

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #9 Minutes: Workshop – Criteria & Indicator Review

February 10, 2007

1. Call to order

Ron Frank, Fraser PAG Facilitator, called the 9th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 9:35 a.m. on February 10, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Al Stobbert, Inch Creek Hatchery	Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Garry Davidson, Seabird Island Indian Band	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	

Members Absent:

Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek	Mark Bond, Reo Rafting
Earl Graham, United Steel Workers	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation
Gordon Sherwood, Cacus Point Resident	Kerry Grozier, District Manager, MOFR	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Gurdev Sidhu, Agriculture	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident	Steve Harvey, Hope Machine Shop.

Others Present:

Heather Morlacci, Observer	Keith Chapman, Teal	Ron Frank, Facilitator
John Pichugin, Teal	Kevin Stanczyk, Teal	

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #9 Workshop Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #9 Presentation handouts – slide notes
3. Fraser PAG Meeting Minutes #8 (Jan 30, 2007)
4. Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets (Criterion 1-6) – Draft 1
5. Table of As Built Road Submission (April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006)

4. Health and Safety

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

5. Introductions of Members at the table

Ron Frank asked the table to introduce themselves. Members introduced themselves.

6. Review Agenda for Meeting #9

Ron Frank asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #9. No additional agenda items were presented prior to the meeting. Ron outlined the meeting's objectives. Heather Morlacci commented that the floor needs to be open to discuss new issues. Ron Frank responded that while this is true, the group needs to complete the work already before it. Ron Frank added that none of these topics will be considered closed. The CSA process is built upon the continual improvement loop.

Ron Frank added that the group will not ratify the minutes from the Jan 30th meeting at this time but this will be done at the Feb 20th meeting.

Ron Frank turned the floor over to Keith Chapman. Keith started by apologizing for the delay in getting the tables and minutes to members so late. Keith acknowledged a complaint logged through the Facilitator and passed on to Keith. The member's complaint regarded not having enough time to adequately review the material prior to the meeting.

Keith Chapman pointed out the handout with the table of roads built and re-activated for the last "As Built Road" submission to the Ministry of Forests and Range. Keith gave a brief overview of re-construction. Bruce Edwards suggested that the table include information regarding the amount of road de-activated for a more complete picture of the roading situation.

Action Item 9A: Look into reporting the amount of road deactivated.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

7. Presentation: Criterion and Indicator Workshop

Keith Chapman conducted a brief presentation that reviewed Sustainable Forest Management definition, how Values are given Objectives, the role of Indicators and Targets. Definitions and examples of Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets were presented. Each of the CCFM SFM Criterion and their Elements were reviewed.

Ron Frank then asked Keith Chapman to lead the group through the table of Criterion and Indicators.

8. Criterion 1: Conservation of Biological Diversity

Keith Chapman asked members to refer to the document “**Draft Values, Objectives, Indicators, and Targets – Draft 1**”. Keith began by explaining a minor change to the line # system. Each line number is preceded by the number of the Criterion which the line belongs to. For example the second line of Criterion 1 is referenced by “1-2”. Keith also explained that all of the information from the previous tables of Values, Objectives, Indicators, and Targets (VOITs) has now been compiled into the one 42 page document.

Criterion – Element: 1-1

KC briefly explained the Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification (BEC) system of BC and their breakdown to subzones. The BEC system is a way of classifying ecosystems based on the life forms they express – in terms of the dominant forest cover (Bio), the geology or terrain influence (Geo), and the influence of climate in this mix (Climatic). The system is a leading edge method for organizing ecosystems which aids in land management and research.

Bruce Edwards requested more information on this system as it is not something that they are familiar with.

Sharie Conroy asked how “we” would know if there is a gap in the representation by subzone?

KC explained that the Ministry of Forests and Range (**MOFR**) and the Ministry of Environment (**MOE**) analyze the representation of old forest by the BEC zone and subzone. They identify what gaps there are and set policy towards addressing problems.

Heather Morlacci commented that there was a tool that she was aware of called SHIM mapping or **Sensitive Habitat Inventory and Mapping**. Heather submitted 8 pages from the SHIM website describing the purpose and products of this tool. Keith Chapman admitted that he had never heard of the system but would look into it for what it may offer the FPAG.

[SHIM website: <http://www.shim.bc.ca/shim/shim.htm> . This tool / atlas appears to be targeted towards managing streams and habitats in the urban/rural and agricultural areas of the Lower Mainland and not necessarily associated with the crown forest. However it may be a useful tool where crown forest management occurs against these areas.]

Kevin Stanczyk commented that, within the DFA, they have several Landscape Unit objectives regarding meeting certain representation by ecosystems and they know where the forest in relation to those objectives. There are no official orders for the Pitt Lake, Hatzic and Widgeon Landscape Units as they have not been finalized. For these areas, there is an Old Growth Order (basically a proclamation by government) which directs licensees how ecosystems are to be represented and what targets for old growth retention must be met. The Old Growth Order states a level of retention over and above what often is set in final Landscape Unit plans in order to have the “room” to set those final objectives. Kevin said that, for accuracy, the term “**Old Growth Orders**” should be included in the Target.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Jim Baker asked where the figures come from. Keith Chapman responded that they come from the MOFR and MOE – they inventory and then identify what needs to be set for retention levels across the areas.

Sharie Conroy asked at what point do individual patches of trees get identified and set aside. Sharie gave an example of a large white owl living in a stand of Old Growth in the Hatzic Valley.

Keith Chapman responded that what they are speaking of is at the landscape level. At the individual stand level is where you would identify nests for owls and other raptors and create buffers around them. At the landscape level, the idea is basically that if habitat is provided it will be used or “build it – they will come”.

Ron Frank noted that raptors are addressed in the Criterion and Indicator set farther on.

Bruce Edwards said that he was reluctant to sign off on indicators that he did not understand or familiar with. Bruce said that he would agree to this line subject to the definition of Biogeoclimatic Zones and Ecosystem classification.

Action Item 9B: Distribute web links with information on the Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification in BC to members

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman. Due Date: Feb 20, 2007

Ministry of Forests Research Branch – Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification Program
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hre/becweb/index.html>

An interactive map showing the BEC zones for BC (large scale) can be found at the from this page (<http://www.bcforestinformation.com/>) or go directly to (<http://www.bcforestinformation.com/maps/frames.htm>) for an interactive map

A detailed description of the BEC system in individual BEC zones and subzones may be found at: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/pubs/Docs/Srs/SRseries.htm>

Action Item 9C: Invite a representative from the Ministry of Environment or raptor specialist to talk about habitat.

Environment Dept: Keith Chapman. Due Date: TBA

John Pichugin commented that in the Hatzic Valley, Landscape Unit planning will take place this year. The process involves First Nations, Government and Industry and public review and comment. .

Bruce Edwards said that he was comfortable with it now subject to the follow-up on the background information.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-1 with the noted changes. Al Stobbart 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-1 approved as amended. Ron congratulated the Table on finalizing their first indicator set.

Criterion – Element: 1-2

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. While the broader scale indicator and target (1-1) addressed landscape level ecosystems, line 1-2 addressed the stand (or cutblock level) retention. Stand level retention (Wildlife Tree Patches) is a percentage of the harvest area (i.e. harvest “x” amount of hectares and retain y% of x hectares). The percentage varies from Landscape Unit to Landscape Unit. At approval of Teal’s Forest Stewardship Plan the target will be 7% for the areas without approved Landscape Unit plans.

Sharie Conroy asked where the retention will be placed. Can it be more than that?

Keith Chapman said that the actual percentage of Wildlife Tree Patches can often be higher due to the restrictions around fish streams. However it can never be lower than the required percentage. Wildlife Tree Patches can be set in locations in order to meet other needs such as around a water license intake a swamp or difficult terrain to harvest.

Bruce Edwards asked if the stand level retention is subject to a public process.

Kevin Stanczyk responded that Teal has to keep to 7% as part of the public process. Landscape Unit Planning may increase it. Now under the Forest and Range Practices Act, there is 7% retention required and Teal will be consistent with it.

Ron Frank commented that Landscape Unit Planning, the Forest Stewardship Plan and the Fraser PAG are all public processes.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-2. Garry Davidson 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-2 approved. Ron added that this is a basic indicator that is adopted by most PAG’s. As with the entire indicator set, any of these items can be changed as the table becomes more educated on these issues.

Criterion – Element: 1-3

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-3. Keith explained that this set addresses ecosystems at the site level. **Coarse Woody Debris (CWD)** is very important to small animals for food, shelter and other needs. Some birds use CWD as well. Keith explained that the target for this indicator reads as a future strategy as the CWD retention will need to be developed in light of the work that the sub-committee on community access to fibre is doing.

Sharie Conroy asked if this CWD can lead to problems such as log jams in streams or debris torrents (mud and woody debris slides in streams). She added that they have a lot of problems with this in their streams.

Keith Chapman responded that it is against the law to put a “deleterious substance” into streams. This includes woody debris. Debris torrents result from poor engineering or logging practices. The CWD we are speaking of is in terms of what is left on the harvest area. This debris will not be introduced into streams.

John Warren asked if there is a criteria or range of values for CWD.

John Pichugin responded that the **Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR)** is in discussion with industry, BC Timber Sales (**BCTS**) etc to come up with targets. These targets need to be aligned

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

to individual licensee's and BCTS's Forest Stewardship Plans as each plan addresses strategies or measures to address CWD.

Heather Morlacci commented that CWD has come down local streams and has resulted in large costs to the community and local and provincial agencies.

Al Stobbart suggested that the Target for this line be changed to read: "Complete an acceptable strategy for management of CWD by December 2007."

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-3 as changed. Bruce Edwards 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 1-3 approved as changed.

Criterion – Element: 1-4

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-4. Old Growth Management Areas (**OGMAs**) are areas that have been set aside during landscape level planning. These areas will be managed perpetually for Old Growth and left to evolve naturally. Some OGMAs are in draft form or are finalized by approved Landscape plans. Each set of OGMAs has some individual flexibility to allow for ground truthing and operational adjustments. If licensees want to adjust the boundary configuration of an OGMA there are rules that apply. The original amount of area must remain the same and any changes have to swap the same timber or forest values for what is being taken. The net area must be the same. This indicator looks at the changes to ensure that the legal objectives for the OGMAs are being adhered to. The Target is "Zero" net loss of OGMA area.

Sharie Conroy commented that she, as a hiker, finds it disturbing that she does not find Old Growth in her area. She added that she wants to see a habitat of Old Growth. Previous harvesting (in the 1930's and on) did not leave any. "I want Old Growth stands to be a value for people and communities".

Keith Chapman responded that OGMA's are set aside from a biodiversity viewpoint. Recreation in Old Growth is managed through the Parks system. Currently there is about 21% of the Chilliwack Forest District set aside in Parks.

John Pichugin added that members of the Hatzic community will have a chance to see where the OGMAs are in the Hatzic area. The Old Growth may be 10 minutes away from your door or it may be 50 minutes away. "I understand where you are coming from and the public will have a chance to comment on these areas".

John Warren commented that the Ministry of Environment went through a public process. Once these areas are set up, it is unlikely that they will be logged.

Kevin Stanczyk responded that in each Order (An Order is basically a proclamation giving legal effect to the plan) there are different provisions for different areas. For example, some harvesting may be permitted if a fire destroys the area.

Sharie Conroy asked what defines "Old Growth".

Keith Chapman responded that Old Growth on the coast is defined as forests of 250 years of age and older.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Heather Morlacci commented that Old Growth trees can be 12 feet in diameter such as in the Elk Valley. Some 100 year old trees can be close to this size.

Keith Chapman responded that individual tree size is not a certain indicator of age. Tree size depends a lot on the growing site, species of tree, and the room it has to grow.

Chief Andy Alex asked if any more transfers of Parks (Provincial/Federal) are being transferred to Municipalities were in the works.

No one at the Table was aware of any pending transfers. Ron Frank suggested that this would be a good question for Keith Warrener (a member of the Fraser Valley Regional District).

Action Item: 9D Ask Keith Warrener at the FVRD if there are plans to transfer Parks between Provincial and Municipal jurisdictions.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-4. Al Stobbart 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-4 approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-5

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-5. Keith pointed out that the Value was changed to include “Mines” as suggested at an earlier meeting. Keith commented that the forest land conversions described here are out of Teal’s direct control but these proposals are referred to affected Licensees for comments.

Chief Andy Alex asked if the transfer of Parks to Municipalities would fit into this line. He added that “We as a PAG group should be saying something”.

Keith Chapman responded that Parks transfers would not necessarily be referred to Licensees as they remain Parks. The transfer would not be seen as affecting Licensees since they do not operate within them so changes in management would not be referred to Licensees.

Al Stobbart commented that the transfer may mean that the Park plan or management may change under new jurisdictions. For example, certain parks in which hunting is currently allowed may see it closed to this activity following changes to individual park status.

Jim Baker commented that some of these areas can be left for gathering mushrooms. “There is a place in the Nahatlatch where they logged and a fire got away and now the mushrooms are gone. These mushrooms will never come back”.

Ron Frank noted that Jim Baker had raised a new Value (Mushrooms) and this will need to be taken up at the next review of the Criterion and Indicators once the current set has been completed.

John Warren commented that the practice of building roads removes land from the productive landbase. He added that the East Anderson area is heavily roaded.

Keith Chapman responded that the issue surrounding the impacts of roads on the productive landbase is addressed in a separate line.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

A brief discussion at the Table suggested that the Value be changed to clarify the road issue. The line was changed to read: “Minimize productive area permanently lost to urbanization, agriculture, mines and other non-forest uses **other than access roads**”.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-5. Sharie Conroy 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-5 approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-6

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-6. Keith explained that the term “Species at Risk” is defined according to the Identified Wildlife Management Strategy which refines the term to mean species that are at risk due to forest and range management [see footnote 1 on page 3 of 42]. Keith explained that the management for species at risk is best handled at the Landscape level. By complying with these Landscape level plans contained in Government Action Regulations Orders Teal can actively manage these species. These Orders set aside areas or prescribe other management for Species at Risk.

Sharie Conroy asked if this planning identifies the individual habitat requirements of these species.

Keith Chapman explained that the Identified Wildlife Management Strategy is a document that addresses Species at Risk. The document describes the species, its habitat requirements, its current threats and status and outlines management strategies. These strategies are then included into the government Orders and Regulations.

Al Stobbart commented that the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) has a good web site for this information.

Action Item: 9D Distribute web links to the Identified Wildlife Management Strategy, Species at Risk and COSEWIC.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: Feb 20, 2007

Heather Morlacci commented that the Sensitive Habitat Inventory and Mapping tool on the Web may have some important information that may be of help. She added that Brad Mason of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Rob Knight of the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection [now the Ministry of Environment] listed as contacts for SHIM have maps of watershed classification and a 142 page report. There is also an Atlas of Fraser River Watershed information on their website [see above for the web link under line 1-1].

Kevin Stanczyk commented that there is a plant – Tall bugbane – that is listed as a species at risk in the Chilliwack Forest District. This plant is known to be located outside of the Defined Forest Area. Kevin suggested that the Indicator for this line specify that it only addresses Species at Risk that occur within the DFA. Kevin added that the Forest Stewardship Plan identifies those species that are known to occur within the DFA.

Keith Chapman responded that these Indicators and Targets are naturally assumed to only address those values that occur within the DFA. However, each line of VOITs will have a detailed indicator description that is used for clarification of items like this. However, it would help to refine the Indicator and help the Auditor assess the Target.

A brief discussion at the Table determined that this clarification be included into the Indicator for this line. The Indicator was changed to: "Compliance with Government Action Regulations Orders related to Species at Risk **for those species listed in the Forest Stewardship Plan.**"

Ron Frank addressed the reference to SHIM. Ron suggested that this new information be evaluated for its role or appropriateness towards Sustainable Forest Management

Action Item: 9E Teal to review SHIM for appropriateness to Sustainable Forest Management.
Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-6 with the noted changes. Garry Davidson^{1st}, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-6 approved as changed.

Criterion – Element: 1-6 a

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-6a. Keith explained that the "6 a" denoted a new line on this table that is not on earlier drafts. This line addresses the management of established Wildlife Habitat Areas that are made legal by government Orders. Similar to OGMAs, these areas have some operational flexibility in order to allow the area to be re-aligned in order to refine the habitat they contain and allow harvesting in low value habitat. Similar to the OGMAs, the net area must be retained. The Identified Wildlife Management Strategy describes the habitat characteristics that need to be maintained.

Kevin Stanczyk added that there may be some harvesting in Wildlife Habitat Areas for very specific reasons, but they must replace the area.

A brief discussion at the Table suggested that the Target be changed by deleting the word "reduction" which is repeated.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-6a with the noted changes. Sharie Conroy 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-6a approved as changed.

Criterion – Element: 1-7

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line is addressed in Line 1-5.

Criterion – Element: 1-8

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line is addressed in Line 1-6 and 1-6a. .

Criterion – Element: 1-9

Keith Chapman explained that there are 3 sub species of Mountain Beaver. The subspecies shown on this line is the only one that occurs within the DFA and that it is a "Blue listed" species which is not included in Species at Risk. [see footnote 2 on page 4 of 42] Mountain Beavers require habitat near streams (Riparian areas). The idea behind this line is that by maintaining Riparian Reserve Zones and Riparian Management Zones (RMZs allow harvesting) that the habitat needs for this species will be maintained.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

John Warren commented that class “5” and “6” streams [streams without fish] do not have leave strips (reserves) and therefore if Mtn Beavers are located near non fish streams they will not have a reserve.

Keith Chapman responded that there is still a Riparian Management Zone on these non-fish streams and the Forest Stewardship Plan prescribes levels of retention in these zones. He added that this species is “blue listed” which means it is of concern but not endangered.

Kevin Stanczyk added that in the Forest Stewardship Plan there is a commitment of greater than or equal to 0% retention on S6 streams so it is not buffered. Kevin suggested adding “where Mountain Beaver sites are known” to this line.

[S6 stream = non fish stream with a defined channel of less than or equal to 3.0 meters in width; S5 streams are non-fish streams greater than 3.0 meters wide]

Chief Andy Alex asked if there are trap lines in these areas. Logging destroys a lot of trap lines.

Keith Chapman responded that trap lines could be located in these areas.

Kevin Stanczyk added that Teal Jones sends referral letters to all of the known trappers about the FSP and they are given an opportunity to respond. There are approximately 12 trappers within the DFA.

Jim Baker said that the table had earlier asked about what species were endangered.

Keith Chapman responded that this request was addressed in the documents distributed at meeting # 4 held on October 30th. Keith showed the table the document: “*Conservation Data Center – Red and Blue Listed Plant and Animal Species in the Chilliwack Forest District*” which lists all of the Red and Blue listed species.

Jim Baker said that he did not have a copy. Keith Chapman said he would get a new copy to Jim.

Action Item: 9F Teal to propose a management solution to Mountain Beaver habitat protection issue.

Environment Dept. Teal Jones Due Date: March 13, 2007

Criterion – Element: 1-10

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-10. Keith explained that the Indicator for this line is in reference to the *Order Establishing Provincial Non-Spatial Old Growth Objectives* which specifies the amount of Old growth that must be maintained in Landscape Units without established objectives. The amounts of Old Growth to be retained across the landscape are prescribed according to the Landscape Unit, the Biogeoclimatic zone and subzone and the Natural Disturbance Type (NDT). There are 4 recognized NDT's in BC. NDT 1 is a typical wet coastal forest which is not often affected by disturbance apart from windthrow. In comparison, NDT 4 is a grassland community that has a fire return interval of as few as 3 years (repeated disturbance). The other two NDTs are gradients between these types.

Chief Andy Alex commented that he is very concerned about Highway 99 construction. “There are different values here which we need to keep in mind.”

Ron Frank responded that the Table is currently managing the set of Values that has been forward to date. Any “new” Values will need to be incorporated into the subsequent revisions of the Criterion and Indicator set.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-9. Bruce Edwards 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-9 approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-10 a

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-10a. This line is very similar to the previous line which incorporates OGMA as an indicator of habitat [i.e. line 1-4].

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-10a. Bruce Edwards 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-10a approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-11

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-11. This line is very similar to the previous line which incorporates stand level retention as an indicator for habitat [i.e. line 1-2].

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-11. Sharie Conroy 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-11 approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-12

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-12. This line is identical to the previous line which incorporates Coarse Woody Debris as a site level indicator for habitat [i.e. line 1-3].

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-12. Sharie Conroy 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-12 approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-13

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line (Species at Risk) is addressed in lines 1-6 and 1-6a.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Criterion – Element: 1-14

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line (Species at Risk) is addressed in lines 1-6 and 1-6a.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Criterion – Element: 1-14 a

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-14a. Keith described how Spotted Owl, a Species at Risk, has been addressed in a separate initiative – the Spotted Owl Recovery Team. This initiative has developed **Special Resource Management Zones (SRMZs)** and directions that outline habitat management for this species. Keith added that the objectives set out in the SRMZs are many and as such problematic to be audited regularly. By setting the Indicator and Target around Teal's compliance with Teal's FSP the auditor can quickly assess this Target.

Ron Frank suggested that this FSP section be distributed to members.

Action Item: 9G Distribute Section 7.2.2.2 of Teal's FSP to members.

Environment Dept. Teal Jones Due Date: Feb 20, 2007

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-14a. Garry Davidson 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-14a approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-15

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line (Native bird species) is addressed in lines 1-2, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6 and 1-6a.

Sharie Conroy commented that Linda Bass lives about 1 km from Sharie. She sees a big white owl living there. They hoot in the spring. Sharie added that they need to be identified as they are seeing fewer and fewer owls all the time.

Keith Chapman responded that Raptors show up as a Value that is addressed further down in the Table [line 1-17]. Keith added that it is against the law to disturb an active raptor nest or the raptor itself.

Ron Frank commented that Keith has done what the Table has asked him to do – to consolidate the Values etc where possible.

Criterion – Element: 1-16

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line (Native bird species) is addressed in lines 1-2, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6 and 1-6a.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Criterion – Element: 1-17

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-17. Keith noted that the Value should be changed to **Raptors** from "Eagles" in order to be more inclusive.

Sharie Conroy commented that there is an eagle's nest above her home. She hasn't located the nest but a neighbour has seen it flying back and forth from what must be a nest.

John Pichugin asked Sharie if she or Linda Bass could help Teal by identifying the nest location. That would be a really big help.

No other comments were put forward from the Table.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-17 as amended. Sharie Conroy 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-17 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 1-18

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line (Species at Risk) is addressed in lines 1-6 and 1-6a.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Criterion – Element: 1-19

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-19. Keith said that this Concern was expressed by a Member as that Member was describing issues regarding the use of pesticides vs. local contractor for the manual treatment of brush. Keith said that he was not sure if the Member wanted to include Hardwoods as a Value.

John Warren responded that hardwoods are valuable in that they do have timber value and due to their shorter rotation length can be of important economic value. He added that people do not like the use of herbicides.

Ron Frank commented that this concern is highlighting other new Values. These new Values will need to be addressed after the initial set of Values is addressed by the Table.

Action Item: 9H Note the new Values of “Hardwoods in Forest Management” and “Herbicide Use” for inclusion in the first revision of the Criterion and Indicator Set.

Environment Dept. / Fraser PAG Due Date: TBA

Criterion – Element: 1-20

Keith Chapman explained that the Value of “Salmon” is addressed under the Soil and Water Criteria.

Criterion – Element: 1-21

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-21. Keith informed the Table that he had asked staff at the Conservation Data Center (CDC) if they had any information or criteria for what tree species or characteristics may be described as “Rare or Unique”. The CDC was not able to offer any parameters around this Value. The staff at the CDC informed Keith that they would take the issue up with the staff biologist to see if he or she would have some ideas.

Ron Frank commented that there has been an expression of the importance of trees that are significant to local people. Ron suggested that this Value may go to the To Do list for the next Criterion and Indicator review.

Sharie Conroy suggested that foresters at the Mission Tree Farm may have some information on this. Sharie suggested that Kelly Cameron or Bob O’Neill may be good people to talk to at the Mission Tree Farm.

Action Item: 9I Talk to local foresters about what trees may be rare or unique to the area.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

Criterion – Element: 1-22

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-22. Keith explained that this line is one that occurs in virtually all Criterion and Indicator sets from other PAGs. Keith explained how the Chief Forester's Standards for Seed Use addresses genetic biodiversity by ensuring that seed is properly collected, inventoried, stored and used so that poor genes are not broadcast into the landscape. Keith added that, by planting seedlings from this seed, the genetic diversity is increased and improved. The seed is selected from "good parents" that demonstrate good tree form and vigour. The seed is collected and used in set areas so that genes are not taken out of their natural environment. The planted seedlings put these genes into the harvested area while there is still natural re-seeding from the wild trees in and around the cutblock. Keith added that most of the seedlings come from seed except for Yellow Cedar which is a poor seed producer. Yellow Cedar is often propagated from cuttings and these cuttings must meet separate standards within the Chief Forester's guidelines.

No comments were put forward from the Table

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 1-22. Sharie Conroy 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 1-22 approved.

Criterion – Element: 1-23

Keith Chapman explained that the Value expressed on this line is addressed in line 1-22.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Criterion – Element: 1-24

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-24. This Value is addressed in lines 1-6 and 1-6a.

Al Stobbart commented there is a lot of ongoing debate surrounding genetic distinction between Bull Trout and Dollie Varden. They interbreed and this seems to result in Bull Trout which carry recessive Dollie Varden genes.

Criterion – Element: 1-25

Keith Chapman reviewed line 1-25. No specific Values were put forward for this Element (*Protected Areas and Sites of Special Biological Significance*)

A brief discussion resulted at the Table regarding bear and cougar dens etc. Sharie Conroy commented that they often have bears but suspects that they den in the caves in the hills nearby.

Kevin Stanczyk commented that Teal protects bear dens and have even pruned bear den trees to make them more wind firm.

Action Item: 9J Keith Chapman to look into the Value of Bear Dens to see where it fits into the Criterion and Indicator set.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

Action Item: 9K Keith Chapman to find examples of Protected Areas and Sites of Special Significance and share with the Fraser PAG.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

Criterion – Element: 2-1

Keith reviewed line 2-1. Keith explained how invasive species pose a threat to Forest Ecosystem Resilience. “Resilience” refers to the ecosystem’s ability to re-establish itself after a disturbance such as windthrow. After such disturbance, invasive species in the area may overtake the area and prevent the ecosystem from responding naturally. The result could be that the site is completely dominated by invasive species. Stanley Park has a problem with English Ivy. The ivy poses a threat to the areas windthrown in the latest storms. Keith added that there is a section in Teal’s FSP that addresses invasive plants but he is waiting for the FSP to be approved as the section may change.

Kevin Stanczyk commented that the FSP’s measures to manage invasive plants involves grass seeding areas ¼ of a hectare or larger that have exposed soils near invasive seed sources or other similar risks to invasive plants.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Ron Frank suggested that Keith review this line and the FSP to see if the Indicator and Target can be completed.

Action Item: 9L Keith Chapman to review the FSP section on Invasive Plants and Line 2-1 to see if this line can be completed.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

Criterion – Element: 2-2

Keith Chapman reviewed line 2-2. The Value is supported by the concept of targeting unhealthy, damaged or at risk stands for harvest where it makes economic sense. These harvested stands would then be replanted with healthy forests.

Sharie Conroy asked if this approach would remove resistant trees with the damaged trees.

Keith Chapman responded that is a good question. There are a number of issues to consider. These stands are often more dangerous to work in and leaving individual trees increases that danger. Also, in the case of root disease (mostly fungi), the disease likely has not affected these trees but after salvaging the harvested stumps supply food for the fungus which then will attack the remaining trees with more vigour. Also these areas are typically quite small and economically marginal. Leaving trees will also make salvage more expensive.

No other comments were put forward by the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 2-2. Bruce Edwards 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 2-2 approved.

Criterion – Element: 2-3 and 2-4

Keith Chapman reviewed line 2-3 and line 2-4 together. Keith explained that these two lines provide separate Indicators and Targets towards Successful Regeneration. Line 2-3's Target is involves regeneration inventories conducted between 3 and 6 years after harvest. The harvested area must meet the standard or it must be fill planted to improve the number of crop trees.

Line 2-4 is similar but the inventory and assessment is typically conducted between 12 and 20 years after harvest. This allows the brush and other competition to express itself as well as any diseases etc. The trees are assessed for their 'Free Growing' status. A Free Growing tree is one that is expected to perform well and not be impacted by brush.

No comments were put forward by the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 2-3. Sharie Conroy 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 2-3 approved.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 2-4. Al Stobbart 1st, Chief Sidney Douglas 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 2-4 approved.

Criterion – Element: 2-5

Keith Chapman reviewed line 2-5. Keith commented that this line is a pretty standard line adopted by most PAGs.

No comments were put forward by the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 2-5. Bruce Edwards 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 2-5 approved.

Ron Frank asked the Table if anyone was staying for supper after the meeting. No members wanted to stay.

Ron Frank suggested that, in light of the current pace and the time, that the Table skip Criterion 3 for the time being and address Criterion 4 next.

Criterion – Element: 4-1

Keith Chapman commented that this line is dependent on the work that the Sub-committee on Community Access to Fiber. The committee is expected to report on February 20th.

Criterion – Element: 4-2

Keith Chapman reviewed line 4-2.

John Pichugin commented that this Target (Reforest in 1 year) may be tough to accomplish. The Target should also address the fact that harvesting takes time – a year or more in some cases.

Keith Chapman responded that the Target may be changed. He had talked to the forester who said that virtually all harvested areas are planted within a year of harvest completion. Seedlings are ordered as much as 2 years in advance and the Seed Use guidelines can make it difficult to grow the trees for the right area at the right time. Harvesting can be driven by weather, markets etc.

Sharie Conroy commented that in sensitive sites there needs to be a tight timeline around reforesting these areas to limit erosion.

Ron Frank responded that planting seedlings will not affect erosion in the first few years as they are quite small.

Keith Chapman commented that the Hydrology presentation had informed us that most slides occur (if they are going to occur) within one year. Seedlings will not help against this.

A brief discussion at the Table suggested that the Target be changed to “Reforest **90%** of harvested areas within 1 year **and 100% within 2 years**”

Ron Frank suggested that this line be left for Teal to thoroughly review. Ron asked the Table if they would be able to support this line as amended pending Teal’s review. Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 4-2. Al Stobbart 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 4-2 approved pending Teal’s review.

Action Item: 9M Teal Jones to review line 4-2 to determine what Targets are achievable.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: March 13, 2007

Criterion – Element: 4-3

Keith Chapman reviewed line 4-3. The idea around the Indicator and Target for this Value is that the salvage of damaged timber and the subsequent reforestation will replace areas with

damaged or dying forests with healthy forests and subsequently change a net release of Carbon Dioxide to a net sink of Carbon Dioxide.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 4-3. Chief Sidney Douglas 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 4-3 approved.

Criterion – Element: 4-4

Keith Chapman reviewed line 4-4. Keith commented that this line was reviewed and amended by the PAG at Meeting #6.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 4-4. Bruce Edwards 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 4-4 approved.

Criterion – Element: 4-5

Keith Chapman reviewed line 4-5. Keith Chapman explained that the use of seedlings with good genes that had superior growth will enhance carbon uptake and storage in forest products.

The Table noted that the Target would read better if the word “seed” was moved to the end. The line to read “100% of seedlings from Class “A” or Class “B” **seed.**”

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 4-5 as amended. Bruce Edwards 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 4-5 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 4-6

Keith Chapman reviewed line 4-6. Keith commented that the Target of 7% was a result of the changes discussed at Meeting #6.

John Warren asked why all in block roads that do not go anywhere are not rehabilitated and put back into forest after harvesting.

Keith Chapman responded that the comments raised at earlier meetings have said that roads are expensive to build and they provide important access for silviculture, fire fighting etc.

John Pichugin commented that it is expensive to rehabilitate roads. That poses a question: “Are these dollars better spent on schools, hospitals etc or is it better to spend the money on rebuilding roads?” John added (“to be candid”) that Teal is not prepared to de-build all in-block roads. Teal takes advantage of roadside areas to grow trees and they grow trees as close as possible to the road’s running surface in order to minimize the amount of area not growing trees. They try to grow as many trees as possible.

Keith Chapman added that, at rotation age, there is near canopy closure over the road. As a result there is a very minimal loss of growing capacity. There may be room for a single strip of trees down the center line of the road.

John Warren said that he is concerned that they do not de-build roads.

Jim Baker asked why the in-block spur roads are not ‘put to sleep’ (debuilt and planted)?

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

John Warren said he was concerned that there is a Target of 7%. We should be trying to do better than the legal maximum. There should be some good numbers to work with – we should know what was achieved in terms for road area. It is not enough to simply accept that 7% is lost growing site.

Keith Chapman responded that it is difficult to determine what an overall Target should be. Is it 4, 5 or 6%? Teal operates in very different drainages in different years. As such it is difficult to extrapolate the experience in one drainage or year and set that as the Target for the other years and drainages.

Ron Frank said that there is an expressed concern to know what is being achieved in terms of permanent road area. This should be flagged for future reference. Teal can report what was achieved. Ron asked the Table if they could accept the line and make it subject to studying what is the effective percentage.

Kevin Stanczyk said that they have the individual percent degrade in their database. This could be tallied and used to provide an idea of what is the actual percentage may be.

Sharie Conroy asked if the terrain conditions were described if that would answer the problem.

A brief discussion at the Table resulted in the suggestion that the Target be amended to say “**Less than 7%**”

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 4-6 as amended and subject to the information requested. Garry Davidson 1st, John Warren 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 4-6 approved as amended and subject to road area information.

Action Item: 9N Teal Jones to provide a summary of Permanent Access Percentage data for the blocks harvested in one year.
--

Environment Dept. Teal Jones

Due Date: March 13, 2007

Sharie Conroy informed the Table that a prospector named Earl Wilder has expressed an interest in a cement plant and a granite/sand quarry in the Hatzic area that will likely propose to remove productive forest landbase.

Ron Frank noted that Garry Davidson needed to leave at 3:30 pm. Keith Chapman suggested that the Table turn to Criterion 6: *Accepting Society's Responsibilities for Sustainable Development*.

Criterion – Element: 6-1

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-1. This line is targeted towards building contact with First Nations and providing opportunities to communicate Aboriginal issues.

A brief discussion at the Table resulted in the suggestion to include the word ‘individual’ into the Indicator. The Indicator to read: “Opportunities for **individual** First Nations participation in the Fraser Public Advisory Group.”

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-1 as amended. Chief Andy Alex 1st, Chief Sidney Douglas 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 6-1 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 6-2

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-2. Keith explained that this line was similar to 6-1. It was felt that the individual pre-meeting contacts with First Nations were very constructive. First Nations have a lot on their plate and this effort does help build the relationship and the line of communication as well as participation.

A brief discussion at the Table resulted in including the work “individual” in the Indicator statement as in line 6-1. The Indicator to read: “Number of invitations to **individual** participating First Nations to attend Fraser PAG meetings.”

The Target was amended to “Minimum of 1 **contact** per meeting”

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-2 as amended. Chief Andy Alex 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 6-2 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 6-3

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-3. Keith explained that this line is targeted towards recognizing and respecting Aboriginal and Treaty Rights by having the relationship and concerns developed into a protocol agreement with Teal.

John Warren commented that there should be an economic component as the Aboriginal Right includes “Title” and this means that there is an ownership of the resources.

Ron Frank explained that he had looked into the issues surrounding Title. He explained that it is the Crown’s obligation to consult with First Nations and accommodate where there is an infringement.

A detailed discussion followed around the issue of Title.

John Warren said that May Trucking has an agreement to accommodate the Boston Bar First Nation with payments and jobs. It is happening so it is not as if the company is not open to doing this.

Chief Sidney Douglas said that Business has their view of accommodating, First Nations have their view and Canada has its view. Our Nations are all working on a Consultation process. Our view is that even though BC is supposed to consult and accommodate, Teal Jones has the timber rights and anything delegated under BC is also the BC government and they (BC government) need to talk to First Nations. It is good what Teal Jones is doing. It is better than what other companies have done in the past.

A detailed discussion followed on the wording of the line. The value was amended to read “**Traditional Territories**”. The Objective was amended to read “**Recognize and respect Traditional Territories of individual First Nations occurring in the Defined Forest Area**”. The Indicator and Target were changed by including the word “individual” to refer to individual First Nations.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-3 as amended. Chief Sidney Douglas 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, Chief Andy Alex abstained. Line 6-3 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 6-4

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-4. The section 7.2.7.2 (*Conservation and Protection of Cultural Heritage Resources*) of Teals unapproved FSP was put up on the screen. Keith explained that the best way to monitor the management of something as complex and diverse as Cultural Heritage resources for over 20 First Nations and provide a good indicator was to use Teal's compliance with this section of the FSP.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-4. Chief Sidney Douglas 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, Line 6-4 approved.

Criterion – Element: 6-5

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-5. Keith explained that the opportunities for economic development and employment are issues that need to be discussed on an individual basis and developed into protocol agreements. Keith said that the term "addressed" in this statement allows for a difference of ideas between the two parties. Where the two parties do not come together there could be an agreement to disagree.

There was a detailed discussion on the wording on this line. The issue of revenue sharing was debated. The Table suggested that the Indicator be amended to include the words "**and revenue sharing**" after the words "economic development".

John Pichugin said that Teal would need to think about this line. It is not practical for Teal to provide this.

Ron Frank suggested that the way to address this issue may be to draft a new line (**line 6-5a**):

Proponent: Boston Bar First Nation

Value: "Revenue sharing",

Objective: "Explore opportunities for employment and economic development"

Indicator: "Percentage of concerns related to revenue sharing brought forward by First Nations during the protocol development process, that are addressed in the agreement"

Target: "100%"

Ron Frank said that this issue (line 6-5a) will take a while to consider. Ron suggested that this be included in the set of "to do" items for the next review of Criterion and Indicators.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-5 unchanged. Al Stobbart 1st, Chief Sidney Douglas 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, Chief Andy Alex abstained. Line 6-5 approved.

Criterion – Element: 6-6

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-6. Keith explained that this line is built around ensuring that First Nations have reasonable access to any of their Traditional Territories in order to conduct their traditional uses.

A brief discussion resulted in amending the Indicator to read "Number of concerns regarding forest access brought forward by First Nations associated with the DFA **that are** not adequately resolved."

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-6 as amended. Chief Sidney Douglas 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. Line 6-6 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 6-7

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-7. Keith explained that accommodating First Nation's requests for timber are best addressed in individual protocol agreements.

A brief discussion resulted in amending the Objective to read: "**Meeting First Nation's requests for** timber for cultural use"

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-7 as amended. Chief Sidney Douglas 1st, Garry Davidson 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, Chief Andy Alex abstained. Line 6-7 approved as amended.

Criterion – Element: 6-8

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-8. Keith explained that this line was targeted towards gathering solid feedback on the Fraser PAG process in order to ensure that it is meeting their needs. The questionnaire would be very similar to the questionnaire that members at the October 6th meeting filled out. This questionnaire could be adapted in order to ensure that there are good "measures" of satisfaction.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-8. Bruce Edwards 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 6-8 approved.

Criterion – Element: 6-9

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-9. Keith explained that this line would ensure that the Table had adequate representation of the interested sectors and that it was reviewed at least annually.

No comments were put forward from the Table.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-9. Al Stobbart 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 6-9 approved.

Criterion – Element: 6-10

Keith Chapman reviewed line 6-10. Keith explained that the Target was left blank as he was not sure of how many and over what period meetings would be needed by Communities.

Sharie Conroy commented that Peter Kokoska logs a woodlot near the community. As he comes from the community he knows what the community is concerned about. This is something that we hope to achieve with Teal.

A brief discussion resulted in the Objective being amended to read: "To build local communities' trust in Teal's forest management through **public** meetings".

There was a detailed discussion regarding the Indicator and Target for this Objective.

Ron Frank suggested that the number and timing of meetings will need to be different from year to year as the legal plans are rolled out as well as when logging is being planned in these areas.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Ron suggested that Teal could produce a [Community Communications] Plan early in the year when they have an idea about what communities are involved and the harvest planning timeframes. Teal would have input from the PAG on the Plan. Ron suggested that the Indicator be replaced with the following statement: **“The number of public meetings held according to the [Community Communications] Plan”**. The Target would then be **“The number of public meeting held according to the Plan”**

Ron Frank asked the Table if this would be a workable solution to achieve the objective. A brief discussion followed in regards to what the plan would be. Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 6-10. Sharie Conroy 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. Line 6-10 approved.

Ron Frank concluded the work on the Criterion and Indicator set.

Summary of New Values

Ron summarized the new Values or Concerns that came out of today's meeting:

1. Jim Baker – Mushroom picking areas

Al Stobbart suggested that these may areas of Special Significance

John Warren commented that they have addressed harvesting plans and had them changed to protect mushroom sites.

2. Sharie Conroy – Accessible Old Growth for hikers

3. Jim Baker – Adequate information from the Ministry of Environment for information about rare or endangered species so there are no major investments in constructed roads etc that due to habitat conflicts.

4. Heather Morlacci – Blue Heron(s)

5. Salmon [line 1-20]

6. John Warren – herbicide use and community consultation

7. John Warren – Hardwoods role in forest management (fiber / ecology / economics)

8. Sharie Conroy – Wildlife dens (bear, cougar, bobcat)

9. Sharie Conroy – genetic resistance to pests (e.g. when they are salvaging)

10. John Warren – The loss of productive growing sites and permanent access structures

Ron Frank concluded the meeting and thanked the members for their good work and the day's accomplishment.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held February 20, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack at 4:30 AM to 7:30 PM