

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #15 Minutes: Variance Development

October 9, 2007

1. Call to order

Nate Ryant, called the 15th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 4:49 p.m. on October 9, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie		

Members Absent:

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

Others Present:

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

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #15 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #14 Minutes: *Indicator Development*

4. Health and Safety

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

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

5. Review Agenda for Meeting #15 / Adapt / Ratify

Nate asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #15 and asked for any proposed revisions.

No additional Agenda items were put forward. Nate Ryant motioned to accept the revised agenda. Bruce Edwards 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

6. Introductions

No new faces were present.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes

Nate asked the group to review the meeting minutes from meeting #14. Sharie Conroy noted a typo on page 3, 3rd paragraph.

No additional revisions were put forward. Nate Ryant motioned to accept the revised minutes. Bruce Edwards 1st, John Pichugin 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

8. Variances for Ratified Indicators

Nate Ryant asked Keith Chapman to begin the variance development discussion. Keith Chapman put a table of ratified Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets (VOITs) on the overhead screen. The table showed a Proposed Variance (from Teal – a starting point for discussion) and an area for the final Variance ratified for the individual VOITs. The Indicator number in the Table corresponds with the Indicator numbering in the Sustainable Forest Management Plan.

Keith explained the table and the role of the Variance. The Variance is a measure of how badly a missed Target was missed.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #1** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Bruce Edwards motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Al Stobbart second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #2** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Bruce Edwards motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Sharie Conroy second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #3** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. John Pichugin addressed the Table – the Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR) is scheduled to establish Coarse Woody Debris objectives by December 2008. We should try to synchronize our Indicator with the provincial guidelines.

Sharie Conroy asked if this strategy takes into account the climate and fire regime. Keith Chapman responded that it would reflect fire dominated ecosystems and also risks to other resources.

Keith suggested that the Variance be changed to December 2008. Nate Ryant suggested that the Target be changed to reflect the MOFR timeline and the Variance allow for delays in the release of the MOFR strategy. There was a brief discussion about how to incorporate the expected MOFR release into the Indicator set. Bruce Edwards suggested new wording for the Target: **Complete an acceptable strategy consistent with MOFR guidelines December 2008**. Al Stobbart 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. The Target for Indicator set # 3 was ratified as changed.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #4** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Keith Warrenner motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #5** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. John Pichugin explained how proposals for forest lands conversion come across his desk and how he responds. Keith asked if all proposals for deletions are referred to the forest licensees such as Teal. John responded that not always. This Indicator set is built around those proposals/referrals that

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

are sent to Teal. Much of this referral is regarding use of roads under permit to Teal. Keith Warrener motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #6** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Bruce Edwards motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Al Stobbart second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #7** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Al Stobbart motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #8** and the proposed Variance of “**February 2008**” (i.e. two months of leeway) and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Bruce Edwards motioned to adopt February 2008 as the Variance for this indicator. Keith Warrener second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of **February 2008** was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #9** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Keith Warrener motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Al Stobbart second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #13** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #14** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #17** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Keith Warrener motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Sharie Conroy second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #18** and the proposed Variance of “Within 3 years of identification” - a variance of one year - and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy asked about some previous logging where logs were left – both cut trees and burnt timber – which resulted in a log jam. Will this lead to something that should be removed right away being left for another year. Keith Chapman commented on the post logging waste and residue assessment within the block. Logs that are merchantable will be assessed a penalty if they were not left for safety or environmental reasons. Keith Warrener asked about windthrow. The longer one waits the worse a problem like windthrow can get. Why not get in as soon as possible. Ed McWaters responded that it comes down to where the windthrow is (i.e. a reserve or other no-harvest area or if it is physically assessable) and whether log markets will allow for recovery without losing money. If it is accessible and economical they will try to recover the damaged timber as soon as possible.

Sharie Conroy commented that it sometimes is a safety factor for people etc down slope. Keith Chapman responded that Sharie’s example is likely a pre Forest Practices Code block where a lot of timber was left and it contributed or caused a debris torrent. If this scenario were to happen today, there would be an investigation by the MOFR and remedial action and penalties could be assessed against the licensee. This indicator set is related to damaged timber (fire, insects, disease, and wind) outside of a Cutblock and not related to post logging slash and left timber.

Nate Ryant returned the discussion to the Variance. Keith Warrener motioned to adopt the Variance of “Within 3 years of identification”. Al Stobbart 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of “Within 3 years of identification” was ratified.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

Keith reviewed **Indicator #19** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Bruce Edwards motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Al Stobbart second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #20** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #21** and the proposed Variance of “1 per year” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. John Pichugin commented that Honeymoon Bay operation on Vancouver Island has a variance of 2 fires per year. We don’t want to have a fire. Nate Ryant said there may not be a need for a variance. If an event occurs, Teal will need to complete an investigation into the root cause and try to improve on it. It’s like a legal requirement.

Keith Warrener asked for clarification of what a fire would be. Keith Chapman responded that it would be any accidental fires within 1 km of an industrial activity. It has to burn forest land (standing / felled timber, regenerating stands). There was a brief discussion on the term of Industrial fire and wildfire. Keith Chapman commented that the term “industrially caused fire” occurs in about 10 SFMP’s that he has reviewed so the term has stood the test of time. Sharie Conroy commented that the Variance should be zero. Bruce Edwards agreed with Zero. Al Stobbart suggested that the Target wording be changed from “Zero accidental industrial caused fires” to “Zero preventable industrial caused fires”.

Keith Chapman asked the Table for any motions on the changes. Bruce Edwards 1st for both changes to the Target and the Variance. The Target to read “**Zero preventable industrial caused fires**” with a Variance of “**Zero**”. Al Stobbart 2nd, all in favour, none opposed.

Nate called for a 10 minute break.

After the break, Bruce Edwards motioned that the Table look at those Targets with proposed Variances of “Zero” as a group and ratify the respective Variances as a group. Keith Warrener 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #22** and the proposed Variances of “Zero” OR “Maximum of 8%” OR “As per individual Site Plans and supporting information”. The topic was opened to the FPAG Table for discussion. John Pichugin commented that Teal is increasingly moving to smaller cutblocks. In the past, the average Cutblock was about 40 hectares and the percentage of in block roads was quite low. Now with smaller blocks with roads running through them, the relative percentage has increased. [% of Cutblock roads = (area in road) / (harvest area of Cutblock)]. We are building about the same or less amount of road but the percentage is climbing. There is also a variable amount of helicopter blocks but this varies from year to year. John suggested that they may need 1% of room around the Target. Keith Chapman asked the Table for any discussion on 8% as a maximum.

There was a discussion on Permanent Access and various ways of tracking it.

Sharie Conroy motioned to adopt Zero as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith Chapman reviewed **Indicator #23** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. The Variance was carried forward as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #24** and the proposed Variance of “2 per year” OR “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy commented that she thought it should be zero. If there is a slide they want to hear the rationale. It is similar to fire. Keith Chapman explained that this Indicator addresses roads built during the Forest Practices Code and that are under permit to Teal so they should be well built, maintained and inspected. There was a brief discussion on what would be defined as a landslide. Keith Chapman responded that under the Forest and Range Practices Act, a slide is defined as a movement of earth and other material that causes a material adverse effect. Keith added that if there is a slide event, Teal is obligated to investigate and file a brief report on the slide and submit it to the MOFR.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

Sharie Conroy asked if there would be a different level of reporting if the variance was Zero per year and you had two slides or if the variance was 2 and you had two per year? Nate Ryant responded that the Indicator would be reported regardless of the number or lack of slides in a year. Sharie responded that if the level of Variance did not change the reporting of the Indicator then she would be happy with a Variance of 2 per year.

Sharie Conroy motioned to adopt “2 per year” as the Variance for this indicator. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of “2 per year” was ratified.

Keith Chapman reviewed **Indicator #25** and the proposed Variance of “2 per year” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy commented that this issue is much different from slides from roads. Their experience has been that many slides happen around 10 years after logging. I feel that roads cause most of them so slides from cutblocks should be relatively rare. If a cutblock is designed and assessed properly there should not be a slide from a cutblock. Sharie said that she would like to know why any slides happen. Ed McWaters commented that slides within cutblocks would include gully failures etc.

Sharie Conroy motioned for Zero as the Variance for #25, Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #26** and the proposed Variance of “1 reportable spill per year” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. There was a brief discussion on reportable spills and accidents. Sharie Conroy motioned for “1 reportable spill per year”, Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance of “1 reportable spill per year” was ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #29** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #30** and the proposed Variance of “Zero” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. Sharie Conroy asked when a reportable spill to water would happen? Keith Chapman responded that this may occur during road building and crossing streams or fueling accidents that reach water. Nate commented that the difference between reportable spills to land and water is that any hazardous materials introduced to water is a reportable spill where reportable spills to land are defined by different amounts. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicators #31 and #32** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #33** and the proposed Variance of “Agreements completed within 1.5 years of expression of interest” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. John Pichugin commented that Teal needs to be careful with this. They had a person taking firewood from one of Teal’s old settings with no safety equipment, 1st Aid, WCB # etc. The MOFR found this guy during one of their inspections and reported it to Teal. The communities or companies that want to salvage timber will need to get all of these procedures and approvals in place and this will take some time and it isn’t as easy as it sounds. John Pichugin suggested going to December 2008. Keith Chapman explained that there would need to be an official expression of interest (in writing) to start the clock. Nate Ryant suggested changing the Target to incorporate the language of having a written request.

Bruce Edwards suggested re-wording the Target to state (changes in bold):

“Complete protocol agreements with individuals or groups from communities with a **written** expression of interest within one year of the **expression of interest**”

Bruce Edwards motioned that the Indicator wording be changed (as above), Keith Warrener second, all in favour, none opposed. The Target (as above) and the Variance of “Agreements completed within 1.5 years of expression of interest” were ratified.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

Keith reviewed **Indicators #34** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith Chapman reviewed **Indicator #36** and the proposed Variance of “minimum 10%” and turned to the FPAG Table for discussion. John Pichugin commented that they have some fertilization projects that they want to do but the budget is evolving. John added that they may need to change the Target wording to expand on “external funding”.

The proposed changes to the Indicator (in bold): “Percentage of identified fertilizable stands (hectares) treated over a 5 year period where external funding for treatment is available **as outlined in the Land Base Investment Rationale (LBIR)**”

John suggested amending the Target to read: “**Average over a 5 year period of 15%** of identified fertilizable stands treated per year”

John commented that they are having second thoughts on fertilizing stands. Teal is having difficulty marketing timber with less than 5 growth rings per inch. It’s nice to fertilize and get a big log but the market for this kind of wood has dried up. Nate Ryant suggested changing the Indicator to incorporate “as per market conditions”. John replied that it is difficult to anticipate the markets 5 or more years out. Keith Chapman responded that we could ratify some language around this Value and then revisit the Indicator later with the PAG when we have more information.

Keith Chapman asked for motions on the changes and Variance. Keith Warrener motioned to ratify both the Indicator change (as above) and the proposed Variance. Bruce Edwards second, all in favour, none opposed. The Indicator, Target and the proposed Variance were ratified.

Keith reviewed **Indicators #37, 39, 41** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #43**. There is no proposed Variance at this time as input from the Fraser Canyon communities is required. The Table agreed to defer developing a Variance for this Indicator set.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #46** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. John Pichugin commented that the Indicator language did not agree with the Objective or visa-versa. John proposed amending the Indicator to: “**Percentage of identified stream or terrain related threats reported to the applicable Regional District**”. Bruce Edwards 1st, Keith Warrener 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. The Indicator changes were ratified (as above). As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **#48a, 48b & 51** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero. Ed McWaters raised the concern regarding “Worksafe BC” [forest industry safety watchdog] and Teal’s exposure to safety concerns when touring members of the public in their work areas. Teal may need to look into this to see how the public can be involved while Teal maintains its safety program. The Variance for **48c** was ratified at an earlier FPAG meeting.

Keith reviewed **Indicators #52, 53, 54, 55, 56** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicator #57** regarding First Nations’ access to their traditional territories and the proposed Variance of “FN access may be restricted where safety is a concern”. The Table responded that they would like to defer development of this Variance until First Nations’ members are present at the Table.

Keith reviewed **Indicators #58, 59, & 60** and the proposed Variance of “Zero”. As agreed, the Variance was carried forward (ratified) as Zero.

Keith reviewed **Indicators #61** and the proposed Variance of “Meetings may be postponed where forest planning is curtailed for operational reasons”. This allows Teal to postpone meetings and associated forest planning if markets collapse or if Teal is deferring an area to work elsewhere. Bruce Edwards 1st, Sharie Conroy 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. The Variance (as above) was ratified.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG November 13, 2007

Keith Chapman congratulated the Table on their first set of ratified Variances.

Keith will include the ratified Variances with the Meeting Minutes.

Keith Chapman commented that the external audit of Teal (registration audit) is scheduled for October 23-25. The auditor requested to meet with the Fraser PAG during that period during the day. Bruce Edwards commented that it would be worthwhile to meet in person with the Auditor. Nate Ryant commented that could be possible. Nate added that PAG members are welcome to participate (observe) the auditor at work. Keith Chapman commented that of the FPAG Members he spoke with on the phone today, one or two were available to meet during the day.

Bruce Edwards enquired about the hydrology map from Drew Brayshaw's report. Ed McWaters responded that he had some information that he will share right after the meeting.

9. Next FPAG Meeting

Nate Ryant turned to discuss the date for the next meeting. Keith asked the Table if they would like to meet with the Auditor with one of the 2 remaining meetings budgeted to March 31st. Keith Chapman added that it would be nice if the two remaining meetings in this fiscal could be used to work on the large list of issues outstanding.

There was a brief discussion at the Table of potential dates and conflicts. The Table decided on November 13th, 2007.

Keith Chapman requested that the Table find a date for the following meeting likely next year. The Table decided on Tuesday, February 5th, 2008.

Ed McWaters asked when the next revision of the SFMP will be distributed. Keith Chapman responded that there has been a lot of work completed on the indicator set but there are also some significant issues outstanding.

John Pichugin distributed travel allowance cheques to Members present. Cheques will be mailed to those with travel claims shortly.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held November 13th, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack at 4:30 PM to 7:30 PM