

Fraser Public Advisory Group (FPAG)

Meeting #26 Minutes

1. Call to Order

Chris Harvey from the Teal Jones Environment Department, welcomed members of the Fraser Public Advisory Group at the Pantry Restaurant in Chilliwack on the 8th of March at 5:30 pm.

2. Members

Present:

- Bruce Edwards, Hatzic Valley
- Sharie Conroy, Hatzic Durieu, McConnell Ck Ratepayers Assoc.
- Randall Dayton, Ministry of Natural Resource Operations
- John Bowles, Harken Towing
- Astrid Dimond, Hatzic Valley Watershed Committee (alternate)
- Mike Peters, Ministry of Natural Resource Operations
- Al Stobbart, Inch Ck Hatchery, FVRD
- Frank Andrews, Stó:lō Tribal Council
- Chief Andy Alex, Union Bar First Nation

Support:

- John Pichugin, Teal Jones Group
- Kevin Stanczyk, Teal Jones Group
- Chris Harvey, Environmental Department
- Kirstin Campbell, Environment Department

Regrets:

- Chief Don Harris, Douglas First Nation
- Heather Morlacci, Hatzic Valley
- Shawn Gabriel, In-SHUCK-ch Nation
- Chief Douglas Sidney, Cheam Indian Band
- Martin Edwards, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation
- Lloyd Forman, FVRD
- Steve Dillen, 4 Wheel Drive Assoc.
- Mary Sandy, Esh-kn-Am
- Chief Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band
- Gordon Sherwood, Cacuse Pt Resident
- Jean Warkentin, Norrish Creek Resident
- Keith Warrener, Teal Cedar Sawmill

3. Documents

Documents distributed to members:

1. FPAG Meeting #26 Agenda
2. Handouts for the presentation (including draft indicators)
3. Summary of changes made to the SFMP Indicators as of March, 2011
4. Draft Meeting Minutes for November 9, 2010
5. Copy of Sustainable Forest Management Questionnaire distributed to all First Nations within the Defined Forest Area

Documents available:

1. SFM Plan
2. CSA Sustainable Forest Management Standards Z809-02 and Z809-08
3. Terms of Reference
4. Summary of recent information on Avatar Grove provided by Sharie Conroy, as well as a summary of the Vancouver Island Land Use Plan, and recent Forest Practice Board's Audit

4. Call to Order, Introductions, Health and Safety & Current Events

Chris called the meeting to order at 5:30. She asked for a round of introductions as there was a new member (Astrid was an alternate for Heather). She pointed out the fire exit.

Chris asked if there were any current events within the member's respective organizations that they wished to share. There were no events noted. Chris indicated a copy of the Sustainable Forest Management Questionnaire that was distributed to all First Nations whom may potentially be affected by Teal's forest management was included in the meeting package. She noted there were no responses yet, but the topics included in the questionnaire would be reviewed in tonight's meeting.

Kirstin summarized the audit performed by the Forest Practice Board Audit of old growth harvesting in Avatar grove and the surrounding area. Teal was audited by the Forest Practice Board, an independent government body who completes audits of forestry practices, following a complaint from an environmentalist. Kirstin noted the location on a map of Southwestern Vancouver Island; near Port Renfrew and oriented the group by pointing out towns and parks in the area. Kirstin described the grove and the current protection within the Defined Forest Area, which currently is legislated to be 16% in Old Growth Management Areas, with an additional 5-14% in wildlife tree patches (of similar type and structure of surrounding harvested forest). She said that ancient trees were considered to be those over 400 years of age, and that a minimum of 6% of the area in the Gordon Landscape Unit currently protects these ancient trees. The result of the audit was that Teal is in compliance with legislation protecting Old Growth Management Areas and Landscape Unit Plan objectives.

John P noted the social values in Avatar Grove, identified by environmental groups. Teal has approached the minister (Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations) and is working in conjunction to protect the area. One option may be to protect Avatar Grove in an Old Growth Management Area, with a no net loss trade for an alternate area.

Kirstin said that Sharie had brought up the issue of Avatar Grove prior to the meeting and had provided some websites with information about the area. Kirstin said she had printed Sharie's information along with the Forest Practice Board Audit Report and that this was available to anyone who was interested.

Sharie pointed out that in the websites she had forwarded to Teal it mentions that the mayor of Port Renfrew was unhappy about the logging of these older trees in the area and whether Teal had addressed the issue or not. She asked if the President of the Port Renfrew Chamber of Commerce had ever been invited to a SIPAG meeting. She said that in November we had spent considerable time going over new VOITs and wanted to ensure that these were actually being followed by Teal (for example, Indicator 6.1.3). John P. replied that the Pacific Marine Circle Route was originally taken by the government from the forestry companies, and that forest harvesting is a way of life in this area. For example, the Pacheedaht have a woodlot in the area and will be hauling along that road. Teal's relationship with the Pacheedaht and Ditidaht is very good. Chris pointed out that the Lake Cowichan Chamber of Commerce and Town Council is represented on the SIPAG and that we have discussed Avatar Grove at meetings; the President of the Port Renfrew Chamber of Commerce has been invited to join a number of times but we have not had a response to date. She also said that there are no visual objectives in the area but Teal does always consider the issue before logging.

Chris noted there is a lot of interest in old growth so she suggested that we can look at old-growth as an issue on a field tour or future meeting to see how Teal is doing in this aspect of their forest management.

Action Item #26-1: Include old-growth management on anticipated field tour in 2011

Environment Department, Nov. 30, 2011

5. Previous Meeting Minutes, November 9, 2010

Chris referred to the draft meetings minutes for the November 9, 2010 meeting. It was noted that the meeting minutes were previously distributed via email, therefore the review during meeting time would be kept brief. This version was updated with comments received from Sharie and Heather via email.

Chris reviewed the status of the action items in the minutes:

- Action Item #25-1: Update contact list and distribute to PAG. This was distributed over email Feb. 14, 2011.
- Action Item #25-2: Post the meeting minutes on the internet. September's meeting minutes are now posted on the internet.
- Action Item #25-3: Re-assess the status of provincial funding for projects on the Defined Forest Area in 2011. This will be completed by the end of the year.
- Action Item #25-4: Contact the IT Department to discuss options for FPAG members to attend a meeting via the internet. We set up a web meeting format but no one requested access via web.
- Action Item #25-5: Distribute 2010 travel allowance cheques at the next FPAG meeting. Travel cheques were distributed to all members present at the meeting and will be sent to those who did not attend the meeting.
- Action Item #25-6: Plan a field tour in the Fraser Valley in 2011. This will occur before the end of the year.
- Action Item #25-7: Update SFMP with above approved indicators. Completed in January.

Chris asked if there were any changes or additions to the meeting minutes. There were none and the minutes were approved.

Action Item #26-2: Post the meeting minutes on the internet.

Environment Department, April 30th, 2011

6. Presentation: Criterion 5 Economic & Social Benefits & Criterion 6 Society's Responsibilities

Chris gave a presentation on Criterion 5 Economic & Social Benefits and Criterion 6 Society's Responsibilities, which included the following topics:

- Benefits for local communities and Aboriginal Peoples (cultural, spiritual, economic, health, etc.)
- Fair distribution of benefits and costs
- Proportion of goods and services sourced from local communities (to the extent that they are available and reasonably cost-competitive)
- Development of working relationships with willing Aboriginal communities and/or people
- Aboriginal Rights and Title

The presentation was a summary of the Homework Package distributed to FPAG members prior to the meeting.

7. Discussion of Core Indicators

Chris pointed out the summary of changes to indicators and noted where we were in the list of core indicators. She pointed out that the indicators reviewed at this meeting have already been approved by the SIPAG.

Chris initiated the discussion of Economic & Social Benefits and Society's Responsibilities indicators by reading each VOIT and, where applicable, comparing the new indicator to old indicators previously agreed upon by the PAGs and supplying background and current status where available

C5.1.1: Quantity and Quality of Timber and Non-timber Benefits, Products, and Services Produced in the Defined Forest Area

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Non-timber benefits	Maintain or enhance opportunities for non-timber benefits derived from the DFA	Quantity and quality of timber and non-timber benefits, products, and services produced in the DFA	Report annually on number of requests for access (e.g., keys distributed, maps, directions, etc.), # fire wood permits issued, & number of beekeepers within the DFA	Public access is restricted where safety, vandalism or sensitive ecological sites are concerns; special access may be required by First Nations and special interest groups

Kirstin noted that quality and quantity of timber benefits, products and services produced in the Defined Forest Area are addressed through several other indicators including: C2.2.2 Proportion of the Calculated long term sustainable harvest that is actually harvested; C2.1.1 Reforestation Success; C2.2.1 Additions and Deletions to the Forest area. In addition, quality and quantity of non-timber benefits are also covered in other indicators such as: C1.2.2: Degree of Suitable Habitat in the Long Term for Selected Focal Species, Including Species at Risk; C1.4.2: Protection of Identified Sacred and Culturally Important Sites; C6.1.3: Level of Management and/or Protection of Areas where Culturally Important Practices and Activities (hunting, fishing, gathering) Occur; and D5-1 Visual Quality Management. Since other indicators reflect timber benefits, the goal of this indicator is thus to monitor non-timber benefits, including:

- outdoor activities;
- hunting, fishing, and trapping activities;
- firewood cutting;
- opportunities for ecotourism;
- cultural and heritage resources; and
- ecological goods and services such as mushroom picking and salal harvesting

These products and services are generally unregulated or are not regulated by Teal at the level of the Defined Forest Area (e.g., hunting and fishing are regulated at the District level by government). Teal's main role in providing opportunities is to provide access to the Defined Forest Area.

Firewood cutting is the sole non-timber forest product regulated by Teal on the Defined Forest Area. Wilderness Watch issues firewood cutting permits on behalf of Teal in the Honeymoon Bay portion of the Defined Forest Area. The Fraser portion of the Defined Forest Area does not currently issue permits.

Kirstin reviewed a list of non-timber forest products that are found within the Defined Forest Area. She proposed this indicator would be measured by: 1. in Honeymoon Bay Operation # firewood permits 2. All First Nations requests for access 3. All other requests for access will be tracked, and 4. number of beekeepers in the Defined Forest Area.

John P. gave an example where Teal provides access to the Defined Forest Area. He said that ATV users had asked for access to upgrade an ATV trail that was located in an active logging area. On the weekends Teal would lock the gate (for safety and to protect logging equipment) and provide a key to the ATV user group so they could go in and work on the trail. Kirstin asked John if he kept track of who had the key and he said that he did.

The next few indicators focussed on Aboriginal title and rights, and participation in the forest economy. Chris pointed out that not all First Nations with traditional territory in the Defined Forest Area were represented at this meeting. She said that they were happy that Frank (representing the Stó:lō Tribal Council) and Chief Andy (representing Union Bar First Nation) were at the meeting, however, we must recognize that one First Nation cannot speak for all First Nations. Please be respectful of those not present and realize that we speak for them tonight as well.

The Defined Forest Area falls within the traditional territory of 6 First Nations in the Honeymoon Bay Operation portion, and 30 in the Fraser Valley Operation portion (activities may potentially impact 50 different First Nations). There are many complex issues, and the following indicators are CSA standard's interpretation of the most relevant issues to sustainable development. Other indicators that are more specific to one or more First Nation may be developed (for example the Pacheedaht Cedar indicator). If these types of issues come up then we will flag them and add them to the agenda, either tonight or at a future meeting.

Chris reviewed the list of Aboriginal core indicators that found in the CSA standard.

C5.2.4: Level of Aboriginal participation in the Forest Economy

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Aboriginal Community Involvement in the DFA	Provide economic opportunities for Aboriginal participation in forestry activities	Level of Aboriginal participation in the forest economy	Report annually on direct involvement through employment or contract opportunities	N/A

Examples of recent employment or contract opportunities include:

- Cowichan Tribes (Khowutzun Forestry Services) were recently hired to manually brush an area in the vicinity of Muir Creek within the Honeymoon Bay portion of the Defined Forest Area
- A contracting company associated with Ditidaht First Nation were hired to burn slash on recently harvested areas within the Honeymoon Bay portion of the Defined Forest Area
- A contracting company associated with the Boothroyd Band have been hired to complete brushing contracts within the Fraser portion of the Defined Forest Area
- Chris noted there are many more examples; the list will be more complete in the Sustainable Forest Management Plan if the indicator is approved.

John P. asked Kevin to summarize for the group how he has been working with the Katzie First Nation. Kevin said that he has been working with the Katzie on Archaeological Inventory referrals. He sends the referrals (e.g., site level plans for blocks) to the Katzie First Nation who then comment upon the plans. Teal addresses their thoughts and concerns, changing the layout of the block where necessary. Teal also hires the Katzie Development Corporation to do Archaeological Impact Assessments. Frank asked if Teal has any Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with the Katzie. Kevin replied that no, it is an informal relationship, an informal agreement. Frank asked what kind of response he has had from the referrals. Kevin said that in Norrish several areas of significance were identified by the Leq'á:mel and removed out of the block (protected from harvesting). Sometimes though, there is little response. Kevin said that Teal has a similar arrangement with the Chehalis in West Harrison.

Frank asked if the referral process captured Archaeological Impact Assessments. Kevin said the referral is for cultural heritage resources and then the AIAs are done with specific groups. They are site specific to each cutblock but a referral is broader. Chris explained to the group that an Archaeological Impact Assessments is a landscape level cultural filter, but referrals are for any blocks or roads within a traditional territory.

Chris said that this indicator is focussing on employment and contracting, which is an important issue to many First Nations, especially since many of the work areas are remote, yet nearer to First Nations' communities.

Frank said that the Stó:lō Tribal Council is having problems with referrals going to the Stó:lō Nation and not the Tribal Council. There is a gap in the referral process because one group does not have the right to respond for the other and referrals sometimes do not go to all groups.

Frank clarified the difference between the Stó:lō Tribal Council and the Stó:lō Nation. Frank said that they represent different First Nations groups. The Tribal Council is not in the treaty process, they pulled out because they could not reach an acceptable agreement that did not extinguish Aboriginal Title and Rights.

There are a number of capacity mechanisms available at the provincial level that the Tribal Council has not activated. There needs to be meaningful consultation and this is left out. They also need the resources to be able to respond effectively to the referral process. There are so many layers in the process and it is very complicated. Chris said that part of the confusion for Teal is that our referral list is constantly changing, different groups have different requests for referrals.

John P. asked Chief Andy how Union Bar fits in. Chief Andy said that they are all Stó:lō and that the name means River People. Up until 1960 there were all individual bands. Under the Union of BC Indian Chiefs 90 Bands were united. This worked for many years until the 1980's when smaller bands were losing money to bigger bands, and there were political splits, government splits, disagreements about treaties and so on. Frank said that Union Bar had remained independent but was now starting to work with the Stó:lō Tribal Council.

Chief Andy said that it is nice to have consultation but that they would also like to have a prospectus about the project in order to fully understand who all will be involved with the project, all the people, companies, and agencies. Chris confirmed that Chief Andy would like to know who he would be working with and Chief Andy agreed. John P. said that from a government perspective the reorganization of the Ministries into Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations may help with this. Randall confirmed that he is trying to have an organizational chart published on the new Ministry website, something that hasn't been done before. Once the chart is up it can be disseminated to First Nations, stakeholders and interested parties.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned for a 30 minute meal break at 7:11 pm, and resumed at 7:48 pm.

Chris resumed discussion about Indicator 5.2.4 by asking Frank what he thought of the indicator. Frank responded that he thought it currently was very general. Chris agreed and said that in a few years once we have tracked the indicator we can improve upon the indicator. Chief Andy said it was a good starting point.

C6.1.1: Evidence of a Good Understanding of the Nature of Aboriginal Title and Rights

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Aboriginal Title & Rights	Understand and respect Aboriginal title and rights	Evidence of a good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights	Report annually on the status and results of 1) individual protocol agreements with First Nations who have an expressed interest, and 2) other requests and responses from First Nations	Aboriginal Title & Rights

This indicator replaces an existing Fraser indicator: F6-5 Progress towards individual signed protocol agreements with First Nations that have expressed interest. Chris noted what a protocol agreement might contain; there is no limitation on topic, just that it is a more formal agreement. This indicator is intended to demonstrate Teal's recognition, understanding, and respect for Aboriginal title and rights. Teal strives to ensure the protection of Aboriginal title and rights through:

- Meeting all legislative requirements (see applicable Forest Stewardship Plans)
- Providing opportunities for involvement in the forest economy (e.g., Indicator 5.2.4)
- Entering into Protocol Agreements with interested First Nations (e.g., Indicator 6.1.1)
- Addressing all informal requests and issues of concern brought forward by First Nations (e.g., Indicator 6.1.1)
- Protecting cultural resources (e.g., Indicator 6.1.3)
- Requesting input on management plans and proposed activities (e.g., Indicator 6.1.2)
- Incorporating First Nations knowledge into the planning process (e.g., Indicator 6.2.1)

Frank commented that the indicator is consistent with the referral process and way of information management and is a process to work towards. Chris said if there is a protocol agreement it is a good indication that there is a relationship in place.

Mike Peters asked how changes would be factored in such as court case decisions. Chris said that this would be caught in the reporting status of the indicator as well as the CSA standard (they are updated regularly), so that changes would be made to the indicators themselves. Chief Andy agreed that the indicator was ok with the contingencies about including a prospectus already voiced. Chris pointed out that the protocol agreements may be different nation to nation and for an individual group it may be more specific.

C6.1.2: Evidence of Best Efforts to Obtain Acceptance of Management Plans Based on Aboriginal Communities having a Clear Understanding of the Plans

All PAG members discussed this indicator in detail. What follows is a summary of this discussion.

Chris said that First Nations are given the opportunity to review all Landscape Level Plans (e.g., Forest Stewardship Plans, Management Plans, Sustainable Forest Management Plans, etc.) when they are new or when there are significant amendments.

Opportunities are also provided for First Nations to review site level information (or Operational Plans) whenever there is a proposed development (e.g., roads or blocks) within their traditional territory.

Information sharing protocols differ for each First Nation, however, the general approach is consistent with the following: draft plans (where relevant including maps and descriptions) are mailed or hand delivered to those First Nations' whose traditional territory have proposed developments or those First Nations who may be impacted by the plan, along with a letter inviting comment and requesting a meeting to review the plan together. Depending on the follow up requested, an Archaeological Impact Assessment may be completed, more meetings may be scheduled or correspondence exchanged until all concerns are addressed.

John P. said that the target should say "mutually agreed upon in information sharing protocols." Al said the objective should give a broader scale since it currently implies Teal managing by themselves. He suggested the objective should include the idea of shared management.

Chief Andy said that the target does not describe how others are involved, and how can Teal fully protect the resources if others don't follow suit?

Frank said that a First Nation component should be incorporated: "working with First Nations to review the FSP and to develop results." He said they would be familiar with the Forest Stewardship Plan through referral. John P. said the Forest Stewardship Plan is already referred to First Nations. Kevin said the Forest Stewardship Plan was advertised in 2006, referrals went out and there was a 60 day response period. Frank responded that it is reflective of how empty the process is when decisions were made 6 years ago without the involvement of a lot of the groups in the territory.

Randall suggested that an additional indicator be created, one for management and another for involvement of First Nations. Chris summarized that this indicator commits Teal to meet legal requirements but Frank is saying that we need to do more to have meaningful consultation; there are some other indicators we should review that better capture some of these ideas.

C6.2.1: Evidence of Understanding and Use of Aboriginal Knowledge through the Engagement of Willing Aboriginal Communities, using a Process that Identifies and Manages Culturally Important Resources and Values

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Respect for Aboriginal forest values, knowledge and uses	To incorporate Aboriginal knowledge into the planning process through information sharing arrangements	Evidence of understanding and use of Aboriginal knowledge through the engagement of willing Aboriginal communities, using a process that identifies and manages culturally important resources and values	All requests for information sharing are addressed in a manner mutually acceptable to Teal and the First Nation	Zero

The strategy for this indicator is similar to that of Indicator 6.1.3 and can be completed at the same time. Evidence of information sharing for management of culturally important resources will be gathered from, but not limited to, the following:

- Management Plan reviews (e.g., Management Plans, Forest Stewardship Plans, Landscape Unit Plans, Vancouver Island Land Use Plan, etc.)
- Site Level Plan reviews (e.g., Logging Plan referrals)
- Archaeological Inventories (Archaeological Overview Assessments are generally done on a landscape or watershed level. They categorize areas based upon the potential for archaeological sites and evaluate existing archaeological resources)
- Archaeological Assessments (Archaeological Impact Assessments are completed, as required, on the stand level where the potential for archaeological sites is rated at moderate or high or at the request of First Nations. The Archaeological Impact Assessment identifies and assesses all impacts on archaeological resources that may result from proposed developments)
- Traditional Use Studies
- Information Sharing Protocols
- Public Advisory Group meetings
- Informal discussions

Chris pointed out that the referral responses are taken into consideration when doing planning. Frank said that the target is pretty good. Sharie said that there is a Hatzic Logging Planning Committee where residents can review plans and ask questions; the process is open and they have a good relationship. Chris said that this is addressed at the site level.

Randall reminded everyone that Frank had mentioned that there is a gap in communication. Frank suggested that a set time frame be established, such as meeting once a year in March or April, so they can be aware of and plan for discussions at that time. He said it will take investment from the Stó:lō Tribal Council to get it to a sustainable level. Chris said that they have information like this already for some groups regularly work with such as the Pacheedaht and the Ditidaht, that it is a good point to start moving forward. Frank said that perhaps by next time they can have similar relationship with Teal.

Frank also said that they have been looking at Strategic Engagement Agreements which will help to streamline the referral process. There are only a few pilot projects in BC, such as with the Nanwakolas Council on the island. What Stó:lō Tribal Council has been doing is working with groups in the territory to let them know that they are looking into these agreements and will be providing support to the communities. Stó:lō Tribal Council has 10 communities they work with as well as government to work towards informed decision making at a high level.

C6.4.3: Evidence of Efforts to Promote Capacity Development and Meaningful Participation for Aboriginal Communities

All PAG members present approved the following Value, Objective, Indicator, Target and Variance that will be added to the SFM plan:

Value	Objective	Indicator	Target	Acceptable Variance
Aboriginal and Treaty Rights	Provide effective opportunities for First Nations to communicate Aboriginal issues	Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal communities	Report on efforts to enhance Aboriginal participation in Sustainable Forest Management	Zero

Chris said that initially this indicator had been worded to promote First Nations attendance at PAG meetings, but it has been broadened to try to increase aboriginal participation in sustainable forest management in the Defined Forest Area. Teal will report annually on new measures to enhance Aboriginal participation as other indicators report on ongoing and existing methods (e.g., annual invitations to join Fraser PAG, referrals and protocol agreements). One example of new methods is the First Nations questionnaire distributed earlier this year.

Randall said that the indicator should be measurable and changes to “Report on efforts to enhance Aboriginal participation etc.” Randall also suggested that Teal could have a workshop and create a matrix of efforts to enhance participation and over time Teal can develop a baseline that can be used to modify the indicator with an actual target value. Frank liked the matrix and information sharing idea.

Chief Andy said he felt it was a narrow path we were going down with indicators and targets and that others may move in and adjust these indicators and targets. John P. responded that he understood what Chief Andy was saying but that they were going to focus on Teal here, he can’t speak for other agencies or companies. John P. asked if Chief Andy thought that Teal was doing a good job up until now. Chief Andy said that he did think they were doing a good job, but that we all have to talk as a community and that Teal has to talk to the other groups. John P. said he could do this alongside with Union Bar.

Frank said that he likes the idea of meeting with Teal to put a process in place for working together and key areas of understanding, and once they meet all these details will fall into place once that piece is taken care of. As Teal reports its number of commitments it will lead to further dialogue. Chris noted that Frank and John were setting a date to get together to discuss a potential protocol agreement in the near future.

8. Next Scheduled Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled for early May, tentatively set for May 3. John P. said he would like to have a mill tour for the group in April, and the date was set for April 13 at 10 am, which will last about 1.5 hours.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m. Minutes recorded by Kirstin Campbell.