

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #10 Minutes: Criteria and Indicator Review (Continued)

February 20, 2007

1. Call to order

Ron Frank, Fraser PAG Facilitator, called the 10th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 4:35 p.m. on February 20, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Al Stobbert, Inch Creek Hatchery	Garry Davidson, Seabird Island Indian Band	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Kerry Grozier, District Manager, MOFR
Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association

Members Absent:

Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Gurdev Sidhu, Agriculture	Mark Bond, Reo Rafting
Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation
Earl Graham, United Steel Workers	Ken Webb, Agriculture	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Gordon Sherwood, Cacus Point Resident	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident	Steve Harvey, Hope Machine Shop.

Others Present:

April Choquette, Teal	Heather Morlacci, Observer	Kevin Stanczyk, Teal
Brian Taylor, May Trucking	John Pichugin, Teal	Ron Frank, Facilitator
Ed McWaters, May Trucking	Keith Chapman, Teal	

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #10 Agenda

2. Fraser PAG Information Tracking System – List of Completed Tasks
3. Fraser PAG Information Tracking System – List of Outstanding Tasks
4. Fraser PAG Meeting #9 Minutes (Criterion and Indicator Workshop)
5. Info & Links to Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification Zones
6. FPAG Meeting Evaluation (membership survey) Form – Feb 19/07 - DRAFT
7. Excerpt from Teal's unapproved Forest Stewardship Plan – Section 7.2.2.2 *Spotted Owl*
8. Excerpt from Teal's unapproved Forest Stewardship Plan – Section 7.2.7 *Objectives set by Government for Cultural Heritage Resources*
9. Excerpt from Teal's "Forest Stewardship Plan Supporting Information" document – Section 7.2.7 – *Cultural Heritage Resources*

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 welcomed and introduced Kerry Grozier who had not attended a number of recent meetings. Ron introduced April Choquette and asked the table to introduce themselves. Members introduced themselves.

6. Review Agenda for Meeting #10 / Adapt / Ratify

Ron Frank asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #10. John Pichugin commented that he appreciated Members coming out to meetings and the commitment that Members have to represent their respective sectors and First Nations. He thanked Members for this effort.

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. Garry Davidson 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd, all Members were in favour - none opposed. The Agenda was ratified.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes: Review for ratification

Ron Frank informed the Table that the meetings will be recorded. The minutes will record Members' comments and Members should review the Minutes to ensure that they are correct in terms of the meaning and intent and not necessarily for each word spoken. Ron Frank asked members to put forward any revisions to the minutes from the **January 30th Meeting (#8)** meeting.

Sharie Conroy said that she had noted a few typos but had lost where they were located. Sharie added that she wanted to clarify her comments regarding community meetings with Teal [page 11, 3rd paragraph]. She wanted to ensure that what she meant was that these meetings would be both ways: Teal holding community meetings and also Teal attending meetings such as the Rate Payers' meetings. Sharie wanted more than Teal's public meetings.

Ron Frank said that Keith will review the minutes for typos.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Keith Chapman responded to Sharie Conroy that he had understood that she had meant that the meetings would be a “two-way street”. Keith added that Teal would need to be formally invited by the community groups to their meetings.

Kevin Stanczyk pointed out that the 2nd sentence of the 3rd last paragraph on page 12 did not make sense and did not add to the intent of what was said so it should be simply deleted.

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. Garry Davidson 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. The minutes were adopted as changed.

8. Criterion and Indicator Review: Criterion 3 – Soil and Water

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to begin reviewing Criterion 3 – Soil and Water. Keith Chapman displayed the Table of Draft Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets for the Soil and Water Criterion on the overhead projector.

Keith Chapman explained the “Line” numbering system. The first number is the CCFM Criterion and the second number is the line # under that Criterion (i.e. Line 3-1 is Criterion 3 and line 1 under that Criterion).

Criterion - Line: 3-1 to 3-7

Keith explained that the Lines 3-1 to 3-7 were moved to the Multiple Benefits Criterion (Criterion 5), specifically lines 5-10 to line 5-11c. They were moved as the Values expressed were not really Soil or Water values (Community safety) but were more aligned to the “fair distribution of benefits and costs”.

Criterion - Line: 3-8

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that a similar Indicator and Target was used for line 4-6. The Table at the Feb 10th meeting had amended the Target to read: “Less than 7.0%”.

Keith Chapman commented that the “As Built Road” information distributed at the last meeting did not have information on the amount of road rehabilitated. Keith explained that he had asked Teal’s forester if any had been done over the same period and the forester said that there was no rehabilitation in that time period.

A brief discussion at the Table suggested that the Target for line 3-8 be changed to “Maximum of 7% per year” and the Indicator clarifies what the percentage pertains to by changing it to read “Average annual Percentage **of in block** Permanent Access Structures”.

Jim Baker asked why has Teal not done any deactivation.

Brian Taylor responded that they had done deactivation but had not done any rebuilding.

Ron Frank said that the Table needs to get the indicators ‘pegged’ down so that they can talk knowledgeably about the data and these things regularly.

Ed McWaters commented about the terms used with respect to roads. **Deactivation** means taking out culverts and bridges and ensuring that water is running down ditches and not on the

road surface. The term **Rehabilitation** refers to pulling the road apart, re-contouring the slope and replanting with trees.

John Pichugin commented that it is Teal's intent to plant everything they possibly can.

Ron Frank commented that Teal selects harvesting systems to meet these goals. If they are exceeded, they can rehabilitate the site and bring the area back to compliance.

John Pichugin commented that in the Forest Practices Code days, Compliance and Enforcement could find Teal out of compliance and fine them or worse.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-8 as changed. Keith Warrener 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-8 approved as changed.

Criterion - Line: 3-8a

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that soil disturbance in terms of Forestry is broken into three components: compaction, scalping and rutting. Keith reviewed the Target and that the percentages for each soil sensitivity type are based on existing guidelines. The soil sensitivity is derived by evaluating the soil's characteristics as well as the steepness and the length of the slope. The "roadside work area" is an area along the edge of roads that is heavily used for machines walking off the road into the slash and where logs are decked, processed and sorted.

Sharie Conroy commented that somewhere in the Soil and Water discussions that she had raised the concern about the connections between the amount of rainfall, harvesting, canopy removal, and soil disturbance and stream flow / run-off. We would really like a base "number" for rainfall and stream flow/run-off from before logging to compare to post logging results.

Ron Frank responded that this is an item that has been placed in the "to-do items" and is part of the work of the Sub-committee on Sites of Special Significance.

Keith Chapman responded that Drew Brayshaw had told the Table in his presentation (Jan 9, 2007) that it is problematic to correlate rainfall with stream discharge as you need a lot of background data. Also monitoring one stream will not necessarily tell you what is happening in the rest of the watershed or other streams. Drew had said it is better to look at the amount and timing of harvesting to manage stream flows and their reaction to storm events. We will try to find a resolution during our sub-committee work

Kerry Grozier asked if the "Roadside Work Area" was defined somehow.

Keith Chapman responded that to his knowledge it was not formally defined (in legislation) apart from the expectation that it referred to the areas along the roads where logging activity (decking, processing and sorting) took place.

Ron Frank proposed that the term be clarified and the line be ratified subject to the final wording.

Action Item: 10A Keith Chapman to distribute soil sensitivity forms

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

Action Item: 10B Keith Chapman to clarify the Roadside Work Area and put it into final language.

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

Action Item: 10C Keith Chapman to look into baseline data for rainfall and run-off to identify the effects of harvesting.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-8a subject to the definition of Roadside Work Areas. Al Stobbart 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-8a approved subject to the definition of Roadside Work Areas.

Criterion - Line: 3-9

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that the line had been amended at a previous meeting to include the words "after 1994" and the Target of Zero.

Brian Taylor asked if the Target of Zero is from 1994 or on an annual basis.

Keith Chapman responded that this would be reported on an annual basis.

Kerry Grozier asked whether a landslide is defined.

Keith Chapman responded that landslides are defined as a certain mass of material moving a certain distance.

Ron Frank called for any questions or comments from the Table. No other questions or comments came from the Table

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-9. Al Stobbart 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-9 approved.

Action Item: 10D Keith Chapman to provide definition of a landslide and related types of mass wasting

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

Criterion - Line: 3-10

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that the line had been amended at a previous meeting to include the words "after 1994" and the Target of Zero.

Jim Baker asked if Teal would be responsible for cutblocks even though they have completely left the area and much time has passed. Does that mean that they are still responsible?

Keith explained that Teal's obligation on cutblocks exists until the block is declared Free Growing (i.e. the block is fully regenerated with healthy trees that are free of brush competition). The time between harvest and a Free Growing declaration is anywhere from 8 to 20 years. After the block is declared Free Growing and the Ministry of Forests accepts that assessment, the block will no longer be under Teal's obligation. Should a slide occur after the block has been accepted as Free Growing it will not be tallied against Teal.

Ron Frank commented that the Hydrologist speaker, Drew Brayshaw, had repeatedly stated that landslides occur naturally.

Keith Chapman added that Drew had said that if landslides occur they typically occur a year or two after logging.

Ron Frank called for any questions or comments from the Table. No other questions or comments came from the Table

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-10. Garry Davidson 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-10 approved.

Criterion - Line: 3-11

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith Chapman explained that the term “reportable spills” is a set term that is set out by the government. There is a list of hazardous materials and their respective reportable amounts. “Reportable” means reportable to the Ministry of Environment. For example any spill of antifreeze to land is reportable.

Ron Frank added that the “reportable” amount is quite a bit lower than the reportable amount to land.

Brian Taylor commented that the Target of Zero may not be achievable. Stuff happens out there. A machine breaks a hose and 40 liters can be lost quickly. Should we not be setting a Target of something like 5? We know that we want to Target “zero” but things happen in the real world.

Bruce Edwards said that on the other hand if we set a target to something like 5 that gives the company 5 free ones.

Brian Taylor said that zero is what you want but you also want a realistic target.

Ron Frank responded that this line is very similar to other indicators developed by other PAGs. We may want to consider a variance.

Keith Warrener suggested that the Variance be set to up to 3 per year.

Jim Baker commented that there is a certain amount of drips and spills from equipment and often it is related to maintenance.

Keith Chapman responded that this line deals with reportable spills which are significant quantities.

Bruce Edwards asked what happens if the Target is not met. Is there remedial action?

Ron Frank responded that they are always required to take remedial action in respect to reportable spills. They have to clean it up.

Keith Chapman commented that reportable spills are reported to the government and remedial action is determined.

Sharie Conroy asked if the Target was in relation to individual machines. If there are three spills from the same machine that would indicate a maintenance or operator problem and would be a considerable problem.

Ron Frank asked for a motion to adopt the Variance that Keith Warrener proposed.

Kerry Grozier commented that he did not feel that the Target is not clear. We need to see what is set as “reportable”.

Keith Chapman responded that he could provide a table of reportable quantities by individual material.

Ron Frank asked if the Table was in agreement that the Target should be Zero. "I think we are all in agreement that it should be Zero. We need to set a Variance to allow for the problems that come up and for Teal to be able to adapt".

Keith Warrener said that he would like to withdraw his suggestion of a Variance of three reportable spills until the table of quantities is reviewed. Keith motioned to adopt the Target of Zero

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-11 subject to the information on what is reportable. Keith Warrener 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-11 approved.

Action Item: 10E Keith Chapman to distribute information on Reportable Spills to land and water.

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

Criterion - Line: 3-13

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith Chapman explained that this item was moved to "Multiple Benefits" as it has been linked to the impacts of a variety of Values.

Criterion - Line: 3-14

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith Chapman explained that the idea is to ensure that conifers are established promptly to ensure that steep areas are further protected from erosion.

John Pichugin addressed Sharie Conroy and asked if this was an issue that is in relation to Sites of Special Significance.

Sharie Conroy responded that she understood that any erosion is detrimental to soil productivity. The idea is to stop any erosion in any way we can.

John Pichugin responded that, to be practical, that the Target be changed to a year and a half to allow the snow to sit on the block afterwards and blocks that are being completed now will not be planted this spring. A year and a half will allow the slash to decay and settle down for reforestation.

Sharie Conroy responded that where they are they do not get a snow pack in their area. It is the heavy winter rains that are the problem.

Kerry Grozier commented that erosion is often addressed by grass seeding. The planting of small seedlings will not really limit erosion. If you want to establish root strength that would be another issue.

Sharie Conroy commented that the negative effects of soil erosion and water run-off will be decreased with prompt reforestation. In our area we do not want the faster run-off and the turbidity.

Ron Frank summarized that what we could do is scrap this line. This line goes into both the reforestation indicator and the Sites of Special Significance work. It then becomes redundant. Teal's forester had said that they would be able to plant 85% of the cutblocks within a year and 100% within two years. That would be addressed in the other indicator regarding reforestation. The issue regarding Sensitive Sites should be addressed in the Sub-committee work. Ron Frank asked the Table adopt the removal of line 3-14 and incorporate this issue in the reforestation indicator and the Sites of Special Significance work. The Table agreed to scrap this line in light of how the issues are addressed in the other lines.

Kerry Grozier said that that made more sense to him. The other members at the Table agreed. Line 3-14 was removed. No members opposed this action.

Keith Chapman commented that grass seeding needs to be used with a note of caution as grass can compete with confers and impede their growth. Grass seeding is often restricted to ditches and other areas.

Criterion - Line: 3-15 to line 3-18

Keith Chapman reviewed these lines. The issues of soil productivity were addressed in the previous lines. Line 3-17 is included with the other issues regarding negative impacts from public abuse ("site security" issues) and moved to Multiple Benefits [Line 5-13].

Criterion - Line: 3-19

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained what is meant by "function", nutrients and humus and their roll in soil productivity. The term function is often interchanged with the term: structure. Function refers to the soil's characteristics that allow the soil to breathe (take in oxygen and release carbon dioxide from root respiration), allow water to move through the soil as well as enable roots to penetrate and move through the soil. Keith noted that the Objective should have the work "Maintain" inserted so it would read: "Maintain natural properties and function of forest soils". Keith explained that the protection of soils is addressed in the other lines above that limit soil disturbance and compaction [line 3-8 to 3-11] which affect the soil's function and nutrients.

Keith Chapman commented that line 3-19 recognized the importance of Coarse Woody Debris to supplying and maintaining soil nutrients. The Target is stated as the development of a strategy as it depended in part on the sub-committee's work on community access to fibre and firewood. That sub-committee submitted a draft of their work today.

Al Stobbart asked about what the term "quality" meant in this context.

Keith Chapman responded that there are different characteristics for woody debris. For example, if this debris were chipped it may be of poor quality for long term soil nutrients. These things will need to be worked out in relation to the different ecosystems on the Defined Forest Area.

Kerry Grozier asked if this strategy is about going back out and re-distributing this after harvest. Kerry said that in his mind the soil properties are more affected by the disturbance discussed earlier tonight. Re-distributing this material may likely incur more negative impacts than simply leaving it where it occurs. Kerry added that Coarse Woody Debris is more often managed for its role in providing certain types of habitat.

Keith Chapman explained that Kerry was correct. Keith said that he did not want to simply repeat those lines again. The distribution of Coarse Woody Debris adds to those lines by addressing the issues surrounding the depletion of humus.

Bruce Edwards asked about what was meant under the “Member Interest or Concern” for this line and how it related to the Objective.

Keith Chapman explained that when these tables were drafted he felt that Membership did not have a complete grasp of what was meant by “Value”. The tables noted the Members’ concerns and then interpreted the “Value”. The members concerns revealed the value.

Ron Frank suggested that the Value be changed to read “**The natural** elemental properties of soil: function, nutrients and humus content”. The Objective to be changed to read: “**Maintain the** natural properties and function of forest soils”.

Ron Frank asked the Table if there was still an interest in maintaining this line in the set of Criterion and Indicators.

Brain Taylor commented that this may be a tough thing to measure. You would need a biologist to evaluate the function and nutrients.

Keith Chapman responded that the Indicator is not the ‘gospel’ on what the actual soil properties are but rather an indication. By ensuring that we are not doing anything to impact the natural state of the soil and its processes we can naturally assume that we are maintaining these properties.

Ron Frank commented that the Table does not need to ratify this line as it is worded as a strategy and the Table will see it when it comes out. We will want to add a note that this is under development

John Warren commented that Coarse Woody Debris is good and bad. The strategy should address how much should be left on the site for soil and for habitat and how much can be taken for fiber and for the local community for firewood and fiber. You cannot take everything off the site and you don’t want to leave it all either.

Ron Frank responded that we will clearly mark this as under development in light of the inter-relationship with these other factors that affect the distribution of Coarse Woody Debris. We will leave this issue to the strategy development and move on with the rest of the Criterion and Indicators. Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to proceed.

Criterion - Line: 3-20

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that this value was brought up at a meeting before the Soil and Water meeting and that this Value was further refined at that and subsequent meetings.

Criterion - Line: 3-21

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that water quality is being addressed by protecting it from pesticides.

Sharie Conroy asked about Potable Water – it is not appear to be addressed in these lines.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Al Stobbart explained that Potable Water does not include surface water. It is not recognized as potable.

Chief Andy Alex commented that they are very much concerned about water quality and this includes spraying herbicides on the ground. "I must bring this up now. We have had an oil spill by a logging company that spoiled our well. I am not too happy with your answer to Sharie's concern about potable water."

Keith Chapman explained the Pesticide Free Zones specified in the Pest Management Plan. It specifies different buffers on all streams and open water (ponds, puddles, swamps, ditches etc). The other lines in the table deal with spills - such as oil - to both land and water which is getting at the root of the problem that Chief Andy Alex described. The Pest Management Plan has measures to ensure that herbicides are not going to impact wells and water intakes. Brush that occurs within the Pesticide Free Zones is not sprayed and is ignored [or treated manually].

Keith Warrener commented that he had mentioned how the Fraser Valley Regional District and the Noxious Weeds Committee (of the FVRD) was being challenged with the issue of invasive plants. With these plants there is often no other feasible choice but to use herbicides. These plants often require repeated manual attempts to get rid of them. That is simply too expensive to be feasible.

John Pichugin responded. He explained that the Pest Management Plan (PMP) is sent out to stakeholders and First Nations for referral. Before there is any application there is a referral each year that treatment is planned in the area. It is up to Teal to respond to First Nations concerns.

Chief Andy Alex commented that he had worked on this issue with BC Hydro already and they changed where they were spraying.

Ron Frank asked the group to focus on what the line was about. Teal is not going to change the fact that they are going to come and talk to you before conducting this work. What this line does is ensure that these buffers are adhered to. The intent would be to protect wells and streams.

Kerry Grozier commented that there is drinking water legislation that must be adhered to.

Keith Chapman commented that at the last meeting some new values were put forward for the PAG to address in the next revision of the Criterion and Indicator set [see the last page of the Meeting Minutes from meeting #9]. One of the new values was "**herbicide use and community consultation**".

John Warren said that there was a study in the interior by Nancy Turner from UVIC that documented the traditional use of 380 plants. Therefore local people do not want Teal to go ahead and spray blocks for brush. Brush can be treated manually with saws for \$750 per hectare or it can be sprayed for \$450 per hectare. It is economical to treat brush with herbicides. Spraying is opposed by the people who value the plants that come up after logging or fires.

Ron Frank responded that John Warren's concern regarding the use of herbicides is noted. Ron said this indicator does not give credence to the use of herbicide but rather is a measure that it is being used in a manner that protects water.

Sharie Conroy said that people in her community go out mushrooming and they would need to know before going out to pick mushrooms if there was any spraying.

Action Item: 10F Note the Value of **Herbicide use and community consultation** for further Indicator development work regarding the use of pesticides.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Action item: 10G Keith Chapman to review drinking water legislation in terms of the use of pesticides.

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

Action Item: 10H Bring in an expert speaker on pesticide use in forestry.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Jim Baker said that he believes that the buffer zones are not big enough and is concerned that swamps and other water bodies are being impacted. It could happen if there is enough of this spraying going on. Jim Baker said that he would like to see a lot more information on the use of pesticides so they could see what this is really all about.

Ron Frank said that this issue has been put in to the Fraser Information Tracking System (FITS) for revisiting at a later date for further indicator development.

Keith Warrenner asked if there should be a separation between what is profitable for treating natural brush such as alder vs. treating something like invasive plants.

Keith Chapman responded that he is not intimately familiar with Teal's Pest Management Plan. To his knowledge each species that is to be targeted under the plan must be specified. So invasive plants would need to be specified – perhaps by each individual plant.

Sharie Conroy said that, for Teal's information, people on the Western Ridge in her area use the creeks etc for drinking water and watering livestock.

Ron Frank said that he has asked Keith Chapman to look into getting a representative from the Ministry of Environment to participate at the Table and help to answer some of these environment related questions.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-21 so that there is a point of reporting on the use of pesticides so that they know that it is compliance. Al Stobbart 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-21 approved.

Criterion - Line: 3-22

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. The Value of Water quality is to be protected from hazardous materials that enter into water. The "reportable" amounts will be given to the Table as for those for dry land mentioned earlier.

Ron Frank asked if the Table wanted to keep this line as it is somewhat redundant when considering "reportable spills" describe earlier.

Sharie Conroy indicated that she would like to see the line included in the set.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 3-22. Bruce Edwards 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-22 approved.

Criterion - Line: 3-24

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. The objective is to reduce the number of impacts to water quality from forest roads. Non-compliance tickets from the Compliance and Enforcement officers of the MOF would be reported.

Keith Warrener moved to adopt (1st), Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-24 approved.

Criterion - Line: 3-30

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith said that the Indicator for this line could be re-worded to say "Compliance with the Riparian Management Section of Teal's Forest Stewardship Plan". As it is worded now it may be problematic to report as one would have to review every stream of every block and report.

Ron Frank suggested that, instead of having "100 %", you might want to have "Zero non-compliance". Ron also suggested that the Objective be changed to reflect the concern regarding the stream pools. He suggested "Maintain natural aquatic habitat including morphology" which would include pools.

A brief discussion at the Table around re-wording the line resulted in the following line wording:

Value: Natural aquatic habitat

Objective: Maintain natural aquatic habitat including stream morphology for aquatic species

Indicator: Compliance with the requirements for riparian management specified in Teal's Forest Stewardship Plan

Target: Zero non-compliance

Keith Warrener moved to adopt line 3-30 as amended (1st), Jim Baker 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 3-30 approved as amended.

Criterion - Line: 3-31 to 3-39

Keith Chapman reviewed these lines individually and commented on where the Values were addressed. Many of these lines are being addressed by the Sub-committee on Sites of Special Significance.

Al Stobbart commented on line 3-32 that the natural supply of sediment is an important and necessary component of streams.

Ron Frank asked the Sub-committee on Sites of Special Significance (SSS) for a status report.

Keith Chapman responded that the committee was working on the tasks associated with refining the VOITs for SSS. The committee is targeting the next meeting for a report to the Table.

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman if he wanted to discuss the next meeting.

Keith Chapman responded that he had received indications from Members that the pace of the meetings and the amount of material to digest was getting a bit onerous. Keith suggested that the next meeting be put off by a week to give Members a break.

Ron Frank asked the Table if changing the meeting to March 20th. Brian Taylor indicated that he would not be able to attend a meeting on the 20th. No other Members indicated a conflict. Ron Frank noted that the next meeting will be changed to March 20th.

Action Item: 10I Keith Chapman to inform Members of the change of date for the 11th meeting which will be held on March 20th.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman **Due Date:** March 3, 2007

Ron Frank called for a 10 minute break and the Table took a 10 minute break.

Ron Frank re-convened the meeting. Ron thanked the Table for their hard work on these Criterion and Indicators to date. We have opportunities for continual improvement on these Indicators in the future. Ron Frank asked the Table for a bit of “facilitator license” so that they can address the Indicators that the Table is prepared to adopt and those lines that initiate a lot more detailed discussion will be deferred to the next meeting. Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to continue.

Keith Chapman started by saying that he will use sign in sheet to tally Member travel for their travel allowance. This will help to streamline this process. Everyone present should sign it – including Observers. The travel allowance cheques are here tonight for members to pick up. Members that did not attend the December 12th meeting may have two cheques. The Travel allowance is for up to and including the February 10th meeting.

CCFM Criterion 5 – Multiple Benefits to Society

Criterion - Line: 5-1

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith Chapman explained that Visual Quality Objectives are set by professionals hired by the Licensees and are approved by the Ministry of Forests and Range. Visual Objectives are taken from set viewpoints such as highway corridors, rest stops and parks and the like.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 5-1. Garry Davidson^{1st}, Bruce Edwards^{2nd}. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 5-1 approved.

Criterion - Line: 5-2

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that this line was discussed with Shawn Gabriel and Al Stobbart via emails and phone calls. In this discussion, it became apparent that the line addressed the “European” concept of wood quality (wood for milling and pulp) in second growth and not necessarily the First Nation’s concept of wood quality and the supply of Cedar for items such as Totem Poles and canoes. Keith Chapman left the line in the set in case the PAG wanted to adopt the line as it is to address fiber supply and quality. If the Table does not want to support the line it will disappear.

Kerry Grozier asked how fertilization improves wood quality.

Keith Chapman responded that fertilizable stands are selected for their attributes: valuable species such as Douglas Fir with good tree quality (straight, healthy, well stocked etc). By targeting and treating stands of high value species of good quality the overall supply of good quality wood will be improved. In addition the treatment is a late rotation treatment where trees are quite large with an elevated live crown. Fertilizing these stands will increase the amount of wood the trees put on their relatively branch free stems (i.e. increase the knot free sheath of wood). Because these trees are quite large the increase in growth does not reduce the number of rings per inch (a measure of wood quality).

Ron Frank asked the Table if there is an interest at the Table to have an indicator.

Bruce Edwards said it sounded good to him.

Sharie Conroy asked if the line could include pruning as well.

Ron Frank responded that pruned stands are targeted for fertilization. Ron Frank asked for an explanation of where the funds for this kind of work come from.

John Pichugin explained the **Forest Investment Account (FIA)**. The Government funds eligible projects and the funds are overseen by the financial company Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC). Licensees receive a share of the FIA budget based on their individual cut. Projects managed by PWC according to set criteria. Fertilization focuses on stands that are at least 5 to 10 years from harvest.

John Warren commented that Teal is putting FIA money into fertilization where it could go to other uses with a higher value. This money could be used to develop trails – which in the Fraser Canyon derive a lot of economic activity – and developing Non Timber Forest Products. These are things that local people would benefit from. John said that fertilizing some trees is not a benefit to communities. There is a set amount and if the target requires a sum of money to go into fertilization of 15% of the recognize stands there may not be money left over for other work.

Kerry Grozier responded that the government puts out criteria as to what the money can be used for.

John Warren said that the Boston Bar First Nation received \$10, 000 dollars to work on the 1848-58 Hudson's bay trail that generated some employment and the trail use. The money is limited to existing, documented trails.

John Pichugin commented that the trail project was a FIA Funded First Nation project that was addressed to an established trail.

Ron Frank commented that, in light of the current detailed debate, this topic will be put into FITS for further discussion. **The line will be removed from the current set of Indicators.**

Keith Chapman spoke for the record to acknowledge that John Warren had raised two new Values: **Non Timber Forest Products and Trails.**

Action Item: 10 J Remove line 5-2 from the current Indicator set for further discussion and Indicator development.

Action Item: 10 K Note Values of **Non Timber Forest Products and Trails** for Indicator

development.

Environment Dept: Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Criterion - Line: 5-3

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith Chapman explained by using the best genetic material (not to be confused with genetic engineering) on site that the general quality and quantity of wood will be improved. Class A seed may not be available for all species at all elevations and for all seed planning zones. The Class B seed will be used where the Class A seed is not available.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 5-3. Bruce Edwards 1st, Keith Warrenner 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 5-3 approved.

Criterion - Line: 5-4

Keith Chapman reviewed this line.

Ron Frank asked for clarification whether inventories etc are considered “landbase” investments.

John Pichugin responded that all FIA dollars have criteria that link them to the landbase. The projects that may be funded by FIA that Teal expects to pursue include Timber Supply Analysis Site Index (productivity) estimates, inventory work for Timber Supply Review such as mapping and aerial photo work etc.

A brief discussion on the wording on the Indicator statement to clarify it. The wording was changed to: “Percent of **allocated** FIA funds re-invested into the landbase”.

Ron Frank asked for a motion to adopt line 5-4. Garry Davidson 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in Favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 5-4 approved.

Criterion - Line: 5-5

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that he had some trouble in coming up with information on a forest level basis around Air Quality in order to come up with an Indicator and Target. This strategy is still in progress.

Sharie Conroy commented that this Value may be linked to the other line regarding productive forest landbase. If you lose the landbase you lose the habitat that supports the trees which may lead to a drying effect.

John Pichugin asked if she meant the working forest.

Sharie Conroy responded “no”.

Ron Frank commented that it has been demonstrated that often the best way to secure a benefit from the landbase is to manage it for its economic values. The working forest protects what Sharie needs which is a large forested landbase to provide the forest benefits.

Keith added that younger, fast growing forests are transpiring (breathing and releasing Oxygen and water vapour) more than old forests so there may be some link to harvesting older slower growing stands and replacing them with young vigorous stands.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG March 20, 2007

Sharie responded that what they see in their area is the vapour clouds constantly going past the trees that are anywhere from 60 to 100 years old – they are not old growth. They feel that they are in a different climatic zone because of the trees and biodiversity.

Ron Frank said that it is good that this is being worked on. It will not be lost. It may not be ready by the end of March but we will get to it – it is simply a matter of when.

Criterion - Line: 5-6

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith Chapman informed the group that Brian Taylor had just handed Keith the report from the Sub-committee on Community Access to Fiber titled: *Draft Wording for Wood Fibre Usage Policy* with a draft *Protocol for Community Log Retrieval*. This outlines the products sought by the Community.

Keith Chapman will work on the proposed language for this line based on this new document. The wording may be quite similar to those lines with First Nations protocol language.

Criterion - Line: 5-7

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. The line targets local communities as Teal hires new employees.

Ron Frank commented that this line came straight from this Table.

Keith raised the question of what the Table would consider “local communities”. Is it Lytton, Boston Bar, Hope, the Hatzic area and Pitt Meadows or is it more inclusive: all the communities from Lytton to Surrey.

Ron Frank stopped Keith Chapman on the discussion on “local communities”. It is a time consuming discussion. It is important that we get it right. The line says what we want. We will need to define local communities later. I am going to propose that we adopt this line with the note that the local communities need to be defined.

John Warren commented that Teal does not hire people in our communities. This indicator does not address this. Teal Jones is not doing good things for the communities that supply the timber from their back yards. This is a key thing. This is not a meaningful line. They need some meaningful criteria that if they are not meeting the criteria the auditor can make a note of it.

April Choquette responded that this is not true and that she objects to this kind of comment.

Keith Warren commented that he believed that they will do their best to hire locally. This discussion has been brought up before and Members at the Table have objected to what was said.

Jim Baker commented that he had gone to meetings with Teal Jones and we had good meetings. We tried to get things going, but the last meeting with Teal Jones, Teal had said that they would get back to us. We offered to purchase but the level of contamination was such that it worked better to lease it. We haven't heard anything more from Teal on this.

Keith Warren commented that the Member is concerned that this looks like something is being “slipped by” here. I believe that they will do their best for communities. I can't see how Teal can answer all of the problems facing Boston Bar.

Ron Frank said that he anticipated that this topic would require further discussion. Ron Frank asked John Warren if he could ratify the line in question. Ron said that he would hate to see the Table not ratify an indicator that said that Teal Jones will commit to prioritizing hiring locally. Will this problem stall the CSA process?

John Warren said that we need indicators and targets with 'bite' that commit the company to provide local benefits to the local communities from where the timber is coming from. Either we have real indicators and targets or no indicators for that section. These indicators are pointless.

Ron Frank commented that we will need to put this indicator forward for further discussion.

Brian Taylor commented that he would like to correct the impression made that Teal/May Trucking does not hire locally in Boston Bar. We have full time employees living in Boston Bar. We can work with this indicator. Boston Bar only has so many people with the skills and experience we need. We don't require unskilled labour. Brian Taylor addressed John Warren: Let us start with the people that we have working for us and build on it. We are not going back to the days when the mill was running with 200 employees – we have to get past that. We hire a number of youths every year from the Boston Bar FN. Let's take what we have and move on.

John Warren had no response.

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to move onto line 5-8

Criterion - Line: 5-7

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. The line looks at the number of existing and continuing contractors and employees working with Teal and May Trucking. The Target statement wording will need to be changed to "The number of contractors and employees from local communities".

Ron Frank proposed that in light of the issues surrounding the similar line (5-6) that we at least have this line for the reporting on who is hired from the community so that we have that information.

April Choquette suggested that they include how many jobs that have been offered into an indicator. I would like to see that. So we would report on the jobs in place and the jobs being offered.

Ron Frank responded that he could see a lot of issues on how to adjudicate a Target regarding job offers. We will note it and track it.

Chief Andy Alex commented that he is concerned about hiring outside of towns. Sub-contractors are hired outside of town and this has been a big issue.

Ron Frank commented that when he looks at these issues he has a hard time understanding how we can turn away a company that says that it will prioritize hiring local people. It appears to come down to a lack of trust between the communities and the company. I don't know how we can get over that unless we work together. That means at some point we will have start working together. I would encourage John Warren to look at working on those issues with Teal Jones in the interim. I would like to move ahead building on some trust and cooperation. These issues are a sign of the changing economy and forest sector and other communities are struggling with these very same things.

Jim Baker asked April Choquette if Teal Jones exports logs.

April Choquette responded that Teal is against exporting logs and they do block log export proposals from other companies. We cannot get enough logs for our mills in order to run full shifts. There is a log shortage at this time. We are out there with our log buyers searching for logs. Some other companies are taking logs south or moving their operations there.

Keith Warrener commented that he was aware that Teal was getting a reputation for “plucking logs” targeted for export.

Jim Baker commented that he had seen logs being exported last year. The unions are shrinking year after year. Maybe we can give Teal some ideas how to keep logs in this country. This is what the PAG group is here for. This could be a “first” here – to suggest things that could help.

April said that she recognizes that the local communities support the larger picture. “I can appreciate that and I want to keep those jobs there”.

Keith Warrener suggested an indicator could be built around training workers.

Action Item: 10L Develop a VOIT set around the number of jobs offered to residents of local communities.

Action Item: 10M Develop a VOIT set around worker training under CSA Element 5.2.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman **Due Date:** TBA

Ron Frank asked for a motion to close the meeting. Al Stobbart 1st, Jim Baker 2nd. The meeting was concluded.

Ron Frank addressed John Warren regarding drafting a letter to the CSA Technical Committee regarding clarification on Aboriginal Rights and Title which had come up at the Feb 10th meeting. John Warren agreed to draft a letter.

Action Item: 10 N John Warren & Ron Frank to put forward a letter to the CSA Technical Committee regarding clarification on Aboriginal Rights and Title. John Warren to draft.

Ron Frank & John Warren **Due Date:** TBA

The meet was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Keith Chapman distributed the Travel Allowance cheques. The remaining cheques for members not present will be sent with the meeting materials.

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

**** Please note the new date for the next meeting ****