

Kaslo Trail Alliance

Back Road Consultation Meeting

April 19, 2012 7:00 to 10:00 pm. Kaslo United Church Hall

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions, Review Agenda

- 7:10 General background of the Kaslo Trail Alliance
- 7:20 Overview of the DRAFT Management Plan and completion process
- 7:40 Detailed review of DRAFT Management Plan trails and uses
- 8:30 Summary of input received and next steps
- 8:45 Questions and Answers
- 9:00 Adjourn

Notes

1. Welcome and Introduction

John gave background, introduced the background information on the yellow information sheet and the evening agenda. Key question is: How does a community make a decision on a joint resource? How do we as a community ultimately arrive at the best possible decision. That decision will be worked into a trails Management Plan.

The Kaslo Trail Alliance is a volunteer effort. Panel introductions

- Tom Duschastel: Kaslo Trailblazers Society
- Shon Neufield: Kaslo Outdoor Recreation Society
- Ian McKinnon: Kaslo Horse Riders Club
- Bill Wells: Woodlot 494
- Herb Thompson: Kaslo to Sandon Rails to Trails Society
- Henry Van Mills: Kaslo Motorized Recreation group
- John Cathro: Facilitator

2. Overview of the Consultation and Management Plan completion process

The Alliance MOU, meeting notes and all Draft material is on the website. A draft Management Plan has been developed to get the discussion started. It is only a draft to help the community

with understanding what options are being considered. No decisions have been made at this point in time. As of Friday hard copies will be available at the Village Office, the Kaslo Library and Kootenay Mountain Sports. Comments welcome until May 18, names must be included – no anonymous submissions. In June after reviewing comments and following Alliance discussion, a revised plan will be made available. Possibly additional comments will be required to reach broad agreement on the final Trail Management Plan.

Justin Dexter is the government representative with the Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resources Operations, Recreation Sites and Trails Division. The area he is responsible for is Big White to Cranbrook .

3. Questions and Answers

Q: What is the scope of the project?

A: Not a plan legal designation but a quasi-legal plan. The purpose is to guide local decisions and the use of trails. So people understand where they are, and the designated usage of trails.

Q: Is there a responsibility for any particular entity to maintain trails?

A: Currently only a few legally designated trails exist and these are formally managed. In the eyes of the Ministry, all other trails are illegal – until they are formally designated. The Trail Alliance is not going so far as to designate trails. This will be up to trail user groups and others based on the outcome of this planning process. Choosing not to manage is one of many options. Unmanaged is potentially what will happen.

Q: Are we not already overregulated?

A: Some community groups have had conflict when applying for funding for trails – CBT and local governments are increasingly reluctant to provide funding for controversial projects. This Management Plan will not be a legal document and is meant to guide local decisions. The alternative is increased trails conflict

4. Instructions on Draft Management Plan review

Fill out the form. The nicer you are the more likely it will be that you are listened to. These people are volunteers.

If we had had a Management Plan supported by a Trail Alliance recommendation, it would have weight with the Ministry when someone applies for commercial use. TOM told story of Monster trail commercial tenure awarded without community consultation.

There is not a clear idea of final decision making. Referendum? The alliance has taken on the responsibility to consult. Comments go to them, and more community input in June. One option is for the Village of Kaslo to formally recognize the plan once the Alliance has finalized it. Comments will be accepted between now and of May 18. Names must be on them. People must take responsibility for their comments.

Comment: Concerned that there is no buffer zone around the private land. Concern for water protection. We are opening a corridor. We have elk, we know they are big. They will go into everyone's garden. Out of town folks camp anywhere, don't contribute to the economy of the town. Concerned about people getting close to their properties and potential for theft. Privacy is an issue – We don't live in town for a reason.

5. Break to go to individual map stations to review specific planning units

45 minute review specific planning units. 1 member of from the Trails Alliance attended to each station to answer questions and clarify draft maps. Approximately 45 comment forms were collected from these stations.

6. Station Masters' Summary

John (Back Road Pineridge):

- Great conversation with and among the people at this station.
- Some folks want to see as many trails as possible with buffers around private land
- Designate a smaller number of trails than were in the guidebook
- Residents of these areas should be on the Trail Alliance
- The area should remain unmanaged
- With history, emotionalism, tribalism, a question: who makes the decisions for the area?
- Heard that people want the trails managed, signed, publicized, plus the opposite – not managed, signed, publicized.
- Some said that they want to jump over logs, others that they do not want to jump over logs.
- As neighbourhoods some said they want a chance to revisit the discussion given new info. In other words, its clear that the Alliance is listening.
- Residents could be the ones to manage the trails
- Management Plan is good, and a guidebook would be better
- The local trapper does not want non-motorized use of any trails

Henry (Motorized Trail Use)

- Motorized trail users need their own area.

- Ken encouraged them to put their interests on a map. Henry resists.

Herb (Wagon Road):

- Little controversy.
- Well established recreation route, little argument with the route. Multi use works there.

Bill: (True Blue and Woodlot)

- Great to correct the draft map.
- Proposed trails to be for multi use? Guidebooks supported

Ian (True Blue and Woodlot)

- Any use is supported up there.
- I enjoy the trails as they are.
- Generally ok.
- Some wasn't to see a buffer around private property

Shon (Wardner and Mount Buchanan):

- Foot and bike conflict on No Brakes mainly.
- Everything else is fairly neutral.
- Hikers feel biker and hikers don't mix. What do bikers feel?
- No Brakes is the only local trail that is open right now. And close to town and dry. So it is congested. More people including bikers, hikers and even motorized from time to time use it

Tom (Kaslo River Trail):

- Increase the south extension to South Fork.
- Some want trails in that system for bikers for kids use – they are close.
- Some clarification on the map mud road is actually a water course going to Josanna's place. We need to clarify the history and site specific geography
- Some say that the rails between the Bridge and the airport should be open for horses.

7. Opportunity at the end of the meeting to speak generally

Gerald Garnett: Emotional response on Back Road and Pine Ridge. Change happened and there was no consultation. Many specific issues (dogs, water, etc.) are solvable. We can think of practical solutions. Locals mostly benefit from trails. But tourists are a benefit as well to the local economy.

Andy Lecuff: We have been skirting the issue of tourism. Glad that is on the table.

Don Scarlett: True Blue trails and airport cause access conflicts and traffic will increase. Encourages signage for public safety at the airport. This cannot be crossed. Suggest that the Village should put up a sign at the airport to alert people.

Adjourn at 9:00 pm