

Stillwater Timberlands Community Advisory Group

June 12th, 2002

Minutes

Meeting recorded by tape recorder

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

6:00pm: Dinner

6:05pm: Welcome given and explanation of tape recording being done as secretary is sick. Material in packages gone over.

Agenda

Agenda was amended to exclude FSC item at 8:50 and summer committee item at 8:55

Introduction

Greg Hemphill and Chris Roddan were introduced to the group

Review of Minutes from May 22nd and June 5th

May 22nd amendment – page 2 under "Green up and retention"

Striking sentence that starts.....It is suggested....Changing it to read " It is understood that over the next 60 years forest management knowledge may increase and possibly change and while the level of retention will remain the same, ***only in rare circumstances***, the patches could be moved to another spot to achieve more positive results. Some reasons for moving them could be because of blowdown, disease or changing conditions.

Minutes adopted as amended

June 5th minutes.... adopted as presented

Correspondence

Incoming -letter from John Reynolds, MP

-letter from Wildwood Ratepayers re: biosolids (to be read and discussed later on the agenda)

Outgoing - letter from CAG to Strategic Planning Support Team at Stillwater

Timberlands Weyerhaeuser

Guest Speaker: Greg Hemphill

Greg began with a recap of CAG's last meeting with him when we spoke for the first time regarding recreation policy changes. Since then there has been ongoing consultation on the Provincial level with some of the bigger recreation groups such as Outdoor Recreation Council, Federation of Mountain Clubs, Four Wheel Drive Assn. and Snowmobilers. A large scale meeting on May 15th with user groups and government and the government got 2 clear messages.....#1 the government is moving too fast and #2 the timing for the changes is difficult because we are already into the recreation season this year. Commitments were made around the concerns. Commitments include -

gradual phasing out maintenance of MOF rec. sites and trails with a target of March 31, 2004 (lines up with CORE review and budget review)

sites and trails will not be dismantled or privatized and will continue to be available for the public to enjoy. Open to the public this year and only closed if there is a significant public hazard.

MOF has a very small budget for maintenance this year.

still searching for other partners that were willing to take over management of recreation sites.

Strategy where trail users and campers were encouraged to respect the environment. Some trails and campsites will not be maintained.

Develop long term strategy for transferring responsibility.

Take back concerns to government

User groups strongly urge government to manage recreation. Parks has an expert panel touring the PROV getting ideas on how to manage site in province. Most user groups would like to see MOF remain in the management and permitting, as they are already involved. Asked government to look at the big picture and look at revenues created from this resource. Groups also said they were willing to be involved and help out but need answers to questions such a liability first.

Question – Were liability issues discussed at these meetings?

Answer - They were. Government does not want liability issues to be a barrier to non-profit groups from taking over sites. MOF committed to looking at what options there were for this issue.

Question – to do with liability....will the criteria be clearly laid out?

Answer – Commercial sites will, in all probability, carry their own insurance. On public land it is assumed there will be shared liability and cost between government and non profit groups

Question – Will criteria be developed for performance standards and what happens if they non profit doesn't live up to the standards in their contract?

Answer – As long as everyone is acting in good faith it is assumed that the Province would assume the responsibility...as happens now. The issue sits in MOF lap now for recommendation to government.

Question – Do you have a see any budget available for maintenance of sites down the road?

Answer - It is assumed the non-profit groups will assume the costs of maintenance of agreed upon sites.

Question – What will ensure public access to public lands?

Answer – Permits and requirements now given by MOF. The insurance will be embedded in the agreements made with the permitting body. Many options are being looked at for the future. Expectations are that management will be left with MOF.

Question – Where will non- profits get the \$ to maintain the sites? It is understood that no park has ever made a profit. Again asked, what a non- profit group is supposed to do?

Answer – They have the flexibility to collect fees. Also hard work and dedication makes a big difference to recreation now. Also expected to in the future. Commercial sites are expected to make a lot of money. Local governments may step forward and help with costs. Larger companies may also do this.

Question – Is criteria available yet as how a site will be assessed for public hazard? Is a copy of this document available?

Answer – It is thought it will be left to the discretion of the manager. Commitment is given not to use this as an excuse to shut sites down. Direction is to keep as many of these sites open as the possible.

Question – Are there any solid deadlines for non profits to take over?

Answer – Government has backed off a bit for this recreation season but they are still looking at things moving forward.

Greg will provide updates on any new developments regarding this issue.

Question – Do you know anything about umbrella liability from the Outdoor Recreation Council

Answer – Just an idea at this time. ORC has backed away a little. This umbrella liability proposal was really just their initial reaction to a shocking proposal. They are now encouraging the government to look at holding the umbrella liability insurance for all groups that take over rec. management.

Rod explained that Weyerhaeuser has applied thru the FIA for recreation money. Rod wanted to know if MOF has funds for this year and how sites are to be managed. Greg committed help in the form of equipment, supplies, staff time etc. but explained that the budget is very tight.

Question – Is it possible to get recreation approvals in a more timely manner (Section 102) similar to the MOF commitment to the Forest Company for cutting permits in the One Plan Pilot Project?

Answer – There is no reason why it should take so long...comments regarding this will be taken back

Thanks given to Greg for attending the meeting.

Guest speaker: Chris Roddan

The group introduced themselves individually so Chris could see who they represented.

Member explained Shearwater Services was retained by the PREDC to develop a presentation package for a proposal regarding a Community Forest tenure in Powell River to present to government and local community groups. Chris gave his working background. He explained he has been meeting with community groups discussing the proposal and getting ideas for the proposal. Greg explained the ideas of community forests are not new and was originally meant to provide for innovation in the forest industry.

The new government is reviewing the community tenure process. If there is a good business case the community pilot projects may have tenure available to be granted. Government hasn't decided what to do with the 5% clawback volume. Support has been given to giving that volume to community forests.

Chris stressed this has to be a profitable venture and well planned. Community consultation is very important. Community forest can be a foundation for a new economy.

Question – Who will pick up the loss if there is a loss?

Answer – There is a risk in any business. A sound business plan is needed

Member commented that Powell River has the best 2nd growth fir in BC so we are told that we have a better chance of being profitable than many other tenures. Other positive aspects are our closeness to the market and good existing infrastructure. Allows for a bit of a financial cushion. It is not the intention of the proposal to not make money.

Question – Will stumpage be paid?

Answer – Greg explained it is an area based tenure so yes, stumpage paid. More flexibility in operations because it is a small tenure. There are different regulations for small tenure's also.

The Government will look at many criteria when judging proposals. 1 – self-supporting 2. – sound forest management...good environmental stewardship 3 – produce revenue for local government and province.

Question - Is there a real possibility they would grant this to PR?

Answer – Greg replied there is a reasonable one. Minister will have to make the best use for the volume. Community has to get on the radar with the province.

Question– Would the government not give the tenure to the people who make the government the most money

Answer – The decision is already made to take volume away from existing tenure holders

Question – Will the community forest be managed in a sustainable way?

Answer- They will have to provide a management plan that shows that it will be managed in a sustainable way

Question – Will timber harvested in a community forest be used in the community?

Answer – Chris replied they are looking at all alternatives, researching demands now.

Question - How large an area are we talking about?

Answer – 2200 hectares aprox.

Member commented that a projection is needed on \$ profit if logs were just sold or if they logs came back to the community and were used here. Member estimated that there would be 6 times the amount of local cash flow would be generated.

It was explained to Chris that CAG stresses in its values and goals for CSA that wood be made available to the community. Other values also fall in line with community forest values. Community meeting to be held re: values for this forest.

Thanks given to both Chris and Greg!

Election

Calls for nominations made 3 times. Chair and Vice Chair reelected for another term. Congratulations given!

Class B Biosolids

Letter from the Wildwood Ratepayers Assn. read regarding Class B biosolids. Ratepayers are asking the CAG to support their bid to have Weyerhaeuser withdraw its offer to the Corporation of the District of Powell River of allowing sewage sludge to be applied anywhere on Weyerhaeuser Lands.

Motion on the floor to write a letter supporting Wildwood Ratepayers Assn. stance on biosolid use on Weyerhaeuser land.

Seconded

Discussion – member noted that anytime CAG was forming an opinion there should be an opportunity to hear both sides of the story. Would like to see this happen before CAG writes its support letter

Members agreed and *motion was tabled* until further evidence could be produced.

-

-

Website

Facilitator asked if the "Stillwater Values and Goals" could be listed separately on the website from "CAG's Values and Goals". Members agreed this would be a good idea. Facilitator also asked about photos posted to the website and if anyone would have a problem with their picture on the web. Three members asked to not have their picture there.

Indicator report

Rod handed out a Summary report on Objectives and Indicators from the SFMP 2001. A quick overview given on some indicators. Review to start in Sept. CAG asked to read them summary over and call or email if there are any questions.

Small Business Sales

Member suggested that there are inconsistencies in the log pricing system at the dry land sort. Rod asked for that person to come to him. Facilitator and chair encouraged member to bring forward the details and Rod would be obliged to look into it. Chair stressed it is the only we can ensure that the sales plan we worked so hard on can be monitored and improved up if necessary.

Action – Member to get in touch with Rod re: problems encountered with local sales.

Next meeting

"Who's minding our forests" co-author Aran O'Carroll is available to come to Powell River June 26th. Group agreed to meet that night.

Action - Member will pursue having Mike Van Ham come to speak to the group on biosolids.

Phillips Arm – Names are in for Phillips Arm and details will be finalized over the next month.

Gibsons Beach

Member wondered who did the logging near Gibson's beach? Rod explained Norske requested that Weyerhaeuser log and get the trees off of the land. Commitment made to put together a plan for logging those properties. Member commented that the plan also would include Lot 450. Member commented that the logging that has been done looks nothing like Variable Retention.

Action - Member suggested sending flower to our secretary who is in the hospital. All agreed!

Facilitator and secretary thanked for the past years service.

Adjourned at 9:20

Next meeting June 26th.

Stillwater Timberlands Advisory Group		
June 12th 2002		
Attendance		
Name	Position	Member Seat
<u>PRESENT</u>		
Eagle Walz Chair	Primary	Recreation
Jane Cameron	Alternate	Recreation
Peter Ranger	Primary	Forest Dependent
Paul Holbrook	Alternate	Forest Dependent
Michael Conway-Brown	Primary	Recreation
Joanne Cameron-Nordell	Primary	Local Business
David Gabelhouse	Primary	Local Govt
Doug Fugge	Primary	Youth
Bill Duff	Primary	Citizens
Karen Duff	Alternate	Citizens
Jack McLinchey	Primary	Motorized

		Recreation
John Passek	Alternate	Motorized Recreation
<u>ABSENT</u>		
Ken Jackson - Vice-Chair	Primary	Recreation
Lorne Marr	Alternate	Recreation
Sonny Rioux	Primary	IWA
Andrew Pinch	Alternate	Tourism
Bill Maitland	Alternate	Contractors
Rory Maitland	Primary	Contractors
Kathleen O'Neil	Primary	Education/Planning
Taylor Holbrook	Alternate	Youth
Ian Fleming	Alternate	Local Business
<i>8 seats in attendance</i>		
Resource – other		
Rod Tysdal	Weyerhaeuser	Stillwater
Cathy Bartfai	Facilitator	
Pam Dowding	Secretary	absent