

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)
Meeting #11 Minutes: Criteria and Indicator Review (Continued)

March 20, 2007

1. Call to order

Ron Frank, Fraser PAG Facilitator, called the 11th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 4:35 p.m. on March 20, 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	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Allan Johnsrude, Ministry of Forests	John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation	
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District	

Members Absent:

Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Gurdev Sidhu, Agriculture	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident
Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Mark Bond, Reo Rafting
Earl Graham, United Steel Workers	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation
Garry Davidson, Seabird Island Indian Band	Ken Webb, Agriculture	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Gordon Sherwood, Cacus Point Resident	Kerry Grozier, District Manager, MOFR	

Others Present:

Ed McWaters, May Trucking	John Pichugin, Teal	Ron Frank, Facilitator
Heather Morlacci, Observer	Keith Chapman, Teal	
Jill West, Teal	Kevin Stanczyk, Teal	

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #11 Agenda

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

2. Fraser PAG Information Tracking System – List of Completed Tasks
3. Fraser PAG Information Tracking System – List of Outstanding Tasks
4. Fraser PAG Meeting #10 Minutes: *Criterion and Indicator Review* (Continued)
5. Excerpt from Teal's unapproved Forest Stewardship Plan – Section 8.1 *Invasive Plants* (FPPR Section 17)
6. *Bear Den Inventory Form* (March 15, 2007) - Draft
7. *Bear Den Protection Key* (March 15, 2007) – Draft
8. Fraser PAG – Rare and Unique Trees – Oregon Ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*) [*Silvics of North America*]
9. *Protocol for Community Log Retrieval –DRAFT*
10. *Draft Wording for Wood Fibre Usage Policy for Teal Cedar Public Advisory Group Committee*
11. *Values, Objective, Indicators and Targets – To be Reviewed (March 20, 2007)*

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 Allan Johnsrude, Ministry of Forests, sitting in for Kerry Grozier. Ron asked the table to introduce themselves. Members introduced themselves.

6. Review Agenda for Meeting #11 / Adapt / Ratify

Ron Frank asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #11. 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. John Pichugin 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd, all Members were in favour - none opposed. The Agenda was ratified.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes: Review for ratification – Feb 20th Meeting Criterion and Indicator Review Continued”

Ron Frank asked members to put forward any revisions to the minutes from the **February 20th Meeting (#10)** meeting.

Sharie Conroy commented that that last paragraph on page 5 says that “landslides typically occur a year or two after logging”. She recalled that Drew said that slides sometimes occur at 10 years or more when root strength of stumps is lost due to rot. She said that sliding after about 10 years has been their experience in the Hatzic area.

Ron Frank asked for any more changes to the minutes. No more changes were put forward. Ron Frank asked for a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Al Stobbart 1st, John Pichugin 2nd. The minutes were adopted as changed.

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

8. Previous Meeting Minutes: Review for ratification – Feb 10th Workshop “Criterion and Indicator Review”

Ron Frank asked members to put forward any revisions to the minutes from the **February 10th Workshop (#9)** meeting.

Keith Chapman read out changes that Al Stobbart emailed to Keith prior to the meeting:

1. Page 7, Element 1-5, paragraph 4, second sentence should read "For example, certain parks in which hunting is currently allowed may see it closed to this activity following changes to individual park status."
2. Page 9, Element 1-9, paragraph 2 (and therefore there if Mtn Beavers...), delete "there"
3. Page 14, Element 1-24, sentence should read "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."
4. Page 21, Element 6-10, paragraph 2: correct (spelling) is Kokoska

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. John Pichugin 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. The minutes were adopted as changed.

9. Review, Revise and Ratify remaining Criterion and Indicators and latest revisions from previous reviews.

Ron Frank explained the importance of doing this work on our indicator set. He explained that if we cannot come to a proper accounting of some of these issues that we are all passionate about, we will have to work on them between meetings or put them into the Fraser Information Tracking System (FITS). They will not fall of the table.

Ron added that the members are reminded to show mutual respect for each other and their viewpoints.

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman to begin reviewing the outstanding Criterion and Indicators remaining. Keith Chapman displayed the Table: Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets – To Be Reviewed on the overhead projector. Keith explained that the table of Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets (VOITs) distributed at this meeting contains all of the VOIT lines that have not been reviewed/ratified to date, those that the FPAG Table sent back for revision and new lines developed since previous VOIT reviews.

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 1-9 is Criterion 1 and line 9 under that Criterion).

Criterion - Line: 1-9

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that the previous VOIT set around this Value was declined by the FPAG Table. Keith explained that there is a strategy for Bears that utilizes an inventory form for assessing bear dens encountered in the field [see handouts]. The information from the inventory form is used to assess the quality of the bear den which will guide how important it is to preserve the bear den tree. These two documents were reviewed by the Ministry of Environment to ensure that they key into the right factors. A similar approach, using an inventory form and an assessment of the information, will be used for Mountain Beaver burrows. As Mountain Beavers are a very different species with different habitat requirements, it will take time to develop these assessment tools.

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

Criterion - Line: 1-21

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that he had talked to the Botanist with the Conservation Data Center (CDC), foresters at the UBC Malcolm Knapp Research Forest (MKRF), the Mission TFL, and at Teal and May Trucking. The one species that the CDC put forward as 'rare' and 'unique' was Oregon Ash.

MKRF offered some general advice for criteria but no specific examples. They identified a population of Sitka Spruce as having resistance to Spruce Leader Weevil but the foresters said that the population was isolated to the MKRF.

The Mission TFL does not have a formal policy but does try to preserve large Western Yew (trunk diameter >25 cm at 1.3 m ht). They also try to preserve Western White Pine and Sitka Spruce as they do not have many within their TFL. They also try to preserve large veteran Douglas fir where possible.

The May Trucking and Teal foresters and Engineers said that the trees described by MKRF and Mission TFL may be rare in their respective areas which are comparatively small to Teal's Defined Forest Area but they did not consider them 'Rare' or "Unique" when considering the DFA as a whole.

Heather Morlacci commented that it is vital to be consistent with the Mission TFL's approach to rare and unique trees. She also asked what the CDC was.

Keith Chapman explained that Mission TFL does not have a formal policy around this so it makes it much more operationally flexible to apply this. If we use this criterion in our Targets it would be really restrictive to apply. Keith explained that the CDC was a department within the Ministry of Environment that evaluates and lists species whose populations that are considered to be threatened. [See: <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/cdc/>]

Sharie Conroy commented that in their local area adjacent to the Mission TFL it has all been logged before so if there are any large trees there they should be saved. Sharie said that it would make sense to protect those trees that the Mission TFL is protecting in their area. Sharie asked if the Hatzic area was the only community adjacent to Teal's potential harvest areas.

Ed McWaters responded that Hope, Harrison, and Boston Bar are other communities that are adjacent to Teal's Chart Areas (the DFA).

Sharie Conroy said that they need an indicator that reflects the communities' Value for these trees. There needs to be communication and work with the communities to protect everything we have there. We don't want to lose any species of wildlife or trees due to logging.

Heather Morlacci gave an example of giant trees cut down in the Elk Valley. She said that their voices were not heard so we need something here. We need to protect old growth.

The CDC also suggested that trees that meet the criteria of the Big Tree Registry of BC may be considered rare and unique do to their large size. Keith explained that the registry lists the largest examples and their locations of all the tree species in BC. Keith explained that there is difficulty in using this criterion as the scoring system requires some detailed measurements. It is not obvious which trees for some species would meet the criteria. The Big Tree Registry also lists a number of shrub species and there are some species with no listing. This registry could be used by modifying some of the criteria so that it is easier to manage operationally. This will take some time to figure out. [See Big Tree Registry (BC): <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bigtree/index.html>]

Keith Chapman responded that he will look at creating an approach to the Big Tree Registry. Much of what the Hatzic folks are talking about is a variation of the initial Value put forward for protecting biodiversity. Old Growth is protected by Old Growth Management Areas that are planned for each Landscape Unit over the province. The VOIT line as it is was not meant to capture trees with local

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

significance but rather over the entire DFA. There could be a VOIT line developed around the locally significant trees. This will allow specific trees to be identified that the local residents want to protect.

Ron Frank noted that the group is not interested in signing off on this indicator with just the CDC criteria for rare and unique. We'll send this item back to the drawing board for further development to include the Big Tree Registry and Sites of Special Significance element.

Action Item: 11A Develop "Rare and Unique" tree strategy/VOIT set around the Big Tree Registry.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Action Item: 11B Develop VOIT set around locally significant trees.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Criterion - Line: 2-1

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. This line was revamped after the initial review by the FPAG and the measures that Teal will implement under its Forest Stewardship Plan are now included in the Indicator set. Keith pointed out that the FSP section on invasive plants is included in the meeting handouts.

Heather Morlacci asked if there needs to be a baseline set of information and inventories in the forest before harvesting.

Keith Chapman responded that there is an ongoing inventory being maintained by the Ministry of Forests that Teal will update as they discover invasive plants in the DFA. Teal will also train staff to identify these plants. There are 42 species of plants listed as Invasive Plants under the Forest and Range Practices Act. Many of these species are only applicable to range land or agriculture and will likely not be within the DFA. There are species such as Japanese Knotweed that will be in the DFA. As far as inventories before harvesting, most of these species are shade intolerant so they are not usually a problem until a few years after harvesting. Most often these plants are dispersed along roads where human beings have transported them on vehicles. The FSP measures will be implemented. If new locations pop up they will be inventoried and registered with the province. Then strategies can develop on how to address these clusters. [see http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/invasive/IAP_01.htm for more information on invasive plants and the database, also Weeds BC at: <http://www.weedsbc.ca/>]

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 2-1. Keith Warrener 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 2-1 was approved.

Criterion - Line: 4-1

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. This line addresses Carbon Uptake and Storage by increasing the amount of durable forest products that store carbon. This is accomplished by allowing local folks to extract more wood from the waste that Teal cannot utilize in their mills. Keith pointed out the two documents regarding the draft protocol distributed at the meeting. The protocol is draft but they are far enough along that we can incorporate them into the VOIT set. Some more work will need to be done to incorporate Teal's legal obligations, biodiversity issues and Teal's obligations under its other certification (the Corporate Management System).

John Pichugin referred to the draft protocols and asked if this is for both firewood retrieval as well as salvaging logs that are suitable for milling into specialty wood products.

John Warren pointed out that the wood needs to be decked such that the community does not have to dig them out of burn piles.

Keith Chapman pointed out item #4 where it says that "any useable logs the Community wants will be set aside".

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

Ron Frank suggested that the protocol line be changed to “decked in an accessible manner”. Ron pointed out that the trucking of wood at the company expense will be left out of the agreement.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 4-1 - subject to the proposed changes to the agreements. John Warren 1st, Chief Sidney Douglas 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 4-1 was approved.

Criterion - Line: 4-2

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. This line was ratified by the FPAG Table previously but Teal needed to amend the line in order to incorporate the operational issues that will make it more practical to implement. The changes reflect the fact that it is often better to let some slashy blocks sit for a year so that planter access is improved so that more productive microsites can be planted. Also high elevation blocks are often planted later in the summer after the snow melts. Due to these proposed changes the Table will need to ratify it under the new wording.

Sharie Conroy commented that they are concerned about hydrology. It takes about 8 years for harvest blocks to reach “green-up” [a measure of hydrological recovery]. This line does not address Sites of Special Significance.

Keith Chapman responded that this line does not specifically deal with Sites of Special Significance. Keith added that a hydrologist may recommend in their report to promptly reforest the site in order to expedite green up.

Ron Frank commented that this is an aggressive strategy to ensure that planting is completed in a quality and timely manner.

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

Al Stobbart commented that he believes that these are higher standards than that required by the Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR).

Keith Chapman responded that most ecosystems have a MOF requirement to be reforested within 6 years.

Criterion - Line: 5-6

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith explained that this line addresses the communities’ interests in extracting economic value from waste where Line 4-1 addressed carbon uptake. The Indicator and Target for this line is identical to 4-1 but they address a different Value under a different CSA Criterion.

A discussion regarding whether this line needed to be ratified. It was agreed that it did need to be ratified as it was addressing different values under a different Criteria.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 5-6. Sharie Conroy 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, and none abstained. Line 5-6 was approved.

Criterion - Line: 5-7

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith pointed out the footnote (#3) that will be the Variance for this line. The Variance clarifies what Teal needs to do as a responsible business in their hiring policy.

John Warren said that they need more of a target that addresses the number of people actually employed in local communities and the amount of harvesting done locally. The issue of shipping logs out of an area and nothing happening within the communities needs to be addressed. Simply prioritizing hiring is a weak target. We need to do better than that in terms of local benefits from local forests.

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

Ron Frank asked if this proposed VOIT set has some value.

Sharie Conroy asked if addressing people who may or may not be trained may be a way to support the community that is closely linked economically to the forest. There are ways to help communities get back on their feet. There is an aspect here of who does the training.

John Pichugin asked if there is a way for Boston Bar to approach Teal with names of people who are interested in a career in forestry.

John Warren commented that this is not a bad point. There should be an element of monitoring the number of local people employed in the area.

John Pichugin asked what would constitute a local community?

John Warren responded that it would be people that maintain a permanent residence in the area from Spuzzum to Jackass Mountain. The problem is that "to prioritize" is not a good Target

Jill West responded that it is possible to use this Target. There needs to be some flexibility. If 7 out of 10 people hired were hired locally then that would show that the communities were prioritized.

Ron Frank suggested that Teal Jones look at the number of people employed.

Keith Chapman responded that it is difficult to derive a number of workers in the DFA because of contracting and sub-contracting and the nature of the work and how these agreements are set up. Some contracts are based on km of roads built, or machine hours, or number of cubic meters of wood hauled. These agreements do not have a number of employees that can be extracted for a report. This makes such a target difficult to report. Other PAG groups and companies use some very different criteria to measure this Value. The Vancouver Island North Woodlands Advisory Group uses the number of log hauling days as an Indicator for this Value. The idea around that one is that when the trucks are hauling, the other forestry phases (falling, road building, reforestation, engineering etc) are also in full swing. Keith said he would welcome any ideas on how to derive a better Indicator.

John Warren commented that the amount of expenditures (\$) spent in local areas on supplies, workers, contractors within the area.

John Pichugin said that it is tough to supply that figure as these are private companies that have a right to withhold this information.

Ed McWaters asked - when talking about local communities - are we only talking about Boston Bar? Or are we talking about Hatzic and Hope etc as well? For example we have a skidder operator who lives in Boston Bar and is currently working in the Norrish drainage. Due to winter snow and fire danger in summer we do not operate there all year. Do we only use this person in the Boston Bar area or do we move him around as the operations move?

Ron Frank said that there appears to be a need for a lot more discussion on this.

Jill West proposed that if this line is at least part of the solution we can adopt this one and work on these problems at the Table in the future.

Heather Morlacci commented that they have a lot of loggers living in their community that go to work elsewhere. Hatzic Valley also has an interest in employment benefits from the forest.

Allan Johnsrude commented that it appears to him that prioritizing hiring from local communities would only be improving the employment situation in communities. It may not go as far as folks may want but you would be going forward. The element missing is the baseline data on who is working out of local communities.

Ron Frank commented that the proposal would be to adopt this line and make an action item that is highly prioritized to revisit this issue.

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

John Warren commented that he could agree to 5-7 as long as we deal with these other economic benefits to the community.

Ed McWaters said that when they are working in Boston Bar they utilize what services (Kal Tire, fuel, restaurants, hotels etc) that are there and similarly when they are working out of Hope.

Keith Warrener said that as a worker in Teal's mill in Surrey, he knows that there are employees that come from Hatzic, Dewdney, and Hope etc and are taking wages back to their communities.

Ron Frank asked if there was anyone that wants to move on adopting line 5-7? There was no response. Ron asked Keith Chapman to move onto 5-8. **Line 5-7 was not adopted.**

Action Item: 11C Develop VOIT line(s) around the Value of Economic and Employment benefits to local communities.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Criterion - Line: 5-8

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. Keith referenced the footnote (#4) for the Variance to this line. Keith noted a typo in the footnote (reference to Vancouver Island) should read "from the Lower Mainland and other adjacent communities where possible".

Ron Frank asked Keith Chapman about what communities would be reported on.

Keith Chapman responded that his original thought is that all of the communities from Lytton to Surrey. The discussion at the Table tonight supports this in that it is demonstrated that these communities are inter-connected in relation to the DFA, the employment and where people are living.

Ron Frank suggested that this definition be added to the footnote. Ron added that coming up with VOIT lines around these Values has been proven to be among the most challenging issues for any PAG. He added that this line is of good value to the PAG as a starting point that be continually improved.

John Warren commented that Brian Taylor, Chief Andy Alex, Jim Baker and he had worked together and came up with some criteria to work with for the community access to wood. Maybe this group, in light of its focus in the canyon, could convene again on this Value and see what we can come up with. I am here because I want to have a good CSA product out of this process. Having March 31st as an endpoint is a poor reason to conclude discussion on this issue. I would like to see a working group have a go at this so that the final plan is something we can feel good about.

Jill West responded that it is a difficult indicator to put together because of tracking mechanisms that are needed to be in place. The sub-committee workgroup proposal will not work in this case. We really need Teal/ May Trucking and the entire group to be involved. The plan will still be a dynamic document after March and these issues can be refined on a continuing basis. Teal is very committed to maintaining this process. The process is about continual improvement. I can appreciate your concern that we rushed but to hold up the plan because we haven't solved everything is not good.

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 5-8. Al Stobbart 1st, Chief Sidney Douglas 2nd. The table vote was split. **Line 5-8 was not ratified.**

John Warren suggested that there should be an attempt to see if the sub-committee can come up with something in the next week.

Al Stobbart commented that we have issues in our area and will this sub-committee be aware of those issues unique to that area?

Sharie Conroy commented that it appears from listening to this discussion that there are areas being left out. If you are isolated in the Canyon then there are few opportunities than say a community such as Hatzic which is less isolated from other opportunities. I do not see a problem with John's proposal for a sub-committee to see if they can see some solutions here.

Jill West said that if the sub-committee can meet and propose something by the end of the month that will be fine. There will need to be input from May and Teal to ensure that what is developed is measurable.

Ron Frank asked John Warren who would be represented on this committee.

John Warren responded that it would be himself, Brian Taylor, Jim Baker, Andy Alex and anyone else interested.

John Pichugin said that they would have someone there.

Chief Sidney Douglas commented that one of the reasons that he is in favour of this is that our local area, Traditional Territory and overlaps with other First Nations has been losing jobs and local businesses as a result. The First Nations spend locally and helped in those hard times. I worked in construction and the idea of “local” has expanded as the economy has grown. The way it is written- “prioritize local hiring” – it does address local values.

Ron Frank called for a 5 minute break and the meeting broke.

Criterion - Line: 5-10

Keith Chapman reviewed this line. The sub-committee on Sites of Special Significance worked on this line and others through emails and phone calls. The lines being proposed are a ‘final’ evolution of a few iterations of these lines. The line used to say “no slides etc attributed to logging...” but the word ‘attributed’ would result in a battle of lawyers that would make the line unworkable. This wording is targeted towards incorporating the best professional advice towards recognizing and avoiding risks to human safety.

Heather Morlacci commented that there were logs at several places from past harvesting that have come down the streams and have impacted our community. We have video and pictures of this. It is an ongoing concern in this area. We have no guarantee here that human safety will be protected. Heather referenced a study on tree canopy removal and impacts to watersheds and hydrology.

Keith Chapman responded that the Table is aware of these concerns. The Hatzic Valley is a good reference to work out hydrological issues in Sites of Special Significance. The idea is to hire the professionals and apply their knowledge and expertise in the field and not construct limits that exclude this input.

Sharie Conroy commented that she sees this line but she has a problem. Belcharton creek was totally overwhelmed in recent storms. It is already a problem so a hydrologist would say there can be no harvesting because there is already a problem.

Ed McWaters responded that they cannot harvest if a specialist says ‘no logging’.

Sharie Conroy said that they cannot handle another ½ inch of increased water level.

Jill West commented that there is flooding that is part of natural processes.

Keith Warrener commented, that from FVRD discussions about the Forest and Range Practices Act, some of the prescriptions within in this legislation require companies to exercise due diligence. One of the issues the new code requires is that forest companies need to look at what everyone else is doing and how their own activities will impact forest resources. I don’t know what else can be done – except ban logging in the Hatzic drainage all together.

Sharie Conroy said that she wants some guarantees. Only a few people have homes on Belcharton creek. I want rainfall monitoring and baseline information.

Bruce Edwards said that all indications are that logging can only increase stream flow. The present condition of the creeks is an issue. Creeks are already overflowing at present without any increased run-off due to logging.

John Warren commented that in the past archaeologists were hired with input from the First Nation so that they would have confidence in the Archaeology being completed. If Teal hires the hydrologist and pays this person, this could lead the hydrologist to ‘couch’ their recommendations. The hydrologist should report to the local people. The people most affected by flooding should agree to the Terms of Reference and who the hydrologist is.

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

Jill West said that these professionals with a strong code of ethics. There is room for conversation about who is qualified and what their qualifications are.

Keith Warrener said that he does not know what else the company can do. We have had 'fly-by-night' companies working for the FVRD and now we only accept certain ones.

Bruce Edwards commented that Engineers are human and their recommendations and opinions can vary from Engineer to Engineer.

Sharie Conroy said that if we go over the report with the hydrologist, that would go a long way to giving comfort to the community. The community can evaluate whether the professional is seeing and understanding what they are seeing and experiencing.

Heather Morlacci said that we should ensure that reports are reviewed with the community. Heather said that notification to communities should not be restricted to newspaper advertisements but be more targeted to individuals.

John Warren said that he would support this if the target said the report was endorsed by Teal and the Community.

Keith Warrener said that we can work together on this.

Ron Frank said that we cannot put the public in the decision making role – the process does not allow this. Teal can review the reports with the communities.

Bruce Edwards said that what can be done is define the areas which do not flow into those creeks which already flood.

Keith Chapman said that they hydrologist would do that – identify those areas with the potential to impact the valley. What does the Mission TFL and the local Woodlot do around hydrology and creeks that flow into the valley?

Ron Frank called for a motion to adopt line 5-10 subject to inclusion of opportunities for Community members to review and comment on the professional reports in Sites of Special Significance in the indicator set. Keith Warrener 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. Those in favour: 3 Members, Opposed: (1 voting member, 1 2nd, and 1 observer) Abstain 1 Member. Table is split on the issue.

Ron Frank asked the Members opposed what could be done to make this acceptable.

Bruce Edwards said that no community should be endangered by logging. It is not a matter of just Hatzic Valley. No community susceptible to flooding should be endangered by logging. You don't need a professional opinion when you face public danger currently. Any additional run-off would increase the danger. The VOIT set should be built around 100% avoidance of areas that will lead to an increase risks to the community. The problem areas could be ground-truthed to delineate areas that do and do not drain towards areas that are flooding.

Keith Chapman responded that the Hydrologists would identify areas that do and do not drain towards problem areas.

Action Item: 11D Incorporate public review and comment on professional reports for communities into a VOIT set

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: TBA

Ron Frank noted that the meeting has gone over the allotted time and asked Keith Chapman to briefly go over the topic of future meetings.

Keith Chapman said that the Table and Teal at the outset knew that they were not going to solve the world's problems in 11 meetings. Keith proposed that the FPAG meet again in one month. This next meeting will allocate some time to the FPAG administration, prioritizing the outstanding Values to be

Minutes ratified by FPAG April 24, 2007

addressed and the outstanding Action Items. There will be a break over the summer and then meet quarterly (~every 3 months). The next meeting would be on Tuesday April 24th. The Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) will be ready to be rolled out by then. The audit is tentatively scheduled for around June. The meeting following the April meeting would be some time in September. Keith said that he will go through the minutes and compile the outstanding Values that have not been addressed to date. Keith added that he is very receptive of Member input on the indicator set between meetings. To date there has only been a very small set of Members that have communicated with him between meetings. It would be very beneficial to him to have some of these issues addressed between meetings as this will help the table run more efficiently.

The Meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held April 24, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack at 4:30 PM to 7:30 PM