

Fraser Public Advisory Group (FPAG)

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to order

Chris Harvey, Environmental Programs Advisor, welcomed members of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at the Pantry Restaurant in Chilliwack on the 7th of September at 5:41.

2. Members

Present:

- Don Harris, Douglas/ In-SHUCK-ch First Nations
- Randall Dayton, Ministry of Forests
- Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Valley
- Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Durieu, McConnell Ck Ratepayers Assoc.
- Heather Morlacci, Hatzic Valley
- Samantha Peters, Sto:lo Tribal Council

Support:

- John Pichugin, Teal Jones Group
- Kevin Stanczyk, Teal Jones Group
- Chris Harvey, Environmental Programs Advisor
- Kirstin Campbell, Environment Department

Regrets:

- Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar First Nation
- John Bowles, Harken Towing
- Steve Dillen, 4 Wheel Drive Assoc. of BC
- Chief Douglas Sidney, Cheam Indian Band
- Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation
- Lloyd Forman, FVRD
- Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch Nation
- Mike Peters, Min. of Tourism, Culture and the Arts
- Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-Am
- Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band
- Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Pt Resident
- Al Stobbart, Inch Ck Hatchery, FVRD
- Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident
- Keith Warrener, Teal Cedar Sawmill

3. Documents

Documents distributed to members:

1. FPAG Meeting #24 Agenda
2. Draft Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2010
3. Summary of the 2009 Fraser Valley Operations Annual Report
4. Handouts for the presentation
5. Summary of changes made to the SFMP Indicators as of Sept. 7, 2010
6. FPAG Evaluation Form

Documents available:

1. SFM Plan
2. CSA Sustainable Forest Management Standards Z809-02 and Z809-08
3. Terms of Reference

4. Call to Order, Health and Safety

Chris called the meeting to order at 5:41. She pointed out the fire exit and said that there were no health issues to report.

5. Introductions: New Members/Guests, changes in Environment Dept.

Everyone introduced themselves to a new member, Samantha Peters, who was attending in place of Frank Andrews, and representing the Sto:lo Tribal Council and Chawathil First Nation. Samantha will be an alternate for Frank Andrews in the future.

Chris also introduced Kirstin Campbell who is now a member of the Environment Department, and will be assisting Chris when she goes on maternity leave at the end of the month.

Chris asked Randall for his contact information which he said was available on this email signature. Chris pointed out that Randall will be attending the meetings as an observer, representing Ministry of Forests, but felt it would be a conflict of interest to vote.

Action Item #24-1: Update contact list and distribute to PAG.

Environment Department, Next PAG Meeting or Nov. 30, 2010

6. Previous meeting minutes, February 2, 2010

Chris referred to the draft meetings minutes for the February 2, 2010 meeting. It was noted that the meeting minutes were previously distributed via email, therefore the review during meeting time would be kept brief.

Chris asked if there were any changes or additions to the meeting minutes. There were none and the minutes were approved.

Action Item #24-2: Post the meeting minutes on the internet

Environment Department, October 31 st , 2010

7. Current Events – Internal Audit Results & Upcoming External Audit

Chris summarized the results of the internal audit, and discussed the upcoming external audit.

Internal Audit Results

On July 12 and 13 the internal audit was completed. The Internal Audit was held in Honeymoon Bay this year but will be in the Fraser Valley next year. There were no non-conformances or non-compliances. There were however, several observations which are findings that Teal can choose to follow up on or not. Teal has chosen to follow up on all the observations. There were also a lot of positive findings. Contractor knowledge was really good regarding the Standard Operating Procedures, and Emergency Preparedness. Everything looked good in the riparian areas and several blocks were checked to see how well the trees were growing back. A few observations were made around missing fire equipment, and these are being addressed. There was evidence that the training was good, but there were issues around tracking of the training records.

Two SIPAG members came along on the field portion of the audit. They said they were glad he went and was happy to see that the operations crew knew what they were doing when Chris asked questions and that they had been taught their due diligence and safety. Overall, they liked how well staff was knowledgeable

Chris said that the External Audit will check similar things as the Internal Audit such as riparian areas, old growth, regeneration, free growing, and crew's compliance with SOPs. Chris also said that we have had a long gap between the winter and summer meetings because of funding issues, but in the future, we will try to schedule a meeting in the fall, winter and spring, leaving a summer break.

Upcoming External Audit

Chris said that the External Audit will check similar things as the Internal Audit such as riparian areas, old growth, regeneration, free growing, and crew's compliance with SOPs. Chris also said that we have had a long gap between the winter and summer meetings because of funding issues, but in the future, we will try to schedule a meeting in the fall, winter and spring, leaving a summer break.

Chris explained that the next audit will be the External Audit happening in the Fraser Valley September 14-16. The auditors are asking for volunteers from the PAG who would be willing to talk to them between 8:30 and 4:30 Sept. 14, 2010. Randall said he would be available. Heather said she would like to comment but will be at work during those times. Chris suggested she write her comments in an email, and that she (Chris) would check with the auditors in case they could call Heather in the evening. Chris also invited members to the field tour portion of the audit but no one volunteered. Chris said she would send out an email invitation to PAG members not present.

Current Events

John thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He said that CSA continues to be very important for the company and that customers are demanding certified wood. In this area, Teal is the only certified company, other than BCTS. FIA has decided not to fund public advisory groups but Teal has decided to continue funding both certification and PAGs. It is challenging to operate during a recession, and things are a little better than 6 months ago. Now the operations are combined into one certification, there are similarities and differences between the two areas which have to be accounted for.

8. Review 2009 Annual Report Results

Kirstin reviewed the 2009 Annual Report Results for the Fraser Valley Portion of the DFA. The results were as follows:

For 2009, Teal was in conformance with the target and the respective permitted variance for 43 of the 46 indicators. The indicators that were determined to be in non-conformance were as follows:

- Indicator F6-1 FN Participation in FPAG
- Indicator F6-8 FPAG Member Satisfaction
- Indicator F6-9: FPAG Membership & Representation

Indicator F6-1 and F6-8: FPAG membership survey, evaluations and invitations to First Nation were not completed due to reduced number of meetings in 2009. These actions will be completed in 2010.

In addition, one indicator, Indicator F3-3 Landslides Resulting from Roads & Cutblocks, did not meet the target but was within the acceptable variance.

John asked Kevin to comment on the two landslides which occurred in 2009, and were reported under Indicator F3-3. He said the cause of the slides were unknown, they occurred upslope of a road and plugged the road. Kevin did not have a chance to see the slide before the City of Abbotsford cleared the road and replaced the culvert. The slide originated outside Teal's operating area.

9. Presentation: Criterion 3 Soil and Water

Chris pointed out a summary list of indicators in the handout package which showed the indicators approved by the PAGs and the list of indicators still needing to be approved. John asked how long before the final list of indicators was needed. Chris said that Teal must be reregistered to the new CSA Standard by the end of 2011 and that all indicators should be finalized by this time.

Kirstin gave a presentation on Criterion 3 Soil and Water which included the following:

- Soil Productivity
- Seasons of Operations
- Soil Rehabilitation
- Coarse Woody Debris (CWD)
- Healthy Watersheds & Water Quality
- Community Watersheds -- Management

The presentation was a summary of the Homework Package distributed to FPAG members prior to the meeting.

10. Discuss Core Soil and Water Indicators

Kirstin initiated the discussion of soil and water indicators by reading each VOIT and, where applicable, comparing the new indicator to old indicators previously agreed upon by the PAGs.

C3.1.1: Level of Soil Disturbance

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Soil productivity: the natural elemental properties of forest soil function, nutrients and content	Conserve productivity of forests soils by minimizing disturbance due to harvesting activities	Level of Soil Disturbance	100% compliance with soil conservation limitations (permanent access structures and soil disturbance limits)	Zero

C3.1.2: Level of Downed Woody Debris

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Natural Ecological Cycles	Minimize negative impacts of harvesting on natural global ecological cycles	Level of Downed Woody Debris	Report on status of Coarse Woody Debris Program a minimum of once per year	Zero

Kirstin reminded members about the CWD Program. She told the group that the program was waiting for legislative changes expected in the spring to finalize the program. These changes have now been delayed until the fall of 2012, so the program is on hold until this time.

C3.2.1: Proportion of Watershed or Water Management Areas with Recent Stand-replacing Disturbance

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Water	Protection of Water resource	Proportion of Watershed or Water Management Areas with Recent Stand-replacing Disturbance	Maintain an Equivalent Clearcut Area within the allowable limits of low peak flow hazard in designated Watersheds, including Gordon River, Harris/Hemmingsen, Hatton Creek, Norrish Creek, Gurney Creek, and Jamieson Creek Watersheds	10%

Chris explained what the term Equivalent Clearcut Area was: the sum total of all recent disturbances within a watershed. By maintaining the ECA below a certain %, it lowers the risk of low peak flow events happening in the watershed. There is a target for each watershed, and when they have proposed developments Teal calculates the total ECA in the area which must be below the threshold to meet the target.

Sharie asked why the Hatzic Valley Watershed was not included as one of the watersheds which has the ECA monitored? John explained that the watersheds listed for this indicator are community watersheds or those with significant fisheries values as designated by Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Forests and Range. The ministries have signed an order to proclaim the watershed as significant for these values. Teal’s Forest Stewardship Plan describes specifically how these watersheds are managed. Heather said that it is possible that such designation could be sought for the Hatzic and that they are looking into it.

The original wording of the target was: “Maintain an Equivalent Clearcut Area within the allowable limits of low peak flow hazard in designated Watersheds, including Gordon River, Harris/ Hemmingsen, Hatton Creek, Norrish Creek, Gurney Creek, and Jamieson Creek Watersheds.” Bruce suggested that the indicator wording not refer to each watershed specifically but to “designated watersheds” instead, which would allow new watersheds to easily be incorporated if they receive such designation. Randall argued it would be beneficial to name the designated watersheds since they are established and new designations are not likely. Bruce suggested the word “including” be added so that it is not limited to the watersheds listed.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned for a 40 minute meal break at 7:00 pm, and resumed at 7:40 pm.

C6.3.1: Evidence that the Organization Has Co-Operated With Other Forest-Dependent Businesses, Forest Users, and the Local Community to Strengthen and Diversify the Local Economy

Bruce said he thought that the target (Prioritize co-operative and business relationships from within the local community) was soft and that it needed to be quantitative. For example, total dollars committed to the community or # jobs created. Sharie commented that the FPAG had discussed total # jobs created rather than income reported in the past for an area in Boston Bar. Don pointed out that it is likely site specific and that some areas will want jobs, others more interested in the service area.

Chris said in the past this indicator has been reported in Honeymoon Bay as: donations to the community, taxes paid, stumpage paid etc. John said it could be a difficult indicator to track, especially since they can't control how their contractors specifically do their business (such as hiring a subcontractor from out of area). It is different that the TFL in Honeymoon Bay because they are concerned with jobs, but here the communities are more spread out.

Sharie said the Hatzic Valley residents are more comfortable with loggers from the local community.

Samantha said that it sounds like an economic renewal strategy for every tenure, and that it could be broken down by tenure.

Don commented that local practices can sometimes be affected by things out of the control of the company such as unions. He also gave an example of where Teal did contribute to the community in Port Douglas. They built a camp and left it for the community who then could add on to the existing infrastructure.

Kirstin suggested that she and Chris will pull together a list of potential measurables for presentation to the PAG at the next meeting. This will give the PAG options for looking at a different target for this indicator. Randall asked if it is possible to track these measurables and come up with an actual target, and Chris replied that yes it would be possible. We have had other indicators in the past where we committed to tracking for five years and developing a quantitative target.

Kirstin and Chris both also noted that there are several other core indicators which overlap with some of the concerns noted by PAG members and that it may be useful to bring these to the next meeting and present them together.

Action Item #24-3: Bring a list of quantitative measures that could be used to track Indicator C6.3.1: Evidence that the Organization Has Co-Operated With Other Forest-Dependent Businesses, Forest Users, and the Local Community to Strengthen and Diversify the Local Economy to the next FPAG meeting.

Environment Dept. November 30, 2010

C6.3.2: Evidence of Co-operation with DFA-related Workers and their Unions to Improve and Enhance Safety Standards, Procedures, and Outcomes in all DFA-Related Workplaces and Affected Communities

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
A healthy and Safe Work Place for all personnel	Establish and maintain safe work practices and environment through adequate procedures and direction	Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities	Teal Manager/ Supervisor to attend Primary Contractor Safety Meetings a minimum of 3 times a year, and review Safety Meeting Minutes from meetings not attended	Zero

Kirstin asked Kevin if it was current practice for Teal to attend Contractor Safety Meetings. He said yes, in Pitt Lake he attends these meetings.

The original wording of the target was: "Teal Manager/ Supervisor to attend Contractor Safety Meetings." John asked that the wording be changed to specify that Teal will attend "Primary" Contractor Safety Meetings, since there are small operators which may have less formal meetings. Also, he said it could be hard for them to attend every meeting when the operations are so spread out. He suggested that they could attend 3 meetings a year with each primary contractor, and then review the safety meeting minutes when unable to attend. Don pointed out that this could be an advantage because sometimes more information comes out when the boss or manager is not present.

C6.3.3: Evidence that a Worker Safety Program has been Implemented and is Periodically Reviewed and Improved

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
A healthy and Safe Work Place for all personnel	Establish and maintain safe work practices and environment through adequate procedures and direction	Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved	All primary contractors working in the DFA are eligible for Safe Certification or have equivalent safety system in place by December 2012	Zero

John suggested that the wording of the indicator be changed slightly to allow more flexibility in their contractors being SAFE Certified. At the time of presentation the target was worded: "All primary contractors working in the DFA are eligible for SAFE Certification by December 2012." John said that although Teal promotes SAFE certification some contractors have difficulty with the concept. He said perhaps we could add "or follow WCB regulations and legislation." Kirstin suggested that we could require that they have "an equivalent safety system in place" and John agreed that made sense. Bruce asked about WCB compliance, and John explained that SAFE Certification went beyond the WCB regulations and legislation and gave an extra level of comfort that the contractors have the training, maintenance and assessment skills needed for the job. Don said that this goes back to hiring, and safety, and how it is not possible really to just hire anyone, they must have the skills and training to do the job.

C6.4.1: Level of Participant Satisfaction with the Public Participation Process

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Public participation	Improve the public participation process	Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process	Each item on the PAG Evaluation Form scores Satisfactory or better	Steps are taken to discuss and remedy, where possible, Poor or Unsatisfactory scores during a PAG meeting

Sharie said she did not think her comments from the audit interview were included in the audit report. Chris said that Teal does not have the ability to ask the external auditors to specifically provide feedback. They decide what is relevant to include in the audit report, which Teal makes sure is discussed during PAG meetings.

The original target was: “PAG Meeting Evaluation questionnaire distributed to all PAG members a minimum of once per year (results of survey communicated to PAGs).” Bruce said that this target did not require any action or improvement to be taken by Teal based on the results of the evaluation. The evaluation could simply be handed out and the target would be met.

Heather asked about PAG members who were missing. Kirstin pointed out that the current target said the evaluation would be handed out to all and Chris said it would be emailed or mailed out to those not present at the meeting.

Randall said that the term “level” in the indicator description implies that actual results should be tracked quantitatively and Bruce agreed. Chris said that the target could specify that a satisfactory or better scoring for each item on the evaluation form is required to meet the target, and that poor and unsatisfactory comments should have steps taken to remedy the situation. Don asked how we would know who was dissatisfied if the evaluations were anonymous. The group decided that all poor or unsatisfactory comments should be discussed at the meeting regardless, but that more detail may be required on the forms. Kirstin suggested that future evaluation forms should specifically ask PAG members to comment if they give a poor or unsatisfactory scoring.

Action Item #24-4: Add a section to the PAG Evaluation Forms asking members to explain all poor or unsatisfactory scores in the comments section.

Environment Dept. December 31, 2011

C6.4.2: Evidence of Efforts to Promote Capacity Development and Meaningful Participation in General

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Ongoing and meaningful public advisory group participation	Provide adequate background information and resources to Public Advisory Groups	Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general	The public participation process shall include discussions of 100% of the 'Discussion Items' for each criterion in the CSA Z809 SFM standard	Zero

The group agreed that they found the phrase “promote capacity development” to be confusing and were not sure what it meant. Chris explained that the wording came from the CSA Standard. She had asked for clarification from the CSA on issues previously, but was told that she had to go through a lengthy process to officially ask a question. The general idea of this indicator is to expand member’s knowledge about forestry issues in general, and Teal’s practices in particular. Teal provides educational opportunities for the PAG by putting together a homework package circulated prior to meetings, which, along with meeting presentations, expands upon the Discussion Items for each criterion outlined in the CSA Standard. Members agreed that current practices

to provide this information were helpful.

Randall commented that he felt that the value and objective did not match the indicator. Sharie asked if the indicator should reflect a larger group beyond the PAG. Kirstin noted that there are other indicators which discuss the broader public's interaction with Teal. Randall said that maybe the indicator should look at how members are brought into the PAG and encouraged to stay. Chris said that there is another indicator which addresses membership evaluation developed by FPAG. Don said it is tough because it is asking many members to travel a long way. He also said he felt the indicator made sense the way it was. Chris suggested that the words "Public Advisory Group Participation" replace "Public Participation" in the value. Sharie agreed this made sense now.

11. Next Scheduled meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled in the fall, and members will be contacted to confirm. Discussion topics will be the forth Criterion Global Ecological Cycles, homework packages will be distributed prior to the meeting. .

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. Minutes recorded by Kirstin Campbell.