

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG)

Meeting #21 Minutes: SFMP & CSA Review

September 15, 2009

1. Call to order

Jill West called the 21st meeting of the Fraser Public Advisory Group to order at 5:36 p.m. on September 15, 2009 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. The meeting sign in sheet was circulated.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Brian Jones, Seabird Indian Band	Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident
Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Prairie	Frank Andrew, Stó:lō Tribal Council	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association
Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Steve Dillen, 4WDABC
Chief Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	John Bowles, Harken Towing	

Members Absent:

Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident	Mike Peters, Ministry Tourism Culture and the Arts
Allan Johnsrude, MOFR	Keith Warrenner, Fraser Valley Regional District	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation	
Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Point Resident	Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-am	

Others Present:

Ed McWaters, Teal	John Pichugin, Teal	Keith Chapman, Teal
Jillene West, Facilitator		

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #21 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #20 Minutes: *Indicator Maintenance*
3. *Summary of External Audit (Nov 24-27, 2008)*
4. *Summary of 2008 [SFMP] Results, Fraser Valley Portion of the DFA (September 2009)*
5. *Revisions to CSA Z809 Standard & Transitions to the New Standard – Power Point slide notes*
6. *Public Advisory Group Terms of Reference – Draft for discussion (Sept 2009)*

4. Health and Safety

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

5. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #21

Jill West asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #21 and asked for any proposed revisions. No additional Agenda items were put forward.

6. Introductions – New Members

Keith Chapman introduced himself and asked the Members at the table to introduce themselves. Everyone at the Table introduced themselves. Don Harris is now chief of the Douglas FN

7. Previous Meeting Minutes

Keith Chapman asked the group to put forward any revisions to the meeting minutes from meeting #20 (October 28, 2008). No changes were put forward. Keith asked for a motion to adopt the Minutes as revised. Sharie Conroy 1st, Bruce Edwards 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

8. Update from Teal – 2009 Fires and Operations

Keith Chapman asked John Pichugin to provide an overview of what has been happening over the last year since the last FPAG meeting.

John said he is glad to say that Teal is still here in light of how ugly it is currently in the forest industry. Teal's owners have been challenged by a large inventory of unsold lumber. Teal has diversified its markets all around the globe including China. Teal sells lumber to Japan as it has for some time as well as into the USA.

Teal has had a number of fires in the Defined Forest Area. A fire near Teal's Pitt Lake logging camp started in August and came very close to the camp buildings. A number of pictures of the Pitt Lake fire were put on the overhead projector. Due to the fire situation in BC at the time an Incident Commander from Ontario was brought in to fight the fire using a fire crew from the GVRD with some additional crew (loggers) from Chilliwack and some fire fighters from Ontario as well. The fire was fought for about 25 days. The camp was saved. Some 6 year old plantations were lost.

Teal also hosted a field trip to Norrish Creek watershed (Cities of Mission and Abbotsford). Teal is active in the watershed. Teal spent about \$1 million on bridges in the area. This access helps the city engineering staff and public as well. The local MLA in Surrey – Dave Hayer, as well as Dick Jones and the mayors and staff of Abbotsford and Mission. Dave issued a news release with complements to Teal on its management in the watershed which is nice to receive in these times.

Teal's mills are operating sporadically – dependent on markets. The Ministry of Forests has been working on increasing efficiencies in the approvals/paperwork involved with current legislation in responding to quickly changing markets. Teal sees some bright light down the road.

Teal continues to make the Public Advisory Groups a priority for its available Forest Investment Account (FIA) funding which has been reduced 20% from previous allocations to Teal. The FIA funding has also been late in being released to Teal. Teal appreciates the effort of PAG members in coming out and participating.

Keith Chapman asked the Table if they had any news that would be important for the Table to hear.

Lloyd Foreman commented that to receive positive comments from George Perry (mayor of Abbotsford) and James Atebe (Mayor of Mission) who have very practical experience is remarkable. James is chair of the parks committee which is high on his list. For him to look at what you are doing and have positive comments is a high recommendation.

9. Review of 2008 External Audit Report

Keith Chapman pointed out the document “*Summary of External Audit (Nov 24-27, 2008)*” in the meeting document package and put a copy on the overhead screen. The External Audit was held shortly after the last FPAG meeting. Keith gave a brief overview of the External Audit process. This was the first audit of the combined DFA's under one CSA Certificate.

Keith reviewed the audit summary. It was a successful audit in that Teal 'passed'. Keith reviewed the six 'areas of concern' and several 'Opportunities for Improvement'. A number of Fraser Indicators were identified as needing improving.

Keith asked the Table for any comments or questions regarding the External Audit.

Chief Andy Alex asked where Honeymoon Bay was located. John Pichugin replied that Honeymoon Bay is about 20 minutes west of Duncan on Vancouver Island. The Allowable Annual Cut (AAC) is about 367,000 cubic meters. It is a company operation with a couple of contractors. The operation is a Tree Farm License (TFL) which is area based

– there is a set area within which Teal has rights to harvest timber (versus the Forest License in Fraser which is a volume based tenure and only general agreements on where Teal can harvest timber within the Fraser Timber Supply Area). The TFL is north of Port Renfrew and up Nitnat Lake. The Olympic Peninsula in Washington State is visible across the straight from the mountains. If you look down from these mountains you could potentially see portions of the West Coast Trail.

John Pichugin asked the Table if they have any questions about combining the two DFA's. Teal struggled for about a year on whether to streamline the certification this way.

Jill West explained that it creates some elements of risk for Teal – if one operation is not meeting the CSA standard, the two operations are deemed to be not meeting the standard. The main difference to Teal is that a lot of the paperwork and auditing process is streamlined and there are some cost savings. External and internal audits will alternate between the two DFA's.

Jim Baker commented that it doesn't make much difference on the ground to have these documents combined. The awareness is there.

Keith asked for any other comments regarding the external audit or the combined DFAs.

Chief Andy Alex asked whether there are different systems for Honeymoon Bay?

Keith Chapman replied that the Corporate Management System (CMS) is implemented equally across the two operations. The CMS gives direction on general activities and procedures such as file systems and training. It spells out how to do many day-to-day things such as fuel management, stream management, document processes for getting MOF approvals with due diligence. The CSA standard requires such as system so that there a structure in place to implement the requirements under CSA.

Jim Baker asked if reforestation was under the CMS as well. Keith replied that generally 'yes'. There is a silviculture Standard Operating Procedure that ensures that silviculture crews are properly trained and that pre-works are conducted. This helps to ensure that the right tree species are planted in the right sites specific for them. It is a general checklist. It outlines the steps for implementing a planting program for example. It is a higher level procedure to ensure that the environment is protected and that legal obligations are met.

John Bowles asked if the CSA Certification is 'year to year'. Keith responded that in a sense it is. Each annual external audit can be 'do or die' and there is risk of losing the certificate.

Chief Andy Alex commented that when he worked for Macmillan Bloedel they got a number of new machines one year and they were so big they had to make the roads bigger and they got into a lot of trouble for that.

Keith responded that roads are a risk and can present a lot of headaches. A simple 6 meter bridge must be professionally engineered, and signed off once construction is complete as well as regular inspections over its life. The CMS helps to organize these requirements.

10. Review of 2008 SFMP and Annual Report

Keith Chapman pointed out the document "*Summary of 2008 Results, Fraser Valley Portion of the DFA*" in the meeting handouts. Keith described the document structure. It is a condensed portion of the SFMP.

Keith gave an overview of the changes to the SFMP on page 1. The SFMP is a dynamic document and shortly after the last PAG meeting in 2008, the SFMP was updated. A lot of duplicate indicators were combined at the recommendation of the External Audit.

Keith briefly reviewed each of the changes listed and the rationale behind the changes.

During the discussion on changes to the Coarse Woody Debris indicator, Lloyd Foreman commented that a local proponent in Boston Bar has applied to harvest firewood for the local community and First Nations. Job opportunities are being explored involving the local mill site. The regional district and MLAs have been really helpful. There have been a number of positive developments in the Boston Bar area and the efforts of Teal have been appreciated.

Keith Chapman continued with the Summary of Results for 2008 and reviewed the two indicators that were in non-conformance and the factors concerning each non-conformance. The status of the Sites of Special Significance indicators was not available as planning in these areas has been stalled by the current market conditions.

Sharie Conroy commented that for Indicator F6-10 on page 44 & 45 there is an error in describing the events. On page 45, last paragraph – they met with the Hydrologist at Sharie's house and they had some concerns which they presented to the Hydrologist and asked to meet with the Hydrologist to discuss them. That meeting has not happened yet. They only received the report and have not discussed the report with him.

Keith Chapman asked the Table if there were any particular Indicators that the Table would like to review in detail.

Frank Andrew asked about the Cultural Heritage Resources indicator F6-4. Frank asked whether the Archaeological Impact Assessments were completed by any of the Sto:lo Research and Resource Management Center was involved in these assessments.

Ed McWaters replied that they are completed by either Golder or Brown and Oaks. A local band member typically participates as well.

Frank Andrew commented that he met with BC Timber Sales and would like to have their archaeologist involved with these assessments. Our operation could be doing more of this work and a chance to review the assessments as well in interest of the Sto:lo TC and member communities.

John Pichugin asked about where a particular band tells Teal that any assessments in their Traditional Territory need to be done by a certain company?

Frank Andrew replied that the Sto:lo TC would work with the local First Nation. Basically the local First Nation would use the same information. It is more about developing the process in the protocol agreements. Meeting with BCTS it appears that the comments from First Nations are pretty sparse. Sto:lo TC is not getting the opportunities to get the work on these referral processes and this is limiting our capacity. We are looking for developing a response to this.

John Pichugin asked about an example of Pitt Lake and the Katzie. Katzie FN has own archaeologist. How would that work in this scenario?

Frank Andrew replied that if the Katzie is taking care of their resources, then we will be okay with that. But if there are other areas that are not covered, then we would need to address this. The province is not doing its consultation process and leaving it up to the proponent and the First Nation without the resources or the capacity. We have to protect this interest and address the jurisdictional interest with the Province. The referrals that come into any First Nation come in stacks and stacks – we can do this for free while the proponents are generating revenue from the resources. The province has not been as involved as they can be; it's their mandate and they haven't dealt with it.

Ed McWaters asked about the GIS overview system that Sto:lo is developing to replace the current system for assessing the archaeological potential – what is the status?

Frank Andrew responded that the referral process involves screening the applications. Sto:lo has the resources but not the capacity – i.e. the man hours for the volume. We can enhance the process for referrals. The Tribal Councils need to look at these protocols and processes. The First Nation involvement has to go beyond logging the comment and letters and calls to First Nations. It is not the same year to year and there are too many gaps in the referral and assessment processes. We are working on a coordinated response with Memorandums of Understanding and Protocol Agreements – not only with licensees but also the communities in the territories.

Frank added that the sooner they can talk – the better. This review of the referral process is indicating that now is the time to review the process and streamline before next spring. ILMB [Integrated Land Management Bureau] let it slide this year yet there is still harvesting etc and there is not the certainty of meaningful consultation process with FN's. The Tribal Council and member communities have stepped forward and said "Let's do something about this. It is not good enough to have this empty referral process and dated mandates".

Chief Don Harris commented that in the Pitt Lake area portion of the Douglas FN Traditional Territory, they have set up a website that sets out the Heritage Act and the steps to follow for any development in the area. We have a checklist that if 'flags' are raised by proposed development then referrals are required.

Frank Andrew commented that they have made progress on a screening process for the Tribal Council and the member communities. If the screening triggers a Cultural Heritage Overview Assessment, or Archaeological Impact Assessment then we start working with the proponent in those areas. We would like to take it a step further and develop it at the Territorial level so that we are at the table with the Nation, neighbours and the Municipalities so that there is certainty across the board.

Keith Chapman asked for any other comments or whether there were more First Nation indicators of interest.

Chief Don Harris commented that the recent Utilities Commission decision is going to highlight the question whether First Nations were properly consulted.

Brian Jones pointed to the Current Status of Protocol Agreements with First Nations table on page 41. If Teal wants to set up protocol discussions with Seabird Island it would be best to contact Brian.

Steve Dillen commented that under F4-6 Permanent Access Structures – the 4 Wheel Drive Association of BC feels that there may be some opportunity to address Permanent Access Structures under recreation and reduce the amount of road that Teal is being 'penalized' for while addressing the lack of recreation indicators.

Keith Chapman responded that F4-6 would probably need to stay the same as forest companies are legislated to limit Permanent Access Structures to 7% - with some exception - regardless of other forest uses. What we would look at is an associated indicator that would look at roads applicable to recreation.

Steve responded that an indicator can be developed around improvements for public access or other public benefit. There was a brief discussion regarding public access and the potential for 'weekend warriors' damaging the environment and buildings. Don Harris put forward an example of people breaking into his home and kicked the walls out from the inside. Chief Andy Alex commented that he asks these people for their address so he can tear up their backyard too.

Brian Jones commented on F6-6 First Nation's Access to Forests. We have a lot of cultural needs such as cedar bark etc, our people are always looking for access to traditional materials including for carving poles.

Ed McWaters commented that they don't have many trees large enough for canoes, but that Martin Edwards regularly asks for areas that are suitable for bark stripping etc.

Brian Jones said that a lot of it comes down to communication.

Chief Sidney Douglas commented that their traditional 11 paddler racing canoes require a log that is 60 feet long and 4 feet in diameter at the center so that there is enough log to make two canoes.

John Pichugin commented that with the Katzie, Teal provided a canoe log which was a very involved project in getting the log to the band office in Pitt Meadows. It is really neat to see that log now as a canoe. It is difficult now for us - to get a log like that now. Areas that may have it which are often restricted to helicopter blocks. The Katzie have agreements to procure logs like this from the parks in their Traditional Territories. Teal tenures are now about 70% second growth forests and steadily increasing.

Keith Chapman called for a 20 minute meal break.

After the break, Keith re-convened the meeting.

11. Revisions to CSA Z809 Standard and Transition to new Standard

Keith announced that printed copies of the new CSA Z809-08 standard were available for PAG members but would prefer if folks could read the electronic version online (<http://www.csagroup.org/repository/group/Z809-08.pdf>). A PowerPoint presentation "*Revisions to CSA Z809 Standard & Transitions to the New Standard*" was projected on a screen and identified in Members meeting document package. Keith reviewed each slide.

Jim Baker asked where the folks involved in updating the standard were located. Keith replied that the update involved a number of committees, interest groups, and academics, and First Nations representatives from all across Canada.

One key difference in the new standard is the requirement for 35 "Core Indicators" for which the Public Advisory Groups (PAGs) will need to develop Indicators, Targets, and Variances. Transition to the new standard will involve a very busy Public Advisory Group schedule in order to finalize all 35 Core Indicators. 20 Indicators are new. The target date is December 2011. Fortunately, about one half of the existing Indicator Set is very similar to Core Indicators. All locally developed Indicators (e.g. Sites of Special Significance, communities, etc) will be maintained at the discretion of the PAG.

Another change is the standard specifies "Mandatory Discussion Items" for each Criterion in the standard. Aboriginal issues and participation has an even greater focus than the previous standard. Discussion items will help to become more familiar with the subject and some of the issues involved. Guest speakers may be brought in to help.

Teal will review the 6 Criterion over the next meetings, the discussion items, Core Indicators, and unique Indicators. Where possible, Teal will match up and revise existing Indicators to any Core Indicators as much as possible. Other Core Indicators will be worked on Criterion by Criterion. Teal will develop draft Indicators for the new Core Indicators for the PAGs to review. Teal will try to maintain consistency between the South Island Public Advisory Group (SIPAG) and FPAG to allow more streamlined monitoring and reporting between Honeymoon Bay and the Fraser Defined Forest Areas.

A example of how similar indicators between Fraser, South Island and the Core Indicators regarding post harvest tree retention. The targets of Fraser and of South Island are verbalizing Teal's Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) commitment for stand level retention. The common Core Indicator can be simply created by stating that the FSP targets be met.

New Core Indicators include "Level of Carbon Uptake", "Level of investments in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability", and "Evidence of good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights."

A number of benefits of the new standard are that Teal will have better consistency across the two DFAs, educational opportunities, improved recognition of Aboriginal Communities, more focus on health and safety and sustainable communities. Teal will strive to make this as easy and straight forward as possible.

Keith Chapman asked the Table for comments.

Sharie Conroy suggested that for a complex subject as Carbon that a guest speaker be arranged such as a university professor. Keith agreed, that would be a subject that would be great to have a guest speaker.

Frank Andrew asked about the timeframe for completing the indicator update. Keith replied that by December 2011.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the communication between the Aboriginal communities and local communities is important in order to build respect. The respect has not been there in the past. In the community of Boston Bar we feel a deep appreciation towards them of bringing a health clinic into the community. The one issue that comes up – and it's seldom money – whether it is employer/employee relationships or differences between our communities - is 'Respect'. Till we get it settled that there is 'equality' we are sitting here wasting time. If we are not getting along we won't be able to even talk about carbon and the other range of issues. Lloyd commented that he felt that the Fraser PAG process has been doing a pretty good job of going down this road to respect but let's keep at it.

Keith asked for any more comments.

Jim Baker asked about the new system and the new ideas from the PAG. Jim requested that if Teal has a problem with any of the Indicators that they let the PAG know as soon as possible. There are a lot of good ideas developed here and we need to speed up that process and keep the consistency so that ideas are not lost.

John Bowles asked whether the 2008 standard release indicates any areas that CSA or others thought were flawed.

Keith replied that CSA would have received a large amount of input and criticism of its 2002 standard and would have reflected on it during the development of the new standard. CSA outlines how it revised and developed the standard in the body of the standard itself. One criticism of the old standard was that there were no 'required' indicators like FSC's forest management standard specifies. This was felt to be a potential weakness and now we have 35 Core Indicators.

Keith moved to the final agenda item

12. Review Terms of Reference

Keith Chapman pointed out the draft copy of the Public Advisory Group Terms of Reference in the meeting handouts. The Terms of Reference has not been reviewed in 3 years since we convened the Fraser PAG. It has been working well to date on most subjects but there have been a couple of issues that come up that were not spelled out very well in the document. Also, there were some dated items regarding the timeline for developing the first SFMP. The changes will also make a consistent Terms of Reference (**TOR**) across the two PAGs.

Keith reviewed each of the changes in the comment boxes in the highlighted document. The PAG will be more involved in selecting new Members.

John Bowles asked if there was a maximum number of PAG members or an optimum number. Keith replied that there was no stated maximum. The current PAG size seems to be a good number for maintaining the process. What really helps the process is if Members can keep Keith updated on whether they will attend [**The best way is to send Keith a quick email at environment@tealjones.com to indicate whether they can attend**]. It helps to set up the room, the number of documents to print, and if a whole number of sectors are poorly represented, whether to change the agenda etc.

Changes to the language around Guests and Observers will help to ensure that there is a mechanism to have others speak while not allowing someone off the street rant and rave and try to blow up the process.

Bruce Edwards commented that he was not aware of this as a problem for the PAG. Guests and Observers bring a lot of value to the Table and they need to be able to participate effectively in the discussion.

Keith agreed. There was a situation at the 2nd or 3rd meeting where an uninvited person attended the meeting and was a bit disruptive during the meeting. There was also an issue following the meeting. It turned out the person was not even from anywhere associated with the DFA. FPAG Members do not want to take time out their evenings and drive to a meeting that has been compromised.

Bruce suggested that the wording be made more flexible by making their participation in the discussion at the discretion of the facilitator and maybe with the concurrence with the Table.

Lloyd Foreman commented that time is the essence. If the person coming in to speak has something worthwhile to say, I want to hear it – especially if they are fresh, new ideas. I don't want to listen to anyone who wants to disrupt the process.

Keith continued the review of the TOR changes. The changes discussed tonight will be reflected in a final version of the TOR for the next FPAG meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Meeting Minutes recorded by Keith Chapman.

**The Next FRASER PAG Meeting will be held Tuesday November 3rd, 2009 at the Pantry Restaurant
in Chilliwack, BC 5:30-8:30 PM**