

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #13 Minutes: Indicator Development – Sites of Special Significance

June 12, 2007

1. Call to order

Keith Chapman, called the 13th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 4:37 p.m. on June 12, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. Keith introduced Nate Ryant as the new facilitator and asked the Table to welcome him to the process.

Nate Ryant gave a brief summary of his background. Nate is a Forestry graduate of UBC and has worked in Industry and consulting. Nate now works on his own and works with forest companies in their environmental certification (ISO, CSA, and SFI certification). Nate is well versed in the CSA standard and works as an auditor for the CSA process. Nate is looking forward to working with the Fraser PAG.

Keith Chapman asked members to introduce themselves. Members introduced themselves and gave brief outlines about their involvement with the DFA and their concerns and the concerns of the sector they represent. Members from the Hatzic community gave an overview of the issues that they are faced with.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District	Wayne Gentry, Union Bar FN
Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident	

Members Absent:

Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery	Garry Davidson, Seabird Island Indian Band	Mark Bond, Reo Rafting
Allan Johnsrude, Ministry of Forests	Gordon Sherwood, Cacus Point Resident	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation
Bruce Peel, Agriculture	Gurdev Sidhu, Agriculture	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Steve Harvey, Hope Machine Shop.
Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Ken Webb, Agriculture	
Earl Graham, United Steel	Kerry Grozier, District Manager,	

Workers	MOFR	
---------	------	--

Others Present:

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

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #13 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG *Group Membership Contact List (May 28, 2007)*
3. *Values, Objectives, Indicators & Targets – To be Reviewed (May 31, 2007)Draft 4*
4. Fraser PAG Meeting #12 Minutes: *SFMP Review*

4. Health and Safety

Keith Chapman and Nate Ryant reviewed health and safety items and asked members to put forward any health and safety issues.

5. Previous Meeting Minutes: Review for ratification

Nate R. asked the Table to put forward any changes to the previous meeting's minutes. Keith Chapman reminded the Table that Members should review the minutes before the meeting and note changes so the Table can note the changes and move on.

Heather Morlacci offered changes to the minutes. Heather read out and presented a hand written account of her comments to be included into the minutes (See attached). The contents of the document will be included in the ratified minutes.

The Table briefly discussed Heather's comments about blank spaces in the Fraser SFMP. Lloyd Foreman agreed that the "blanks" are regrettable but the process will likely always have some areas that will need improvement and will likely not be perfect for some time.

Keith Chapman asked for any other changes to the minutes. No other changes were put forward. Motion to adopt the meeting minutes as amended. John Warren 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour. None opposed.

6. Review Agenda for Meeting #13 / Adapt / Ratify

Nate reviewed his role as Facilitator as described in the FPAG Terms of Reference.

Nate asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #13 and asked for any proposed revisions.

Sharie Conroy asked to submit two newspaper articles that may be of interest to the PAG. Sharie noted that the question was raised last year about the difference between CSA and FSC certification. These articles touch on these issues again. Sharie requested that Keith Chapman discuss these articles that appear to contradict what had been explained in relation to the forest's role in the carbon cycle.

Action Item: 13A Keith Chapman to review and comment on Vancouver Sun articles submitted by Sharie C. and distribute to the Fraser PAG for information.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: July 31, 2007

Bruce Edwards motioned that an agenda item be added to tonight's meeting. Bruce requested that the Table vote on the question of having the FPAG email correspondence included in the record for the Auditor.

Keith Chapman responded that all email correspondence is currently filed for the Auditor. Keith pointed out that email messages from Teal (Keith) all have the "E2-1" file code at the top of the body of the message. All of these messages and replies from members or other messages from members are stored in a digital file for the Auditor. After some confusion and some discussion it was agreed that Bruce's new agenda item was currently standard and did not need to be ratified by the FPAG.

7. Review of Action Items

Nate asked Keith Chapman for a review of Action Items. Keith responded that there was not very much to review on the Action Items as little evolved since the Table last reviewed them and that the meeting was a bit behind.

Nate turned the Tables attention to the main agenda item: review of draft Values Objectives Indicators and Targets.

8. Sites of Special Significance

Keith Chapman displayed the document "**Values, Objectives, Indicators & Targets – To be Reviewed**" dated May 31, 2007 on the overhead screen. Keith explained that the Sites of Special Sub-committee met at Sharie Conroy's house and worked on the VOITs for Sites of Special Significance (SSS). The Sub-committee came up with general wording and Keith tried to ensure that the spirit and intent was maintained through to the wording presented. In general, some of the changes were necessary to provide clear Indicators and Targets that were also measurable. Keith also explained that this table also has a number of VOITs that the FPAG Table had not had a chance to comment on. The left hand column of the table now lists the indicator number that is close to that in the SFMP list of VOITs.

Keith Chapman reviewed line 44a and footnote 1.

Sharie Conroy asked about community input/involvement in identifying where human safety is at risk.

Keith pointed out Draft Indicator 48a where open community meetings are proposed to allow community stakeholders to voice their concerns. Keith explained that these meetings would be held when Teal has some idea about the terrain and general areas where they would like to harvest and be able to discuss the communities concerns and still incorporate them into final planning/engineering.

Sharie Conroy commented that they need more than simple input. They need to sit down with the expert to discuss how the concerns will be dealt with.

Keith Chapman explained that Draft Indicators 48a, 48b, 48c, and 48d are set up to allow the community to have certain milestones where they can put forward their concerns (48a) and be certain and satisfied that the concerns are addressed adequately (48b-c). Draft Indicator 48d is proposed to provide a tangible way for the stakeholder to review proposed activities in the field.

Keith Chapman displayed a flow chart illustrating the general timeline for forest development and explained the points at which the community meetings would provide input and when stake holders could review Teal's plans and completed assessments. [See attached flow chart]. The first community meeting would provide an opportunity for Teal to present its general plans for where potential roads and blocks would be located. Stakeholders would be able to ask questions and put forward their values and concerns that they would like Teal to consider before finalizing any harvesting and road plans.

Indicator 48c provides an opportunity for the community and stakeholders to see how Teal addressed their values and concerns put forward at the initial meeting.

Bruce Edwards asked about how the term “consensus” was defined and how it would work. How it is defined (75 % in agreement) is really “majority agreement” or “75% agreement”.

Lloyd Foreman said that he was concerned about “consensus”. Consensus is ideal but a disgruntled party could show up and not agree to anything which would make reaching a consensus impossible.

Keith Chapman explained that because the meetings are open there could be both constructive parties and people that want to shoot everything down.

Nate Ryant suggested replacing the term “consensus” with “general agreement”. Bruce Edwards and Lloyd Foreman agreed that this would be more suitable.

Sharie Conroy said that she was concerned about the 25% that may not be in agreement. What about those that have legitimate questions that remain unsatisfied? What can we do to address those concerns? The company could have an expert that says there will be no problems and another party could have an expert saying that there will be problems.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the issue of conflicting experts will come up. If Teal has an expert that says there will be no problems but that expert turns out to be wrong then Teal will be in the wrong. There is a comfort zone there: Teal doesn't want to be wrong and then be harshly penalized for damaging a value and potentially be put out of business.

Bruce Edwards suggested that there could be a problem with meeting attendees that are not potentially affected being in favour while a minority that could be affected is “out voted”.

Keith Chapman suggested that the wording could be changed such that general agreement is reached with those stakeholders with specific identified concerns.

The wording for the Indicator for line 48c was changed to “**General agreement at open community meetings among stakeholders who have the potential to be directly impacted, held during forest management planning, that professional plans and assessments address stakeholders' specific, identified issues and values associated with Sites of Special Significance**”

The Target was changed to read “**Seek general consensus (100%)” with a variance of 25% (i.e. 75% in agreement).**

Lloyd Foreman commented that he had a similar discussion regarding ‘consensus with the public’ in his work with the community forest in the canyon. Another community forest had been running 7 years longer than the canyon community forest process but they were not that much farther ahead. “You always try to reach consensus...but if you can't reach consensus the world can't stop”.

Keith Chapman called for a motion to adopt 48c as amended.

Wayne Gentry commented that this is only as good as the number of people that show up to vote. The Table agreed that this was a problem.

Sharie Conroy pointed out a problem at a previous open house were attendees wanted to hear back from Teal but did not get a response. It needs to be clear who will receive information.

Lloyd Foreman said that it is impossible to keep everyone in ‘the loop’. Each representative at the Fraser PAG is responsible to keep members of their sectors informed.

Keith Chapman said that the community meetings could be improved by having a checkbox beside their name & address indicating that they would like to receive information.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 31, 2007

Keith Chapman asked again for a motion to adopt 48c as amended. Keith reviewed the adapted wording for this indicator. Lloyd Foreman 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. **Indicator 48c was ratified as amended.**

Nate Ryant called for a 10 minute break and the meeting broke at 6:05 pm.

After the break, Keith Chapman started at draft Indicator 48a on page 1. Keith Chapman explained that this Indicator is built around the idea that Teal's engineering staff has completed some preliminary field work to get an idea of where blocks and roads may be located. After this initial field work, Teal can conduct an open meeting to solicit input from the community members. This indicator is built around the idea of giving the community stakeholders an avenue to voice their concerns. Keith reviewed the draft wording of 48a.

Bruce Edwards raised the concern that, theoretically, there could be 5 meetings with 200 people at each meeting where everyone says "no way" to future development. The wording allows Teal to say 'we met the target' and then carry on. The stakeholders want to be able to review and a chance to concur or argue with the plans.

Nate Ryant responded that this indicator may not be necessary as Indicator 48c provides the stakeholders with the arena to review the plans and reach general agreement with them.

Sharie Conroy commented that there needs to be an avenue for stakeholder input and for stakeholders to be able to provide anecdotal evidence or water tests for example.

Keith Chapman commented that Indicator 48A is redundant in that you can't reach the general agreement target for Indicator 48c without having an initial meeting to establish the list of stakeholder concerns.

There was a brief discussion at the Table about 48a.

Bruce Edwards commented that, when in doubt, the Table's solution is to add another Indicator. We have a lot of Indicators around this. Any time we can reduce the number would be good for everyone. I don't want to throw out the baby with the bath. There is good language and mechanisms in this indicator.

Keith Chapman commented that the elements and language of 48a – which is the part of the process for 48c – could be included in the detailed description of 48c. The issue is delivering on the concerns.

Nate Ryant suggested adopting the flow chart into the detailed discussion of 48c and incorporate the process into 48c. Indicator 48a is "just a number – how many meetings".

Keith Chapman asked for a motion to scrap 48a and have the spirit and intent incorporated into the detailed description of 48c and how that indicator will be met. Lloyd Foreman 1st, Keith Warrenner 2nd. All in favour, none were opposed. **Indicator 48a was removed from the indicator set and the elements will be included in 48c's details.**

Keith Chapman moved to Indicator 48b and reviewed the draft wording. Keith Chapman explained that this Indicator is an accounting – "here is the list of concerns, this is how many concerns that were addressed".

Nate Ryant commented that this Indicator appears redundant as well. This is part of the process of 48c. Nate asked Keith Chapman to review the flow chart. The flow chart was reviewed.

Keith Chapman responded that it is redundant in that it is a simple number (% of issues addressed) where 48c says the same thing but asks if the stakeholders are happy with how the issues have been addressed.

Keith Chapman asked the Table for any more thoughts for 48b. The Table suggested that the Indicator be kept. Keith Chapman called for a motion to adopt. Sharie Conroy 1st, Lloyd Foreman 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. **Indicator 48b was ratified without any changes.**

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 31, 2007

Keith Chapman reviewed draft Indicator 48d. Keith suggested that this indicator will likely be needed to allow those stakeholders that want more information to have a chance for a field review. Keith Chapman asked for any comments.

Sharie Conroy asked for a definition of “field review” and “reasonable”.

Keith Chapman offered a draft definition for field review: “an *opportunity for a concerned stakeholder to have an on site examination of proposed road and harvesting plans. An opportunity for the stakeholder to provide input and ask questions.*” This definition would be included in the detailed wording for the Indicator.

Keith Chapman offered a draft definition for reasonable: “*i.e. reasonable requests. A rational and practical number of requests to discuss and examine forest development plans as they relate to specific, identified issues or concerns.*” For example a specific issue or concern may be related to a water intake. This definition of what is reasonable is different than that described in footnote #9 which is related to another indicator (indicator 51).

Bruce Edwards commented that there should be some measure of consensus with the results of the field review.

Jill West commented that the Table needs to consider that these indicators are not completely independent of each other. Indicator 48c addresses the concept of stakeholders being in agreement with the proposed plans.

Lloyd Foreman commented that there has to be a balance. We want to ensure that the communities’ concerns are addressed. This will ensure that.

Nate Ryant commented that 48d is part of the process for Indicator 48c.

A brief discussion at the Table suggested that Indicator 48d be re-numbered so that it appears above ratified 48c.

Keith Chapman asked for a motion to adopt 48d. Bruce Edwards 1st, Keith Warrener 2nd. All in favour, none opposed, none abstained. **Indicator 48d was ratified and the indicator number will be changed to 48a.**

Keith Chapman moved to draft Indicator 49. Keith reviewed this line. Keith commented that the indicator for this line has the wording “available and comparable” in place of the sub-committee term of “anecdotal evidence”.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the term “anecdotal” could be an urban legend.

Keith Chapman commented that the dictionary definition of anecdotal is different than the legal interpretation that Sharie Conroy offered (courtesy of John Conroy, LLB).

Bruce Edwards commented that there is also the scientific use of the term anecdotal. Anecdotal information to a scientist is information not confirmed by a reproducible experiment or investigated thoroughly enough to be sure. Bruce gave an example of a medical study where 34 of 45 anecdotal reports turned out to be valid.

Keith Chapman responded that there isn’t 100% scientific truth in ‘anecdotal evidence’.

Bruce Edwards agreed that it would be better to use other words.

Sharie Conroy asked if “personal observations” could be used to determine if negative impacts to water occurred.

Lloyd Foreman commented that observations would be information. They would still need to meet the test of being available and comparable.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 31, 2007

Sharie Conroy commented that it would be key to get the available information prior to logging.

Keith Chapman responded that this would be key. The difficulty would be to definitely link any impacts back to the logging. If problems arose, would Teal need to hire a hydrologist to report on the cause?

Lloyd Foreman responded that having a professional assess the problem would be an absolute must. It may not be clear to anyone but an expert.

There was a brief discussion on water testing and the expense. It depends on what the water is being tested for. Heather Morlacci said that it was \$152 for a well water test; there is also a requirement for newer drilled wells to be tested. Impacts from logging would most likely be to turbidity.

Sharie Conroy commented that everyone in their valley has tests as well as a Master's student report. There is data.

Nate Ryant asked the Table if there needs to be more data gathered around this indicator regarding testing. We may want small milestones in the indicator set. We may want to develop and report on this indicator this year. We can identify the intakes that may be potentially impacted, determine what water qualities are being tested, gather the tests, report on the pre-tests, and then compare after harvesting. I don't want to put this indicator back a step but that is my suggestion.

Keith Chapman responded that everyone is interested in a good, robust indicator in the end.

There was a discussion at the Table about re-charge areas for streams and deep wells.

Chief Andy Alex commented that he was concerned about the Target of "Zero negative impacts..." What happens if there is a negative impact? I would suggest that companies take the approach of leaving the water as good as or better than they found it. Companies may need to go to the communities and say 'we are going to do some harvesting – it may have negative impacts to your water. Does the community want to take that chance'? If they do damage the water they should fix it.

Bruce Edwards agreed with Chief Alex. Teal Jones may damage our water. They may lose their certification. But what about the consequences to the water licensee's? The timber licensee could be liable but this hasn't been tested in court. It may come down to the number of lawyers each party could afford. It is a matter of deep concern for the Hatzic community. We support logging but don't want to 'pay' for the negative impacts.

Jill West responded that Teal would not be granted the Cutting Permit [The legal document authorizing a forest tenure holder to harvest timber for a set area (i.e. cutblocks)] until the MOF is satisfied with the assessments.

Nate Ryant asked if this Indicator goes beyond the minimum legal requirements. Does this Indicator provide for a little more protection for this resource? The only system that deals with the negative impacts specifically would be the legal system.

Lloyd Foreman commented that 100 years ago we had a lot less timber than we have today. Between the railroads (fires), natural fires and the logging companies, Yale a hundred years ago was completely burnt or logged. Poor logging practices have been turned around.

John Pichugin asked Bruce Edwards how the other licensees deal with this – namely the woodlot and the TFL - or how the community feels about them in the Hatzic.

Bruce Edwards responded that Peter Kokoska lives in the valley and what he does is subject to a lot of scrutiny. Bruce said that he believes that Peter takes extraordinary measures to ensure that there isn't any cause for complaint.

John Pichugin asked why Teal could not be expected to do the same. Teal is trying to be a good corporate citizen. It appears that there is a wall there.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 31, 2007

Bruce Edwards responded that his personal experience with Teal started with a meeting at Hatzic Hall in 2000. The Ministry of Forests' representative's attitude appeared to be "we are the MOF and we can do what we want – like it or lump it". Teal said that they wanted to work with the community. That made a very positive impression. This CSA process is making a positive impression as well. Another licensee had the attitude "we don't give a damn what you think". JS Jones has only recently been involved with the valley. Because people living in the valley stand to lose so much and stand to gain so little, we need to build that trust. The trust will be built through practice.

Lloyd Foreman commented that there needs to be some sense of trust. Lloyd said that he is pleased with the process and the input of the communities. I am comfortable with this process and it is as good as it gets.

Sharie Conroy commented that because of past logging and past flooding, they have concerns about anyone logging in their valley. The concern is about more run-off being added to the existing problem. The community sends a letter to all the logging companies and government agencies that say the same thing: "**don't log in the drainage area**". When the pumps are closed when the Fraser is high, we are in trouble. What we want to hear from Teal is that they can log and not impact the valley. We have six logging companies that want to operate on both sides of the valley. The taxpayers have spent \$10 million on damage to date.

John Pichugin said that they have committed to having a professional assess the potential impacts before harvesting. The report may well say "no – don't log here". We don't know until the report is made. We are trying to say that we want to work with the community, we want your input, we want to get the professionals in here and listen to them. We are trying to work with people.

Keith Warrener commented that there is no way to resolve some of these issues here. You are right; it will be the MOF District Manager that will make the decision on logging in the valley. Everyone understands the potential impacts of logging to the valley. We are trying to deal with it in a responsible way. The only way may be through the MOF. Speaking from an FVRD standpoint, we are looking for companies that are going to come in and be responsible. If Teal says that they are not going to log without a professional's okay – I believe them. The trouble is that another licensee could come along and log areas that Teal walks away from. We can't solve the problem here. We can try to meet the goals that the community wants.

Nate Ryant commented that the Table is talking about two different problems here: potable water and flooding. Let's focus back on the potable water and the indicator. The way this Indicator reads, are we addressing the issue sufficiently?

Bruce Edwards commented that within the limitation of what the Table can do, this indicator is good.

Nate Ryant noted the time (7:30). Does the Table want to adjourn the meeting?

Keith Chapman raised two points of business: Where does the Table sit with the proposed line? Does the Table want to motion to scrap it or adopt it? We also need to pick a date for the next meeting.

Bruce Edwards said that they don't want to scrap it. It is good. We'd like specific technical information on the testing to provide context.

Nate Ryant asked what technical details need to be sorted out.

Keith Warrener said that what he is hearing is that most people don't believe that there cannot be zero negative impacts. What are we talking about? Did the water get warmer or dirtier or what? The word "zero" really has to go. We also need definitions.

Keith Chapman suggested that they park the indicator for now, get some definitions, review legislation, and list what elements of water quality we would want to track, and hammer this out a bit and present it at

a future meeting. Keith asked about a future meeting date. He asked the Table to consider their schedules and the fact that summer and fishing season etc are coming.

Action Item: 13B Review potable water legislation, list potential elements of water quality that may be tested and revise the indicator wording for draft indicator 49 (VOITs to be Reviewed – May 31, 2007)

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman Due Date: July 31, 2007

Nate Ryant asked Keith Chapman how close the Table is to completing the list of indicators outstanding.

Keith Chapman said that they had just finished some of the more contentious ones but there are a few more. The Fraser Canyon / Multiple Benefits sub-committee will likely have draft indicators to be reviewed by the FPAG.

Keith Warrener interjected and motioned that draft indicators 44a, 44b, and 46 be ratified as drafted. Lloyd Foreman 2nd.

Keith Chapman noted the motions and asked the Table for those in favour of 44a.

Bruce Edwards commented that he was not comfortable with going ahead with these right now without a good discussion as they are so important.

Keith Warrener withdrew his motions.

Keith Chapman suggested that the Table may want to consider reviewing line 51 which has had some discussion and Keith had a sense that they Table was much in favour of the draft wording.

Keith Chapman reviewed the line. The issue of public abuse is a common concern among most of the sectors at the Table. Keith reviewed the definition of reasonable (footnote 9). This line is drafted as a way to push back on this issue.

Jeanne Warkentin asked who would be the people that would be involved with this. We have these concerns in our area.

Keith Chapman said that the BC Wildlife Federation (BCWF, see: <http://www.bcwf.bc.ca/>) may be a potential contact. There was a comment brought to Keith's attention through Ron Frank. A First Nation's member was uncomfortable with the BCWF due to some of the standpoints of the BCWF on First Nations' hunting rights. There may also be some outdoor clubs, 4x4 clubs etc that may use a particular area and do want to contribute. The idea is to help out any groups with gate keys, maps etc. These groups would act as citizens that observe and report to the RCMP or the MOF. This would provide or help to put more eyes and ears out there to push back on these issues. Observers would note licence plates or other useful info and report. They would not get directly involved.

Keith Warrener commented that Teal or any forest company can do little directly on these issues. The company can inform the MOF of what is going on out there. Ultimately it is the MOF that has to make a decision on those roads. The company can facilitate the connection between people who may observe problems and directing them to the proper agencies.

Heather Morlacci commented that they have some great 4x4 groups that do a lot of cleanup. We also have problems with automatic weapons in the area.

Keith Chapman asked for a motion. Jeanne Warkentin 1st, Keith Warrener 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. **Indicator 51 was ratified without any changes.**

Keith Chapman asked for a date for the next meeting.

John Warren said that he would like to see the Multiple Benefits strategy solidified before the fall and would like to meet in a month.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 31, 2007

Tuesday, July 31st was proposed. The Table generally agreed that this would be a workable date. **The next Fraser PAG meeting was set for July 31st at the Pantry Restaurant.**

Keith Chapman thanked everyone for going 20 minutes over time. Keith told the Table that Nate would not be able to stay for dinner as he needs to head back to Kamloops.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held July 31, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack at 4:30 PM to 7:30 PM