

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #14 Minutes: Indicator Development

July 31, 2007

1. Call to order

Nate Ryant, called the 13th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 4:37 p.m. on July 31, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie | Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident | Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident |
| Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN | John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation | Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association |

Members Absent:

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

Others Present:

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Brian Taylor, May Trucking | John Pichugin, Teal | Nate Ryant, Facilitator |
| Ed McWaters, May Trucking | Keith Chapman, Teal | |
| Heather Morlacci, Observer | Kim Allen, Mission TFL | |

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #14 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #13 Minutes: *Indicator Development* – SSS
3. *Drinking Water Definitions and Information (July 2007)*

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

4. *Fraser Information Tracking System – Completed Tasks*
5. *Fraser Information Tracking System – Outstanding Tasks*

4. Health and Safety

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

5. Review Agenda for Meeting #14 / Adapt / Ratify

Nate asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #14 and asked for any proposed revisions.

Keith Chapman asked the Fraser Canyon sub-committee for any items they would like to put on the agenda. Nate Ryant suggested that there be time slotted for an update from the committee.

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

6. Introductions

Nate Ryant introduced Kim Allen, RPF, from the Mission Tree Farm Licence 26. Kim is observing the Fraser PAG. Kim Allen stated that he is the Forester in charge of the District of Mission TFL. The Mission TFL is ISO 14001 certified [very similar to Teal's Corporate Management System, see <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/iso9000-14000/understand/inbrief.html>]. The Mission TFL is keeping an eye on CSA certification and this is an opportunity to observe the public advisory aspect.

The FPAG Members and Teal representatives at the Table gave self introductions.

7. Update from the Multiple Benefits to Society Sub-committee

Nate asked if a member of the sub-committee could provide an update for the Table.

John Warren said that the committee had a couple of meetings since the last couple of FPAG meetings. They have not developed any draft indicators. It is a work in progress. The best ideas they can come up with is related to monitoring economic activity in the area. The goal is to get Boston Bar back to the way it was before the mill closed. The forestry activity in the area is one part of the solution.

John Warren distributed "*Draft #2 Strategy for Redevelopment of the J.S. Jones Mill Site in Boston Bar*" which outlines potential ideas for the mill site.

Nate Ryant commented that, based on his understanding of the issue and past minutes, there are two separate issues: the mill site and indicator development. Nate Ryant asked if this understanding is correct.

John Warren responded that indicators related to how much May Trucking is spending or number of employees in the area is a limited interpretation of the CSA Criterion of Multiple Benefits. The mill site is a major asset with substantial potential for economic benefits to the community. I don't see this as a separate issue from the business of the Fraser PAG with respect to Multiple Benefits. It can be built into the Indicator set for this Criterion.

Nate Ryant responded that, to his understanding, the mill site is not out of the question for discussions between senior representatives of Teal and the Community. That is a long term prospect. Do we have any ideas for what we could measure today? Nate asked John Pichugin to re-iterate the discussions that Teal has had with the Fraser Canyon representatives.

John Pichugin responded that they have had discussions with the Canyon representatives about a month and a half ago. John Pichugin's understanding was that the Canyon folks were going to work on a proposal and come back to John P to relay it back to Tom or Dick Jones.

Lloyd Foreman commented that his vision is that the draft is a good start but it is of no consequence other than a point of interest for the PAG. Lloyd is comfortable with the idea of coming to an agreement for the

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

mill site away from the PAG Table. This is two separate issues. Certification is vital for the communities. We have to make this certification work. The mill site issue is 'life and death' for the community. I would like to keep the mill site question separate though.

Nate Ryant asked if John Warren is okay with it. It is not minimalizing the mill site issue – just simply keeping the issue in a separate arena.

John Warren responded that the Indicator around this issue could be: *the progress made on the issues identified*. The measure would be: *has there been progress?* I agree with not making this a big issue for the PAG. Having it addressed in an Indicator in the plan is a legitimate way of keeping this issue active.

Nate Ryant commented that, from an auditor's perspective, I would look for continual improvement or progress so things can't just stall. They have to progress and not fall off the table. You have to start with something and improve over time. The Indicators developed to date may not be to the liking of everyone but they will form a baseline and be improved.

Lloyd Foreman asked John Warren what the Indicator would be around this.

Keith Chapman suggested that the Indicator around this issue could be derived from those developed to date for the First Nations. We have Indicators for number of protocol agreements completed after an expression of interest from individual First Nations. These Indicators identify communities that want to engage in a relationship with Teal and Teal must respond to this interest. There is obvious interest from the Canyon communities for a business proposition.

Lloyd Foreman commented that, from a community's perspective, there should be something to say there is a positive plot on the side of Teal to put together something workable.

Keith Chapman suggested that development of the wording of the Indicator around this issue be included in tonight's agenda if we can get through our other business.

The Table agreed that this should be done.

8. Previous Meeting Minutes: Review for ratification

Nate R. asked the Table to put forward any changes to the previous meeting's minutes.

Bruce Edwards asked that, as a matter of procedure, the Draft strategy/proposal document should be received as a point of business. Bruce motioned that the Draft be received. Lloyd Foreman 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. Motioned carried.

Keith Chapman informed the PAG that all documents put forward by PAG members are placed into the Fraser PAG record for the Auditor to review.

Nate Ryant returned to the Meeting Minutes for questions or revisions.

Heather Morlacci commented that on page 6, third paragraph from the bottom, third sentence should read: "*Heather Morlacci said that is was \$152 for a well water test*".

Nate Ryant asked for any more changes.

Keith Chapman reminded the Table that the minutes must be reviewed prior to the meeting. No other comments or changes to the minutes were put forward.

Nate Ryant asked the Table to ratify the minutes as amended. Lloyd Foreman 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour. None opposed.

9. Sites of Special Significance & Other Indicators

Nate Ryant turned to the main meeting topic. The Table will pick up where they left off at the last meeting in reviewing and adapting Indicators. Indicator numbers 44a-b, 46, and 49 have not been reviewed to date.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

Keith Chapman displayed the document **“Values, Objectives, Indicators & Targets – To be Reviewed”** dated May 31, 2007 [distributed June 12, 2007] on the overhead screen. Keith reviewed the draft Indicator 44a and its footnote. Where human safety is identified at community meetings, during engineering or Terrain Stability Field Assessment then a professional report will be generated and Teal will conform to the recommendations of the report.

Nate Ryant commented that this is an example of an Indicator that would have a Zero Variance. Nate asked for comments from the Table.

Brian Taylor asked if this pertains simply to the general public or does it include workers. Workers are exposed to greater risks during road building and harvesting.

Lloyd Foreman responded that worker safety is under the umbrella of Worksafe BC [Workers Compensation Board]. I think that would be doubling up. The Public doesn't have a comparable coverage except for something like this here. The Table was in general agreement.

Sharie Conroy asked what if the company follows the recommendations and still something happens?

Keith Chapman responded that there is the concept of “risk” built into the assessment and backed up by recommendations. Risk is the probability of an event happening AND the consequences should that event occur. If there is a Low probability and a Low consequence the Risk would be Low. Human safety is always considered a High or Very High consequence. A moderate or higher probability of an event occurring with a High consequence would result in recommendations to either not log it or use special techniques to bring down the probability of the event occurring. The professional is putting himself/herself on the line when making the assessments and recommendations to Teal.

Sharie responded that she understands what is written but not how it works. We are already flooding and don't want any more flooding. We do not want logging within our drainage area that will result in increased flooding. We want to be able to sit down with the professional and ask them to show us that we will be safe. I am here to ensure that the community is not put at greater risk.

Keith Chapman responded that the Indicator the Table ratified at the last meeting [48c - General agreement among stakeholders] provides the arena for having this discussion with the professionals and ensuring that the stakeholder's concerns are met. Indicator 44a is a bit redundant to the general agreement Indicator but this ensures that all instances of Human Safety are addressed as they may not always occur within the Sites of Special Significance.

Bruce Edwards commented that he had not read the Hydrology Report for the Durieu Ridge (West side of Hatzic Valley) which will provide the context of ‘professional assessment’ in terms of what it is and what safeguards it provides.

Keith Chapman responded that the Sites of Special Significance Indicators allow for Bruce to have that report, to read it and then discuss it with the professional in order to evaluate its relevance and safeguards.

Heather Morlacci commented that the Hydrology was only received by the Hatzic representatives yesterday so she had not had time to review more than a few pages. I have lived in areas where slides and other unexpected events happened. Who covers damages etc when an unexpected event happens?

Keith Chapman responded that it will come down to a post-event assessment of what did happen and possible reasons why. If the professional missed the trigger or was not competent in his recommendations then one could go after that professional in a legal arena. Teal has the responsibility of ensuring that they have good professionals, with the experience and expertise to provide a competent assessment. As Professional Foresters, we have to ensure that we are familiar with the professionals we engage with and are satisfied with their level of competence and professionalism.

Heather Morlacci said that they cannot evaluate this Indicator line without having read the report and an opportunity to ask others to respond to it.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

Ed McWaters responded to Heather Morlacci and Bruce Edwards' comments. We have moved beyond the general CSA process. This Hydrology report has nothing to do with the CSA process. This report is addressing concerns within a Site of Special Significance [SSS]. There is a process under our SSS Indicators to review and comment with the professional. This report deals with a very specific area and a very specific issue. You don't have to comment on the report today. The CSA process is not about reviewing the contents of reports.

Lloyd Foreman commented that Ed's comments put it into a nutshell. These special issues will be dealt with. Hatzic has issues and the Canyon has issues. The CSA process takes a fairly general overview of the issues that pertain to the Defined Forest Area. We have built mechanisms to deal with these issues. I have said this before: This process is a bureaucratic response to a bureaucratic initiative in other countries. They are trying to block our markets and we are trying to demonstrate that the reasons they are using to block us are not the case. We are demonstrating that we have sustainable forest management principles in place. We don't want to ignore your issues but we don't want to bog down on every site specific issue.

Nate Ryant commented that his understanding is that the report is a broad range assessment of a watershed. When Teal goes to harvest an area, there will be more specific reports for each individual cutblock. You cannot do better than a 100% conformance in this instance. I don't see any holes in this.

Sharie Conroy responded that what people want is a guarantee that they will not incur more damage related to harvesting. I want to ask "How are we protected as a community and is it a part of this discussion? How are we protected if there is no baseline? Is the Hydrologist going to provide a baseline?"

Keith Chapman responded that the professionals would provide this information. Teal hires professionals to answer these questions. If you have the report in hand and the professional in front of you then you will be able to assess how the community will be protected.

John Pichugin commented that when considering all of our operations, if, for example, we are logging above the Coquihalla or Trans Canada Hwy we will hire professionals no matter what because we know there could be risks there. We are saying that we will do this in all of our areas. This is what we want to do. As a professional, I would want that report.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the new Sea to Sky Hwy is a good example. There would be no risks if they did not put it in, but we are taking that risk because the Province wants that road. Logging comes with certain risks: fallers get killed, truck drivers get killed. It is an economic necessity to conduct this business while identifying and reducing the risks.

Sharie Conroy commented that the Hatzic valley has been reported to death. It hasn't changed anything and we have skepticism about the 'professional'. Professionals may not see everything they need to see or they can make mistakes. I think we are covered by the fact that we can meet and review the report with the professional.

Lloyd Foreman asked Sharie about the Mission TFL: "How are they doing as corporate citizens?"

Sharie responded that they have been going to meetings, open houses, and we go in there and discuss issues like trails and old growth and generally they have done really well and tried innovative things.

Bruce Edwards suggested that "infrastructure" be included into the language of this indicator or 44b. A brief discussion at the Table on the wording of the Value, Objective, Indicator and Target followed. The wording for **Indicator 44b** was changed to the following (changes in **bold**):

| Value | Objective | Indicator | Target |
|---|---|--|---|
| Infrastructure and Private & Community | Protect infrastructure , private and community property from | Completion, conformance and compliance with site specific hydrological and/or terrain stability | 100% compliance and conformance with |

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

| | | | |
|----------|---|--|---|
| Property | increases in slides, debris torrents, and flooding attributed to harvesting and roads | assessment reports from qualified professionals where infrastructure , human safety, private or community property is at stake. | recommendations from qualified professional reports |
|----------|---|--|---|

Chief Andy Alex suggested that the term “weather permitting” be included into this indicator line.

Keith Chapman responded that would be one of a suite of possible recommendations that the professionals could make in within their reports.

Keith Chapman asked the Table if they were ready to motion to ratify the Indicator.

Bruce Edwards said that he would like to review the report and the indicators in light of the report before finalizing this Indicator.

Nate Ryant commented that the Hydrology report will be reviewed under the SSS indicator process.

There was additional discussion of the Hydrology report and its relevance to adopting Indicators 44a or 44b.

Sharie Conroy asked if the Table finds that the Indicators are not adequate, can they be changed down the road?

Nate Ryant responded “Yes”. The Indicator set will be regularly reviewed by the FPAG and regularly make any changes they feel are necessary. That’s part of the continual improvement process.

Keith Chapman suggested that the Table take a ten minute break and allow Bruce Edwards to read the document and maybe that will give Bruce comfort with what is being tabled.

The Table took a 10 minute break.

Nate Ryant recalled the meeting to order.

Keith Chapman asked Bruce Edwards if he had a sufficient review of the Hydrology report. Bruce responded that he had not enough time to adequately review the report.

Keith Chapman suggested moving on to the next Indicators. Keith reviewed Indicator 46 and the associated footnotes and asked for comments from the Table.

The Table indicated that the Indicator was fine as it was worded and suggested ratifying it. Bruce Edwards 1st, Lloyd Foreman 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. Indicator 46 was ratified without any changes.

Keith Chapman reviewed Indicator 49. Keith reviewed the issues that were discussed at the last FPAG meeting and the action items that came out of those discussions. An information blurb on potable water was sent via email for background information [hard copy distributed at meeting #14]. Possible parameters that may be monitored to establish changes in water quality are turbidity dissolved organic carbon, nutrients (nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus), temperature and dissolved oxygen.

Bruce Edwards asked whether pathogens could be considered.

Keith Chapman responded that bacteria could be tested for as well. Harvesting is not directly associated with bacteria.

Sharie Conroy if Teal would be conducting testing or would they collect everyone’s tests?

Keith Chapman responded that stakeholder’s would volunteer past test results to Teal and that Teal may be testing after harvesting to determine if negative impacts occurred.

Lloyd Foreman commented that if logging was going on around an intake of his that he would be bringing post logging tests and previous tests to Teal to demonstrate negative impacts. I don’t know if Teal needs to collect the reports beforehand; they are readily available. I would have some baseline information that

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

would show any problems. Setting up a bureaucracy of filing tests and regularly testing everything is not what I would want to do – it's overkill.

Keith Chapman asked John Pichugin if Teal would be comfortable with the testing aspect of this Indicator.

John Pichugin asked the Table how often and long testing would need to continue after harvesting until the Indicator was satisfied. Is it once a month or once a year and for how long?

Sharie Conroy responded that Teal and stakeholders need the baseline for water quality in respect to forestry activities in or around their water sources. If testing results show a harvesting related problem then Teal would pick up the bill for that testing. Then they would investigate what the problem was and go from there.

John Pichugin asked Sharie Conroy if she gets water from a well or intake or..? Has an engineer certified it?

Sharie Conroy said that her water comes from a spring via a pipe [sandpoint] into the ground. It is almost distilled water – it's so pure. Sharie didn't know how deep it went. It was not certified by an engineer but has been in use for over 50 years. She has a water license.

John Pichugin said that he would like to brush up on the drinking water standards or drinking water act as there are certain things that a person with a water license must do to ensure that they are protected. I need to ensure that we are doing something that fits the regulations. I am not saying "no" that we are not going to do any testing. I need to see these intakes and wells.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the Target is "Zero negative impacts to water intakes and wells as a result of harvesting". I can live with that; that's a major commitment. I don't see testing every house – that is nearly an impossible task.

John Pichugin said that this is why I am being cautious. Before finalizing any cutblocks, an engineer has to go on site and familiarize himself with the plan to ensure that he is comfortable with it. What I am saying is, I need to do my due diligence.

Nate Ryant pointed out that the wording of the Target is "impacts to water intakes and wells" which doesn't speak to the water quality objective. The Target needs to be specific to the Objective and Indicator.

Ed McWaters commented that it is easy to manage and assess logging related effects on streams with intakes. When you are talking about wells and groundwater from a huge underground aquifer it becomes very difficult or impossible to link the harvesting activity to the water quality.

Sharie Conroy responded that no one knows where the water enters into the aquifer. Does it come down through the swampy areas into the bedrock aquifer? I can imagine that logging might affect these re-charge areas as they may be drier in the summer after harvesting. That will affect our quantity of water.

Nate Ryant asked where Sharie Conroy gets her water quantity information.

Sharie responded that they know how long it should take to fill up the water tank they use to store water. It has been observed for the last 34 years. We have never run out of water. It takes between ½ hr to an hour to fill. We can write it down and submit it to Teal before harvesting.

Nate Ryant responded that, for something like this, we need something documented and quantifiable. We also need to define "logging". Does it include roads, right-of-ways, etc?

Lloyd Foreman commented that the large fires and logging in Violet Springs has never impacted the flow or quality of water.

Bruce Edwards suggested that the word "turbidity" be taken out as it appears that this is the only parameter.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

John Pichugin asked if there are water licenses that take water directly from the stream and how they treat their water to make it potable.

Sharie Conroy responded that, as far as she knows, they don't treat it. It depends on the age of the homestead. Sharie said that when they moved into the area, they couldn't turn the water on until it was tested. It appears that, as long as they are using it domestically and don't serve multiple residences it doesn't need to be treated.

Nate Ryant asked the Table where they stand on this draft indicator.

Lloyd Foreman said that they have a dialogue and a commitment from Teal to not impact the water. This is not a bad thing.

Sharie Conroy commented that people don't want anything to happen to their water. The Bouchier's lost water from their creek after the harvesting 60-70 years ago. This experience worries us in the Hatzic Valley as so many of us are supplied water one way or another from Durieu ridge. The Hydrology report suggests that, to address the flooding issues, that there be some limit to the extent of the harvesting. This gives me some comfort that the drinking water will be less impacted.

Nate Ryant asked the Table if they want to go ahead with this Indicator. The Target is "Zero negative impacts". There is no Variance with a Target like this. Nate asked John Pichugin if he was comfortable with the testing aspect.

John Pichugin said that he would need to look at the testing issue in more detail and he needs to talk to Ed and perhaps call Sharie Conroy to discuss some of the details. John asked Sharie if she could let John know how many wells and intakes are associated with this side of the valley.

Action Item: 14A John Pichugin to review Drinking Water legislation and the proposed Indicator for Potable Water

Environment Dept. John Pichugin Due Date: September 4, 2007

Nate Ryant noted the time and asked the Table to change subjects and consider the Canyon/Mill Site issue in regards to developing and Indicator around the progress on this issue. Are there any existing Indicators that we can use?

Keith Chapman responded that there are not any existing Multiple Benefits indicators at this point. Keith added that he had been thinking about potential Indicators for some time and had jotted down some potential Indicators derived from other Licensee's SFMPs. Keith displayed the list on the overhead screen (Potential Indicators for Multiple Benefits to Society – see attached). These ideas are just thoughts that can be used to facilitate discussion. Keith reviewed the 8 potential Indicators (A-H). These Indicators had not been reviewed with Teal. One potential problem with some of these Indicators would be the reporting of contract dollars and similar business aspects. These could be used to derive the contract amounts for individual contracts which may be more disclosure that desired. Another consideration is that Teal (and all other Licensee's in the Province) just had 20% of their tenures taken back by the government so employment has been impacted due to the lower harvest volume.

Keith Chapman asked if the Canyon had any silviculture contractors. Lloyd Foreman and John Warren responded that they did not.

Kim Allen asked how "local contractors" would be defined. His experience has seen a local contractor who hires elsewhere and a non-local contractor who often hires locally. Kim added that, for the Mission Municipality, they do not have a local hiring preference. This is due to trying to get the most competitive rates, attract businesses and to stimulate competition which is reflected in tax rates in the end. Typically the local person should have a competitive advantage.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

Keith Chapman responded that they had not worked this out. Keith would like the PAG to weigh in on this. One idea tabled previously was that it would incorporate all of the communities from Jackass Mountain near Lytton to Pitt Meadows as Teal's chart areas are so spread out.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the key is "offered". Local people need to have the first cut at the work but if they cannot compete then they do not get the work.

Nate Ryant suggested that "local" could be tracked via postal codes associated with the DFA.

Further discussion at the Table discussed the issues associated with local employment, hiring outside of the community, migration of workers and worker choice.

Nate Ryant asked if there could be an Indicator drafted that addresses progress on the Canyon/Mill Site issue.

John Warren suggested "number of new business and jobs operating on the Teal Cedar properties in Boston Bar". Right now there are none.

Nate Ryant asked John Warren if he wanted to take this to a measurable indicator around the discussions towards that goal.

John Warren suggested an indicator built around the level of satisfaction of the PAG members with the process established through a feedback questionnaire to PAG members. You can assess the progress with the process in this manner. Also an Indicator in regards to the number of jobs on the site would be helpful. One could also assess the progress from information from the sub-committee.

There was a brief discussion about the mill site not being a part of the DFA and the issues associated with developing an indicator for an area not within the DFA.

Lloyd Foreman suggested that there be something to demonstrate progress and that the parties are meeting in good faith to arrive at a solution to this issue.

There was a brief discussion about how to develop this into something measurable.

Keith Chapman suggested that they sketch out the wording for an indicator. John Warren suggested initial wording for the Indicator. Spring 2008 was suggested as a Target date for the MOU.

| Value | Objective | Indicator | Target |
|--|--|---|---|
| Utilize community resources in forest management | Generate employment opportunities in communities associated with the DFA | The progress (Memorandum of Understanding - MOU) made by the community representatives and Teal representatives towards creation of economic activity and employment in the central Fraser Canyon | Completed MOU between Teal and the community representatives by April 1, 2008 |

Keith Chapman asked if this Indicator wording was ready for ratification. The Table indicated that they were ready. Keith Chapman motioned that the Indicator be ratified. Lloyd Foreman^{1st}, John Warren^{2nd}, all in favour, none opposed. The Indicator for Multiple Benefits to Society was ratified as developed by the FPAG.

Nate Ryant turned to discuss the date for the next meeting. There was a brief discussion at the Table of potential dates and conflicts. The Table decided on September 4th, 2007.

The next Fraser PAG meeting was set for September 4th, 2007 at the Pantry Restaurant.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, October 9, 2007

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