

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #20 Minutes: Indicator Maintenance

October 28, 2008

1. Call to order

Keith Chapman called the 20th meeting of the Fraser Public Advisory Group to order at 5:35 p.m. on October 28, 2008 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. Keith circulated the meeting sign in sheet.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association	Steve Dillen, 4WDABC
Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Allan Johnsrude, MOFR
John Bowles, Harken Towing	Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery	

Members Absent:

Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-am
Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Keith Warrenner, Fraser Valley Regional District	Mike Peters, Ministry Tourism Culture and the Arts
Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Point Resident	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation	

Others Present:

Jillene West, Facilitator	Keith Chapman, Teal	Heather Morlacci, Observer
John Pichugin, Teal		

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #20 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #19 Minutes: *Priority Indicator Development*
3. *Indicator Maintenance: Review of Selected 2007 Non-Conforming Indicators*
4. *"Just a Hectare" – Power Point slide notes*
5. *"Just a Hectare" – Terms and Definitions*
6. *2008 Field Trip document package*
7. *Fraser Public Advisory Group Meeting Evaluation form*

4. Health and Safety

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

5. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #20

Jill West asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #20 and asked for any proposed revisions. Jill noted that two additional items will be added to the agenda under "Fraser PAG Business": review of the Internal Audit and changes to the SFMP. No additional Agenda items were put forward.

6. Introductions – New Members

Keith introduced himself and asked the Members at the table to introduce themselves. Everyone at the Table introduced themselves.

7. Previous Meeting Minutes

Keith Chapman asked the group to put forward any revisions to the meeting minutes from meeting #19 (September 9, 2008).

John Pichugin suggested that on pg 3 (near the end of the 3rd paragraph from the bottom of the page) that the 2nd last sentence be changed to read “Teal needs to remain profitable, but also has a responsibility to manage the land”. Also, John requested that the 2nd sentence in the 5th paragraph from the bottom be changed to read: “As a person who signs plans, I would be outside of my professional ethics if I would have the professional selection be vetted by the public”.

Keith asked for any other changes to the minutes. No further changes were put forward. Keith asked for a motion to adopt the Minutes as revised. (Al Stobbart) 1st, John Pichugin 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

8. Other FPAG Business: Teal’s CSA Certificate update, External & Internal Audit,

Keith asked Jill West to review the audits and Certificate status as she had been very active in these files.

Jill reviewed the internal audit held in September. It involved a couple of days in the Fraser operations (Teal and May Trucking). The internal audit found 3 non-conformances related to training, document control, and corrective actions. Specifically a few members of the logging crews did not receive their awareness training this finding was elevated to a non-conformance as there was a similar issue identified in last year’s internal audit. Document control is always a challenge to ensure that the latest versions of the documents replace earlier versions. Similarly, this was identified last year.

Keith Chapman asked Jill to briefly explain what a “non-conformance” means in regards to audits.

Jill responded that a non-conformance is a formal way of saying that the company is not meeting a part of the CSA Standard. The CSA Standard has specific requirements to be followed. These particular non-conformances are where Teal has not followed a few of their procedures (such as document control) required of the Standard satisfactorily. These are not rampant problems but they will be reviewed in order to fix them.

Jill continued with the internal audit findings. The audit also found 2 potential non-compliances (where legal requirements may not have been met) related to silviculture reporting and Site Plan (block prescription) content requirements. These are only “potential” as MOFR has not issued a ticket.

Keith Chapman asked Jill to explain what follow-up Teal will undertake from the internal audit. Jill responded that Teal will have the Managers meet, review the audit findings and develop action plans to address the identified problems. The problems will need to be addressed prior to the next internal audit (i.e. within the next year). The management review will be happening in a few weeks. Jill asked if there were any questions.

Steve Dillen asked if the training issue was in respect to new employees? Jill responded “yes”.

Keith Chapman elaborated on what this training was in regards to new employees being familiar with Teal’s policies and procedures, Teal’s CMS and CSA initiatives and who to contact if a problem comes up. It is not about training fallers to be fallers; it is generally about training crew such as fallers in Teal’s document requirements and who to report to if an issue arises in the course of their tasks.

Steve Dillen asked about non-conformance with printed material. Is it about having out of date, printed material in use where there is new material that should be in place? Jill responded “yes, it is out of date material that was still in use”. Steve asked about “corrective action items”?

Jill responded that as part of Teal’s Corporate Management System (CMS) and its Standard Operating Procedures there is a system of block and road inspections for ensuring that plans are being followed and that they are working. Teal has a spreadsheet that tracks action items that stem from these inspections. Teal had not been maintaining this spreadsheet.

Sharie Conroy asked if there was a time limit for correcting these findings? Jill responded that Teal sets its own time limits based on the nature of the action plans needed. Definitely, at the very least they need to be addressed by the next internal audit – so within a year. Teal wants to be implementing these right away so generally the action plans should be in place and being worked on prior to the external audit in November.

Al Stobbart asked if there will be a progress report before the next meeting? Jill responded that the next meeting is in February 2009 so there will be a progress report.

Action Item 20 A: Teal to report on the action items from the internal audit and the progress on these items for the next FPAG meeting.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman

Due Date: February 2009

Steve Dillen asked how the internal audit findings relate to the indicator's status. Jill responded that there were items identified related to the indicator set. There were recommendations made. These are not non-conformances but recommendations for improvement.

Jill West turned to discuss the External Audit. It is scheduled for November 27th -30th. Teal has not received the audit plan from the Auditor. The audit will cover both Fraser operations and Honeymoon Bay operation on Vancouver Island. If anyone is interested in attending the audit please let us know tonight or very shortly after the meeting. The auditor will be contacting a number of the FPAG membership to interview about the FPAG process. Unfortunately, it will be conducted during business hours so that may be a problem for some members.

Sharie Conroy asked if they should make an appointment? It is a busy time for me. Jill responded that we could try. It is really up to the Auditor so it is difficult to say.

John Bowles asked who QMI is? Jill responded that QMI SAI Global (Quality Management Institute SAI Global, <http://www.qmi.com/>) is the registrar who holds the contract for being the third party auditor for Teal's certification.

Jill turned to discuss the status of Teal's two CSA certification certificates. Teal currently has two separate certificates for its CSA certifications at Honeymoon Bay and for Fraser. In order to reduce the administration, Teal has applied to have the two certificates merged into one that will cover both operations. For Fraser, the text of the SFMP will make references to both the Honeymoon Bay and Fraser operations. The indicator tables and reporting (appendices 1 & 2) will be organized by operation and there will be a set of appendices for each operation. The Terms of Reference document will also be revised to cover both PAGs. The PAGs will not see a lot of changes, the plans etc will be 99% the same as before. Each operation will be audited once per year – either external or internal. Each operation will have an external audit every two years. Administratively, there are benefits to amalgamating the certificates but there also some potential risks. If one operation messes up, then both operating areas will be deemed to be messing up.

Jill asked the Table for any questions.

John Pichugin asked the Table how many Members were contacted last year? Sharie Conroy said that she was contacted.

Keith Chapman asked Sharie if she wanted to speak with the Auditor? Sharie responded that she did. Keith responded that normally the Auditor selects Members randomly but Keith would communicate this with the Auditor. Keith added that he would expect that the Auditor will want to speak with all of the FPAG First Nation Members.

John Pichugin asked if any other Members wish to be contacted?

Jim Baker responded that after working in the woods for over 40 years a lot of this seems like foolishness but in this day and age there is a lot of due diligence stuff now. In the old days a workers were well aware of what is going on but now things are different and workers need to be informed about a lot more.

Jill West added that they hope to have the SFMPs merged in the next couple of weeks and will let the FPAG know when it is on the web. Jill added that the internal audit and the external audit for Fraser identified a number of duplicate indicators that repeat the indicator set under two or more CSA Criterion. For example, in tonight's hand-outs we have Indicators 4-1 & 5-4 which are identical. Teal would like to remove the duplicate and keep one set under an appropriate Criterion/Element. Really it is about slimming down the plan and helping to focus on Indicators. Are people strongly opposed to this idea? Also, the external audit last year identified some Indicators that may be under the wrong element. Teal would like to review this and move Indicators within the SFMP to a more appropriate Criterion or Element.

Keith Chapman asked the Table if there were any comments or concerns about removing duplicates and re-arranging Indicators to other Criterion/Elements? Once we build an Indicator, it probably does not a big concern to the FPAG where exactly the Indicator is located but rather that it is in the plan and is being reported. Is anyone opposed to these two changes?

Al Stobbart asked what criteria would be used to determine where Indicators should be?

Jill West responded that the CSA Standard has descriptions for each of its Criterion and each of its Elements. Teal will review each Indicator against these descriptions and ensure which Indicator is the most appropriate.

Minutes Ratified by FPAG, September 15, 2009

Jim Baker commented that as long as the 'idea' around individual Indicators is still maintained within the Plan, he does not see a problem with re-arranging Indicators and reducing duplicates.

Keith Chapman responded that if a Value has been raised by the PAG and an Indicator has been developed, it will remain within the SFMP. The duplicates will disappear and the specific locations in the plan may change but no original Indicators will be removed. It is a streamlining procedure. Also, the Fraser Indicators will be identified with an "F" with the Indicator number to let people know what operation it refers to.

9. Indicator Maintenance: Review of selected 2007 non-conforming Indicators (1-8, 4-1/5-4, 5-5, 6-3)

Keith Chapman pointed out the document "Indicator Maintenance: Review of Selected 2007 Non-Conforming Indicators" in the meeting document package and put a copy on the overhead screen. Keith explained that the Indicators in this document did not meet their respective Targets and Variances for 2007. We developed good indicators with good intentions but in application, due to external factors, these Indicators were not met.

Keith Chapman reviewed the current wording for Indicator 1-8 and explained why the Indicator was not met. Keith explained that "critical habitat" is considered to be their individual burrows and the immediate area around their burrows where they forage. Keith briefly explained that the strategy for managing Mtn Beaver was not developed as the provincial government is proposing legislation to make all Mtn Beaver burrows automatically protected which made any other strategy that may be developed by Teal redundant. Keith explained that he had an action plan to follow up on the current status of this draft legislation. Keith made some phone calls and sent an email to the head of legislation with the Ministry of Environment. The Ministry of Environment representative suggested that the legislation may be enacted as early as next spring but with the provincial election etc this may change.

Keith Chapman reviewed a draft proposed change to the Indicator.

Sharie Conroy commented that the proposed change ignores the Value/Objective to maintain/protect habitat.

Alan Johnsrude suggested that maybe the Indicator could simply be revised to follow the draft Order. The Order reads to "not damage or render ineffective".

Jim Baker commented that Teal will need to take the bull by the horns and manage this species and not wait for government.

Jill West suggested tracking the percentage of Mt Beaver burrows that are not damaged or rendered ineffective.

Steve Dillen asked why the revised Indicator would expand to cover all sub-species.

Keith Chapman responded that this would align to the proposed legislation and also make it more operationally simple in that the sub-species would not need to be identified which may involve some detailed examination of the animal. We could change this to be specific to only those sub-species in the DFA or only those sub-species that are blue listed.

Steve Dillen asked if the Indicator could be 'delayed' until the legislation comes out?

Keith Chapman responded that the Auditors would want to see the indicator reflect the current situation and then change later when legal policies change. Ed McWaters received some general practices from the Ministry of Environment on how to handle these burrows and this is an interim management strategy.

There was some general discussion at the Table regarding maintaining the interim strategy and reflecting this in the revised Indicator.

Bruce Edwards asked how often Mtn Beaver would be encountered in proposed road locations. Keith responded that he was not sure but it may be as seldom as one every other year (?)

John Pichugin commented that Mtn Beaver like disturbed soil and often move into road edges after they are built which may indicate that we are enhancing habitat. I am no expert on them but this is what is happening.

Sharie Conroy commented that as long as the strategy is supported by MOE and it includes their burrows and any surrounding habitat that they would require.

Keith Chapman responded that these issues would be addressed in the management strategy. The strategy will be incorporated in the appendix for the Indicator and shared with the FPAG.

Bruce Edwards commented that there should be a strategy document to review before finalizing this Indicator. Jill West responded that Teal will track this action item and deliver the strategy later. If we put this through this evening, it will be put into the SFMP which the Auditor will review for 2008. If we delay we will not be able to report until 2009. This is definitely an improvement over what we have.

Action Item 20 B: Teal to complete a management strategy for Mountain Beaver within the DFA, incorporate the strategy within the Appendix 2 of the SFMP and review at the next FPAG meeting.

Environment Dept. Keith Chapman

Due Date: February 2009

The Indicator wording was revised to the following and Jill West asked if there was any motion to adopt this change:

Ind #	Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Variance
1-8	Mountain Beaver	Maintain and protect critical Mountain Beaver habitat	Percentage of Critical Mtn Beaver habitat that is identified and managed as per the strategy	100%	None

Steve Dillen 1st, John Bowles 2nd, all in favour, 2 members abstained. The Indicator was adopted as revised.

Keith Chapman called for a 20 minute meal break.

After the break, Keith re-convened the meeting. Keith turned to Indicator 4-1/5-2, reviewed the current wording and the issues around why the Indicators were not met in 2007. Simply, any agreements associated with the Indicators require that both Teal and the Proponent work on them but the Proponent in this case has not been able to finalize their proposal. Keith reviewed the proposed changes. Keith asked the Table for discussion.

Jim Baker discussed the history and current status of their proposal. The planner mill is running now but markets have changed and people have moved away and John Warren passed away. In short, the proposal itself has not at a point where Teal's concerns have been met so an agreement cannot be finalized at this point.

John Pichugin commented that there is an accommodation agreement between May Trucking and the Boston Bar First Nation where May would provide logs for BBFN's sawmill. This agreement is different than what the Indicator is about. This Indicator is about a separate agreement for the Proponent to go into old Teal blocks and salvage logs.

Allan Johnsrude commented that Teal only holds part of the 'equation' for this agreement. Could the Variance be revised to allow more time for the Proponent to finalize their end?

Keith Chapman responded that could be changed. The Target could also be changed to read that the protocol agreements be finalized within X amount of time after a draft document is agreed to by both Teal and the Proponent.

Jill West suggested that maybe a timeline be left out all together.

Chief Andy Alex commented that he had been working with John Warren and Brian Taylor on this issue. We can take and mill wood from other sources such as seized wood from the MOFR and the Union Bar First Nation has an agreement to take wood from the Boston Bar area. Union Bar has an agreement with MOFR to take cedar. We have already supplied Seabird Indian Band with cedar already. We also are working on an agreement with the Boothroyd. There have been a lot of things out of our control that have limited our good intentions. I would like to follow up with what we were working on with John Warren and Teal.

Keith Chapman commented that there are real challenges and limited capacity to resolve them. Would it work for the Indicator to simply track the progress as it happens and not set a specific timeline? Or do we set a timeline for when an acceptable draft protocol should be finalized?

Jill West commented that sometimes drafts get held up too. Sometimes they get political. The Proponent and Teal are working in good faith and will get there eventually.

There was a general agreement at the Table that tracking the progress was the most practical way of changing this Indicator.

Keith Chapman asked for any motions to adopt the revised Indicator as worded below. Jim Baker 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. The changes were ratified.

Ind #	Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Variance
4-1 & 5-4	Maximize the efficient use of timber	Opportunities for the efficient use of timber which Teal cannot economically market	Progress towards individual signed protocol agreements for Community Log Retrieval with interested individuals or groups from Communities	Report annually on the status of individual protocol agreements for Community Log Retrieval	The intent of this indicator is to monitor the progress of proposed Community Log Retrieval Agreements

Keith Chapman noted the time and asked the Table if they wanted to press on with the next two Indicators for review or start John Pichugin's presentation? Jill West responded that they should press on with the Indicators as they are essentially the same issues and changes as for 4-1 & 5-4 and it would not take much time.

Jill West reviewed 5-5 & 6-3. These indicators need the timeline removed.

Keith Chapman reviewed 5-5 and the issues with the timelines for the two parties (Teal and the community) and the proposed changes.

Jill West asked if the Table is okay with adopting the suggested changes. There was general agreement that this was fine.

Keith Chapman asked for a motion to accept the two indicators as revised. Jim Baker 1st, Chief Andy Alex 2nd, all in favour, none opposed. The two indicators were changed as follows:

Ind #	Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Variance
5-5	Economic benefits to local communities	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	Report annually on the progress of the MOU	The intent of this indicator is to monitor the progress of the MOU
6-3	Aboriginal and Treaty rights within Traditional Territories	Recognize and respect Aboriginal and Treaty rights within the Traditional Territories of individual First Nations occurring in the DFA	Progress toward individual, signed protocol agreements with First Nations with an expressed interest in establishing protocol agreements	Report annually on the status of individual protocol agreements with First Nations with an expressed interest	The intent of this indicator is to monitor the progress of protocol agreements with First Nations

10. FPAG Meeting Evaluations

- Keith Chapman asked the Table to look through their meeting packages for the *Fraser Public Advisory Group Meeting Evaluation* form. Keith asked Members to complete the form and that he would collect them after the meeting.

11. Presentation: “Just a Hectare” by John Pichugin

John Pichugin explained that the presentation was from the Coast Forest Products Association which Teal is a member. The reason they put this together was to communicate industry concerns to government about the working forestry land base, how it is shrinking and what that means for the industry and the province.

After the presentation there was a brief discussion about the land base and the current condition of the industry. John Pichugin commented that there is some promise in Japan and China for BC forest products as they have been found to be superior to concrete or brick construction in earthquake zones. John suggested that the link to the video of one of the earthquake tests be shared with the FPAG. (see: <http://www.coastforest.org/top.html>)

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

Meeting Minutes recorded by Keith Chapman.

The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held Tuesday February 3rd, 2009. The meeting location will be announced in January 2009.