

**Stillwater Timberlands Community Advisory Group  
Special FSP Meeting  
Brooks School Library**

**February 1, 2006**

**Minutes**

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

Quorum noted

6:42pm: Meeting called to order

**Safety Review**

Facilitator welcomed everyone. Safety rules were noted – also fire exits and first aid attendants in case of emergency.

**Code of Conduct**

Code of Conduct was posted and noted.

**Thanks**

Chair thanked members for attending and for providing the meeting venue. Thanks also to facilitator and secretary for volunteering their time.

**Agenda** and copies of Cascadia's new FSP and background information were provided.

**Summary** - The summarized version of the FSP is not yet available. 25 copies will be provided for members when available.

**Maps** were posted. It was noted that they are also available for viewing at Cascadia's office.

**Cascadia website info**

Member noted that someone tried to get the FSP from Cascadia's website on January 27<sup>th</sup>, (advertised release date) and found that it was not available.

It was suggested that complaint should be made to Cascadia.

Chair noted that members have known for two years that this meeting would take place. Members have done their homework and looked at the draft document and noted that it is difficult to understand.

It was noted that much of the earlier work for FRPA regs and the FSP process came from CAG. The rest of the province gained from the work that CAG did in the beginning.

### **Purpose of meeting**

Chair noted that the purpose of the meeting is to frame a response to the new Coastal wide FSP to Cascadia and to the Ministry of Forests. Authority to sign off on new FSP is Greg Hemphill, who is well known to CAG members.

*Question* - Who is our audience?

*Answer* - Cascadia and Ministry of Forests.

Members were encouraged to look critically at the FSP document; members have spent a long time comparing the old and the new. Members need to -

- decide what strategy to put forward
- be pro-active and focused
- use references in response
- any strategies mentioned in response must be consensus based
- fine-tune wish list
- go back and find out if ideas are grounded and well based
- articulate strategies for three or four issues

Facilitator noted that each member has their own values individually. No one can debate others values of behalf of seat, but members have the right to pass on views individually to Cascadia and MoF. (IWA put forward their view to the company separately for Pilot FSP)

### **Patrick- report**

Copies of report were provided (attached to minutes).

Some concerns highlighted were-

1. Biodiversity
2. Riparian
3. Access and Recreation

Plan does not stand alone- there are FRPA regulations and Landscape Unit Plans Pilot project provided Stewardship Zones, and the new FSP does not have zones as known in the pilot. New plan refers to specific landscape units. Landscape units that are specific to our DFA are Bunster, Lois, Powell-Daniels and Powell Lake.

### **Biodiversity**

*Although the titles would suggest that each of the zones was exclusive in its subject matter, quite the opposite is the case. Within the old-Growth Zone, for example, there are references to wildlife, recreation, tourism, mining, etc., as well as to the “conservation of old growth habitat and the restoration of old-growth attributes on previously harvested areas.” The breadth of the criteria indicates to me that these zones should be considered as one entity for our discussion, rather than as separate compartments for the classification of CAG’s values and interests.*

*With this approach, we are faced with the fact that zoning placed some restrictions upon harvesting in almost one-third of what was TFL39 Block 1 in 2002. These restrictions varied from an absolute prohibition [e.g.: Elephant Lake and Goat Island Old-growth Zones], to “protecting . . . recreational features . . . while allowing for commercial timber harvesting” [4.3].*

- OGMA’s are difficult to understand
- For information on LUP’s- requires going to a guide, (120 pages long)

### **Riparian**

*The FPPR requires [s.8] Cascadia to “ conserve, at the landscape unit level, specified values within riparian areas.” The FSP offers essentially the same seventeen classifications with similar protection along the banks and shores. The most notable exception is class L1-A which applies to lakes larger than 1000 ha in size and has no protection. Lois Lake is an example, but it should be noted that some protection is afforded by VQOs.*

*Sections 50 through 51 of the FPPR place explicit restrictions upon logging in riparian management areas, reserve zones, and management zones. The FSP provides for limited variance from the FPPR. Such variances may be required for road construction [4.3.1.4], environmental protection [4.3.1.6], etc.*

*This FSP lists the Community watersheds in our area and requires [4.3.4.2] that logging and road construction comply with the constraints of Appendix C.3 [terrain stability] and C.4 [sediment control].*

- Pilot provided protection for riparian areas
- FSP relies on FPPR standards
- Pilot offered 17 levels of classification
- Powell River Canoe Route has its own protection
- Community Water sheds are noted

### **Access and Recreation**

It was noted that the Pilot included an access management plan. That plan is not included in the new FSP. It is not considered an approved document by Cascadia.

*Pilot - With regard to zoning the remarks made under Biodiversity apply equally to recreation. Each recreation and tourism zone [Table 7] includes limits on opening size and minimum adjacency requirements.*

*The buffers along various portions of the Sunshine Coast Trail are divided into reserve zones and management zones. These zones provide natural cover adjacent to the trail with some increased density of forest in the outer zone.*

*Similar protection is offered to the Powell River Canoe Route and its portages.*

*Section 2.7.2 lists some fifteen roads—or portions thereof—that are to be maintained for public access with either 2WD or 4WD standard. Temporary closures are to be advertised.*

Appearance is covered under “Visual Quality Management” and visual quality objectives [VQOs] are established [Table 11]. The five different levels of harvesting provided allow for up to 30% tree removal.

*FSP - The references to trails are limited and specific to those established by legal order.*

- *Objective #19 [FSP 4.7.1] defines the trails as Beta Lake, Powell Forest Canoe Route, Lost Lake, and Appleton Creek with the appropriate legal reference. As a general rule no harvesting may occur within ten metres on either side of the trails.*

*There is no reference to public access through the road net. Nor is there any reference to maintaining roads to any given standard.*

*The former Forestry recreation sites, which have been maintained by Weyerhaeuser/Cascadia, are protected by their removal from the FDU [FSP 3.1(b) and Appendix B.2].*

*As before, appearance is covered under “Visual Quality” [FSP 4.6] and Objective #18 requires that harvesting and road construction fall “within specified levels of alteration.” That said, the “specified levels” are not very specific [FSP 4.6.2]. For example, harvesting to partial retention standard only requires that the cut block be “small to medium in scale” and “natural and not rectilinear or geometric in shape.” On the plus side however, while lacking the numerical restrictions of the Pilot’s Table 11, the FSP does carry forward into the FDU all of the areas governed by VQOs as we know them today.*

- No reference to public access
- Reference to trails limited and specific to those established by legal orders
- No reference to maintain to 2x4 standards
- Former forestry recreation sites that were maintained by Weyerhaeuser/Cascadia are protected by their removal from the FDU.
- Visual Quality – specific levels. FSP does carry forward into the FDU all of the areas governed by VQO’s.
- Don Benn is still working on the VQO/ recreation inventory.

### **Conclusions**

1. *OGMA. The actual amount of OGMA within the area covered by the FSP is determined by the various Landscape Unit Plans. I suggest that CAG should ask that the statutory minimum be increased. How much? That is for CAG to decide; but perhaps 2-3% would be a good start?*
2. *Although here are buffers on most lakes, the lack of them on L-IA lakes is of concern. CAG should ask for buffers on all lakes.*
3. *While recognized trails are protected, and Cascadia has agreed to not “disregard” the Sunshine Coast trail, More definitive protection is required. I suggest that the recognized buffers of ten metres be promoted for the Sunshine Coast Trail.*

*Question – Which ministry will be involved in monitoring riparian areas?*

*Answer – Ministry of Environment. List of species that are protected came from the Ministry of Environment, but that list could be changed.*

*Question – Who will monitor Cascadia’s protected species?*

*Answer – Provincial government -Ministry of Environment.*

*Question – Do buffers refer to trails or lakes?*

*Answer - Buffers on trails and lakes- both.*

*Question* – Does the new plan include buffers on lakes?

*Answer* – All are in the FPPR regs - section 49 – website

Examples –

L1A - lake over 1000 riparian management area- zero – no buffers

L1B – between 5-1000 (or if the Ministry says) – 10 metres reserve and 10-metres management zone

*Question* - Is there a different section for streams?

*Answer* – Yes, in FRPA regs - section 47.

e.g.

L-2 –more than 2 hectares – Coastal Douglas fir 30 metres buffer- 10 metre reserve 20-metre management

L-3 – Riparian management 30-metres no reserve

L-4 – very small lake no buffer concerns

*Question* – L1A lakes have no buffers?

*Answer* – Correct

Member noted that management practices don't allow cutting down to shoreline. It was noted that there are restrictions on roads being built inside the management areas because of sediment etc.

Member asked for clarification on reserve and management zones.

*Reserve zone* – no logging

*Management zone* – some logging allowed.

### **FSP is hard to read**

Member noted that the draft version of the FSP is unusable- only two protected areas are mentioned in the new plan and they are above the timberline e.g. Emma Lake and Centre Lake

Many sections have been changed in the new plan.

Member noted that VQO's are the same as in the Pilot.

*Question* – Is there a requirement of a certain % to be protected?

*Answer* – No but there are now reduced areas where logging is permitted.

### **Retention**

Original tables showed partial retention - 1.6% - 7%. New plan describes how they should look. Up to date inventory is not ready, Don Benn has promised new one soon. Company has gone with what they have.

### **New FSP concerns**

Member commented that –

- with no % carried forward from Pilot it is hard to judge
- All the hard work by CAG seems to be lost

- Having to go back for references makes the reading of the document difficult
- No road access commitments
- No fibre sale agreements for small business

### **Fibre Sale Agreement**

Facilitator noted that Cascadia would not commit to Fibre Sale agreement in the FSP but it is included in the CSA process.

### **Access Management Plan**

Member noted that they need to do the same with the Access management plan; the Access plan could be critical in the future.

### **Pest Management Plans**

*Question* – Are they included in the new FSP?

*Answer* – No.

### **Variable Retention**

*Question* – Is there any mention of variable retention? A lot of work was done on VR; why not take forward to new document?

*Answer* - Can't tie Western Forest Products to it (VR).

Member noted that there are two types of VR, the one we know and the new BC standard. They won't commit to the one we know and love.

Member suggested a letter to company regarding VR.

**ACTION** – Send letter to company on VR for clarification.

*Question* – Who to send letter to?

*Answer* – Cascadia, Western or Forestry - maybe all three.

Facilitator suggested address letter to Cascadia and ask them to forward to the new company.

Member noted that liabilities and assets transfer when new company takes over.

Thanks to Patrick for detailed work

### **Break 7:55-8:05pm**

Members asked for electronic version of report to be sent out

**ACTION** - Send out electronic version of report to all members.

### **Eagle – report**

Have compared new draft to old. Six years ago company and community came to an agreement-

- Company has gained flexibility in not having to wait two years to log.
- Can log species that is more profitable.
- Assurances were given to CAG
  1. Zoning – timber 5% retention
  2. Habitat zones – 15% retention
  3. Recreation and tourism – 20% retention
  4. Old Growth patches – 60% with a few 66-70%

Now with new plan it seems like 1000's of old growth trees are going to be available for logging

66% retention goes out the window

20% retention goes out the window

15% retention goes out the window

5% retention goes out the window

Wealth, and community values and biodiversity will be lost. It is a tragedy to see how many trees will be lost – there will huge numbers of old, mature trees of 80, 120 or 200 years old that will be logged.

Tourism, community, recreation and wildlife values will all be affected.

### **Public Meeting – suggestion**

Member suggested a public meeting to let the public know what is important to us and what we stand to lose. Volunteers from CAG incorporated values into the Pilot project for the last five years. Company now says it has come to an end. If company is sold to another company, that type of obligation should be kept. We need to keep that moral obligation. We can educate the public and let them know what is involved.

1. There are no assurances that there will be fibre access
2. No assurances for the Sunshine Coast trail
3. There will be reduced buffers on lakes and canoe route portages

Breakout group was suggested to highlight areas of concern

Need to go out and let the public know – a public meeting within the next two months. Member made a request for a venue for meeting

It was noted that members have been asked to talk to the community about community values. There are concerns about biodiversity and the loss of 1000's of trees that were set aside. Access plan needs to be addressed. Sunshine Coast trail had no legal order but should be recognized. The SSCT is in the recreation inventory.

### **FSP Public Display**

Facilitator noted that a public display will be held on February 20, 2006. Members should encourage public to attend.

Facilitator asked around the table for opinions on a public meeting

Member noted that it is unclear what the coastal wide FSP is. Understanding of the document is flawed. Member noted that not many people show up to public meetings, but members can talk to lots of people. Some members felt it was too soon to have a meeting when more information on new plan is needed. Access, protection for watersheds and other issues are not definite in the plan.

Member noted that contractors would not participate in a public meeting as they are trying to build a relationship with the new company.

Member noted that the new plan is not very readable, has many loopholes, and lowers the standards set for the community, including zones that were already established in the past. Comments from public include concerns that include-

1. Old growth
2. Visual qualities
3. Canoe route
4. Trails
5. Buffers

Without the stewardship zones, it will be difficult to keep track.

Member noted that the previous plan noted 60% old growth. New plan can't say what we are losing.

- Watershed concerns are covered in appendix C.
- Riparian area regulations are enforced

Member noted that only written comments are considered. If all advisory group members write and public write individual letters, they have to all be considered. Members can go to the public at any level. Member suggested getting an opinion from Jessica Clogg, a recognized expert in forestry law in BC.

Member noted that the document is hard to understand. Items of importance are –

1. Jobs
2. Recreation
3. Trees – VQ
4. Canoe route and trails
5. Enjoyment of the forest
6. Access
7. Habitat
8. Business

Member felt that a public meeting at this time would not answer all questions.

Member felt that it was unacceptable to have so little time for review and comments.

Member felt that Cascadia people don't understand community values. It was noted that the group relies on the forest for jobs as well as for recreation. There is a need to go to small operators to see what they want. Public needs to know more.

Member noted that plan meets government standards, but more education is needed.

Member in favour of a public meeting noted that the advisory group should enforce what we stand for and re-establish what the public really wants–

1. Community values-
2. Jobs – forestry dependent
3. Sustainable forest
4. Recreation trails
5. Alpine access

Member noted that knowing that there will be a loss of old growth, resulting in loss of tourism and old growth habitat. Member suggested that it is reasonable to ask Cascadia what amount will be lost, and the reason the zones are not in the new plan.

Member noted that it would be helpful to get summary from Cascadia.

Members agreed to ask Jessica Clogg at West Coast Environmental Law Association for assistance.

**ACTION** –Member will draft a letter on behalf of CAG to be sent to Jessica Clogg.

Chair noted that –

- There was no consensus to hold a public meeting at this time (maybe later).
- Members should work with their constituents.
- CAG will prepare a letter to Cascadia and Ministry
- Company has to respond to every letter received
- Each group can write own letters tailored to their own values

Member suggested that a letter stating that the FSP is not a good document to read could also be sent to the Ministry of Forests.

Facilitator suggested that the homework for members could be to compare the old values with what's in the new plan.

### **February 8, 2006**

No FSP discussion next meeting.

Half meeting will be for Cascadia and half will be for Island Timberlands. Public not involved in February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting but there will be a public meeting on February 13<sup>th</sup> hosted by Friends of Eagle River with Island Timberlands as guests. No protocol is yet established for Island Timberlands meetings.

**Eagle River**

Invitations were received to walk Eagle River site.

*Question* – Did member talk to Greg Hemphill regarding Sunshine Coast Trail legal questions?

*Answer* – Yes – drawback is that “some companies might not like it”

Member noted that if legal status is applied for, then other organizations could apply to run it.

**Next regular CAG meeting – Feb 8 2006**

**Town Centre Hotel**

**RSVP**

**Meeting adjourned 9:10pm**

**Stillwater Timberlands Community Advisory Group  
February 1, 2006  
Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Member Seat</b>
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Jane Cameron – Chair</b>	Primary	Member at large
<b>Ken Jackson – Vice-Chair</b>	Primary	Recreation
<b>Eagle Walz</b>	Primary	Recreation
<b>Monty Tyrwhitt-Drake</b>	Alternate	Recreation
<b>Michael Conway Brown</b>	Primary	Environment/Access
<b>Mark Forsyth</b>	Alternate	Environment/Access
<b>Patrick Brabazon</b>	Primary	Local Govt. (Regional)
<b>Bill Maitland</b>	Alternate	Contractors
<b>Kathy Kirk</b>	Primary	Education
<b>Debby Waslewski</b>	Primary	Citizens
<b>Dan Waslewski</b>	Alternate	Citizens
<b>Andy Davis</b>	Alternate	Citizens
<b>Jack McClinchey</b>	Primary	Motorized Recreation
<b>Nancy Hollmann</b>	Primary	Environment
<b>Paul Goodwin</b>	Primary	Forest Dependent
<b>11 Seats represented</b>		
<b>ABSENT</b>		
<b>Erika Hein</b>	Primary	Youth
<b>Don Krompocker</b>	Primary	Labour
<b>Dave Rees- 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair</b>	Primary	Tourism
<b>Joanne Cameron-Nordell</b>	Primary	Local Business
<b>Rory Maitland</b>	Primary	Contractors
<b>George Ferreira</b>	Alternate	Local Business
<b>Bernie Angel</b>	Alternate	Local Business
<b>Paul Holbrook</b>	Alternate	Forest Dependent
<b>Les Falk</b>	Alternate	Local Govt. (Regional)
<b>Lorne Marr</b>	Alternate	Recreation
<b>John Passek</b>	Alternate	Motorized Recreation
<b>Andrew Pinch</b>	Alternate	Tourism
<b>Kevin McKamey</b>	Alternate	Contractors
<b>PRESENT</b>		
<b>Resource – others</b>		
<b>Cathy Bartfai</b>	Facilitator	
<b>Pam Dowding</b>	Secretary	