

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #18 Minutes: FPAG Representation & SFMP Review

July 22, 2008

1. Call to order

Keith Chapman, called the 18th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 5:45 p.m. on July 22, 2008 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. Keith introduced Jillene West as the new Facilitator. Nate reluctantly bowed out as he had too many schedule conflicts. Jill brings a lot of expertise to our process. She works with a lot of other PAG groups, is intimate with Teal's SFMP and the CSA Standard and will be able to hit the ground running.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

John Bowles, Harken Towing	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Mike Peters, Ministry Tourism Culture and the Arts
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Steve Dillen, 4WDABC	Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery

Members Absent:

Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation	Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Point Resident
Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association	Kerry Grozier, District Manager, MOFR, Observer	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident
Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District
Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation	Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-am	
Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident	Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band	

Others Present:

Ed McWaters, May Trucking	Jillene West, Facilitator	Keith Chapman, Teal
Heather Morlacci, Observer	John Pichugin, Teal	Ken Webb, Observer

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #18 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #17 Minutes: *Indicator Development*
3. FPAG Membership Contact List (July 2008)
4. FPAG Membership Review (July 21, 2008)
5. New Indicators Adopted by Teal in October 2007
6. SFM Plan 2007 Results Summary (July 2008)
7. Priority Values, Objectives, Indicators & Targets – To be Reviewed (July 22, 2008)

4. Health and Safety

Jill West informed the Members present that the meeting is recorded to help with taking Meeting Minutes and that the recording is erased once the minutes for that meeting are ratified. Jill reviewed health and safety items and asked members to put forward any health and safety issues.

5. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #18

Jill West asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #18 and asked for any proposed revisions. No additional Agenda items were put forward.

6. Terms of Reference – Current Status

Jill pointed to the Terms of Reference (TOR). They set out the rules for PAG meetings. There has been one small change – the removal of the “sign off” page at the back to reduce the administrative burden. Jill asked for any comments from the Table. No comments were put forward. Jill asked for a show of hands for those that support the TOR and a show of hands for those that do not support the TOR. One member abstained and the remainder of the Members supported the TOR. Jill informed Members that if they have any comments or questions to let Keith or Jill know.

7. Introductions – New Members

Keith circulated the meeting sign in sheet. Member travel allowance is tallied according to names on the sign in sheet. Keith asked if new Members could let him know the travel distance between the meeting and their home for calculating the travel allowance. Bruce Edwards commented that gas prices have increased significantly in the last year or so and that the travel allowance rate should be updated.

Action Item: 18A John Pichugin to review travel allowance km rate and report at next FPAG Meeting

Environment Dept. John Pichugin

Due Date: September 9, 2008

Keith asked the Members at the table to introduce themselves, who they represent and some of the issues they have in regards to the DFA. Keith introduced himself and pointed to the *FPAG Membership Contact List* and asked Members to review the information for correctness. This info will just be for FPAG purposes only and will not be put on the web. Please let Keith know if any changes need to be made for accuracy and confidentiality. Everyone at the Table introduced themselves.

John Bowles asked the Table who were the new Members. John Bowles, Steve Dillen, and Mike Peters are new Members present.

8. Previous Meeting Minutes

Keith Chapman asked the group to put forward any revisions to the meeting minutes from meeting #17 (February 12, 2008). Keith informed the new Members that he emails out the Minutes beforehand for Members to review so that they can bring any changes up at the Meeting. This saves time in reviewing/correcting the minutes. The ratified minutes are posted on the website [http://www.tealjones.com/Cert_FPAG_Meetings.htm].

Bruce Edwards commented that under item “6 Introductions” on page 2, that Dick Bogstie is also the Deputy Emergency Coordinator for FVRD Electoral areas F and G. Heather Morlacci pointed to a typo on page 6, 4th paragraph from the bottom. Jill asked for any more changes. No further changes were put forward. Jill asked for a motion to adopt the Minutes as revised. Al Stobbart 1st, John Pichugin 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

9. FPAG Representation: Sector Attendance to Date, missing Sectors; 2008 Invitations.

Keith Chapman displayed the document “FPAG Membership Review” on the overhead projector and pointed it out in the meeting handouts. Keith explained that the document is a quick overview of how the various FPAG sectors have been represented at all of the meetings to date and what Teal did to follow up. Keith started on page 4.

Members had commented at the last meeting that attendance seemed to be dropping off particularly with First Nations. Keith reviewed the graph on page 4 and how it demonstrated the waning attendance for Members and First Nations. First Nations representation is challenging in that each individual First Nation has a heavy load of referrals to review and a limited amount of capacity. This is understood and is something that Teal continues to work on.

Keith moved to the graph on page 3. Keith reviewed the graph and the sectors. The graph showed that the representation for the Agricultural, Labour and Recreation/Tourism sectors was notably low and much lower than any of the others. Keith briefly explained who these representatives were and some reasons why they were not able to attend. These members were considered to be “inactive” as per the Terms of Reference.

Keith moved to the beginning of the document to “Inactive Members”. Teal sent letters to the inactive representatives for the Agricultural, Labour and Recreation/Tourism sectors that pointed out their attendance to date, an option to renew their Membership or to identify a replacement representative and a date to let Teal know (April 24, 2008). These people have chosen not to continue with the FPAG process.

Keith sent invitation letters in early April 2008 and another set in early June 2008. These letters were sent to all First Nations/First Nations groups associated with the Defined Forest Area. Letters were sent to five Environmental Non-

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, September 9, 2008

Government Organizations. This included the David Hancock Foundation who had sent a letter to Teal regarding concerns about an eagle roosting area that he believed may have been within the DFA. David had asked how he could participate in forest management so Teal invited him to the FPAG. Nine letters also went out to representatives for businesses related to the DFA, a fishing guide within the DFA, a 4 wheel drive club (“Herd of Turtles 4x4 club”), and the BC Wildlife Federation.

Keith reviewed the responses from the invitations. The 4x4 club referred the invitation letter upwards to the 4 Wheel Drive Association of BC and Steve Dillen joined FPAG. Steve had mentioned this to Mike Peters of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and the Arts who became interested and contacted Keith Chapman. Keith invited Mike Peters to the group. Two other invitees are interested and may decide to join in the future.

One First Nation group, Esh-kn-am decided to join FPAG. Seabird Island Indian Band changed their representatives and Chief Clem Seymour is now the representative. Other First Nations have shown some interest and Teal will be following up with them. Boston Bar First Nation has not determined whether their new Forestry representative will be active in the FPAG.

At the end of the Membership review process we have three new Members and one new First Nation. Teal will continue to work on First Nation participation and to identify a representative for wildlife/environment either from an environmental organization, government agency or a wildlife expert.

Keith asked for any comments from the Table regarding representation. No comments came forward. Keith suggested that if there are any thoughts to either call or email with any questions or suggestions.

10. New Indicators Adopted by Teal

Keith Chapman displayed the document “New Indicators Adopted by Teal in October 2007” on the overhead projector and pointed it out in the meeting handouts. Keith explained that the work the Table did in 2006 and 2007 identified a lot of Values associated with the DFA and then developed Indicators for most of these. In all of that work, no values were specifically identified under *CSA SFM Element 1.4 – Protected Areas and Sites of Special Biological Significance*. The CSA standard requires that at least one indicator be developed for each of the CSA Elements. Teal adopted these indicators in October 2007. The CSA standard allows Teal to adopt additional Indicators to those put forward by the PAG.

Keith reviewed the description and requirement of Element 1.4 and why this is part of being sustainable in forest management. Keith reviewed the four indicators Teal adopted and explained what each Indicator means. Indicator 1-20 will need some revision as there is a bit of discrepancy between the Value statement and the Objective statement etc. All of these Indicators adopted by Teal can be changed by the FPAG during their regular reviews of the total set of Indicators.

Jim Baker asked about Indicator 1-20. Does this track everywhere that Teal is working like the Island etc? How is this stuff tracked? Do these Indicators track the number of hectares etc from year to year?

Keith responded that these Indicators are associated with Teal's DFA in the Chilliwack District and will report for that geographic area. The Indicator sets were borrowed from Teal's Honeymoon Bay PAG (the South Island Public Advisory Group). The reporting for items like Wildlife Habitat Areas and Winter Ranges is done by stating the hectares that are required and what changes to those hectares are made so there are hard numbers to follow. Keith Chapman referred to the *SFM Plan 2007 Results Summary* and showed how these items are tracked. Indicator 1-20 simply tracks the location and recording of special biological sites.

Keith asked for any further comments from the Table on these new Indicators. No further comments came forward.

11. SFMP Review: Results from 2007 Annual Report

Keith Chapman displayed the document “SFMP Plan 2007 Results Summary (July 2008)” on the overhead projector and pointed it out in the meeting handouts. This document is simply a chopped down version of the 120+ page Appendix II of the SFMP which concentrates on the results from 2007. The review will concentrate on the Indicators where the Targets were not met. The FPAG Membership should review this document and put forward comments prior to finalizing the SFMP report for 2007. Any issues should be brought forward by Members 2 weeks prior to the September 9th FPAG meeting (Comments prior to August 26th 2008). That will give us about 5 weeks to put forward comments.

Keith reviewed the “Summary of Changes” on page 1 and why some administrative changes were made to some Indicators. Keith reviewed the “Summary of Changes to Indicator Numbering”. The changes to the numbering system became important when new indicators were being developed or combined and trying to keep the numbering system logical. The new numbering system shows the CSA Criterion number and the number of the Indicator (i.e. Criterion# - Indicator #).

Keith Chapman paused the meeting for the 30 minute meal break.

After the meal break Keith continued with the results summary. Keith pointed out the Indicators that did not meet their Targets on page 4. Teal met 59 of the 65 Indicators. Keith went to the first of these Indicators (1-8 Mountain Beaver) on page 13. Keith reviewed the issues that led to the strategy for Mt. Beaver not being developed. Teal anticipated that the Government may be putting forward legislation that may make any strategy developed by Teal redundant or temporary. The draft legislation was put forward in May 2007. Any strategy developed by Teal regarding Mt Beaver Habitat would need to be in sync with the final legislation. No Mt. Beaver burrows were identified in 2007. Keith reviewed the approach to Mt Beaver habitat that the strategy was going to incorporate. The external Auditor will want to see this Indicator adapted to this situation.

Keith asked the Table for any thoughts. Jim Baker said that he has a lot of respect for this little creature. Every bit of any logging area should be thoroughly walked prior to logging. This goes for all of the animals and plants. In our area of Boston Bar, we have lost 150 specimens of insects, plants, animals etc. Do we want to lose another 150 in the next 15 years? This is getting pretty serious. Someone needs to be responsible, perhaps the engineer, to look out for issues regarding these species that are threatened.

Keith asked Jim if he felt that it would be good to have some training for engineering staff to identify and recognize threatened species in order to help them manage them in the field? Maybe we could list those species that are most threatened by forest management and provide some training and documents for the engineering.

There was some discussion at the Table on Mt. Beavers the three sub-species and its habitat needs, current forest management, the BC Identified Wildlife Strategy and the draft legislation.

Jill West suggested that Teal get a current update on the status of the draft legislation and let the FPAG know when this will be finalized etc.

Action Item: 18B Keith Chapman to review the current status of the proposed Order under the Government Actions Regulation regarding proposed Wildlife Habitat Features.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman

Due Date: September 9, 2008

Keith moved to the next Indicator not met (4-1 Community Log Retrieval Agreements, pg 23). Keith reviewed the Indicator, the purpose of it and the current status. The Indicator was not met as the community proponents did not put forward solutions to the issues (legal, environmental etc) that Teal identified. Currently the log retrieval agreement is in the proponents' hands. This may be an Indicator that the FPAG may need to revise to incorporate the concept that these agreements are a two-way street. It may involve developing an Indicator that tracks the progress.

Jim Baker agreed with this general assessment of the current status and potential solutions.

John Pichugin reviewed the issues that surround this Indicator and a Log Retrieval agreement.

Steve Dillen commented that maybe the Indicator and Target could be revised to incorporate the idea that these agreements will be finalized by Teal in a certain amount of time after the proponent has answered Teal's concerns. Keith noted the comments and will incorporate these suggestions into a proposed revision.

Action Item: 18C Keith Chapman develop some alternative Indicators for Indicator 4-1 Community Log Retrieval Agreements

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman

Due Date: September 9, 2008

Keith noted the time and moved to Indicator 6-1 First Nation Participation in FPAG, page 31. Keith reviewed the Indicator and the current status. Keith reviewed the reasons why this Indicator was not met. At the time the Target date was coming up the FPAG was deeply involved in a lot of work on Indicators, Variances etc and was meeting every 3 weeks or so. This was not a good environment to bring new Members into as it would have overwhelmed a lot of them. The decision was made to let this lapse until a better time to bring in new Members. This opportunity arose this spring and all of the First Nations were invited.

Keith asked the Table for any comments. John Bowles asked if it is safe to say that this Target was met for 2008? Keith responded that it was. That will be something that the external Auditor will be looking for is how the Indicator will be maintained. First Nations involvement and issues with the DFA are emphasized in the CSA Standard.

For the benefit of new Members, Al Stobbert pointed out the fact that the Indicators regarding First Nations were all developed with First Nations' input. Keith Chapman added that even the Variances were deferred until there was a First Nations' representative present at the Table. No other comments came forward from the Table.

Keith moved to Indicator 6-3 First Nation Protocols on page 32. Keith reviewed the Indicator and the current status. Keith reviewed the reasons why this Indicator was not met. The issues around this Indicator are very similar to

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, September 9, 2008

those involved with the Log Retrieval Agreements. There are two parties that need to come to agreement: Teal and the individual First Nation. First Nations are heavily burdened with referrals regarding their Traditional Territories from outside parties. Al Stobbart added that individual First Nations also have different and sometimes shifting priorities so finalizing a protocol agreement may not always be the priority.

Keith suggested that maybe some of the ideas regarding the Log Retrieval Agreement be applied to the FN Protocol indicator.

Jim Baker asked if there is a time limit on these agreements? Keith responded that the term of the agreement is agreed and set into the agreement and it is often 1 or 2 years.

Al Stobbart commented that he is familiar with the Katzie First Nation and, to some degree, the Chehalis. These two groups are interested in forestry but with the slump in forest products, the incentives are not there at this time. The Katzie are now concentrating on the Independent Power Producers that are interested in developments within their Traditional Territory. Al agreed that the changes suggested for Indicator 4-1/5-4 Community Log Retrieval Agreements may be applicable to Indicator 6-3.

Keith Chapman moved to Indicator 6-9. Keith reviewed the Indicator and the current status. Keith reviewed the reasons why this Indicator was not met. The issues around this Indicator are very similar to those involved with Indicator 6-1. It was decided that it was not a good time to change the FPAG Membership and bring in new Members at a time when a lot of detailed Indicator work was being done on the long list of Values. Teal addressed the FPAG Membership and Representation early in 2008.

Keith reviewed the Indicator 6-10 Public Meetings and the current status. Keith reviewed the reasons why this Indicator was not met. This Indicator was not met as the forest development planning in areas associated with these communities was curtailed due to the slumping market for forest products. This Indicator will be met in 2008.

12. Priority Values, Objectives, Indicators & Targets – To be Reviewed

Keith Chapman displayed the document "Priority Values, Objectives, Indicators & Targets – To be Reviewed" on the overhead projector and pointed it out in the meeting handouts. This document is focused on the outstanding Values that the FPAG has worked on for a considerable time but has not finalized Indicators. Keith reviewed the history and the current language of Indicator 5-7. This Indicator combines the Values of "Safety", "Human Safety" and "Infrastructure and private & community property". If an event affects private or community property it is impossible to rule out the potential for that event to affect human safety. Keith reviewed what is involved with professional assessments and their reports and the role of Professional Foresters in working with those assessments.

Keith Chapman turned to the Table for any comments. Al Stobbart commented that the current wording looks like it works. It addresses the concerns that were raised with this Value. Al commented that Jeanne Warkentin wanted to see that people were identifying and managing the risks to people and the community. Steve Dillen offered some changes to the Objective statement by changing the statement to read "*Protect human safety infrastructure, private and community property resulting from **damage resulting from** increases in slides, debris torrents, and flooding attributed to harvesting and roads*". This gets to what the value is about – protection from damage.

Bruce Edwards commented that there would be concern about any increase in flooding. How do you demonstrate damage? It is difficult enough to demonstrate increases in slides and flooding. It is even more difficult to demonstrate damage.

Al Stobbart suggested eliminating the word "increases". Bruce suggested taking out the word "potential" in the Indicator.

Jill West suggested that the Target does not need to repeat the same language and can simply be stopped at "*100 % conformance with recommendations from qualified professional reports*".

Keith reviewed the changes on the overhead.

Steve Dillen suggested some more changes to the Indicator language. Bruce Edwards suggested a comma after 'safety' in the Objective statement. Keith showed the current changes to the Indicator set.

Heather Morlacci asked about who would pay for the professional's? Keith responded that Teal would pay for the professionals. If the community wanted to pay for professional assessments, they are welcome to procure their own reports. Some discussion followed on costs of professional reports.

Jill West pointed out that there are also other Indicators that report on community meetings and community input into these reports.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, September 9, 2008

Keith Chapman noted the time was getting close to 8:30 and reviewed the Indicator as changed. The changes as follows (Changes in **bold** or ~~strike through~~):

Indicator #	Value	Objective	Indicator	Target
5-7	Human safety, infrastructure and private & community property	Protect human safety, infrastructure, private and community property from damage resulting from increases in slides, debris torrents, or flooding attributed to harvesting and roads	Completion and conformance with site specific hydrological and/or terrain stability assessment reports from qualified professionals where human safety, infrastructure, private or community property is at risk due to potential increases in slides, debris torrents, or flooding attributed to harvesting and roads	100 % conformance with recommendations from qualified professional reports where human safety, infrastructure, private or community property is at risk due to potential increases in slides, debris torrents, and flooding attributed to harvesting and roads

Bruce Edwards said that he was unhappy with “damage” being included in the wording. It is more difficult to demonstrate “damage” than simply flooding and slides. Damage may involve having to litigate. The wording should simply regard protection from flooding, debris torrents etc.

Heather Morlacci suggested that there be no slides etc.

Keith Chapman responded with the suggestion that the entire Indicator set be revised so that the Objective is “No slides, debris torrents etc impacting human safety etc”, the Indicator may be “Number of slides etc impacting human safety and property etc” with a Target of “Zero”.

Mike Peters had to leave the meeting to make an appointment and left at 8:30.

Heather Morlacci said that their community has had a lot of problems with poor practices and resulting impacts. We need to take the time to get this wording right. We don’t want to track the number of impacts. We want no impacts - maybe a combination of the Target of no impacts and professional reports.

There was a brief discussion on evaluating actual causes of flooding or slides and pinpointing the actual trigger (i.e. logging or natural).

Jill West suggested that these two Indicators be set as a priority in the next meeting agenda. Keith suggested that he will fine tune this a bit and perhaps make some alternative Indicators to address these Values.

Heather Morlacci said that would be good.

Keith Chapman thanked everyone and reminded them of the field trip Saturday, September 13, 2008. The trip will likely go up the Sowaqua drainage near Hope and will be about 6hrs long. Please drive home safely.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Meeting Minutes recorded by Keith Chapman.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held September 9th, 2008. The meeting location will be announced shortly.

5:30 PM to 8:30 PM