

**Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team
Meeting #3
Thursday May 26, 2006
6 to 8 pm
District of Squamish Council Chambers
Meeting Summary**

Participants

Representative/Individual	Organization
Bob Baker	BC Wildlife Federation
Kristi Bane-Allen	Squamish Environmental Conservation Society
Jack Cooley	Squamish Streamkeepers
Victor Elderton	North Vancouver Outdoor School
Carl Halvorson	North Vancouver Outdoor School
Steve Hanson	BC Federation of Fly Fishers
Shaun Hollingsworth	BC Wildlife Federation
Roman Lehocky	Independent
Randy Marchant	Independent
Deb McBride	Independent
Caroline Melville	Squamish River Watershed Society
Brian Niska	Whistler Angling Club
Dan O’Kane	Independent
Pete Plathan	Independent
Dana Protti	Steelhead Society of BC
Gilbert Sage	BC Federation of Fly Fishers
Edith Tobe	Squamish River Watershed Society
Tony Toth	BC Wildlife Federation

Members of Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee present:

- Chessy Knight - District of Squamish

Meeting Facilitator: Tom Sadleir - Cornerstone Planning Group

Note-taker: Vikram Singh - Cornerstone Planning Group

Communications

The following communications materials were included in an information package provided to all participants:

- Meeting Agenda
- April 27, 2006 Stakeholder Team meeting summary
- Draft Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference
- Ministry of Environment update on Cheakamus Steelhead Fish Culture Program
- Draft Project Suggestion Form
- Proposed Motion re LWD habitat structures: Doug Morrison

Adoption of Meeting Notes

April 27, 2006 meeting notes were adopted without further comment.

Draft Terms of Reference

The Draft Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference was discussed. Members took issue with the decision to limit Stakeholder Team meetings in 2006 to five. The Team felt they should be able to meet as issues related to the recovery of the Cheakamus River arise. The view was expressed that any CN budget concerns are irrelevant given the scope of the damage to the river and the need to keep recovery efforts moving forward. Any attempt to limit the meetings would be viewed as limiting public input.

The public vs. closed nature of the meetings was also discussed. The view was noted that Stakeholder Team meetings should be open to the public and that the meetings should be advertised in the newspaper. It was noted that the meetings were actually intended for Stakeholder Team members and that any non-members showing up would be considered observers and would not be recognized by the facilitator unless previously arranged.

The Draft Terms of Reference will be forwarded to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) for review and approval.

Membership

Current membership was discussed and it was noted that inactive members would be contacted prior to the next meeting to see if they were interested in remaining members or wished merely to be kept informed of Stakeholder Team news. The final membership will be included in the Draft Terms of Reference being forwarded to CERTC.

Next Meeting

A tentative date of June 22, 2006 was set for the next meeting pending the release of some version of the Draft Recovery Plan for Stakeholder Team review (see notes below regarding Draft Recovery Plan). Representation from CN, Ministry of Environment, Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Triton Environmental is requested at the next meeting.

Website Update

It was noted that the revamped website (www.certc.ca) is near completion. Stakeholder Team members will be informed when the new site is live.

Draft Recovery Plan

The Stakeholder Team noted that it was imperative that they have an opportunity to review and comment on some version of the Draft Recovery Plan prior to its presentation at a scheduled late-July open house. The nature of the Recovery Plan was discussed including its emphasis on determination of recovery targets. The Stakeholder Team also wishes to see a timeline for all recovery projects. The Team re-emphasized the time sensitivity surrounding many recovery issues and the need for recovery efforts to move more quickly. The June timeframe was noted as particularly sensitive and that more resources must be dedicated to ensure that this window is fully explored.

Project Updates

The Stakeholder Team requested recovery project updates on a regular basis. It was suggested that an update be provided at the start of each meeting by Triton Environmental.

Steelhead Fish Culture Program Update

The Ministry of Environment update on the steelhead fish culture program was discussed. (10 pair of steelhead broodstock were collected and live spawned at the Abbotsford hatchery where the eggs are also incubating; the rearing plan had not been finalized). The team felt the update provided at the meeting was out of date, inadequate and that it should have been provided respectfully in person. The view was expressed that civil servants who oppose the program should not be coordinating it.

Rationale was requested as to why 10 pair were collected instead of the originally planned 20 pair.

Members raised the issue that an independent monitor should be present during all program phases. It was noted that such a person is being hired but that this was two or three months away. It was further suggested that this person could provide updates to team meetings.

Open House

The team requested that substantive information be presented (e.g. Draft Recovery Plan, individual project updates) at the open house scheduled for late July. The team expressed a preference for a public meeting format (presentation/question-and-answer session) in place of an open house format (informal drop-in utilizing information stations). Suitable venues were discussed.

Project Suggestion Form

A Draft Project Suggestion Form was presented and discussed. CN Environment is accepting recommendations for projects to be designed, managed and completed by CN. (This is separate from a second form being prepared that is intended for organizations to submit their own project proposals to CN Environment for funding.) Minor revisions were suggested to the Project Suggestion Form to make it appear less intimidating to individuals interested in submitting suggestions.

It was noted that a community education requirement/component was also missing from the form.

The Stakeholder Team discussed the merits of a team review of individual suggestions and a subsequent vote to lend the group's weight to a recommended project prior to its being forwarded to CERTC or a project review committee. It was agreed that individual stakeholder team member suggestion forms would be forwarded to all team members prior to next meeting for consideration, including Deb McBride's completed form suggesting a "Squamish Estuary Waterflow Enhancement" project.

Motion

Doug Morrison, not present, requested prior to the meeting that a vote take place on a motion he tabled at the April 27, 2006 meeting, as follows:

Whereas even the largest woody debris may eventually become displaced, and ultimately wasted over time;

And whereas even the largest woody debris may pose a greater danger to rafters and kayakers, and even more so if cabled;

The Stakeholder Team moves:

That some very large rock and/or concrete formations be seriously considered, with appropriate approvals, for structural habitat enhancement in some places as appropriate, where large woody debris would normally be used.

After brief discussion, the motion (moved by Doug Morrison and seconded by Bob Baker) passed unanimously.