

Kaslo Trail Alliance

Back Road Consultation Meeting

November 10, 2011, 7:00 to 10:00 pm. Kaslo Senior's Hall

Agenda

1. General Intro: Trail Alliance, Goals, Workplan
2. Alliance Members Introductions
3. Presentation: Allyn Steward
4. General Discussion: Process, etc
5. Detailed Trail Discussion: Worksheets

Notes

1. General Introduction

John provided some general background on the purpose of this meeting. While trails have been built and used in the Kaslo area for a very long time, the release of the Trails Guidebook in May 2010 raised concerns from some community members, especially residents of the Back Road and Pine Ridge. As a result, RDCK Director Shadrack asked John Cathro to engage in the process to see if the dispute could be resolved. After discussions with key players, the Trail Alliance was formed to bring together trail user groups and forest tenure holders to work cooperatively on developing a Kaslo Trails Management Plan based on strong public support.

2. Alliance Members Introductions

Rick Hewat, Kaslo Outdoor Recreation Society

Stu Heard, Kaslo Trailblazers

Don Hunt, Kaslo Motorized Recreation Group

Herb Thompson, Kaslo to Sandon Rails to Trails Society

John Addison, Kaslo and District Community Forest Society

3. Presentation

Allyn Steward presented photos and brief remarks about the trail building for mountain bikes on the 'No Brakes' trail (formally Mount Buchanan Connector). His concern is that this is a potentially dangerous trail built very close to town in

an area that had been used by hikers. There are no safeguards in place to avoid potential accidents. He is also concerned about the level of trail development in and around the Pine Ridge area, done without any consultation. Trails have been widened, linked together and the network expanded. This has upset many residents of the area, and these are people who built the smaller trails that were there originally.

4. General Discussion

John Cathro facilitated a general discussion.

- An issue is conflict of uses on trails, eg Skiers & Hikers
- Can the Community Forest (CF) designate bike areas: make money from permit and control use?
- CF is looking at “recreational tenure. Partnering with KORS. No immediate revenue opportunities, but applying for tenure in the Nordic Ski Area;
- We need to have recreational opportunities. This is good for community!
- An issue is location of trails with lots of use;
- Big groups need to be away from residents;
- An issue is Guidebooks being sold for money and inviting lots of folks;
- Models exist on how to make this work. We need to use them. For example, in Smithers in the “Onion” area;
- Issue is impact. Locals in small numbers have less impact;
- Impact can be on people and values such as water, nature, wildlife, sense of quiet.
- Noise and groups should be in areas that do not bother people.
- Legal designation can take months, years.
- Backyard link trails were built by locals and the new developed trails remove the original intent;
- On the Back Road parking is an issue and so is water
- Cumulative impact an issue;
- Water is an issue, this is a sensitive area;
- Many people do not want managed trails on the back road
- Issue is connection with interface project from 2 years ago. Promises were made at the time that these trails would not be developed, and now they are being developed by some of the same people involved with that project
- What is the link to the OCP? Is the Back Road area designated as on recreation use?

- The rate of change is too fast
- Guidebook cost was a barrier for many: \$12 is too much.
- Trail size is an issue. Small trails have lots of ferns & moss and are 16 inches wide. Large trails have side barriers and are 3-4 feet wide.
- Trails as vector for damage, vandalism, water problems
- Who has authorized the work to date? Who gave those folks that authority?
- Has decision of trails been made?
- Kaslo has extensive trails compared to other areas
- "I'm disappointed". Interface project in Backroad area was a problem and this seems to be just more of the same.
- ATVs and mountain bikes have biggest potential impact. We need to find alternate area for them – not adjacent to residences
- This is just the thin edge of the wedge. Soon trails are wider and used more
- Trails should not go through people's back yards
- Example of dog in water system.
- We should 'obliterate trails on map' – get rid of them;
- In Pineridge there have been about 800m of new trails without any consultation
- Who polices / monitors / maintains the trails?
- Who has authority, which government agency? Ministry of Sports, Tourism and the Arts
- Does Sufferfest need a permit? Yes
- Encourage use is similar to managed, publicized, designated use
- Signage and deactivation are potential problems
- Mud road needs to be deactivated
- This whole issue was opened by Sufferfest
- Is there a role for the Alliance as gatekeeper or clearing house for trail-related issues in Kaslo – where do people go with questions, suggestions, and proposals?
- Expand alliance to include BR water user Society? The Alliance needs to discuss this and meet with them
- Safe to say that a summary of the discussion so far is no to managed / developed trails in Back Road
- The Alliance comprised of groups with interest in trail development. What is lacking is other user groups such as water user groups
- How to make this planning process more inclusive?

- In Pineridge, vandalism has happening as a result of trails;
- In Pineridge, one of the original developed trail crosses private land
- On “O” Avenue trails in Pineridge public use is OK but publicized use in not supported
- Remove trails from internet (Chamber of Commerce, Trailblazers) that are not supported
- Sufferfest and trailblazers maps are on the web;
- The Guidebook is the problem. It publicized trails with no public support
- Confirm that Alliance members present have no plans for trail development in the Pineridge and Back road areas
- Back Road residents do not want developed / managed trails in their watersheds
- Add 4th option to list of trail designations: discourage use, deactivation and signage saying “stay out”;
- Alliance should consider developing planning criteria. Managed Trails will be: Away from private. Away from water. Away from residences;
- RDCK has no jurisdiction over crown land

5. Detailed Trails Discussion

Several people submitted comments on the worksheets provided, although many people felt that the consensus was that managed trails should not be in the Back Road and Pineridge areas, and that the detailed comments were therefore not required.

Adjourn the meeting at 10:00