



CLOSING LETTER

FPB/IRC/81

File: 97250-20/020413

September 05, 2002

Dear Participants:

Re: Resolution of Complaint File 020413 – Sechelt Boundary

I have decided to stop the Sechelt Boundary complaint investigation because, having regard to all the circumstances, I believe that further investigation is not necessary in order to consider the complaint. This is the Forest Practices Board's report on the circumstances and resolution of the Sechelt Boundary complaint.

The Complaint

On July 5, 2002, the Sunshine Coast Conservation Association (the complainant) submitted a complaint that International Forest Products Ltd. (Interfor) did not show the municipal boundary of Sechelt in the correct position on their forest development plan (FDP) maps. The complainant thought that the public review and comment period would be more meaningful if the maps showed the correct boundary. As a solution, the complainant wanted to have the correct boundaries shown on Interfor and Ministry of Forests' maps.

Background

In 1986, the government expanded the District of Sechelt boundary to include an area of provincial forest locally known as hidden grove. The area has never been taken out of the provincial forest. In 1994, Interfor submitted plans to the Ministry of Forests to log within the area. Interfor's map showed the municipal boundary based on the Ministry of Forest's forest cover maps. Members of the community explained that Interfor's map showed the municipal boundary in the wrong place. Ministry of Forests rejected the cutblock and updated the forest cover maps to show the municipal boundary in the correct location.

In 2001, Interfor again advertised an FDP that did not show the municipal boundary in the correct location and proposed a cutblock in the area. The complainant informed Interfor of the mapping error during the review and comment period. Interfor changed the category of the cutblock to information only and corrected the municipal boundary in its final FDP submission to the district.

Resolution Efforts

Following the submission of the complaint, Interfor sent the complainant a copy of the final FDP map showing the municipal boundary in the correct location. However, the complainant is still concerned because the revised boundary is not prominent enough on the map. As well, the complainant is concerned that the boundary mapping error will reoccur in Interfor's future FDP submissions. For the last FDP, Interfor obtained maps from the Ministry of Forests. Therefore, the complainant wanted to make sure that the Ministry of Forests maps were updated.

Government is changing the way it handles mapping. Previously, Ministry of Forests updated information such as municipal boundaries when it updated forest cover maps. Now, the Ministry of Forests only updates changes in vegetation. The Surveyor General updates cadastral information such as municipal boundaries. The Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management coordinates distribution of the information to licensees. Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management staff contacted the Surveyor General to enquire about the boundary. The municipal boundary is shown in the correct location on the Surveyor General's maps and the next download of map information to Interfor will contain the correct municipal boundary.

Conclusion

Although the municipal boundary is not shown as prominently as the complainant would like, the complainant is encouraged that Interfor corrected its map. The complainant is also encouraged that government's next update of map information to Interfor will show the municipal boundary in the correct location.

I would like to commend representatives of the complainant, Interfor and government for their forthrightness and willingness to resolve this complaint.

Yours sincerely

W.N. (Bill) Cafferata R.P.F.
Chair