

FUTURE OF THE MUNICIPAL FOREST RESERVE WORKING GROUP

MEETING #2 - NOTES

Date: June 10th 2020

Time: 6:00PM PST

Location: Remote – Zoom (Host in Vancouver, Attendees from North Cowichan)

Attending: Larry McIntosh, Susan Derby, Roger Wiles, Deb Savory Wright, Bruce Coates, Brad Seely (UBC), Rick Martinson, Sharon Horsburgh, Paul Tataryn, Stephen Sheppard (UBC), Robert Fullerton, Mike Petereit, Karen Hogstead, Rhonda Hettinger, Sally Spencer, Margaret Symon, Andrew Sawden, Megan Turnock (LEES), Rebecca Anderson (LEES), Erik Lees (LEES), Shaun Mason (DNC), Megan Jordan (DNC), Brad Seely (3GreenTree Consulting), Dr. Stephen Shepard (UBC)

Purpose of Meeting: To provide more information to working group members and to gather feedback on engagement for the Municipal Forest Reserve process and educational materials.

Issues Discussed:

#	ITEM	ACTION
1	Welcome & Logistics	
A	All attendees introduced themselves and briefly described their interest/ involvement with the municipal forest.	
B	Megan (Lees + Associates) went over meeting logistics and participants asked questions about Zoom and the meeting agenda. Megan let participants know that as consensus was not reached last meeting about recording, the meeting would not be recorded except for the UBC Partnership Group presentation.	
2	Terms of Reference	
A	LEES+Associates went over the terms of reference and reopened the discussion from the last working group meeting. This meeting is a direct result of the request for an additional working group meeting.	
B	LEES+Associates reminded participants that meeting minutes will not be verbatim but capture high level discussions.	

C	<p>Privacy – Names and bios were released without the consent of working group members.</p> <p>Erik let the group know that this information was not released by the project team or the Municipality reminded everyone to respect the privacy of the group (outlined in the TOR).</p>	
D	<p>LEES+Associates paused for questions.</p> <p>Q: Why were the meeting notes not posted? A: The minutes were posted on the District’s website http://www.northcowichan.ca/forestry</p> <p>Q: Were you expecting comments on the meeting minutes? What type of feedback were you looking for? A: We are looking for key comments that may have been missed, but stopping short of a “group write” of the minutes.</p> <p>Q: Is the working group not meeting until August? Is this our last chance to give feedback before the interim report? A: We will be sharing a summary of the feedback from the WG and the WG will have a chance to provide feedback on the survey and discussion guide.</p> <p>Concern was expressed by working group members about the lack of opportunities to provide input prior to the interim plan.</p> <p>Q: We will not get to see the survey before it goes out? A: Working group will be able to test the survey and will have two weeks to provide the project team with feedback before the survey goes out.</p> <p>Comment: LEES had not received any feedback on the online survey. Q: Directed to Erik: Were you expecting feedback on the survey questions? What type of feedback were you looking for, and how was that expected to be communicated to you and the group? A: Lees: To be frank I didn't elicit feedback due to the pause in engagement.</p> <p>Q: How do we express to the public what the financial range is for carbon? A: UBC Partnership Group has primary estimates but are hesitant to release these figures without sufficient review. The discussion guide is first step in building the public’s understanding and sharing tools and scenarios with working group and public so people get a sense of how this will work.</p>	
3	<p>Presentation by Brad Seely from UBC Partnership Group</p> <p>Begins at 6:36PM, Concluded at 6:58PM</p> <p>The presentation was recorded and will be posted with the meeting minutes.</p>	
A	<p>Working Group Members asked questions of the presenter, Brad Seely.</p>	

	<p>Q: Has the Cowichan community marketplace been contacted to ask them about the financial viability of a carbon project in North Cowichan/ possible partnerships? A: Yes, UBC partnership has been in touch with them.</p> <p>Q to the WG: Was the presentation understandable? Was the level of detail sufficient for the general public?</p> <p>A: More basic information on how trees sequester carbon would be helpful for a broader audience. It would also be helpful to have supporting financial information.</p> <p>Q to Brad: Is there a range of costs we can use to compare? A: UBC Partnership is optimistic about the multiple benefits (financial and non) of a carbon offset project within the municipal forest reserve. COVID has impacted the financial forecast of carbon offset projects but they are noticing a positive trend.</p> <p>Q: Will the presentation be made available to the group? A: Yes we have recorded it and will distribute it to the WG and it will be posted on the Municipality’s website and in PlaceSpeak.</p> <p>Q: Are you aware of work by Dr. Rachel Holt, on old growth using a site class index? Will her work have any application in the context of the Municipal Forest? A: I am aware of her work, but it is not directly applicable to the municipal forest reserve.</p> <p>Q: How would this be used as a decision-making tool? A: surveys and community feedback can be used to help us to apply weights to different criteria. When applying forest management scenarios, we can look at these weights, and make more informed decisions. There will always be trade-offs, and we are looking to balance many values.</p> <p>Q: Are there ways we can create hybrid scenarios? Or zoning areas? A: Yes</p> <p>Q: How aware are you of the Trails and Park Master Plan that Stantec did a few years ago? The working group is being asked similar questions as we were throughout the engagement for that plan. A: We are familiar with it, but its focus was recreation.</p> <p>Comment: Simplify the presentation for the public.</p> <p>Comment: For many in the community there is not a clear understanding as to what has happened in the past in terms of logging etc.</p> <p>Q: To what extent is the carbon project going to be included in communications with the public. A: We could present examples of carbon projects from elsewhere to build understanding, but it is important to keep it straightforward for the public.</p>	LEES
4	<p>Discussion Guide</p> <p>Participants were assigned to four “break-out” groups to discuss the Discussion Guide that was circulated to the WG prior to the meeting.</p>	

<p>a</p>	<p><u>Report back</u></p> <p>Group 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thought that overall, the discussion guide is helpful • Should be more detail on the work that has already been done by the District of North Cowichan with regards to the Municipal Forest. <p>Q: Will the discussion guide be shared alongside the survey? A: Yes, however key information about the project/ history of the MFR will also be included in the survey.</p> <p>Group 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thought that the history section paid a homage to past and current "harvest and plant" management practices and therefore implied an acceptance of the status quo. • Should have more history from 1981-present of evolving perspectives in the social, educational and research realms. • The guide should include links to examples of innovation forestry projects from other communities. • The guide should be more focused on education, more instructive photos. <p>Group 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guide needs more information about carbon offsetting • What about the private lands adjacent to the MFR? These areas are being logged at a rapid rate and it impacts the MFR. • Each mountain is used differently (i.e primarily a for mountain biking, hiking forestry activities, etc.). Each mountain should be described in the guide. <p>Group 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guide should be more concerned about the future use of the MFR • Should include information about the parks & trails plan (SM to send link to plan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ https://www.northcowichan.ca/EN/main/departments/parks-recreation/parks-and-trails-master-plan.html • The guide neglects equestrian activities in the MFR • Concern was expressed that there is too much information in the guide and that readers would lose interest if it is attached to the survey. 	<p>SM</p>
-----------------	--	-----------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety information was missing <p>General comments:</p> <p>Megan (Lees + Associates) asked that working group members take another look at the discussion guide and send her comments by the Monday June 15th. She also asked that WG members do not share this document outside of the group as it is a draft. However, they are welcome to share specific questions relating to the development of the guide with their networks.</p>	
5	Next Steps	
a	<p>A few of the working group members expressed concern that this would be the last time for working group member to provide input before the development of the interim plan. Some WG members felt that the process was being rushed/ cut short.</p> <p>Megan (Lees + Associates) explained that due to COVID-19 related delays, that engagement has just begun and will be ongoing until next spring.</p> <p>There was a suggestion to provide the working group with an up to date schedule of engagement activities as there was confusion about how/ if the schedule had shifted due to COVID-19.</p> <p>Megan (Lees + Associates) briefly went over the planned engagement activities.</p> <p>The DNC will post an updated engagement timeline on their website.</p>	SM/MJ
b.	<p>Next meeting and how can we improve?</p> <p>It was agreed that there would be an additional meeting in a week’s time to discuss the online survey. The date/ time for this meeting will be sent out ASAP.</p> <p>What can we do better?</p> <p>Many of the working group members expressed that it was a productive meeting with minimal technical issues (considering it was our first Zoom meeting as a group); there was one member who had a technical glitch during the UBC presentation.</p> <p>Small group discussions should have a designated note-taker.</p> <p>Some member expressed that they expected there to be more work involved with the working group, and that feels like this portion of the engagement is being rushed.</p> <p>Others expressed that they did not understand the comment about this being rushed and that this process has been in line with what was outlined in the TOR.</p> <p>The WG would like to see a “where we are going roadmap” for next meeting, and not just an agenda.</p>	<p>LEES/DNC</p> <p>LEES/DNC</p> <p>LEES/DNC</p>

	<p>A suggestion was made for more communication tools for in between meetings, such as a discussion forum.</p> <p>Would appreciate if the project team would get the materials out to the WG sooner next time.</p> <p>The working group would appreciate more clarification around how information is communicated and how they can work with each other.</p> <p>The working group would like to see the Discussion Guide and Survey before it goes to the public.</p>	LEES/DNC
6	Meeting adjourned at 8:32PM	

Notes by: Rebecca, LEES+Associates.

Distribution: by email