

Southwest Island Public Advisory Group (SIPAG) Meeting Minutes

1. Call to order

Chris Harvey, Environmental Programs Advisor, welcomed members of the Southwest Island Public Advisory Group at the Shaker Mill Restaurant in Lake Cowichan on the 16th of September at 4:30.

2. Members

Present:

- Kirstin Campbell, Terra Tree Forestry
- Tom Jones, Pacheedaht First Nation
- Jim Humphrey, Chamber of Commerce
- Pat Weaver, Cowichan Lake Community Forest Co-operative
- Dennis Martel, Wilderness Watch Committee
- Sandy Peters, Valley Fish & Game Club
- Vince Callander, Local Business
- Tim McGonigle, TFL 46 Worker Lake Cowichan Town Council

Support (TJG):

- Mark Carter, Operations Planner
- Chris Harvey, Environmental Programs Advisor

Regrets:

- Jack Smith, Lake Cowichan First Nation
- George Williams, Ditidaht Band
- Larry George, Cowichan Tribe

3. Documents Distributed to Members:

1. Southwest Island Meeting #22 Agenda
2. Draft Meeting Minutes for November 12, 2008 (#21) meeting
3. Corporate Tracking System for Administrative Tasks – SIPAG outstanding and completed tasks
4. Handouts for revised CSA SFM Z809-08 standard power point presentation
5. Summary of External Audit (November 24-27 2008)
6. Summary of 2008 Results Honeymoon Bay portion of the DFA (September 2009)
7. Draft indicator for Pacheedaht Cultural Cedar
8. Public Advisory Group Terms of Reference
9. Fraser Valley Indicators that may be of interest to SIPAG

Documents available:

10. Copy of the revised (amalgamated) SFM Plan
11. External Audit Reports
12. CSA Sustainable Forest Management Standard Z809-08

4. Review Membership

Chris noted that all members present were quite familiar with each other so the introductions would be postponed as Larry George was hoping to arrive late and introductions would be required at that time.

Chris noted that she has contacted both Will Jansen from Department of Fisheries and Rob Brower from the Nitinat hatchery. Both are interested in attending meetings, however this is their busiest time of year so it wasn't possible to attend tonight's meeting. Chris will continue to invite both Willi and Rob to future meetings. Chris also emailed the president of Port Renfrew Chamber of Commerce, Jon Cash and invited him to attend a meeting, however she hasn't received a reply.

Chris noted that Pat Weaver is here representing the Forest Co-op but she is no longer a member of the Town Council. Tim suggested that he be the representative for the evening and then make future arrangements at a later date.

Action Item #22-1: Contact Town Council regarding representation
Environmental Department November 18th, 2009 (or next meeting)

Chris circulated the member contact information and alternates sheet and asked members to double check their information was correct, add alternates if possible.

Action Item #22-2: Update member contact information and distribute to members
Environmental Department November 18th, 2009 (or next meeting)

5. Previous Meeting Minutes

Chris referred to the copy of the draft meeting minutes for the November 18th, 2008 meeting. She highlighted the overall purpose and discussion of the meeting (review of the visit to the Pacheedhat village, presentation of Pacheedhat Cedar Strategy by Tom, background information of First Nations within the HBO portion of the DFA and a review of the existing First Nations indicators regarding cedar and fisheries). Chris reviewed each of the action items and the status. The Corporate Tracking System for SIPAG Tasks, including a list of the outstanding and completed action items was also distributed, however members had difficulty reading as the print was too small. Chris read all the outstanding actions and noted that future copies of the Corporate Tracking System would be larger for legibility. There were no issues raised with the draft meeting minutes, Chris confirmed that they would be finalized as is. Chris also noted that due to the confidentiality of the topic (Pacheedaht Cedar Strategy) the meeting minutes would not be posted on Teal's website. This is also why the minutes were not distributed via email prior to the meeting. All members agreed.

Action Item #22-3: Finalize meeting minutes for November 18, 2008 meeting
Environmental Department November 18th, 2009 (or next meeting)

6. Current Events/ Management Issues

Chris asked members if there is any news they would like to share regarding the sectors or groups they represent? No news was offered.

Revisions to CSA Z809-08 SFM Standard

A power point presentation summarizing the changes to the CSA Z809-08 SFM standard was offered by Chris. The presentation included: general facts and an overview of the SFM standard; highlighted key changes to the standard; proposed Teal's methods of transition and benefits of a revised standard.

Some concerns were raised about a loss of flexibility, how can a Canada wide standard fit our small corner of BC when you can't even use the same management techniques in the interior and coast? Chris, Mark and Tom explained the indicators do not set targets, they are set locally. Chris noted future indicator discussions would include more emphasis on alternate strategies, forecasting, etc. As an

example the Pacheedhaht Cultural Cedar indicator would be presented in this format later in the meeting.

Questions and concerns were expressed by several members regarding core indicators. Chris provided an example of an existing indicator that was very similar to one of the core indicators (and very similar to the Fraser PAG indicator). Some core indicators are aligned or mostly aligned with existing indicators (the wording is different but the spirit and intent of the indicator is the same). Other core indicators will be new to the group. Tom confirmed that the method of presentation for new indicators would be a group discussion, with examples or potential indicators provided by Teal (Mark commented that potential indicators are discussed prior to meetings to ensure compatibility with legislative and management framework). Then the remaining existing indicators and the coverage of local issues and circumstances can be compared, and discussed with the PAG, to help determine what will remain as local indicators. Locally applicable targets for both core and local indicators will also need to be set (or reconfirmed). Minor rewording of existing indicators to align with the Fraser portion of the DFA may be proposed for consideration by SIPAG. In order to prioritize PAG resources, it was agreed that minor rewording or re-organization would not be discussed with the PAGs, however the groups would be notified of all changes; and if there were any questions or concerns they would be added to the meeting agenda. A member asked if it was mandatory for the two portions of the DFA to be the same? Chris noted that it was not mandatory, however consistency would be nice.

The group agreed with the proposed approach to developing new indicators and reviewing existing indicators. Chris noted that the next meeting we would focus on the first of the indicators, Biodiversity, which would be estimated to take one or two meetings.

Summary of the External Audit (November 24-27 2008)

Chris referred to the handout provided summarizing the QMI External Audit completed last November 24-28, 2008 and read the highlights (Re-assessment audit so both HBO and FVO were audited, as well as dry land sorts; successful audit so re-registration; no instances of non conformance, six areas of concern; eighteen opportunities for improvement; six good practices). She noted that the full audit report is here at the meeting or available upon request. Tom asked if there was an executive summary available? Chris noted that Teal's website has an executive summary posted and she would confirm and send the link to members.

Action Item #22-4a: Confirm executive summary of 2008 External Audit is posted on Teal website
Action Item #22-4b: Forward link to SIPAG members
Environmental Department November 18th, 2009 (or next meeting)

7. Review 2008 SFM Plan Annual Report

Chris noted that the report is 32 pages long so she would read the summary and members could indicate any indicators they would like to discuss further. Chris mentioned that the revised Sustainable Forest Management Plan (March 2009) version is posted on the Teal website (a web link was emailed to the group prior to the meeting) and printed versions are available upon request. Pat and Vince requested printed copies.

Action Item #22-5: Print copies of SFM for PAG members.
Environmental Department November 18th, 2009 (or next meeting)

Chris noted that the results were an improvement over the 2007 results. Sandy asked about the data for H5-12? Chris and Mark noted that they were short a clerical position which normally would be entering training records. They noted that conversations with managers and supervisors indicated that

training was being completed, however the records were not entered into the system. Mark asked Tim if he thought that was fair? Tim said he thought it was fair to say that the training had been completed. Sandy asked if the situation would be remedied soon? Mark noted that it would not be hiring anyone in the near future, they would have to find another way to enter the records. Sandy asked who is responsible for training? Mark noted that Island Pacific Logging (IPL) was the contract who completed all the logging so it was a shared responsibility, Teal assists the managers and supervisors to complete training and participates in safety meetings.

Chris noted that normally we would dedicate a larger portion of the agenda to reviewing the results, however we missed a meeting in the spring so the results were emailed. Members took 5-10 minutes to review the summary of the 2008 results. Various indicators were discussed. Pat asked if Teal provides any scholarships? Mark noted that they do not out of the HBO office, however they may out of the sawmill office. Kirstin asked if indicator H3-10 should be considered out of conformance as we did not meet the targets. Chris noted that you could consider it out of conformance, but because it was within the allowable variance it was considered the 'next level'. She asked if the acceptable variance should read +10%? Chris noted that the target was 20% of the FIA budget and the acceptable variance was 10% less (or -10%).

Action Item #22-6: Confirm if Teal donates any scholarships.

Environmental Department November 18th, 2009 (or next meeting)

8. Pacheedaht First Nation Cultural Cedar Indicator

Chris distributed a draft indicator H6-8 and noted that Mark, Tom, Stan Jones and herself discussed this indicator prior to the meeting and all were happy with this version. Tom asked why cypress was crossed out? Chris noted that the Pacheedaht Cedar Strategy was concerned with more tree species than only cedar and cypress (i.e., Douglas fir and yew) so rather than listing all the tree species she substituted 'other tree species'. Tom noted that the term 'historical' is used in the objective, he asked what is the definition of historical? He was concerned because another forest company had defined it as the last 5 years and he felt that wasn't fair. Chris and Mark noted that is not Teal's intention with this indicator, historical would indicate long term traditional use, could be hundreds of years ago. The group agreed that this needed to be clarified in the indicator. Mark also noted that it must be understood the limitations of this indicator are within the Pacheedaht traditional territory. Mark and Tom noted the current status of the inventory was close to 500 trees within the DFA and close to 700 in total.

Chris explained the strategy to achieve the target was Teal incorporates cedar conservation at the planning stages. Trees are preferably selected from previously constrained areas, such as Riparian Reserve areas or Old Growth Management Areas in order to limit the impact on the timber resource and minimize constraints on harvesting in the present and future. Future, long term accessibility is considered when trees or areas are selected. Teal's layout crews incorporate cedar conservation into field planning; where potential candidates are located in the field, they are measured and marked with a unique numbering system. Individual trees or small areas located near cutblocks are generally selected.

Alternatively, where resources can be obtained, a Pacheedaht field crew will locate trees and small areas where large cedar timber types are indicated in constrained areas, such as Old Growth Management Areas or Parks. Vince asked how it works in the parks? Tom explained that they have had confirmation from the Ministry of Sustainable Resources that trees are available to First Nations within Parks for cultural purposes, but it should be noted that it is only one tree here and there that is being removed. Accessibility is usually a large factor within parks. Mark also explained that the

Ministry requested a windfirm buffer on the park edges so this is another alternative area where cultural cedar may be located. Vince asked how it works when they deactivate a road? Tom explained that it is a 400 year planning horizon so it is expected that roads will be built and deactivated and built again. Pacheedaht will need to manage it similar to a 400 year mine. The next stage will be recruitment, Tom asked Mark to keep in mind any areas with cedar plantations that are constrained under today's rules and will not be logged in the future, that were not previous constrained under past legislation (i.e., strips between the road and streams are ideal. Mark noted the Glad 12 strip.

Chris explained how the Pacheedhat Cultural Tree Inventory is monitored (internally by Teal) and as funding is available, Pacheedaht field crews monitor selected trees and areas to ensure trees meet the specified size and quality parameters. They may either accept or reject trees, and notify Teal of the status. Denis asked are they mapped? Tom said ideally they would be in the future, however right now they are GPS co-ordinates, which are not always reliable (handheld GPS in the woods).

The forecast for achievement of the target was discussed. In the past four field seasons, Teal crews have identified close to 500 trees (over 100 trees per field season). It is reasonable to expect similar progress towards the first (3 year) target of 700 trees. The location of the last 100 trees (to meet the 5 year target of 800 trees) is anticipated to require more resources as some trees in the inventory may be rejected and need to be replaced, and selection criteria may become more precise in order to meet all the trees specified in the size and quality parameters. Pacheedaht First Nation has requested a minimum of 1400 trees throughout their traditional territory. The DFA encompass a large portion of Pacheedaht traditional territory, and therefore a large portion of the trees will be located within the DFA. A target of 800 trees within the DFA has been set, however this number may need to be adjusted where resources outside the DFA combined with the inventory inside the DFA do not meet the overall target (i.e., an additional 600 trees must be located within Pacheedaht traditional territory).

Vince asked if they should put in a variance for the timing? Tom said that they were very happy to have a commitment from Teal that will be verified by a third party, before this it was always good will. All members approved the indicator with minor rewording.

Action Item #22-7a: reword the objective or define the term 'historical'

Action Item #22-7b: finalize the Pacheedhat First Nation Cultural Cedar Indicator and add it to the SFM plan

Environmental Department March 31, 2010

9. Review Terms of Reference

Chris distributed the revised Terms of Reference (TOR) she indicated that this TOR was very similar to the existing TOR, however since we need to operate under the same TOR for both public advisory groups some revisions were required. No significant changes to Introduction or Goals (just changed references to SIPAG and FPAG to PAG, etc.). Some changes to membership selection:

- clarified process for potential members to become active members
- clarified process to inactivate a member (who is not participating)

Some changes to Roles and Responsibilities section:

- TJG – no changes
- Facilitator - no changes
- Active Members – clarified only active members may vote

- Observers – clarified roles and responsibilities
- Guest – clarified roles and responsibilities
- Observer Members – NEW (i.e., government position)

Timelines were clarified for the maintenance of the SFM plans. Communication (internal, external) – no changes. Code of conduct – added steps to be taken for those who consistently disregard the code of conduct. Tom commented under the Code of Conduct number 5 – members should not criticize other members but they should be able to disagree with other's points of view. Members agreed that this should be reworded. No changes to the Decision Making method, Dispute resolution Process or Adjusting the TOR.

Members were satisfied with the revisions. Chris noted that members could review the TOR with their respective groups if they wished and bring forward any further comments. The TOR will be confirmed and approved at the next scheduled meeting.

Action Item #22-8: Revise TOR Code of Conduct #5 to allow for varying points of view or opinions Environmental Department November 18 th , 2009 (or next meeting)

Action Item #22-9: Finalize TOR Environmental Department November 18 th , 2009 (or next meeting)
--

10. Review existing indicator for Fraser Operations portion of the DFA

Chris distributed a copy of some of the indicators for the Fraser portion of the DFA. She explained that she only listed those indicators that would potentially be applicable to the Honeymoon Bay portion of the DFA. At a previous meeting it was requested that SIPAG have an opportunity to see what the Fraser PAG has developed. The intention was not to vote on each indicator but to see where there is interest. Each indicator was reviewed: some were noted as interesting, some were noted as similar enough to existing indicators that they could be reworded for consistency, others were rejected as not of interest. Chris suggested that as we review the 6 criterion over the next few years we can revisit the Fraser PAG indicators and roll them in with SIPAG indicators as desired. The group agreed this would be a good approach.

11. Next Scheduled meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled in November, likely the 18th, however members will be contacted to confirm. Discussion topics will be the Criterion Biodiversity, homework packages will be distributed prior to the meeting. .

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m. Minutes recorded by Chris Harvey