

Fraser Public Advisory Group (FPAG)

Meeting #25 Minutes

1. Call to Order

Kirstin Campbell from the Teal Jones Environment Department, welcomed members of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at the Pantry Restaurant in Chilliwack on the 9th of November at 5:40 pm.

2. Members

Present:

- Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Valley
- Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Durieu, McConnell Ck Ratepayers Assoc.
- Heather Morlacci, Hatzic Valley
- John Bowles, Harken Towing
- Steve Dillen, 4 Wheel Drive Assoc. of BC
- Al Stobbart, Inch Ck Hatchery, FVRD
- Frank Andrews, Sto:lo Tribal Council

Support:

- John Pichugin, Teal Jones Group
- Kevin Stanczyk, Teal Jones Group
- Kirstin Campbell, Environment Department

Regrets:

- Chief Don Harris, Douglas First Nation
- Randall Dayton, Ministry of Forests
- Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar First Nation
- 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
- Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident
- Keith Warrener, Teal Cedar Sawmill

3. Documents

Documents distributed to members:

1. FPAG Meeting #25 Agenda
2. FPAG Evaluation Form (for those who had not filled it out previous meeting)
3. Updated Contact List
4. Draft Meeting Minutes for September 7, 2010
5. Changes to Provincial Funding of Projects within the DFA
6. Summary of Indicators for FPAG Approval
7. Handouts for the presentation

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

Kirstin called the meeting to order at 5:40. She introduced herself to members who has not been at the previous meeting, and explained that she will be facilitating the meetings while Chris is on maternity leave. She also told everyone that Chris had a healthy baby boy at the end of September and that mom and baby were doing well.

Kirstin pointed out the fire exits, and then asked those who hadn't already filled out an evaluation form to do so.

She pointed out the updated Contact List. Bruce had a few corrections to the Contact List. He asked why he was still an alternate rather than an active member? John agreed with Bruce that several months ago Bruce had been made an active member. Steve asked that Kim Reeves, the President of 4 Wheel Drive BC, be added as an observer to the contact information and email list. Kim may attend the meetings from time to time.

Action Item #25-1: Update contact list and distribute to PAG.

Environment Department, Next PAG Meeting or Feb. 28, 2011

5. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #25

No one had any additions to the agenda.

6. Introductions: New Members/Guests

There were no new members to introduce. However, Kirstin asked Al to update everyone on his new representation at the PAG. Al said he retired from DFO in the spring and now is representing the FVRD as a Director for Area G, in addition to representing Area C where he lives. The Director for Area F, Dick Bogstie, also asked him to keep him informed of issues arising in the upper Pitt River. Al continues to represent fisheries in his new role on the PAG.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes, September 7, 2010

Kirstin referred to the draft meetings minutes for the September 7, 2010 meeting. It was noted that the meeting minutes were previously distributed via email, therefore the review during meeting time would be kept brief.

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

Action Item #25-2: Post the meeting minutes on the internet

Environment Department, January 31st, 2011
--

8. Current Events – External Audit Results & Changes to Provincial Funding

Kirstin summarized the results of the external audit, and changes to Provincial Funding of forestry-related projects.

External Audit Results

The External Audit took place Sept. 14-16, 2010 in the Fraser Valley. The Auditors spent two days in the office and one in the field. The field tour took place in both the Pitt River and Hope operating areas. During the course of the audit the auditors interviewed 2 PAG members, Randall Dayton from the FPAG, and Jayne Ingram from the SIPAG. They also talked with Clive Baudin, Ministry of Forests, Cobble Hill. The Pacheedaht Band in Port Renfrew responded to the auditors' letters asking for input from First Nations Group with a letter to the auditors.

There were no non-conformances and no non-compliances from the audit. There was 1 area of concern, and 5 opportunities for improvement.

Kirstin read results from the External Audit Report:

Positive Aspects of the Management System

- Continued strong efforts in the PAG process with good FN participation.
- A diverse PAG in both the South Island and Fraser Valley areas.
- Harvesting contractors (Southview) update of the prework form to include new operators as they enter the harvest area and their documented inspections of their operations.
- Teal Jones received an excellent letter from the Chilliwack District Manager due to favourable comments he received from the Fraser Valley Regional District about Teal Jones certification efforts.

Area of Concern

- The audit found that 3 - S6 streams (presently dry) had logs decked in them contrary to the Yarding and Loading SOP which states to protect the stream channels and banks and maintain natural drainage patterns. Ensure the plans address the placement of logs during harvest to protect the riparian resources.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Consider formalizing the use of road inspection forms in the CMS. Some road inspections results are being written on different forms.
 - Kirstin noted that this is already in progress
- Consider keeping all woody debris piles away from standing, reserved trees. A woody debris pile was too close to standing timber in SQ10A.
 - Kirstin mentioned that this would be done in the future
 - Bruce asked was this an issue because of fire hazard
 - John answered yes, and that occasionally the piles are close to timber because of the sized of the block (small blocks) but that they would only burn when conditions permit, such as the day before rain is expected
- Consider backing up information that goes into the SFM annual report. It was difficult to get the information that provided the basis for the annual report, such as Ungulate Winter Range areas.
 - Kirstin said this is in progress
- Consider tracking all road issues that require follow-up. Boston Bar area road issues were not being formally tracked, like the Pitt and Norrish Creek areas are being tracked.
 - In progress

- Consider fully completing the incident reports by ensuring all areas of the report are completed during the investigation. Although 2 wildfires were reported fairly recently the forms were incomplete in the root cause and corrective and preventative action areas.
 - Kirstin and Chris will be following up with all new incident reports to make sure the root cause is identified

Changes to Provincial Funding

Kirstin discussed recent changes in provincial funding for projects in the DFA. She mentioned that these changes have occurred in 2010, and that further changes may occur since the BC Government restructured the Ministry of Forests within the previous two weeks.

As it stands now, several funding sources are now amalgamated: Forest Investment Account Landbased Investment Program (FIA LBIP), Forests for Tomorrow, base forest health funding, and base invasive plant funding. Most projects within the DFA, such as fertilization, and road deactivation, were funded under the FIA LBIP in the past few years. The new program is called the Land Based Investment Strategy (LBIS) and is administered by the Ministry of Forests rather than PriceWaterhouseCoopers. Unlike previous fiscal years, funding for projects is no longer based on AAC.

Funding continues to be available for projects as long as they meet the objectives of new funding under the LBIS. Priority funding areas are:

1. Treatments to address mid-term timber supply (fertilization, spacing and backlog brushing)
2. Reforestation of areas impacted by catastrophic disturbance (i.e. Forest For Tomorrow)
3. Tree improvement
4. Forest health and mitigation of invasive species
5. Forest inventory activities - prioritized towards the midterm timber supply.
6. Fish passage
7. Ecosystem Restoration
8. Fuel management (along with Union of BC Municipality Funding)

The Fraser Valley has two indicators which may be affected by the changes to funding:

F4-4 Fertilization

Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Percentage of identified fertilizable stands (hectares) treated over a 5 year period, where funding is available	Average over a 5 year period of 15% of identified fertilizable stands treated per year	Minimum average of 10% of identified fertilizable stands treated per year

Currently there is funding for fertilization projects in the Fraser TSA. This is managed by the Fraser Co-op, which is made up of licensees and First Nations groups. At this time, it is unknown if any of Teal's stands will be fertilized. Indicator F4-4 does specify that funding must be available for fertilization for it to be applicable.

F5-3 Landbase Investments

Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Percent of allocated Forest Investment Account funds re-invested into the land base	100%	Zero

Aside from funding for fertilization, the only project funded in the DFA was a re-inventory project in TFL 46.

Since funding availability is changing Teal wanted to inform the PAG of these changes, and suggest that we re-evaluate these indicators in a year's time. We may want to modify these indicators in the future to better reflect funding availability.

Action Item #25-3: Re-assess the status of provincial funding for projects on the DFA in 2011.

Environment Department, December 31st, 2011

9. Presentation: Criterion 4 Global Ecological Cycles

Kirstin pointed out a summary list of indicators in the handout package which showed the indicators yet to be approved by the FPAG. She reminded everyone of the tight timeline needed to approve all core indicators before September 2011. She re-iterated the purpose of the re-registration audit in 2011 which will be to the new 2008 CSA Z809 Standard. She mentioned that the audit will be taking place September 19-23.

Kirstin also mentioned that the next meeting will focus on Community and Aboriginal Issues and asked if members would be interested in setting up a webcam meeting venue. This would allow members who might not be able to attend in person to attend from home over the internet.

John asked the group if any members had experience with this type of meeting and several members said they had. Steve said that he had done them before and found it to be useful. Frank said that more First Nations representatives might attend a meeting if this was available. Kirstin asked if in these types of meetings people were able to ask questions. Steve said yes, but that he suggested that the questions be typed rather than spoken to eliminate confusion during the meeting. John said that he would ask the IT Department to look into the options for the next meeting.

Action Item #25-4: Contact the IT Department to discuss options for FPAG members to attend a meeting via the internet.

John Pichugin and Environment Department, December 31st, 2010

Kirstin told everyone that they would be receiving their travel allowance cheques at the February meeting. John asked Sharie, Bruce and Heather if they carpoled and they said they did. Kirstin said she would email them with the meeting dates to find out who drove to each meeting. John B. said he did not require a travel allowance cheque.

Action Item #25-5: Distribute 2010 travel allowance cheques at the next FPAG meeting
Environment Department, next PAG meeting or March 31st, 2011

Kirstin then gave a presentation on Criterion 4 Global Ecological Cycles which included the following:

- Carbon in Forests
- Carbon Cycle
- Forests, Carbon Source or Sink?
- Wood Products and Carbon
- Implications for Harvesting
- Carbon Emissions from Fossil Fuel Consumption in Forest Operations

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

10. Discuss Core Global Ecological Cycle Indicators

Kirstin initiated the discussion of global ecological cycle indicators by reading the VOIT, and discussing how the indicator would be measured.

C4.1.1 Net Carbon Uptake

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
Global ecological cycles	Minimize carbon emissions and maximize carbon storage	Net carbon uptake	Maintain net positive carbon storage over the DFA from forestry operations (excluding carbon emissions from natural, uncontrollable events such as wildfire)	Zero

Bruce asked if Kirstin knew what % of a harvested stand was made into wood products. Neither Kirstin nor John knew the answer. John said that avoidable waste of what is harvested was 5-7% and they know this from waste residue surveys. Kevin said they are able to use even the smaller logs these days with their small diameter lumber mill in Port Kells. Al said this quite a change from his time working for Canfor where the minimum diameter utilized was 14 inches or so.

11. Discuss Other Core Indicators

Kirstin initiated the discussion of other core indicators by reading the VOIT, discussing how the indicator would be measured, comparing the indicator to similar indicators (either similar core indicators, or indicators from the previous SFMP).

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

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
Forest community well-being and resilience	To continue to foster good working relationships with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy	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	Prioritize co-operation with forest users, local businesses, and the local community	The intent of this indicator is to provide a general idea of the co-operation with Forest-dependent Businesses, Forest Users, and the Local Community, and results will fluctuate over time

Kirstin presented to members the proposed measures of this indicator. The final list of measurables approved by PAG members present were:

- # of new requests from forest users responded to favourably, excluding those requests not granted where safety, fire risk, vandalism or sensitive ecological sites are of concern.
- # of new local employees hired.
- # of local suppliers and services utilized.

John B. asked Kirstin what was an example of a request from a forest user? Steve said recreation users, and John P. said hunting. Heather pointed out that sometimes having access is not a good thing when the access is abused by dumping of garbage or doing harm to the environment, such as is occurring in McConnell Creek.

Bruce wondered if the measurable should read that the request must be reasonable and asked if Teal might turn down someone's request for access. John P. and Kirstin responded that this might occur when safety or fire risk is a concern. John P. this may happen if there are operations ongoing in the area someone might want to enter. Sharie asked if access was always granted as in the case of mushroom pickers who may find that their prime mushroom picking area has been logged. She said this happened in an area she knows of, but that this was not logged by Teal. John said they are willing to work with mushroom pickers if the pickers are willing to share the location of their

picking spot. Quite often, he has found that they will not share this information. In Boston Bar, Teal worked with a First Nation group to identify a mushroom picking spot and to make sure blocks were not planned on these sites.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned for a 30 minute meal break at 6:55 pm, and resumed at 7:32 pm.

C5.2.1: Level of Investment in Initiatives that Contribute to Community Sustainability

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
Contributions to society (including local community)	Assess the level of investment in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability	Level of investment in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability	Report on total dollars contributed to initiatives that contribute to the local economy and community sustainability	The intent of this indicator is to provide a general idea of the dollars contributed to the local economy by harvesting activities within the DFA, results will fluctuate over time

Kirstin discussed the proposed reporting method and measurable for this indicator. Bruce asked what an example of a local resource project would be. John P. responded that they have completed a stream rehabilitation project and inventory project where they looked at tree height and age in the TFL in Honeymoon Bay, as an example. John B. asked what is FIA funding and John P. responded that it is Forest Investment Account funding which was awarded to the DFA.

Steve pointed out that the focus of the indicator really is on initiatives that contribute to community sustainability, meaning initiatives that would give back to the community even after Teal no longer operates in the area, and above and beyond harvesting contributions. John P. responded that just by Teal operating they are providing to the community's sustainability through jobs and money into the local economy by purchasing local goods and services. Steve said that he read the indicator's intent as in going above and beyond everyday harvesting practices and contributing initiatives that would give back in perpetuity. For example, investing in an initiative that promotes multi-use recreational activities within a certain area, such as they are doing in TFL 25. John B. pointed out that if Teal stops logging though, someone will take over logging in the area so it is sustainable income for the community. Heather said another initiative would be investing in educating the public. Kirstin said that this was an indicator we would also be discussing later tonight. Steve said he did not think that buying local goods and services was a community initiative. Sharie agreed.

John P. said he was having trouble coming up with an example of an initiative that Teal is doing that would be considered part of this indicator. Kirstin said that funding of the PAGs would be an example of such an initiative since it is above and beyond what is required of Teal. Steve agreed that this is an example. Kirstin also said any project

funding by the Provincial Government, such as fertilization (for mid-term timber supply) or inventory projects would qualify. John P. said that then activities such as re-decking the wharf at Pitt Lake would be an example of an activity that contributes to community sustainability because the dock is open to the public. Sharie agreed and said she knows people use that dock all the time. Also, grading of public roads would also provide a contribution to the community. Kevin asked what if the activity did not have a dollar value attached. Kirstin asked if members would agree that an in-kind dollar amount could be assigned to anything non-monetary and members agreed.

The final list of measurables approved by PAG members present were:

- Revenue to local government from taxes
- Support of local resource projects (corporate)
- Support of local resource projects (government funded)

C5.2.3: Level of Direct and Indirect Employment

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
Contributions to society (including local community)	Assess the monetary benefits to the local community as a result of harvesting	Level of direct and indirect employment	Report on total dollars contributed to direct and indirect employment	The intent of this indicator is to provide a general idea of the dollars contributed to indirect and direct employment in the DFA, and results will fluctuate over time

Kirstin explained that originally indirect employment had not been included in the measure of this indicator since it was being reported in other indicators (C5.2.1 and C6.3.1). However, since the PAG members asked it be removed from C5.2.1 it could instead be reported here as:

- \$ spent at local businesses and services.

Members agreed that this made sense.

C5.1.1 Quantity and Quality of Timber and Non-timber Benefits, Products, and Services Produced in the DFA

Kirstin said that she had intended to discuss this indicator but since there was no First Nation representation at the meeting (Frank Andrews left at the break) she would like to discuss it at the next meeting. Members agreed. Bruce suggested that the same wording in the Variance for C5.1.1 be used in C6.3.1 to clarify when forest users might not have access to the DFA.

C5.2.2 Level of Investment in Training and Skills Development

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
Investment in DFA Workers	Opportunities for workforce training and skill development	Level of investment in training and skills development	100% conformance with internal mandatory training requirements	20%

Kirstin described the requirements of the training for employees and contractors. John B. said he has found that training requirements are increasing for contractors these days.

C6.5.1: Number of people reached through educational outreach

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
Information and decision making	To inform and educate the PAG and other public through field trips, school tours and public presentations	Number of people reached through educational outreach	A minimum of one educational outreach activity each year	Zero

John asked if Heather, Bruce and Sharie had enjoyed the previous field tour in with Teal, and whether there was a need for another tour. They said they had liked the field tour and would like to attend another. Other PAG members expressed interest and John said that Teal would plan another field tour in 2011.

Bruce asked Kirstin if the variance is zero whether Teal would be in non-compliance if there were 3 educational outreach activities in a year. Kirstin replied that no, in this case exceeding the target is acceptable.

Action Item #25-6: Plan a field tour in the Fraser Valley in 2011
 Environment Department, December 31st, 2011

C6.5.2: Availability of Summary Information on Issues of Concern to the Public

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
Information and decision making	To summarize issues of concern to the public and make these available on an annual basis	Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public	Make summary information of issues of concern available to the public, including updating Teal's website at least once a year with PAG meeting minutes	Zero

Steve asked if the PAG meetings were the only forum for public concerns. He wondered how other issues of concern were brought forward if not at a PAG meeting. Kirstin said that intent of the PAG meetings were to talk about issues of concern to the public, even if they were expressed outside of the PAG venue, the intent was for all to have an opportunity to bring the concern forward during a meeting.

John gave the example of Avatar Grove on Vancouver Island. He said he had been contacted by environmental groups about logging in the area and that he has told them that Teal is looking at the area but has no plans to harvest the area right now. Steve asked if John P. had issued a formal statement. Sharie commented that such a statement on their website might be useful. John said no, he didn't feel it was appropriate for Teal to be issuing statements since they were in business for timber harvesting. Kirstin said he had responded directly to environmentalists, and that the issue was brought up at SIPAG meetings in the past. Steve said then that this was an example of an issue of concern addressed in PAG meeting minutes.

Steve said he just wanted to make sure that this indicator covered all issues of concerns and interactions with the public. Kevin said that the referral process was also a public process and asked if we should be summarizing this information. He felt it was too much information to be summarizing and putting on the website. Steve asked if the referral information was available in the office and Kevin replied that it was. Steve said then the information was available to the public. Bruce suggested that indicator be reworded so that the PAG meeting minute updates were included but that it didn't limit the source of information to the PAG meeting minutes. Steve agreed with this suggestion. Sharie said this way the information is clearly available, just not necessarily on the web.

Action Item #25-7: Update SFMP with above approved indicators.

Environment Dept. January 31, 2011

12. Next Scheduled Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled for February, and members will be contacted to confirm. Discussion topics will be Criterion 5 and 6 Community and Aboriginal Issues. Homework packages will be distributed prior to the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m. Minutes recorded by Kirstin Campbell.