> - (follow the links in the left hand menu)

Sharie Conroy noted that a word was missing on page 8, last paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line. This sentence was changed to "You can only study these events after the fact with statistical analysis and compare records of all previous floods".

Al Stobbart noted that the second last sentence of the paragraph above that paragraph indicates that he is not in favour of ripping up roads right after logging. He said that he is a big fan of that practice. The table agreed to delete that sentence.

Ron Frank asked for any more changes to the minutes. No more changes were put forward. Ron Frank asked for a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Al Stobbart 1<sup>st</sup>, Keith Warrener 2<sup>nd</sup>. The minutes were adopted as changed with no abstainers or opposition.

## **8. Review of Action Items**

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to review the Action Items. Keith started by explaining the two documents distributed at the meeting [documents # 9 and 10 above]. These documents are pages out of Teal's Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) that is currently before the Ministry of Forests for approval and a page out of the supporting document for the FSP. These pages cover the FSP sections on Cultural Heritage Resources and how Teal will manage them. Also, a replacement "Agenda" for the last meeting is in the package. **Please replace the Agenda from last meeting with the one with Drew Brayshaw's presentation in the agenda title.**

Ron Frank reminded members about the day session on February 10, 2007. The session will be focused on finalizing the Values Indicators and Targets. **The meeting will be 9:30AM to 4:30 PM at the Pantry in the banquet room near the washrooms.**

Keith reviewed the outstanding items. Ed McWaters and Jim Baker had reviewed the Deer Winter Ranges. Jim said that it looks like things make more sense where things are planned. Keith asked Jim Baker if the sub-committee on community access to fiber was progressing. Jim said that there are 6 or 7 people from the community also working on it. The target date of Feb 20<sup>th</sup> appears achievable.

Keith asked if there were any Action Items that members would like to prioritize. No comments were put forward.

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to start his presentation on Meeting Society's Responsibilities.

### **9. Presentation: Society's Responsibilities**

Keith Chapman conducted a short presentation on the CCFM Criterion 6: "Accepting Society's Responsibilities for Sustainable Development". Keith reviewed each of the elements of the standard. Keith reviewed the list of First Nations and First Nation's representative groups that have asserted territories that occur within the Defined Forest Area. Keith noted the First Nations that are participating in the FPAG. There are so many FN's associated with the DFA as the DFA is spread out from Pitt Lake to the Lytton area. It is hoped that this CSA process will help to build relationships with these First Nations.

Keith reviewed the term "Cultural Heritage Resources" and the management of CHR. Keith reviewed how these resources are managed within the landbase and how the Archaeological Potential Model indicates the potential for an area to contain archaeological remains and how the "rating" initiates what further assessments are completed before logging and road building can commence. The rating is based on the proximity to logical areas for First Nations use (proximity to salmon streams and other food sources and identified archaeological sites etc). The model has some shortcomings in that it doesn't address items like traditional trails as they traverse a wide range of landscapes. Each First Nation has a different approach to how to apply the information from the model.

Working relationships with First Nations are individual agreements with FN's. They can be formal agreements or discussions at meetings. Landscape level plans such as Forest Development Plans or, now, the Forest Stewardship Plans are referred to FN's for comments.

The Fraser PAG is a new mechanism for exchanging ideas and information between Teal and FN's.

The general Public's opportunities for input include their comments on FDPs / FSPs and their amendments. The public can also telephone or email comments related to Teal's development to Teal's planning staff. The Fraser PAG is also a mechanism to solicit public input.

### **10. Identification of Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets for Society's Responsibilities**

Ron Frank asked Keith to put up the slide listing the Criterion and its elements.

Ron Frank asked the table to look at element 6.1 "Aboriginal and Treaty Rights". What do First Nations need to hear from society and Teal Jones in particular in order to respect Aboriginal and Treaty Rights? What is showing respect to Aboriginal Rights and Treaty Rights? Ron said that Treaty rights are a modern day expression of Aboriginal Rights. Ron asked how many of the groups at the table were in treaty negotiation. One FN indicated that they were in talks towards Treaty.

Don Harris added that Treaty Rights are more defined than Aboriginal Rights. Aboriginal Rights are more of a broad term. Treaty's define Aboriginal rights and make them more clear. Brian Jones commented (joking) that he is a technician – not a politician - so he cannot add much to the definitions. Don Harris added that Aboriginal Rights defy a single broad statement as it varies from community to community. "A lot of us don't really know". Also it is a term that is regularly being shaped by the courts.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Don Harris added that, in terms of the High, Moderate and Low rating, the rating level needs to be increased if something is found on the ground. Keith Chapman responded that he had left a few things out of the explanation of the model. To clarify...just because an area is rated as "Low" for the potential to have CHR's it does not mean that if a CHR is located on the ground it can be ignored. The company involved has to be diligent. If you stumble across these things there is still a requirement to keep and protect it. Also, if there are known archaeological sites in an area, the model increases the rating for that area and the surrounding area to reflect that there is evidence of FN's use in the area.

Keith Chapman asked Don Harris what would help to foster the communication and information sharing related to CHR between FN's and Teal? We can start to design a VOIT line around this issue. The Value would be the Cultural Heritage Resources; the Objective would be to protect them. Don Harris said that an Archaeological Impact Assessment would be needed. There needs to be a mechanism to advise the associated FN's about the object.

Ron Frank asked the table if they agreed with the Objective: Recognize and Respect Treaty Rights? The table indicated that they agreed with this as an objective. Al Stobbart responded that the general public has the perception that Aboriginal Rights and Treaty Rights are the same thing. Don Harris helped to clarify: Aboriginal Rights are still there with Treaty Rights. Treaty Rights are more defined in terms of the relationship with rest of the country.

Jim Baker commented that, in Lillooet, when they were working on the railway one guy found a site and it stopped the work on the spot. It helps to know that these things are out there and where they are in advance so that we can plan around them. Don Harris added that he was aware of a "public company" that had planted poles right in an old village site. Keith Chapman commented that these are examples of why a professional archaeologist is needed when things are found as it is easy to overlook what is under your feet and obscured by many many years.

Ron Frank turned the discussion back towards the work on element 6.1. Keith Chapman said that the Value so far is "**Aboriginal and Treaty Rights**", the Objective is to "**Respect and Recognize Aboriginal and Treaty Rights**". Keith asked the table about the indicator for this Objective, that is: *How will we measure the "Respect and Recognition"?* Don Harris said that will depend on individual communities.

Chief Andy Alex shared their experience with grave sites being dug up by logging companies. They were fortunate to get involved with Simon Fraser University (SFU) which helped with the documentation of the site and restoration. SFU is a good resource to go to.

Keith Warrener commented that he would like to see a Teal Jones initiative to develop trust with First Nations as an objective and get it down in writing. Everyone has a different point of view. If it is in writing then it will survive as people in different positions change. Actions develop trust.

Jim Baker asked why the maps given to companies do not have all the sites marked on it.

Kevin Stanczyk responded that the Model developed by the Chilliwack Forest District was developed under the Forest Practices Code. Now companies do not need to use the model under the new legislation (Forest and Range Practices Act). We intend on showing FN's maps of areas we want to develop and let these FN's provide direction. Teal will only use the model where FN's want it used. We found the model had flaws which led to Archaeological work being done where it wasn't necessary or missing where it needed to be done.

## Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Jim Baker commented that he has seen active forestry work being shut down because workers discovered a site. People – including FN workers - lost days of work until it was sorted out. These things need to be figured out beforehand.

Ron Frank responded that is what is being brought forward: how to share information up front.

Brian Jones commented that First Nations Geographic Information Systems info is protected from the general public in order to protect sacred sites from vandalism. We are talking about communication in order to build knowledge on both sides. First Nations “fight many fires” and all of the issues compete for people’s time. It is not that we don’t want to respond. We just have a lot of things to deal with. A lot of the information is all oral. It takes a lot of money to transfer this knowledge into other forms (maps, text etc.) for others to use. It is better to start the communication process early.

John Warren commented that the concept of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights ignores “Title”. Aboriginal Title exists in BC and aboriginal people have an ownership right to trees and minerals. It is not enough to simply refer plans to FN’s. Timber companies are making money and FN’s need a share of it. Forest and Range Agreements (FRA’s) between the province and FN’s are limited and inadequate but they at least recognize Title. How many agreements does Teal Jones have with FN’s? Agreements are needed to address employment, contracting, payment for harvesting. The Boston Bar FN has an agreement with May Trucking. Other FN’s need something similar.

Ron Frank responded that, to his knowledge, Aboriginal Title is an Aboriginal Right. This will need to be clarified.

**Action Item: 8B Ron Frank to determine whether Aboriginal Title is included under Aboriginal and (Treaty) Rights (CSA SFM Element 6.1)**

**Ron Frank: Due Date: February 10, 2007**

Ron Frank asked for a representative of Teal Jones to respond to the Accommodation issue that John Warren brought up. April Choquette responded that Accommodation of First Nations is a Government to Government issue. April added that if there is money paid out on the profit that John Warren refers to, then it stands to reason that there should be payment back to the company when they lose money.

John Warren responded that is a poor way to address the question. Teal is taking a valuable resource off of the land. The First Nations have a right to the resources and a share in the benefits from those resources.

Ron Frank interjected. We need to find that position of trust. There are two things here: 1) The respect of Aboriginal and Treaty rights and 2) Economic benefits. Ron added that what he has heard from Teal Jones is that they are more than available to interested FN’s to establish agreements. Ron added that the term “protocol” has a government to government connotation in respect to First Nations. He suggested that terms like “stewardship agreements” or “Memorandums of Understanding” be used to refer to agreements between the company and FN’s.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Don Harris commented that these agreements need to be developed individually with each FN community. Kevin Stanczyk agreed. These are not things that can be summed up in one document to address the interests of each separate FN community.

Chief Andy Alex added that all of their villages and towns – like Hope – have been losing resources. We had 5 saw mills in Hope in the late 50's. We all want a piece of these resources. There is so much progress worldwide. We have marketing boards which results in the best wood being sent to places like Japan. This was our first notice that we are losing our timber from our own back yard. We can save a lot of arguing by saying that it is these “marketing boards” that are the main factor behind us losing our resources internationally. We are losing a lot of our jobs with this ‘progress’. As technology changes, people come along and say “We can make a better use of it” and they take the timber off of our hands.

April Choquette asked if sending logs overseas was a concern. Do you want to see these logs manufactured in BC?

Chief Andy Alex responded that we used to manufacture all of the logs in BC. We were all happy and working. We had the most beautiful timber resources in the world. We make a deal with people and then ‘two minutes later’ someone hears about it and says “we have an interest in that property” and we lose the resource. We want the logs to stay in BC.

Ron Frank responded that we hope to revisit the issue regarding the issue of employment in our communities. If we cannot, we will have to revisit it on Feb 10<sup>th</sup>. We all agree that there is an economic component to these agreements between the company and FN's communities: mutual benefits of jobs and access to resources. We are living together and there is only one set of resources to work with. It is a struggle.

Chief Andy Alex responded that what John Warren is talking about is that each village is different. Different needs for economic and other development. We have an interest in economic development. Some programs help us to work with Economic development. I've been working on Self Government since 1980 in talking about Treaty Rights and Self Government. At each step in these talks there would be a re-organization of the people at the talks. There can be 20 First Nations under one roof or at a Tribal Council trying to represent their needs. It doesn't work so well. Each community has different needs and different understanding of forest development and economic development. In the 1960's we had the Union of BC Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) representing 196 individual bands working on these issues and self government. Government came along and fragmented that organization. We lost the progress.

Ron Frank commented that the table – after 8 meetings - can agree that we are working together to try and solve these problems. He added that the UBIC is still around and that Chief Sidney Douglas missed tonight's meeting as he was attending these meetings. Ron Frank then revisited element 6.1. Do we have an indicator? How are we going to measure whether Teal Jones and the people around this table are measuring up under this commitment? He added that this may depend on whether Aboriginal Title falls under this Element. Ron added that it was his understanding that Aboriginal Title does fall under this Element.

Keith Chapman responded that potential indicators could be developed around opportunities for sharing information. The Opportunity for participating in the Fraser PAG is one example. We could also develop an indicator around pursuing individual protocol agreements.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Ron Frank proposed allocating a segment of the FPAG meetings towards addressing FN issues. We can't trust if we can't understand and we can't understand unless we have opportunities to communicate.

Don Harris commented that Aboriginal Title is being recognized by the courts one bit at a time. Most recently, the courts ruled that Aboriginals are justified in harvesting timber on crown land for personal use (firewood, homes, furniture etc). You cannot lay it all out in one document. There are ongoing changes.

Ron Frank asked if it would be helpful to allocate time at the table for First Nations to come forward on these various issues. Don Harris responded that you could do that but it will not address those FN's that are not here. It's going to be different for each FN.

**Bruce Edwards that it would be valuable to establish a point of contact for First Nations communications as every little bit helps.**

Ron Frank said that the table should be aware that any of the stakeholder groups and First Nations here have the right to come forward and share information that they feel is important to this process. That is our commitment to Public Participation. Ron then concluded the input to Element 6.1 noting that there was a lot of input so far.

Ron Frank called for a 10 minute break and the meeting adjourned for a break. (6:00-6:10 pm)

Ron Frank re-convened the meeting and opened the discussion to Element 6.2 *Respect for Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses*. We have actually covered a lot of material that would fall under this element. To summarize, First Nations are interested in communications but they have capacity issues (funding, other priorities etc). **Communications** is an interest to both FN's and Teal Jones. Second, there are a number of values in the forest, in addition to the cultural sites and other **Cultural Heritage Resources** (Value), that is pretty clearly understood. There needs to be **individual FN input on how those resources are protected** (Indicator). The district CHR Model may not be effective or there needs to be input on how and when it is used. Teal Jones has an interest in relating directly to FN's regarding Teal's development and establishing how Teal's activities may affect them. The lack of information in a usable format and the confidentiality of that information must be part of that discussion. In addition, **access to the forest for various uses** is a value. Also heard was interest in **employment and economic development** (Value).

Don Harris commented that a lot of info is not recorded. For instance, there may not be records of certain plants that have FN uses. There may be traditional plants that are site specific and there may not be any record of these sites. There is one **plant for traditional medicine** that is only known to occur on two spots. Ron Frank commented that this should be noted as there may be an interest in maintaining certain ecosystems across the landscape and that these medicinal plants, like many other plants, are associated with certain ecosystems or plant associations. Ron added that this may be too coarse to address plants that are only known in a few locations.

Ron added that Don had told him during the break that Don's community, like other communities, has special needs and interests in a relationship with Teal Jones. Ron asked Kevin Stanczyk to address this.

## Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Kevin Stanczyk responded that the provisions in the Forest Stewardship Plan meet the legal requirements/standards in a way that is “measurable and verifiable”. Kevin added that one of the commitments in the FSP is that Teal is committed to enter into agreements with interested First Nations. A number of FN’s have expressed an interest in establishing these agreements and some of these initiatives are under way. These agreements can address everything from confidentiality to any other specific issue.

Ron Frank then called for input on values for Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge, and Uses. Ron Frank gave one example – First Nations have an interest in accessing Cedar for cultural use. Ron added that the recent court ruling that Don Harris referred to is pretty recent and that the implications and application of this ruling may need to be further defined.

Sharie Conroy commented that there should be a value around the future use or access to Cedar. What will the future access to this resource be? There may be a need for a plan to set aside timber for this use.

Ron Frank said that there is a MOF initiative around this issue called the Old Growth Cedar Strategy. Ron asked Teal representatives if they had any information about this MOF initiative. None of the Teal representatives were aware of it.

Keith Warrener commented that he was aware that certain areas are set aside and that the Chilliwack Forest District is working on this issue.

Ron Frank asked if Teal is prepared to respond to the issues around wood for Cultural use.

April Choquette responded that, whether it was a legal requirement or not, Teal has provided timber for cultural use. They have help select, harvest and transport timbers for some First Nations in the past. This wood has been used for everything from masks to canoes. Teal will work together with First Nations in this regard when called upon.

Ron Frank added that he was aware that the MOF does offer Free Use permits for harvesting timber for this purpose. He added that he didn’t want to suggest that they are easy to get. Ron summarized April Choquette’s point that Teal is interested in working with FN’s on an individual and reasonable basis. Ron added that another way that Teal can accommodate this need is by providing access to lands to find and harvest these products. This access includes access for other timber and non-timber forest products as well as Aboriginal fishing and hunting etc. Ron asked Teal if there were any other comments regarding access.

Kevin Stanczyk responded that the only impediment to access would be temporary gates put up around active logging and road building sites for public safety around the work site and to decrease vandalism to its machines. These gates are removed after the work is completed. Road deactivation is the only other reason that would limit/ eliminate access. Other than for these issues there will be access.

Ron Frank asked if there are any access issues from FN’s. Don Harris responded that logging roads are the only access they have into his community.

Ron Frank commented that Kevin had said that Teal occasionally has to close roads. Is there any way that FN’s can contact someone to determine if there will be gates? Kevin Stanczyk responded that all of the gates should have a sign with a contact number to call. If it is a gate that Teal or May Trucking has put up interested FN’ can contact the engineering department to

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

get information on when a gate will be open and potentially get a key. Generally the gates are locked on the weekends and after work hours.

Brian Jones commented that the general interest in his community towards Cedar is to know when Cedars are being harvested so that members can peel the bark and collect roots. Brian was not clear if this use can occur when the tree is standing or after it is felled. The community would be interested to know when Cedar is being harvested so that they can gain access to those areas and take what they are looking for. Much of this material is being used in Seabirds adult education programme. They are always looking for a source of Cedar bark and roots.

Ron Frank asked for a response from Teal. Kevin Stanczyk responded that this was a case where communication is really important.

Brian Jones responded that, in regards to establishing protocol agreements, Seabird Island would like to establish one with Teal. Kevin Stanczyk acknowledged this request.

John Warren commented that Boston Bar FN is generally pleased with the agreement that they have with May Trucking. This agreement includes payment for timber harvested in local drainages, payment for industrial traffic through the reserve, assistance for developing a SFM plan for the local managed forest, hiring local loggers, hiring local forestry field technicians, money from the Forest Investment Account for rehabilitation, firewood, and consulting on forest development. He suggested that this should be done with more communities. There maybe issues that the BB FN's agreement does not address.

Ron Frank summarized the input on Element 6.2 – that communications are the key to the solution here. He added that he looks forward to seeing this happen and to seeing how it will be addressed in the Criterion and Indicator Set. Ron asked for a last call for information on 6.2 from FN's representatives. If there are more thoughts after the meeting please email ([environment@tealjones.com](mailto:environment@tealjones.com)) this input will be circulated to the rest of the group.

Brian Jones made a general comment regarding building trust between FN's communities and Teal. He said he often tells people outside the community that to build that trust it is important to be a part of some of the things that go on inside the community and being active in some of the opening ceremonies or festivities. Members of the FN communities will begin to see that the corporate world is not the demon that it is often made out to be. Members also need to know more about how the corporation is structured, why it is structured that way and how they can build joint ventures and protocol agreements and so on. He added that he has often said that the best meetings are often outside 'over a cigarette' where there is an informal setting where trust is developed. Joining and creating relationships is about building trust. This is not necessarily about going after Teal for money but perhaps its about joining forces to bang on Government's 'door' over issues like building capacity or accessing resources. This process may be one way to get past Government bureaucracy and say 'these are the issues and concerns that come from both Teal and FN's communities'. Governments may listen more if we were to go together. Brian recalled when they came out with the Forest and Range Agreements he had asked the MOF "is this really the way that we want to go?" He said to them that he would rather that the corporate doors were opened up for them to walk into so that they could understand the corporate world and look at ways to foster joint ventures and potential revenues that would be generated in such a venture. We would like to create more joint ventures that they both can benefit from. We need to understand the corporate world we already understand the

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Government. Seabird started a process about 4 years ago with Brian Taylor (May Trucking) and Interfor in an effort to find ways to work together.

Ron Frank asked the table to turn to Element 6.3 Public Participation. Ron asked Keith to share some thoughts on this topic and spearhead this discussion

Keith Chapman commented that this Element requires demonstrating that the public participation is well designed and functions to the satisfaction of participants. Part of this may be having an annual review of the PAG – a public participation mechanism. We can develop some indicators and targets around our PAG. An indicator may involve the evaluation form completed by PAG members with feedback on how the PAG meetings are being conducted [a FPAG evaluation form was completed by members attending the October 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting]. Forms could help identify information gaps or where Teal is failing in the public participation process. These forms could be modified or adapted to better identify issues under this topic.

Ron Frank added that he was aware of questionnaires used elsewhere where members are asked whether members are satisfied with the process. It asks how members feel about the meetings and also about the whole process. These questioners provide a rating that can be used to measure group satisfaction. This is one indicator we could develop around this.

Sharie Conroy commented that there appears to be a lot of similarities between First Nations communities and non FN communities in dealing with the issue of trust. The non FN communities need to be heard and not simply left with the consequences of management decisions. We need to meet with Teal and walk those areas of concern so our communities know where Teal is going to log. This way the community can show Teal how they use these areas. It is the connection that is important. “Come and talk to us, sit in on our rate-payer meetings. The past [experience with logging] has not been kind to us”. When the logging is completed they are left with the result. There should be more than just Teal’s public meetings to discuss these issues.

Jean Warkentin commented that she felt that Sharie’s comments were well said. “It is the same in our community and I felt much better when Teal came and met with us and responded to our concerns”.

Ron Frank responded that we need some measure of group participation: Would a survey of each stakeholder group giving feedback on a number of areas? Keith will put together a survey and we can review it to see if that will address this measure.

**Action Item 8C** Develop a draft Stakeholder Survey form for members to provide feedback to Teal on the FPAG.

**Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Keith Chapman responded that what he heard from Sharie Conroy was not so much about Teal documenting the inroads being made but more about actual physical meetings in the community. Keith added that his understanding is that communities need Teal to come and have ‘good and neighborly chats’ – like public meetings when Forest Stewardship Plans are rolled out or when logging development is being proposed near a community. The feedback forms discussed are a useful tool for the PAG to use in helping Teal to improve this process.

Jean Warkentin said that the **public meetings** sound good.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

Kevin Stanczyk responded that Teal is committed to holding public meetings and working with community stakeholders on plans in their areas.

Ron Frank commented that this issue probably fits into **Element 6.4: Information Sharing for Decision Making with a big "C" for Communication**. Ron asked how formalized does Teal want to make this. If we don't have an agreement to meet then the meeting doesn't happen. Do we want to give some thought to a communication plan or some other commitment?

Keith Warrener commented that it is difficult for companies to know all of the various groups and members of the community. The Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) asked Hatzic to bring forward these groups. If a community group registers with us, and Teal sends the FVRD a set of plans, we will be able to communicate with the community group notify them of Teal's plans. In turn Teal can then ask the FVRD for a list of groups that may be associated with certain plans.

Kevin Stanczyk commented that he 'takes off his hat for the FVRD'. They pointed out the Norris Creek residents at Deroche. If we are aware of concerns then we will dialogue with them and notify them on plans. The District Manager has to decide if referrals are done right – the right people received the right information and the plans adequately address their concerns. If Teal is aware of the issues and concerns from the public then Teal will have the open houses and discuss the plans. Kevin used the Hatzic Valley as an example. Teal has not done any logging there but when Teal starts planning for the Hatzic Ridge on the west side of the valley, they will develop an idea about where they want to build roads and log. They will then have an open house and invite those people that are concerned and discuss their plans with them. That's when staff will meet and walk the ground with folks like Sharie Conroy who are concerned about the area.

Ed McWaters commented that the idea of the Forest Stewardship Plan is to identify the issues and deal with them in the plan. The FSP is advertised and comments from stakeholders are addressed in the plan. In theory, once these issues have been raised, stakeholders should not have to raise this issue again. For instance, the Hatzic area has issues related to terrain stability and hydrology. Legally, the FSP must then address the issues. When engineering is completed the issues have to be dealt with according to the FSP. There will always be a concern for stability and water quality in the Hatzic area. Stakeholders will not need to raise this issue or need to have plans referred to them as the licensee is legally obligated to deal with the issue the first time it is raised. Individual stakeholders or stakeholder groups in the Hatzic valley can take comfort in knowing that these concerns will be addressed even if not every individual of the community raised it themselves. The plans will not be advertised again. If individual groups said that they want to review these plans, then Teal will follow up on those commitments.

Bruce Edwards commented that there are two issues being discussed: 1) Due diligence in respect of the Forest and Rang Practices Act and, 2) Good neighbourliness which affects the day to day relationship between the logger and the "loggee". At public meetings with the public in Hatzic and Teal 2 years ago, Teal promised only to log with full involvement of the public. That was done and Teal got off to a good start with the community and this should continue. It is important to keep the Community groups apprised of plans so consultation can be done all along the line. Bruce added that the email list [emails to Fraser PAG members are sent courtesy copy to interested members of the Hatzic community that have requested it] and the ability to continue that will continue the good working relationship. Bruce recommended that stakeholders that Teal

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

maintain communication with the identified stakeholders so that they follow the plans so that the decisions leading to a cutting permit are made with consultation all along the line. Hatzic has that line of contact for the community. This could serve as a model for other communities.

Kevin Stanczyk commented that this is Teal's objective and goal is to work with the community.

Ron Frank asked if there was any more input into the Public Participation Element. No more comments were forwarded. Ron then noted the time and asked Keith Chapman to cover loose ends around the other Elements.

Keith Chapman revisited the issues concerning what has been previously described as Sensitive Areas such as around Norrish Creek and Hatzic where there is a lot of concern related to terrain and hydrology problems. These problems and the Values at stake have been discussed at virtually every meeting and the Elements to date. These problems are largely associated with upslope forestry activities affecting community and private resources down slope. The term 'Sensitive' has a lot of different meaning to different people and agencies. Teal proposes to refer to these areas as **Sites of Special Significance**.

Sites of Special Significance can be defined as areas where down slope and downstream community resources may be potentially impacted by forestry activities. These areas would include Hatzic Ridge, Norrish Creek, Deer Point (on Pitt Lake – an area with a lot of water licenses and homes) and other areas with water intakes etc. [and all established Community Watersheds]. These will be areas where Teal will practice a higher level of due diligence. Teal will have experts (Hydrologists or Geotechnical Professionals) provide professional, site specific evaluations and recommendations. These recommendations will then be put into the plans and then implemented in the area. These sites may be defined by a line on a map or be defined in words. This is yet to be determined. By defining these areas as Sites of Special Significance (SSS), it will trigger Teal's planning department to implement the higher level of due diligence. That is what the table wants to see.

Keith Chapman noted how Sharie Conroy was being very diligent in regards to ensuring that all of the potential issues around hydrology (water quantity, quality, flooding etc) and terrain stability (landslides, debris torrents, soil erosion) that may affect her community. Keith added that we are not hydrologists so we may not be able to list all of the possible angles associated with these two topics. The goal is to group these issues and deal with them effectively. To deal with them effectively we need professional advice and due diligence in implementing it on the ground to protect these resources. The VOITs will be built around ensuring this layer of planning takes place. This will ensure that all of the possible problems that may occur around these areas around the forestry / Urban / Agricultural interface are recognized and managed. This will achieve the overall goal in a measurable and verifiable way.

Keith Chapman asked the Table if this seemed to be an acceptable approach.

Keith Chapman continued explaining that, where possible, many of the lines in the VOIT tables that will require the same layer of expert input as an Indicator in these tables will be consolidated into a single line. What remains to be done includes defining the criteria or location of these SSS. "We can work on that. Is it so many meters from a water intake or so many meters upslope or is it something that a hydrologist defines or do we say this is the logical place to put

Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

it?” Keith added that he doesn’t want to ram-rod this approach through but wants to encapsulate the issues and provide a good product for the group that addresses their values.

Sharie Conroy indicated that it sounded okay “at the moment”. Keith Chapman said “you would want to see it right?” Sharie agreed. Keith offered to have a sidebar with Sharie and trade the wording back and forth. We can roll out the wording on February 10<sup>th</sup>. We can trade around some emails and with anyone else that is interested and then report back to the group.

Ron Frank identified the sub-committee and asked for any others participants. Jean Warkentin and Bruce Edwards indicated that they wanted to participate as well. Sharie Conroy said that Heather Morlacci from Hatzic would also like to participate. Keith Chapman asked Al Stobbart if he would be able to participate on the sub-committee in light of his expertise on a lot of this. Al agreed.

**Action Item 8D** Fraser PAG Sub Committee to work on Indicators and Targets around planning work in Sites of Special Significance.

**Sub Committee:**

**Sharie Conroy, Jean Warkentin, Bruce Edwards, Heather Morlacci, Al Stobbart and Keith Chapman Due Date: February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Ron Frank asked – as part of this same process on these Sensitive Sites should the community be part of this and if so should it be part of Element 6.4 *Information for Decision Making*. Keith Chapman agreed; if you are operating in an area that may be a Site of Special Significance then it is best to comb the community.

Ron Frank asked if there were any more comments. He noted that the meeting was ahead of schedule. Ron asked Keith to go on to the next item.

Keith Chapman noted that something that has come up regularly is the issue of site security around road access and elements in the public abusing that access. Keith re-iterated his comments from the last meeting that Teal is a tenant on the landbase that builds roads. Elements of the public are abusing this access and dumping garbage etc etc. Teal doesn’t have the capacity to eliminate this problem. There is some responsibility to try to limit this problem and try to mitigate it. Keith proposed that Teal help those groups that have already positioned themselves to deal with this issue. The BC Wildlife Federation and Wilderness Watch have volunteer patrols that report wildlife infractions such as poaching to authorities. They also report other abuses. Keith proposed that the issues around site security be addressed by helping these groups tackle these problems. Keith noted that Wilderness Watch observes and report infractions to Conservation Officers and the RCMP. Assistance may be in the form of updated maps, keys to gates, or information. This will provide an avenue for Teal to foster another level of oversight in the forest where people are looking out for these problems and reporting them. The Value for this problem will be something like “**site security**” and the Objective would be to **protect forest resources from public damage**. The Indicator would address how Teal is working on this problem – by **helping Wilderness Watch**. The Target would be to **maintain a suitable support mechanism that helps Wilderness Watch with their needs**.

Keith Chapman asked if this approach to site security sounds like a viable way to deal with this problem. Don Harris commented that about the only resource left is these public groups as the

## Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

various government ministries have been downsized. Keith Chapman added that this approach is not a silver bullet but a step in the right direction.

Don Harris suggested that signage makes a big difference. Contributing towards signage may be a help to these public groups. The group Public Watch helped in our area by letting people know that there are folks watching. The problems subsided a bit.

Jim Baker commented that back in the late 40's kids in his community near the Sooke Potholes used to visit the potholes (a swimming area) and note people's licence plate numbers. It worked very well. The community businesses there gave the kids a T-shirt for their help. In a first year it made a huge difference. Now the area is a park. It also showed the kids a thing or two. I know first hand what is being talked about here. I've seen areas in the back of West Harrison with all of these same things going on.

Ron Frank asked Jim Baker if he was a member of the BC Wildlife Federation. Jim said he was a past member. Keith Chapman asked if any other people at the table were members. Al Stobbart indicated that he was a life member though not active. Don Harris said that he used to be. Keith Chapman asked if members knew of a local chapter of the BCWF. Al Stobbart said that there was a Surrey office and added that he didn't think there would be a down side to helping out.

Ron Frank asked the table if there any other local groups that would be of help.

Keith Warrener commented that these groups do want to help but may not know who to contact or what to do. Maybe Teal could put up a sign addressed to wilderness clubs offering them a way to help. Also the gates around active logging sites are up for a year or so but maybe some groups could get keys and then start to buy into the idea of playing a role instead of trying to get around the gates other ways. Al Stobbart added that a sign saying "if you see a problem, call this number". Keith Warrener cited an example of a 4x4 club that started to clean up Sumas Mountain once they saw that they could make a difference.

Sharie Conroy commented that she felt that this would be a good idea in her area.

Keith Chapman commented that these groups do know who to call as some of them are well organized. One group on the North Shore (North Vancouver) is supported by the RCMP. One would try to ensure that the group has a good protocol and relationship with the authorities and about patrolling safely.

Ron Frank said that there are two questions before us: 1) are there any concerns with moving forward with supporting Teal Jones in this initiative? Ron Frank noted that no one indicated any concerns. Ron Frank asked 2) Are there any objections to moving ahead with constructing Values Objectives and Indicators around this issue. Ron Frank noted that no one indicated any concerns.

Ron Frank then turned the subject to the next meeting on Saturday, February 10<sup>th</sup>. He asked Keith Chapman to outline the meeting. Keith Chapman said that he intended to get an updated table of VOITs for all of the work to date but he wasn't able to update it and print it in time. Keith added that will send a copy of the updated tables with the meeting minutes. He asked members to review the table and consolidate their thoughts on them. We will build a workshop style

## Minutes Ratified by FPAG February 20, 2007

approach to the meeting so that the meeting will not be too tedious. Keith will send out a workshop outline and members can offer some feedback and items for the agenda.

Ron Frank asked that input to the agenda should be provided as soon as possible beforehand so the meeting can be planned. Ron thanked everyone for a very productive meeting.

The meet was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Ron Frank spoke up and said that a number of members were asking about the travel allowance. Keith Chapman responded that he will tally the travel and give the info to Teal. Hopefully payment will be ready for the next meeting.

**The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held February 10, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack at 9:30 AM to 4:30 PM**