

Stillwater Timberlands Community Advisory Group

November 24th 2004

Minutes

Brooks Secondary School

Attendance: refer to attached sheet

Quorum noted

6:03pm: Meeting called to order

Welcome

Chair opened the meeting and welcomed members and guests:

Safety Review

Facilitator noted safety rules – fire exits and first aid attendants in case of emergency.

Recorded meetings

Facilitator pointed out to new members and guests that CAG meetings are tape-recorded.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Agenda was reviewed and accepted with additions.

Introductions

Chair introduced guests –

Quentin Dodd, observer, from West Island Woodlands advisory group.

Michel deBellefeuille from Nanaimo Weyerhaeuser office (CSA

standards)

Dan Waslewski, guest and prospective member.

Code of Conduct

Code of conduct was posted and noted.

Review of Minutes of November 10th

Minutes from November 10th were reviewed, discussed and accepted with no amendments. It was noted that later changes could be made to the minutes if required.

Member asked whether the suggested letter of support for the community forest had been sent.

It was noted that the letter was in draft form and would be forwarded soon to members for review before mailing.

Correspondence

Letter to Doug McCormick regarding FSP comments from group

Handout from Ducks Unlimited provided by member

Handout from Department for Environment and Rural Affairs – News release regarding forest certification schemes that are acceptable in England – from website

Review of Action List

Action List was reviewed and discussed. Actions regarding indicators were separated and will be reviewed at a later date.

Company Updates – Steve Chaplin

Steve provided updates as follows-

BC Coastal FSP Meeting.

- Review and comments on draft results and strategies for 4 objectives.

- Plan to review and comment on all draft results and strategies at the next meeting on Dec 15 and 16th in Courtenay.
- Reviewed draft target timelines. (Subject to change)
 1. Dec 2004 Rough Draft Complete
 - a. No backgrounder or support documentation will be complete or available at this point.
 2. Jan 2005: Review draft with CAG groups
 3. Feb 2005: 1st Nations consult and public review
 4. Re-Draft of FSP document based on comments from CAG's, 1st Nations and Public Review
- Need to gather up all legal objectives for Stillwater *Block 1 and 5 and TL areas and provide to BC Coastal group.*

Question – List of values for FSP does not contain "community values"?

Answer – Commitment for community values in FSP will be put into CSA, values will still be still there, but not at the FSP level.

Steve noted that four items were discussed at the last meeting-

Soils

Wildlife

Riparian zones

Biodiversity

Land use and Jefferd Creek were also discussed.

Guest (environmental chair for advisory group on island) noted that any information that the company can provide in advance would be very helpful.

Member suggested that CAG members could attend other advisory group meetings.

FSP Audit

- *Scheduled for Dec 1st and 2nd*
- *Darryl Reynolds from WLAP will participate on Dec 2nd*
- *Blocks to audit include: LL-054, LL-011, TM-182.*
- *Roads to audit include: Roads to access HB-171, spurs HB 30 – HB 36*

It was noted that CAG members have volunteered to participate in the FSP audit on Dec 1st and 2nd.

FSP Annual Public Review and Display

Planning a display in the mall for either Dec 14th, 2004 or January 6th, 2005

Request for participation from CAG members.

Five members volunteered to help at the mall display. Members suggested that Thursday January 7th, 2005 from 2- 9pm would be a mores appropriate time. Members will set up a CAG table at the mall.

VR Map WL-909 (Map Provided)

WL-909 is in the Timber Zone

Retention Requirement is 10%

Retention left in WTR (Wildlife Tree Reserve) is 20% = 5.6ha

No Fallers choice of Group retention within the cutting area

Whiskey Creek Response / Update

- *location.*
- *Complexity of the installation of the CMP*

Future maintenance issues of a permanent access structure in a snow avalanche chute. Geotech report recommended either a Large Culvert or a removable bridge

P-Eng designed two structures for the crossing a

- 3600mm diam x 25000mm long CMP (Corrugated Metal Pipe) for a permanent access structure
- 12 meter removable bridge as a temporary access structure

Stillwater looked at both of the options at the time of the day and chose the bridge option.

Considerations for the decision was based on;

- Costs
- Lowest Risk Option.
- *Relatively short operating duration that Weyerhaeuser would be active or present in the Valley, and the opportunity to use the bridge in another future*
- *Consideration of access and maintenance issues beyond Whiskey Creek bridge.*
- *Forest Development Plan comments from MOELP that had concerns over unlimited access to the valley.*

Commitment was previously made to maintain 4 x 4 access to Whiskey Creek Bridge as a staging area for the Diane Valley when operations are complete.

A full geo-tech report was provided for member as per request.

Question - Member asked whether the road beyond Whiskey Creek has been "put to bed"

Answer – Yes

Member noted that members of the Alpine Club have discussed recreational and vehicular access into the valley.

Historical information will be gathered regarding the details of bridge

Historically access was only by spur roads

Tourists on coast want to be able to drive to a fjord valley

Eco-tourism and rock climbing is growing

Door should be kept open for access

Suggestion - Could a removable bridge be put in place for 4x4 access?

Heli-logging and logging equipment may keep people out

Diane Valley and adjacent High Falls creek area is the last uncut valley

Member will put together a proposal when all historical has been gathered

Facilitator noted that the zoning for Diane Valley was an 11th hour decision that was made when looking at zones.

Question – Is there another bridge down below?

Answer - Yes the 100 ft bridge stays and is not being deactivated – it is a big permanent structure.

Requirements for CSA 2002 Standards

Michel deBellefeuille

Michel noted that Dennis Fitzgerald introduced a broad overview of 2002 standards a few months ago.

Members noted that the overview was not brought to Stillwater CAG.

Michel noted that the new standards (2002) were to be implemented by November 2005 –

Companies should have Sustainable Forest Management Plans that align with the 2002 standards by November 2005

By April 2006, companies will re-certify with new plan

Standards have changed – clearer, better organized and easier to understand

Copy of key concepts (Z-809/02) with key definitions was provided –

1. Key areas of the new standard (5.3 and 5.4) describe the Terms of Reference – Michel noted that updating of the terms will be required.

2. Identification of values and, and upgrading of all criteria and indicators will have to be done.

3. CCFM criteria – five or six are given

4. New format sheet showing columns for

- CCFM criterion - one

- SFM elements - many

- Value - many

- Objective - one

- Indicator - one

- Target - many

- means to identify targets

- legal requirements

- means of achieving objectives and targets

- acceptable variance

Copies of some of CAG's indicators on a new sheet were provided.

Michel noted that thirty of CAG's indicators have been reviewed. Michel's suggested indicators and targets were shown in red. West Island and Port McNeil's have all been done. It was noted that several indicators are used and duplicated for different things – tried to eliminate some that involved third parties – e.g. Forest Service and FIA funding

Michel noted that there is a lot of ownership connected to the indicators, and that he is not trying to "demolish" CAG's version. CSA guidelines and definitions are being used to rebuild the table. We now have to ask how do we measure something and "does it make sense or not"?

Question – What about #10 - the goal that states, "There is no introduction of non-native species without environmental impact studies"

Answer – Yes – we would want to know that it is controlled – rules are the same under FRPA (Forest Range Practices Act)

Member noted some confusion referring to fir that is planted where cedar used to be. Quality of the DFA and reproduction of native species is an important value.

Member noted that when CAG did indicators, there was some mistrust between members and the company. It was noted that there were discussions at that time about Monsanto and Weyerhaeuser, modifying the forest in the states– now, five years on, it is good to review the indicators with more knowledge. CAG does not want "Americanization of the forests, i.e. tree plantations vs. natural forests.

Member noted that Michel seemed to have a different concept of indicator #STW10 (in red) regarding native species

"The % of seedling annually planted on the DFA that are either non-native or genetically engineered is less than 5%"

Members strongly opposed the "5%" and agreed that it should be 0%.

Member cautioned that the rewriting must not change the intent at all, and that inadvertent changes unnecessarily raise questions as to motives.

Member suggested using an "X" instead of a number, since at the end of the day, CAG will go through and revisit indicators.

It was noted that Michel is re-wording according to 2002 standards and making notations where necessary.

When review is finished, members will go through the indicators – Michel noted that he is only re-wording according to the 2002 standards.

Question – What is a means to identify a target target?

Answer – Targets will vary from group to group. Measurable tests are used to identify targets.

Question – The purpose is to move to 2002 standard?

Answer – Yes. Standards provide spreadsheets and working papers.

Question – We don't know what the new FSP will look like – how much time do we have to deal with CSA indicators? We don't want to lose any of them because of the changes in the FSP.

Answer – Time line is for re-certification in 2006. This time next year (Nov) will be the time for final review of indicators.

Question – When the new FSP is approved, can it be amended, and can values be protected without a break?

Answer – There are anxieties about a "break"- before anything happens to jeopardize a value, Stillwater people are well aware of what is important e.g. Canoe Route etc.

Question – Could there be a legal "bridging document"?

Answer – Yes, we could amend and add things if necessary.

Question – Looking at the handout from the English government on certification and comparison tables – what does it mean?

Answer – England gets wood from all over the world. Companies only have to meet requirements. FSC has its own certification standards, CSA has different standards – CAGs are unique to CSA.

Plutonic Power Corp -Maps

Facilitator noted that maps showing proposed power lines from Plutonic Power Corp were posted on the board.

Process for Sale of Fibre

Facilitator noted that an updated version was provided with handouts.

Break – 8:10 – 8:22pm

Housekeeping Items

Code of Conduct was displayed and noted.

ACTION - Steve offered to make a poster of Code of Conduct for meetings.

Guest invitations – guests should be invited through the chair.

New seats – discussion - Terms of Reference for new seats (7.2.1 and 7.2.3) states that applications for new seats should be made *in writing*. Members agreed that 7.2.2 should be revised to also state "*in writing*"

Terms of Reference sub-committee will meet to review and bring comments to the table.

New CSA 2002 requirement advises changes to Terms of Reference – CAG said "NO" to some changes.

Member noted that the general opinion was that CAG was already as large a group as is manageable. Vacant seats still remain open in the Native and Labour sectors, but they don't affect a quorum.

Maintaining and realigning seats was discussed.

How should CAG strategically format discussions with other CAGs? – If new FSP goes through, some values could be lost. CAG's future depends on how Weyerhaeuser handles the FSP for the coast.

CAG's continued participation depends on the new FSP

How are meetings run according to the Terms of Reference?

Problems should be solved as they arise to maintain solidarity within the group

Terms of Reference have been re-written four times and have worked well so far

Committees – what purpose? How long do they exist? Standing committees or ad hoc?
Discussion on clarification of committees.

Examples of committees -

a) Old growth committee – standing committee – long term

discussions

b) Terms of Reference committee – ad hoc – meets once a year to

review

c) Access committee – Once a year review – with general input from

members and the public

It was noted that whenever something important comes up, members are notified and invited to comment or join sub-committees.

Question - Is a quorum required?

Answer - No.

Issues are brought to the table for review by the whole group.

Member noted that sub-committees have worked well since CAG's inception. Committees are struck to discuss anything that requires more time than meetings allow.

Ratify any changes as per new 2002 CSA requirements

Should we look at other models?

Committees are built on trust and consensus

New member package should include an information sheet on how sub-committees function

CAG should retain what has worked successfully in the past

Member moved that CAG carry on meeting with sub-committees as they have historically

Members did not think that terms for sub-committees should be too "formalized"

Terms of Reference needs a method of dealing with more than one client

Need to keep flexibility and stay transparent

Define purpose and roles of sub-committees in Terms of Reference

Member noted that CAG was in the beginning, a room full of strangers who came together because of an interest in forestry, and worked together as a team. Trust began when the process started and has continued as the group has evolved.

Steve noted that the Terms of Reference do not clearly describe how sub-committees work, and suggested an addition to the terms when revised.

Members agreed that the sub-committees have worked well in the past and should be kept fairly casual, if too structured the committees won't work as well.

Member noted that since being a new member requires a steep learning curve, sitting in on a sub-committee meeting could be very useful.

It was noted that any members are welcome to participate in sub-committee meetings, and in future notices will be sent out by e-mail to all members with dates and times of meetings.

Facilitator noted that the sub-committee for the Terms of Reference will be looking at the 2002 CSA standards for CSA.

Members agreed that they liked the way things are working now.

-

Old Growth information

Member noted that information on old growth was not readily available, and suggested a time frame for information that has been requested.

ACTION - Steve will provide information as soon as possible – mid - Jan 2005.

New Seat

It was noted that the Terms of Reference have not been followed for the changing and addition of new seats. Members should, in future, apply *in writing* to bring in a new member. Members are allowed up to two alternates. Discussion was held regarding alternate citizens seats and vacant labour seat.

Member nominated Dan Waslewski and Andy Davis to be the alternate citizen seats.

New Terms of Reference committee

Members volunteered for the new Terms of Reference committee. It was noted that input from all members is welcome.

Executive meetings

Members discussed a new level of decision-making and asked whether the Chair, Vice Chair and second Vice- chair should be allowed to meet and discuss issues away from the CAG table. One member was not in favour and noted that everyone should participate in all decisions. It was noted that continuous input from all members has worked well in the past. Members agreed to re-visit this item at the next meeting on Dec 8th and continue the discussion.

Introduction of Guest Helen Sandler

Guest noted that she came to CAG meeting as an observer – noted that it was difficult to become involved unless she represented a sector. Guest observed that CAG seemed like a flexible group that "gets things done"

Community Forest - Letter of Support

Member suggested a letter of support from CAG to the Ministry of Forests for the new community forest in Powell River. Member suggested that the benefit to the community at large could be between \$200,000 and \$400,000 per year.

Member noted that a dollar figure might not be correct – as no one knows yet what the result will be. Committee members are working on application.

Members of the committee include Dave Gabelhouse (Chair), Vern Kinley (PR Wood), Greg Hemphill, (Ministry of Forests), Rod Tysdal, Forester and Ron Fuller. Members of the committee are looking at other management models and putting together a business plan, and are also looking at an FSP.

Question - Member asked whether there was an environment seat on the committee, since the others seemed to be part of the business community.

Answer – No, but public consultation process will be followed.

Member suggested that letter should include the recommendation for public consultation and participation in the process.

Members were all in favour of writing the letter.

ACTION – Letter to be sent in support of Community Forest

Next Meeting

December 8, 2004

Meeting adjourned - 9:50pm

Stillwater Timberlands Community Advisory Group

November 24th 2004

Attendance

Name

Position

Member Seat

PRESENT		
Eagle Walz - Chair	Primary	Recreation
Ken Jackson - Vice-Chair	Primary	Recreation
Joanne Cameron-Nordell	Primary	Local Business
Tony Smith	Primary	Education
Paul Goodwin	Primary	Forest Dependent
Jane Cameron - 2nd Vice-Chair	Primary	Member at large
Patrick Brabazon	Primary	Local Govt. (Regional)
Debby Waslewski	Primary	Citizens
Jeff Mah	Primary	Local Govt. (Municipal)
Fran Ferguson	Alternate	Recreation
Nancy Hollmann	Primary	Environment
Michael Conway Brown	Primary	Environment/Access
Dave Rees	Alternate	Tourism
Erika Hein	Primary	Youth
Rory Maitland	Primary	Contractors
14 Seats represented		
ABSENT		
Jack McClinchey	Primary	Motorized Recreation
Andy Davis	Alternate	Citizens
Paul Holbrook	Alternate	Forest Dependent
Bill Maitland	Primary	Contractors
David Gabelhouse	Alternate	Local Govt. (Municipal)
Les Falk	Alternate	Local Govt. (Regional)

Lorne Marr	Alternate	Recreation
George Ferreira	Alternate	Local Business
Terry Peters	Alternate	Citizens
John Passek	Alternate	Motorized Recreation
Andrew Pinch	Primary	Tourism
Dianne Mason	Alternate	Education
Kevin McKamey	Alternate	Contractors
Carol Sansburn	Alternate	Education
Guests		
Dan Waslewski	Wildwood Ratepayers	
Resource – others		
Stephen Chaplin	Stillwater	Weyerhaeuser
Michel deBellefeuille	Nanaimo	Weyerhaeuser
Cathy Bartfai	Facilitator	
Pam Dowding	Secretary	