

Fraser Public Advisory Group (Fraser PAG) *Meeting #22 Minutes: Indicator Maintenance*

November 3, 2009

1. Call to order

Keith Chapman called the 22nd meeting of the Fraser Public Advisory Group to order at 5:35 p.m. on November 3, 2009 at the Pantry Restaurant, Chilliwack, BC. The meeting sign in sheet was circulated. Keith introduced Chris Harvey, facilitator. The meeting audio is recorded for the purposes of the Meeting Minutes only.

2. Registration of FRASER PAG Members

The following members were present:

Jim Baker, Boston Bar	Frank Andrew, Stó:lō Tribal Council	Al Stobbart, Inch Creek Hatchery, Director Area G FVRD
Lloyd Forman, Boston Bar Resident, Director Area A FVRD	Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Valley Emergency Coordinator	John Bowles, Harken Towing
Randall Dayton, MoFR	Heather Morlacci, Hatzic Valley Watershed Committee	Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident
Brian Jones, Seabird Indian Band	Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Valley, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association	

Members Absent:

Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar FN	Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Point Resident	Mike Peters, Ministry Tourism Culture and the Arts
Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band	Keith Warrener, Fraser Valley Regional District	Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch First Nation
Chief Don Harris, Douglas First Nation / In-SHUCH-ch FN	Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation	Steve Dillen, 4WDABC
Chief Sidney Douglas, Cheam Indian Band	Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-am	

Others Present:

Chris Harvey, Facilitator	John Pichugin, Teal	Keith Chapman, Teal
---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Fraser PAG Meeting #22 Agenda
2. Fraser PAG Meeting #21 (Sept 15, 2009) Minutes: *SFMP & CSA Review*
3. *Public Advisory Group Terms of Reference – Revised Sept 2009*
4. *FPAG Meeting 22 Biodiversity Presentation Slide Notes*

4. Health and Safety

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

5. Additions to the Agenda for Meeting #22

Keith C. asked the group to look at the Agenda for Meeting #22 and asked for any proposed revisions. Keith noted that John Pichugin would like to make an announcement regarding recent events important to the FPAG.

Sharie Conroy noted that folks in her community were concerned that ATV's are accessing the lake driving along the lake and accessing their property and there have been break-ins. These folks want to talk to Teal about limiting the access. Keith C. said he would contact Sharie for more information.

Bruce Edwards put forward a motion to accept Heather Morlacci as a FPAG Member. Bruce noted that she represents the Hatzic Valley Watershed Committee and has had a strong attendance record.

Heather explained briefly what the committee does and how it related to the DFA. The committee reviews watershed issues – much of which has been discussed at the FPAG Table in regards to local hydrology issues.

Chris Harvey turned to the Terms of Reference in regards to new Members. Chris reviewed the criteria. It was agreed that Heather met all of the criteria. Heather was accepted as a new FPAG Member.

Keith asked for any more additions to the Agenda. No further Agenda items were put forward.

John Pichugin thanked everyone for attending and for the effort it takes to participate. CSA certification is important to Teal. The announcement is that May Trucking employees Brian Taylor and Ed McWaters, no longer work for May or Teal as of the end of September. The current economic situation is leading to very tough decisions. John added that he is not aware of what is going to happen in the near future as far as replacements etc.

Jim Baker asked John if May was still one of Teal's prime contractors? John replied that they are still logging as of today.

6. Introductions

Keith Chapman 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 #21 (September 15, 2009). No changes were put forward. Keith asked for a motion to adopt the Minutes as revised. Lloyd Foreman 1st, John Bowles 2nd. All in favour, none opposed.

8. Current Events

Keith Chapman asked Chris Harvey to comment on upcoming events.

Chris Harvey announced that the External Audit is scheduled for the week of November 23rd. The audit will look at "Chain of Custody" [tracking logs & lumber from source, through processing, and on to customer] at Duke Point Sort and Honeymoon Bay operation. They are not going to visit the Fraser office but may look at some records and documents located there. They will be interested in contacting PAG members from both FPAG and SIPAG and will be sending contact letters out to all FN's associated with the DFA. Next year Fraser will be the focus of the audit. If any PAG members are interested in talking to the Auditor, please contact Keith and he'll pass along that to the Auditor. The Auditor will likely be contacting Members on Thursday Nov 26th. It can be in the evening or during the day as convenient for PAG Members.

Brian Jones asked Chris to explain more about what the External Audit is. Does it involve financial statements? Logging practices.

Chris replied that the audit is a certification audit which will be performed by QMI-SAI Global (<http://www.qmi.com/>). They will look at Teal and determine if Teal is meeting the CSA standard in regards to how the PAGs are run, SFMP, Corporate Management System (Training Records, SOPs etc) and Chain of Custody. They will be in the field for a couple days looking at indicators.

Frank Andrew asked if they will be engaging the FN's. Chris replied that they will be sending letters to all FN's associated with the DFA with a questionnaire, and will likely try to contact all of the FN's Members of FPAG/SIPAG.

9. Terms of Reference – review minor changes

Keith Chapman turned to the latest draft of the Terms of Reference containing updates from the last FPAG meeting. Keith reviewed the changes made in the last meeting.

Bruce Edwards suggested that #5 of the Code of Conduct on page 7 be removed all-together. The concept of not insulting other members is described above. We will be criticizing some comments but respectfully.

Keith Chapman asked the Table for support for striking item #5 under the Code of Conduct. All in favour, none opposed. The final text of the TOR will be brought to the next meeting.

Presentation: Criterion 1 Biodiversity

Keith Chapman pointed out the PowerPoint slide notes in the meeting handouts for Biodiversity (Criterion 1, Elements 1.1 to 1.4) and projected it on the screen. The slide presentation contained an overview of Biodiversity including:

- Forest Fragmentation & Loss,
- Natural Disturbance Regimes and Patterns,
- Maintenance of Populations and Communities, Local and Regional
- Maintenance of Populations and Communities
- Local and Regional Protected Areas
- Integrated Landscape Management
- Silviculture Regimes and Tools
- Invasive Plant Species
- Exotic Tree Species
- Native Seed Stock
- Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)
- Biological Resources of Cultural Heritage Significance
- Sites with Special Biological and Cultural Significance
- Conservation of Old-Growth Forest Attributes
- Participation in Government Programs to Protect Threatened and Endangered Species
- Discussion of Biodiversity
- Ecosystem diversity
- Species Diversity
- Genetic Diversity
- Sites of Special Biological Significance

Homework (“Biodiversity Discussion Items”) on these topics was sent to Members in mid October.

Keith Chapman reviewed the presentation. The Indicators to be reviewed from this presentation are draft Core Indicators required by the new CSA Standard. CSA provides the Indicator statements (e.g. 9 Core Indicators for Criterion 1 “Biological Diversity”) and the PAGs develop the Value, Objective, and Target. Since the new Core Indicators are new, there are no existing examples to review.

Keith reviewed a proposed Draft Core Indicator for “Ecosystem Area by Type”. Discussed the definition and role of ecosystems and how they can be tracked. There are about 9 ecosystems in the Fraser portion of the DFA.

Al Stobart asked how it is possible to change an ecosystem?

Keith replied that Teal is making an enquiry to the CSA Standards committee for more information on that. The most obvious answer is that a forest ecosystem might be changed by paving it or some other permanent physical alteration where the ecosystem area is lost or not functioning.

Sharie Conroy asked about ecosystems at the stand level. We know the general plants locally. There are certain small areas, about 30 hectares, that are old growth hemlock up on a ledge that previous logging has missed. They have a unique understory of blue huckleberry and this forest is not seen anywhere else on the whole side of the valley.

Keith C. replied that the ecosystems are described and mapped and are based on soils, temperature, precipitation etc. The forest that Sharie is speaking of occurs within one of those ecosystems and is a ‘plant community’ that has developed within that ecosystem over time and with a particular set of local disturbances or lack of them.

Sharie Conroy asked what “Maintain” means, does it mean that it is clear cut?

Keith C. replied that harvesting removes much of the plant community but leaves the ecosystem intact such that if given the time and similar treatments or natural disturbances as Sharie’s example, the stand would develop and end up the same as what was harvested. Removing or changing ecosystem area would be accomplished by paving or flooding a terrestrial ecosystem or draining a wetland ecosystem.

Keith Chapman called for a 20 minute meal break.

After the break, Keith re-convened the meeting. Keith projected a map of the ecosystems in the Fraser DFA and pointed out the differences between ecosystems in the interior (Interior Douglas Fir wet & warm, the Engelmann Spruce Sub Alpine Fir moist warm) and those towards Hatzic (Coastal Western Hemlock dry maritime, CWH very wet maritime submontane, CWH very wet maritime, montane, and Mountain Hemlock moist maritime windward).

Sharie commented that slides don’t grow anything so they are areas that remove ecosystem area.

Lloyd Foreman commented that we are coming at this from two different levels. BC and more local residents want to be sustainable and know that forests are protected. The other level is the international community that is telling us that they are not going to buy our product unless we are meeting certain criteria. This indicator is largely geared to the international community that sees other regions destroy ecosystems as a way of doing business. This indicator is a check box for those questions that largely come internationally.

John Bowles asked if this indicator was developed by CSA because there was a real concern? Keith replied that

the indicators came out of a number of international agreements and the Canadian Council of Forests Ministers. Al Stobbart commented that the markets where sustainable forest management is valued most, say Europe, they have altered much if not most of their ecosystems. When you look at this indicator from that perspective it makes sense.

Jim Baker commented that he had been in the forest with Foresters from Germany where being a forester is considered to be a very prestigious job and tough to get. They were pointing out a lot of issues such as soil erosion and ecosystems even back then. When we logged in Manning Park, with a small well suited machined with a couple of guys, we were able to harvest without leaving an impact. When west Harrison was first logged way back when, they rigged up big sky lines to A-frame barges in the lake and dragged every log across the hill down the same path and gouged out a trench you can still see today. Our younger people need to be educated on the success and failures in the past for a strong foot forward. I can see the scenario where the old mistakes could be repeated again. The other side of this is that enforcement in the woods needs to be increased.

Chris Harvey re-capped the discussion on the Indicator and asked for more comments.

Lloyd Foreman moved that the indicator be adopted as worded. Bruce Edwards 2nd, All in favour. New Core Indicator 1.1.1 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Ecosystem Biodiversity	Conserve Ecosystem diversity at the stand and landscape levels by maintaining the variety of communities and ecosystems that naturally occur in the DFA	Ecosystem Area by Type	Maintain current area by type	Zero

Keith C. turned to Core Indicator 1.1.2 “Forest Area by Type or Species Composition”. The standard allows for some flexibility on this indicator: it can be either “Forest Area by Type” or it can be “Species Composition” or both. Species composition is a tough one as the species planted after harvesting older forests are different species but are more ecologically suited to the disturbance and ecosystem (i.e. pioneer species). While areas are planted to one or more species, all of the species that would come back naturally also come up and augment the planted trees.

Sharie Conroy asked how planting different species than the original stand can affect other species such as birds, insects and amphibians? Also, there is a risk to cropping the same species repeatedly and depleting the reserves of nutrients that individual species seek out. You can’t grow corn two years in a row. Soils need a ‘rest’ some times.

Keith C replied that opening sizes are limited in size to 40 hectares or less and the standards for regeneration require that natural, ecologically suited species are regenerated. Wildlife Tree Patches preserve a good portion of the harvested stand and there are also landscape level reserves such as parks, Old Growth Management Areas, Wildlife Habitat Areas, Ungulate Winter Ranges and Riparian Reserves that further protect areas for species to move around and find their niche.

Keith C added that the Chief Forester released a letter in September 2009 that urges foresters to consider the future of the stands that they are regenerating and what the climate may be like (e.g. warmer, drier etc) and consider the anticipated risks due to disease, insects and fire. The letter promotes the idea that the more species planted will often decrease the overall risk to a regenerating stand.

Lloyd Foreman commented that it doesn’t matter what we plant, Mother Nature will still bring back the species that would occur naturally. Forestry is different than farming in that forestry largely leaves the soil undisturbed and only harvests crops once or twice a century.

Sharie Conroy responded that there are also problems with overcutting, short rotations of 35 to 50 years, soil erosion etc. and reduced forest productivity such as seen in parts of Europe on their 4th and 5th rotation. We need to be aware of these issues.

Keith C. replied that soil erosion is a concern and there are indicators on that issue. Forestry in BC has learned from the European examples of good and bad and soil productivity is being maintained at the 1st and second harvests and there are requirements for leaving Coarse Woody Debris for soil and biodiversity etc. Historically, many areas in Europe and Scandinavia are stripped of all Coarse Woody Debris and even smaller branches and the stumps in some cases.

Chris Harvey informed the Table that soil productivity can be discussed at future meetings when those indicators are discussed. Chris recapped the discussion comments. There are two ways to measure this indicator: by forest area by type such as plantations, swamps, alpine etc OR by Species Composition. The Species Composition

indicator is difficult to place a meaningful target on as there is species alteration due to nature or harvesting. The Forest Area by type may be more applicable to the DFA. Chris asked Keith to review the definition of "Plantation".

Keith reviewed the CSA definition of Plantation. This definition does not describe any of Teal's regeneration activities. Teal does not use exotic species, engineered species or establish hybrid popular plantations. Teal regenerates areas with natural species with a minimum of intervention and brushing so that a very natural stand develops after harvesting. The term "Plantation" is often used in forestry in BC when speaking about planted cutblocks but the CSA term is more about replacing natural stands with exotic species etc. with very limited species diversity and forest critters. Tracking "Forest Area by Type" would track the amount of area in exotic Plantations, lost wetlands,

Al Stobbert commented that the "Species Composition" indicator is almost impossible to track and manage. Al had worked with the forest ecologist Karl Klinka from UBC earlier in his career at the Forest Service. Karl would say that a given 3 meter radius plot would take 30 minutes to inventory the plants that were there, 3 days to tell what insects that were there. Moving the sample plot over one chain would come up with a very different inventory of plants and insects and that hasn't addressed the animals that may occur. I don't think species composition would be feasible to do in a meaningful way.

Jim Baker asked if the Indicator wording could be changed. Chris Harvey replied that that wording is set by CSA and is the one thing they don't have much control over. We can pick "Forest Area by Type" OR "Species Composition".

Frank Andrew commented that a balanced approach is needed between sustainable harvesting and the integrity of the landscape. Maybe when we look at this indicator next year after an audit we may have a more refined idea of what we can do with this.

Chris Harvey asked the Table for any further comments or a motion to adopt. Lloyd Foreman 1st, John Bowles 2nd. All in favour. New Core Indicator 1.1.2 was approved as follows:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Ecosystem Biodiversity	Conserve Ecosystem diversity at the stand and landscape levels by maintaining the variety of communities and ecosystems that naturally occur in the DFA	Forest Area by type	Maintain current forest area by type	Zero

Keith C. turned to Core Indicator 1.4.1 "Proportion of Identified Sites with Implemented Management Strategies". The term "*Identified Sites*" is not defined in the CSA Standard but is taken to mean sites identified by government processes which, in BC, are called "Known Sites". Known or Identified sites are recognized by government for important values including rare and unique sites of ecological, geological, historical or cultural importance. Government develops policy guidelines and sets objectives for their management (i.e. protect). In BC, the Forest Stewardship Plan is the management document that states results and strategies for all Known Sites. The Target would be that Teal's FSP addresses all of the sites identified by government.

Chris Harvey added that the process can be generalized in that government identifies these sites through its one inventories and consultations. It then develops management strategies and makes it "Known". There are not many examples of Identified Sites in BC that do not have management strategies. The management strategies give guidelines and legal parameters on what Teal can and cannot do.

Lloyd Foreman commented that the FSP is a good mechanism as it is a public document and it captures the objectives set by government for areas they have identified.

Brian Jones commented that regarding "culturally important sites" there are sometimes things that fall through the cracks. One example is a person working at the MOFR noticed a cutting permit being processed for an area that had not been recognized for the cultural significance to a First Nation. I don't know where we can base our information on "culturally important sites" if the government is missing items like this in their process. When we look at traditional use studies completed 10 years ago there is new information that comes out. How is that information addressed? How does that information get to Teal?

Keith C. responded that there is a section in the FSP regarding entering Memorandums of Understandings with willing First Nations. Any sites not identified by government processes directly could be identified during the consultation process between Teal and the individual First Nations. There were a number of comments at the last meeting that the referral process was not working very well at all and that is something that we need to improve on.

Frank Andrew commented that the only way to come up with the inventory of these values is by engaging in a land use process involving First Nations, government and industry, which is comprehensive such that the gaps in the Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) are closed. There has to be some linkage there – it's too wishy washy.

Sharie Conroy suggested that the Target could be changed to add an element in addition to the FSP that would encompass the "culturally important sites".

Brian Jones commented that during the referral process some industry representatives will say that 'since this was already logged we don't need to do the details on the particular block'. This is used as a lever to persuade FN's to approve of the activity. It's sometimes dollar driven and that it is the way that it goes.

Brian Jones added that biodiversity is not just simply the loss of species it is the loss of culturally important species of plants etc such as medicinal plants. We see more of the Culturally Modified Trees in our inventories. The list of species that were in the forest that we used to gather is still being built through our Traditional Use Studies. Where are you going to find that information? Invasive species are also a concern. Everything is invasive at some level. Everything invaded when the ice retreated. How far back in time do we go to develop this list?

Frank Andrew commented that this concept can only be taken to a certain level until we start to get to the government's responsibility regarding consultation, accommodation and compensation.

Chris Harvey summarized the concerns. There is a concern that the 'culturally important sites' are not captured adequately in the FSP. Chris suggested that another indicator could be developed to capture this value where the FSP does not. There are indicators on sites brought forward by the public, there is a whole set of Criterion that addresses First Nations values and relationships. The inclusion of 'cultural sites' in the biodiversity indicator is one of the changes that CSA has made in the last revision of the standard.

Brian Jones commented that the message is that no matter how many indicators we have it won't get captured.

Heather Morlacci commented that this is important and needs to be recognized. The system is so appalling that we need a special link to identify and protect these values. I would like to see that protection in place.

Keith Chapman commented that it seems like the 'cultural' part of the indicator needs to be removed and treated specifically in a separate indicator with clear language and with a clearly measureable target that is not mired in the FSP referral process

Frank Andrew responded that that made sense, it sends a message to government.

Bruce Edwards suggested that the Value could be changed to include the concept that government is not doing a complete job of identifying these important cultural features.

Chris Harvey responded that is what she is hearing at the table – to remove the reference to 'cultural' in indicator 1.4.1 and develop another indicator.

Bruce Edwards commented that there may be other similar problems with sites out there that have not been recognized by government to date. There may need to be a mechanism to identify these sites.

Chris Harvey responded that there is another Core Indicator that does provide a mechanism for identifying other biological sites.

Al Stobbart asked if the FSP goes through a public process. There are many sites that the government or First Nations do not want the public to know about in order to protect it.

Keith C responded that there is an avenue for people to raise their concerns. But for special sites, there needs to be some expertise to recognize a truly unique or important site. The same goes for culturally important sites. As far as protecting sensitive information, there are mechanisms to mask the true locations of some features or to keep certain information confidential during the FSP process and for the certification audit process. There is language in the CSA Standard regarding protecting sensitive information.

John Bowles asked whether indicator 1.4.2 covers a lot of the concerns raised here?

Keith C briefly reviewed the draft indicator. The problem of adequately identifying the cultural sites is still present.

Bruce Edwards suggested that they still need to address the sites that are identified by government and also have a process for identifying the remaining sites and managing the values of those sites. We will need an explanatory note on what "Identified Sites" are and what they do and do not include. I don't think we want to take out the reference in 1.4.1 to government identified sites. Maybe the government has identified 60% and 40% remains to be identified. We don't want to ignore the 60%. We'll need a process for identifying the 40%.

Chris Harvey commented that the PAG could leave the wording for this indicator draft and discuss the current status and strategy at the next meeting (the background context and definitions around special sites).

Brian Jones asked when the next FPAG meeting and SIPAG meeting at Honeymoon Bay was to be held; it would be nice to have the information from that process to look at. Chris Harvey responded that the next FPAG meeting is scheduled for February 2010 and SIPAG will be having a similar meeting as tonight's FPAG meeting on November 18, 2009.

Keith C. noted the time and concluded the 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 February 2nd, 2010 at the Pantry
Restaurant in Chilliwack, BC 5:30-8:30 PM**