

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #17 Minutes: Indicator Development

February 12, 2008

1. Call to order

Keith Chapman, called the 17th, meeting to order of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at 5:30 p.m. on February 12, 2008 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. Nate Ryant was not able to attend.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
John Warren, Boston Bar First Nation		

Members Absent:

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

Others Present:

Allan Johnsrude, Ministry of Forests, Observer	John Pichugin, Teal	Debora Soutar, Madrone Environmental
Ed McWaters, May Trucking	Keith Chapman, Teal	Richard (Dick) Bogstie, FVRD
Heather Morlacci, Observer	Kevin Stanczyk, Teal	

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #17 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #16 Minutes: *Registration Audit Report*
3. FPAG Outstanding Tasks
4. Ratified Criteria & Indicators – Variance Development (Feb 12, 2008)
5. FPAG Priority Outstanding Values for Development
6. FPAG Values for Development
7. Teal Jones Supplemental Indicators (October 2007)

8. FPAG Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire

4. Health and Safety

Keith Chapman reviewed health and safety items and asked members to put forward any health and safety issues.

5. Review Agenda for Meeting #17 / Adapt / Ratify

Keith reviewed the objectives for the meeting. Keith asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #17 and asked for any proposed revisions.

No additional Agenda items were put forward. Keith motioned to accept the revised agenda. Keith Warrener 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

6. Introductions

Keith asked the Observers to introduce themselves. Debora Soutar works for Madrone Environmental. She represents Teal in administering Forest Investment Account projects. Richard (Dick) Bogstie is a resident of Hatzic Valley, the elected representative to the Fraser Valley Regional District, and also chairs the electoral area services committee for the FVRD. Dick is also the deputy emergency coordinator for FVRD electoral areas F and G.

Keith asked the Members at the table to introduce themselves.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes

Keith Chapman asked the group to put forward any revisions to the meeting minutes from meeting #16.

Keith Warrener noted that there seems to be more Members absent than present and asked if there was a declining turnout – especially in terms of the First Nations representatives. Keith Chapman responded that all of the Members are sent emails and all of the active Members are called prior to the meeting. The First Nations reps had a variety of reasons why they could not attend including – concluding negotiations on treaty agreements, work conflicts, and a medical case. Keith Chapman added that they are currently working on the next round of invitations including all of the First Nations associated with the DFA.

Keith Chapman asked for any more comments or revisions to the minutes. No revisions were put forward. Keith called for a motion to accept the revised minutes. John Warren 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. Keith Chapman informed the Observers that meetings are tape recorded for the purpose of writing the minutes and the recording is destroyed after those minutes are ratified by the group.

8. Variance Development

Keith Chapman asked the Members to find the document on Variances in their meeting package showing the ratified Variances to date and put the document on the overhead screen. Keith asked the group to turn to Indicator #43: *Economic benefits to local communities*. Keith reviewed the Indicator line. Keith noted that the Target (a completed Memorandum of Understanding by April 1st, 2008) is coming quickly. Keith asked the Table for any input on what the Variance should be. Keith C. asked John Warren about the development of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

John Warren commented that they have been having meetings. They had a meeting with CN rail about potential for the site. They have not come up with anything specific. It is difficult to commit the land without the basis to do so. They will need to get a draft out before April 1st for Teal to respond to.

Keith C asked if April 1st would be a workable target to get the MOU in place? Any thoughts on a Variance?

John Warren responded that they should get something done. John suggested an extra month.

Keith C asked if anyone else had any comments or suggestions.

John Pichugin commented that when he met with the Canyon representatives the message that he got was that the Canyon representatives would put together a solid business plan, backed by financing that John P could take to Tom or Dick Jones to evaluate. Is that different than your interpretation of the meeting?

John Warren said that it is difficult to come up with a business proposal out of the air. There was an idea to re-start the planer mill. We don't know what is happening with the planer mill. It appears to be an obvious opportunity – the equipment is there. There is the issue of union obligations on the site. This would need to be cleared up. The union issues could lead to picketing if not addressed. That is not a small issue.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 22, 2008

John Pichugin said that the union issues need to be resolved, the financial aspects and the community backing needs to be resolved. To have this done by April 1st is a pretty tight deadline. At the meeting with John P and the canyon representatives it was agreed that there needed to be a solid business plan for Teal to evaluate.

John Warren said that they are not lumber experts. They need expertise to develop a proper business plan based on market research etc. Teal has the expertise in this area and could be recommending options. We've had our meetings and have spoken to CN Rail, greenhouse operators, and looked at the garbage incineration facility in Burnaby.

Keith C commented that it appears that there is a capacity issue in knowing all of the business potential for the site but that opportunities are being explored. Are you getting close to narrowing in on any attractive options?

John Warren responded that they haven't done anything for two months for a variety of reasons including the weather.

Keith Warren commented that some people can come up with a business plan in about 30 days but a lot of people cannot. I don't think that you would be able to achieve what you would like to achieve in this time period.

John Warren said that really what is needed is a MOU first which will provide the basis for a business plan, financing etc. We have to do more work on our part. We need some input from Teal on what potential exists in the lumber industry and markets. The MOU simply needs to state what things need to be done and by whom in order to develop a business plan. The draft overview was a good start towards providing ideas for the site.

Al Stobbart said that because of the time constraints etc – maybe the Variance could be to have a “Draft “ by April 1st.

Allan Johnsrude commented that there may need to be some clarity as to what needs to be within the MOU – the structure of the relationship and who does what in getting towards a business plan.

John Pichugin suggested that maybe the Indicator could be reworked towards delivering a “Terms of Reference”.

John Warren said that a Terms of Reference would not be appropriate as that is only an outline of what things are to be done at 'some point'. A draft MOU would at least be a basis for discussions.

Allan Johnsrude suggested changing the Target to having a draft by April 1st.

Keith Warren said that April 1 is a pretty tight timeline for developing any document. That's only 45 days from now. We've been discussing this problem for 10 years; to turn around this in 45 days seems impossible.

John Pichugin said that part of having this MOU will be to have a business plan. I have to be blunt and direct – that is what we agreed to at our last meeting. Show us the business plan and we'll talk. John added that he and Brian Taylor are willing to meet and talk about this.

Keith Chapman asked the Table whether anyone wants to move on any of these suggestions.

John Warren said that an extra month (June 1st) would make it less unrealistic. Since we last met we've had discussions with CN rail. There are other developments such as the major hydro power line in the area and also independent power producer projects.

Keith Warren 2nd the Variance of June 1st. Several members abstained from voting. None opposed. The Variance was ratified as June 1st.

Keith Chapman moved to the next Indicator line for Variance development – Indicator 57 *Aboriginal Forest Values and Uses*. Keith reviewed the Indicator on page 17. The Variance that Teal proposed: *FN Access may be restricted where safety is a concern*. Keith asked John Warren, as representative of the Boston Bar First Nation for comment on a Variance.

John Warren responded that the proposed Variance would work. If there are particular FN Values they can be discussed and accommodated. This is not a major topic for the Boston Bar but as it stands this will work.

Keith Chapman asked for other comments on the Variance for this Indicator. No additional comments came forward. Keith asked for a motion to adopt the proposed Variance. John Warren 1st, Al Stobbart 2nd. One abstained, three Members in Favour, none opposed. The Variance was ratified as proposed.

9. VOIT Development for: Soil & Water, “Rare Trees”, “Flora & Fauna”, Human Safety, and Potable Water

Keith Chapman moved to developing VOITs for FPAG priority outstanding Indicators. Keith put the document *Fraser Valley Public Advisory Group Meeting #17: Priority Outstanding Values for Development* on the overhead screen. Keith turned to the first Value: *Flora & fauna associated with Sites of Special Significance*. Keith pointed out the two previous ratified VOIT lines associated with Sites of Special Significance (SSS). Keith raised the point that these two ratified

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 22, 2008

indicators appear to capture the Value of flora and fauna in the definitions and application of these two indicators. These two Indicators are meant to be a 'big basket' into which any particular values in SSS can be identified and addressed.

Sharie Conroy commented that local residents are attached to local trees and birds and animals. We want to protect these things so that they are not lost due to logging. People want the dialogue. If they are concerned about a particular animal etc they want to be able to raise this point with Teal and for Teal to pay attention to the particular value. They will want to see that Teal will incorporate the particular value into their plans and then communicate to the residents that they addressed their concerns and how they did so.

Keith C. asked Sharie if the previously ratified Indicators for SSS capture this or does there need to be a specific Indicator for Flora and Fauna in SSS?

Keith Warrener asked Allan Johnsrude if the Ministry of Forests if this issue is not already covered? Are they aware of Sites of Special Significance and local Flora and Fauna – certain trees animals etc?

Allan Johnsrude responded that this is addressed by the Ministry of Environment and the Conservation Data Center. They maintain a database of where eagles roost or where species of risk reside. Flora and Fauna are addressed more broadly at the landscape level [i.e. 25000 to 100000 hectares] primarily by Old Growth Management strategies. There are ecosystems that are considered to be under-represented and the Ministry of Environment is trying to address this in landscape level plans.

Sharie Conroy commented that there are local residents that feel that they are really knowledgeable about areas 'in their back yard' vs. the more general knowledge from outside sources as to what could be there or should be there etc. The most important point is that people in the community want the dialogue. They don't want people from outside making all of the decisions without running it past the local residents. And to have the opportunity to tell organizations like Teal what is there and what is important.

Keith Chapman responded that the dialogue component is built into the other two ratified SSS indicators.

Allan Johnsrude commented that he agreed with Sharie – the government generally deals with things on a very broad level. Local knowledge definitely adds value to local management decisions.

Keith Warrener asked whether they need this Indicator – it's already addressed in the two ratified Indicator lines. The government captures the broad level concerns, the two indicators 48b and 48c capture the local level concerns. Residents at public meetings are going to raise the issues that they are aware of in their 'back yards' which is really important. Teal is willing to listen. What is this indicator asking for that is not addressed in the other two?

There was some discussion at the Table of simply referring to Indicators 48b & c in the Indicator and Target/Variance for the Flora and Fauna value. Heather Morlacci commented that there needs to be regular liaison with the various Ministries to stay current with information that can be applied locally.

Keith Chapman asked for any more comments on the proposed Indicator for Flora and Fauna. No additional comments came from the Table. Keith reviewed the two approaches to the Indicator: 1) accept that this is a separate Value to be addressed in a separate Indicator, or 2) to leave the Value and Objective there and refer to the other two Indicators (48b&c) in the Indicator and Target.

John Pichugin commented that 48b & c is a process and will be the basis for evaluating the Flora and Fauna Objectives.

Sharie Conroy said that it is the process that is important. Sharie asked if there was general consensus in the community on a particular management approach to a local SSS value but there are up to 25% of people that are not in agreement – could an expert be brought in to say "yes this is okay to handle this value this way" or there needs to be more study etc. Can professionals be brought in to clear up any dis-agreement over facts.

Keith Chapman responded that the 75% general consensus was in order to safeguard against a 'spoiler' who wants 100% inventory of everything and to study everything to the nth degree. However, we don't want to go with the majority and tell the 25% that 'sorry, you lose' and your concerns don't matter. That is a tough one.

Sharie Conroy responded that they want that dialogue. We want to know that peoples real concerns can be addressed – a safety net. Because of what has happened in the past, people are a bit skeptical. The concerns need to be answered. At the moment, it appears that the process should work. People will want information to alleviate their fears. They may not all listen to a Forester on the subject of birds. They may want an expert in that particular field.

Keith Chapman responded that this could be something that can be done to strengthen the existing indicators. Keith asked Ed McWaters how he was making out with his referral work with the Hatzic community for future development.

Ed McWaters responded that they haven't rolled out their plans yet. They have had some meetings with general concepts about their concerns. There is a Hatzic Land use Committee group and they had their first meeting last week. They

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 22, 2008

discussed general principles around planning harvesting. The concerns have been well articulated – we know what they are. In terms of a specific flora and fauna in that particular area we don't know that. From an ecosystem basis, the Hatzic area is in the Coastal Western Hemlock ecosystem which is one of the most common ecosystems you can get on the coast. From a broad landscape level it is as generic as you can get. Someone may have a special biological concern. We will work through that. Until we get the concerns through we haven't proposed any blocks. We have shown "economic units" of timber in the area, we have the hydrology report saying don't harvest more than x hectares here and do this there. We have some planning guideline tools now.

Keith Chapman asked the Table what they want to do with the Indicator – we could remove it – satisfied that it is incorporated into the other SSS indicators or we could leave it as it is and refer to the other two SSS Indicators.

Sharie Conroy suggested keeping the Indicator there and referring to the other two.

Al Stobbart asked how that would work as the other two SSS Indicators have two separate Targets?

Keith Chapman explained that this is similar to the Indicators on Soil protection. With that Value we have indicators around Coarse Woody Debris, roads, landslides, and soil disturbance. Combined they address the objective of soil protection. Keith asked if anyone wanted to second Sharie's motion. Keith Warrenner 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. The Indicator was ratified with the Indicator and Target referring to 48 b & c.

Keith Chapman turned to the next priority outstanding Value: *Rare and Unique Trees*. Keith reviewed the Indicator line and some of the history around development of the indicator (i.e. the Big Tree Registry). Keith asked the Table if this Value was a SSS value and, if so, is it addressed in the three ratified Indicators for SSS?

Sharie Conroy responded that she thought that this was to apply to the whole Defined Forest Area. She asked Allan Johnsrude what would happen if something like a Yew tree is found in the area?

Keith Chapman responded that Yew is not rare. It can be unusual to find it in certain places but where it typically grows it can be quite common. They have little niches where they tend to grow: productive sites at low to mid elevations and is often associated with Yellow Cedar. There has not been too much call to preserve them as they have not been deemed so unique as to warrant protection. They do re-sprout from the stumps after logging or seed into harvested areas.

Allan Johnsrude commented that this is a bit broadly defined and depends on the context. Is a 2 m thick old growth tree rare? Or is it rare to find this tree in a second growth stand? The MOFR is looking at harvest blocks after harvesting to look at the Wildlife Tree Patches (**WTPs**) in terms of how well the WTP represents the original stand or unique wildlife/biodiversity elements associated with the cutblock.

Keith Chapman commented that he had talked to the Ministry of Environment Conservation Data Center and their biologist about what would be considered rare and unique for the Chilliwack Forest District. They suggested Oregon Ash which is thought to be out there but there is not a lot of them found. He also talked to staff at the Malcolm Knapp Research Forest (UBC), and at the Mission Tree Farm as well as Teal staff. The Mission TFL preserves veteran Douglas Fir and Western White Pine. Keith added that he would consider Garry Oak as rare and unique – there are some isolated pockets left after glaciation in the valley. The "Vancouver" variety of Trembling Aspen may also be something to consider.

Sharie Conroy commented that it is important for the public to know that special trees are protected. Whether it is for genetics or species etc. From a public point of view Sharie was disappointed that she hiked all over the Mission TFL and not seeing any old growth trees. When she inquired with the Mission TFL she was told locations of the few examples that were there. That was a disappointment.

Ed McWaters commented that the Ministry of Environment had comments to Teal regarding development in the West Harrison. They were concerned about Veteran trees in second growth for wildlife habitat. We left a 'ton' of them where it was safe to do so.

Sharie C responded that this is what we would like to know. That there is some regard for preserving trees that are special for other uses than timber.

Allan Johnsrude said that at the Landscape level the Old Growth Management strategy is trying to accomplish a part of this concern over old growth. The goal is to protect 11 or 13% etc by Landscape Units by Bio Geo Climatic ecosystem while looking at the level of representation in parks etc. The strategy is about trying to maintain representative amounts of Old Growth. It is not targeted to a specific tree or diameter etc.

Keith Chapman called the meal break.

Keith Chapman re-convened the meeting and picked up at Rare and Unique Trees

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 22, 2008

Sharie Conroy commented that during the break they were chatting. It seems that during the past loggers would come across special trees and not cut them. What is unique and rare and what is worth leaving was subject to the loggers of the day. Now there does not seem to be that safeguard.

John Pichugin asked Sharie if she had seen any of Teal's logging maps. Sharie replied that she had not. John suggested that either Ed M or Kevin Stanczyk could put on a presentation on what they are looking for when doing the engineering for a cutblock and roads. It will show what will be retained as Wildlife Tree Patches and the prescriptions that are given to the logging crews to follow. That would be useful to this discussion to know what is done around this currently.

Sharie agreed that a presentation would be very helpful to understand how things are planned and considered. I don't know what we can do with this Indicator at this point.

Al Stobbart said that for the time being we can fall back on 48 b and c to protect trees that we know about.

Keith Chapman suggested re-visiting the indicator after a bit of 'education' on block design. Keith reviewed the Indicators 48 b & c which has the value of locally rare and unique species incorporated into them. It was agreed that this Value is addressed in these indicators.

Allan Johnsrude commented that there are a few things already done that recognize locally rare and unique trees at a broader scale. At the very local scale, these indicators will work to capture this Value.

Keith Warrener commented that once these features are identified, how are these communicated to future development proposals? It is frustrating to think that these features can be forgotten and then someone else comes along and harvests there.

Allan Johnsrude responded that in the world of GIS (Geographic Information Systems) these things are mapped and tracked. It is a matter of how that information is communicated. Some of the rare and unique trees could be registered with the Conservation Data Center. If is only rare and unique at the local level, it can be 'captured' spatially and protected.

John Pichugin commented that there are two stages to capture these special places. At the landscape level there is Old Growth Management Areas in place or being developed. At the block level, there is a set percentage of the harvested area that has to be protected for one rotation length – a WTP. That is spatially defined and protected and tied to that cutblock. If someone comes along later and submits a cutting permit to the MOFR, it will come up as a conflict and the proposal will be rejected. It often makes obvious sense to put the WTPs in these areas to protect them. Individual trees can also be identified as a Wildlife Trees and similarly protected.

Keith Chapman made some changes to the Indicator. The Objective wording was changed to "Preserve examples of trees or tree species that are locally rare or unique **within stand level retention (Wildlife Tree Patch or Wildlife Trees)**."

John Pichugin suggested an Indicator could be geared around how well WTPs meet the objectives for stand level retention for the particular Landscape Units.

Keith Chapman responded that this would involve filing a rationale with each WTP for each block for an auditor to see and evaluate the rationale. Most of this information is not documented. It would be straight forward to document this in SSS and file the rationale.

There was a brief discussion at the Table on how WTPs are selected and the rationale that goes into the selection.

Al Stobbart commented that the other Indicators for SSS were a bit more esoteric where this value is pointing to a particular tree or group of trees.

Keith Chapman responded that the Indicator can be fleshed out to speak to the rationale of locating WTPs and incorporating local values.

The Table agreed to park the Value for Rare and Unique Trees till new wording is developed for the Indicator and Target that looks to the rationale for declaring WTPs etc.

Keith Chapman moved to the next priority Value: *Quality and quantity of potable water*. Keith reviewed the current wording of the Indicator line to date. Keith proposed adding the word "licensed" to describe which water intakes and wells are addressed in this indicator.

There was a brief discussion about potential drinking water sources, such as Harrison Lake, for the future and whether that should be incorporated into this indicator. The Fraser Valley Regional District has identified some future sources of water supply that may be developed for the region. **It was agreed to add this item as a new Value for future VOIT development (Future sources of Potable Water).**

Keith C. returned to the VOIT for Potable Water and asked for comments.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, July 22, 2008

Sharie Conroy commented that there are probably a lot of people in rural areas that take their water from springs and streams. Depending on how close you are to 'civilization' people may or may not be testing. In our area, I can think of only one that tests their water. We need to have tests for our own protection we test about once every ten years. For quantity someone would need to measure volume of water out of a pipe and document it. That would be tough.

Keith Chapman responded that yes it is tough and that is why we are still talking about this a year and half from when it first came up. Teal needs to rely on people testing and providing these tests in order to make this economical. There are over 20 licenses in the Hatzic Valley near Teal's chart now. Teal needs to have reliable measurable data to compare results.

Keith Warrenner asked Sharie Conroy if she was licensed? Keith W. said that people drawing water from creeks should be testing.

Sharie responded that she was licensed. There are people that do not test from creeks and they continue to avoid it.

Keith Warrenner commented that he does not see how any agency or company can protect people that are taking water without a license.

There was a detailed discussion at the Table on water licenses, testing, water volume, recharge areas and aquifers.

Discussion returned to the Indicator set for *Quality and quantity of potable water*. Sharie Conroy said that "quantity" needed to remain in the indicator.

Keith Chapman said that people with water licenses would need to have some documented tests of water quantity. There is the issue of where drilled wells will naturally lose capacity over time as sediment collects. Al Stobbart gave an example from the hatchery where pumping large amounts of water can reduce the well's capacity (quantity over time). Al Stobbart said that a stopwatch and a 5 gallon bucket can give an accurate indication of water flow.

John Pichugin asked if the Target could be changed to read: "Zero negative impacts to **licensed** water intakes and wells as a result of harvesting" and that the Indicator should include "licensed" as well. Keith suggested changing the wording of the Target to reflect the Indicator by changing the Indicator to read "**Number** of negative impacts to **licensed** water intakes and wells as a result of harvesting is zero".

Keith Chapman asked the Table if there was a motion to adopt the Indicator set as changed.

Sharie Conroy moved to ratify it (1st), Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. The Indicator was ratified as amended.

Keith Chapman asked for a Variance for this Indicator. Sharie Conroy suggested "Zero". She added that both sides of this Indicator hope to have full conformance with the Indicator. Keith asked for any other thoughts on a Variance. No other comments were brought forward. Keith C asked for anyone to second Sharie's suggestion. Al Stobbart 2nd. All in favour, none opposed. The Variance of Zero was ratified.

Keith Chapman noted the time, adjourned the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

**The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held April 29th, 2008 at the Kanyon Restaurant, Hope at
5:30 PM to 8:30 PM – Please note the new location!!!**