

Draft

Bulkley Valley Community Resources Board Meeting Minutes

Date: Feb. 18, 2019

Location: Smithers Town Office

Board members confirmed: Eric Becker, Ron Vanderstar, John Fisher, Bob Mitchell, Christoph Dietzfelbinger, Ted Vanderwart, Bryan Swansberg,

Absent: Karen Price, Cor Van Der Muelen, Matt Sear

Visitors: Dave Stevens

Recording: Sue Brookes

Attached: nothing

Next Meeting Date Mar 18, 2019, Smithers Council Chambers

Item	Discussion
Organizational Intro/Agenda Review	<p>Introductions, Ron Chair</p> <p>Approved January 2019 minutes - all agreed to accept w/some spelling and wording changes. Sue to confirm with absentees there are no further comments and then post.</p> <p>Next Meeting Date confirmed: Mar 18, 2019, with Mark Schuffert as a possible guest.</p> <p>Agenda Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- no additions- Glenda Ferris sent her regrets and she cannot reschedule at this time due to a family illness <ul style="list-style-type: none">• FYI files should be mailed in docx format!• https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/Dss/index.htm a link to the Skeena Stikine Natural Resource District
Financial Report (Ron)	<p>- monies owed are on their way in; including a refund from the BVRC, income from the MOF (\$5200) and a third o/s item....</p>

Item	Discussion
<p>7:20pm</p> <p>Terminology:</p>	<p>Provide advice related to land use planning and forest practices to the Chair of the Forest Practices Board, Kevin Kriese.</p> <p>Review of the compilation of “Comments on LRMP Practices and Projects Reports” led by Bob</p> <p>OSBG - objectives set by gov’t, GAR - gov’t action regulation, FRPA - forest range and practices act, HLPO - higher level plan objectives, perhaps we should have a handout of these...</p> <p>7 fish sensitive watersheds id’d in LRMP yet only 5 ended up in the regulation - who determined this? To get the other 2 into the regulation it’s heavily bureaucratic, now it is a GAR process, this is a difficult process. This is the same process as with community watersheds.</p> <p>Great work compiling comments.</p> <p>Impacts on water quality, habitat and other features are known but some projects with known impacts are missed altogether - our board may not know what these projects or impacts are; things stakeholders may have explored may easily be missed.</p> <p>From the table: Is it ok to have a panel review and hammer out a new LRMP over a period of time? Answer: The gov’t should update these LRMP’s and come back to the board with a technical committee to support development.</p> <p>There’s agreement there are inadequacies and holes in this review/report. This report doesn't address the fact that once an FSP is approved it doesn’t always reflect the values of the LRMP.</p> <p>There’s a lot of work to be done on this report and we think it should be done more thoroughly. We still need to be specific enough to identify those values that require protection of the land base. WHMA established that certain values need protecting.</p> <p>Referring to ‘objectives are hard to measure’, what are the intrinsic values of certain things?</p> <p>Timber valuation gets lots of \$ spent, caribou valuation is getting more provincial resources - citing the species protection act. How do we know values are protected when noone says the LRMP is effective?</p> <p>Bottom Line:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does anyone have any further comments or objectives?

Item	Discussion
<p data-bbox="191 153 363 189">7:40pm</p> <p data-bbox="191 898 363 1003">The Trespass Act</p>	<p data-bbox="363 153 1430 226">Propose solutions that we would think are beneficial in range management planning.</p> <p data-bbox="363 233 1430 375">Perhaps the encroachment of populations requires changed boundaries. There will be push back, these grazing leases are long term. Publicly funded solutions like fencing is a challenge to the range act which will be pretty difficult to make happen.</p> <p data-bbox="363 382 1430 560">Perhaps we can tweak some components, we don't necessarily want fencing everywhere...if cattle are on your property you should be compensated. The crown gets \$3.5 per month, why not private property owners? In mining you always have to give notification you are crossing private property, why is this not true in ranging?</p> <p data-bbox="363 567 1430 602">a laugh about FREE range....</p> <p data-bbox="363 609 1430 644">Essentially regulatory notification was proclaimed 100 years ago.</p> <p data-bbox="363 651 1430 793">There's been examples where the officer and bull dozer were at work on private property without notification. They worked it out but the crown needs to know what's at risk. Dealing with private property damage is beyond the scope of the board.</p> <p data-bbox="363 800 1430 898">Not all crown land is free range perhaps we need adjusting the zones, suggesting zones where you can have cattle here but you need to pen them.</p> <p data-bbox="363 905 1430 1003">The Trespass Act - you can walk across a property line anywhere as long as there is no intent. If you are aware of risk to the property than you have intent.</p> <p data-bbox="363 1010 1430 1045">Should cattle on crown land be considered wildlife? Damages are paid.</p> <p data-bbox="363 1052 1430 1087">Elk are fenced at public expense.</p> <p data-bbox="363 1094 1430 1192">Can we not put this on a map and see the grazing tenures and private lands and planning units, what are the values for these units? Then we can find conflicts?</p> <p data-bbox="363 1241 1430 1419">It may be worth writing a letter concerning the values in the LRMP Decision - does anyone want to be the lead in drafting a letter for the board's approval? Well what would we say, while agriculture and ag. opps are a value there are instances where they conflict with other values like w. quality, fish and wildlife habitat, quiet enjoyment of property. This requires a knowledge base.</p> <p data-bbox="363 1457 1430 1493">We want to protect agriculture but this is dropped somewhere in practice.</p> <p data-bbox="363 1530 1430 1566">Bottom Line:</p> <ul data-bbox="363 1572 1430 1717" style="list-style-type: none"> • what are the values the board is to represent specifically? • we don't want to restrict the amount of ranging on crown land • the crown needs to know spawning beds, headwaters, more.... • departments will find money to protect certain environments & values <p data-bbox="363 1724 1430 1797">E will try to get a map from Mark S where the free range grazing tenures are. There is a management plan for every grazing lease.</p> <p data-bbox="363 1803 1430 1864">R will contact Kaaren and tell her where we're at, we're looking into it further</p>

Item	Discussion
8:20pm	<p>Trail Mapping, 'BV Recreational Access Database' This could be termed 'the implementation of the Summer RAMP' led by Eric.</p> <p>This is slow getting the Webmaster to get at it. Our partner, Brandi Hughes Recreation Sites and Trails (FLNRO) is reluctant to acknowledge trails that aren't maintained. Even with designations like user maintained, seasonal, motorized and/or non motorized. According to her we need to define maintenance levels, legal designations. We do have the summer RAMP plan. Brandi may come up with \$1000, we do have \$2300 RAMP funds already. - 60 named trails, they are reluctantly on the database, she has nothing on private land, like trails behind Call Lake etc., she feels by having these recognized they are promoting and hence putting themselves at risk of liability.</p> <p>Mark Fisher is supportive of the project in theory!</p> <p>What is maintenance? Walking on it is maintenance, if its findable its being maintained. Defining maintenance is like defining better condition; using a trail is leaving it in better condition, defining better condition is too objective a term.</p> <p>RAMP is designating appropriate use. RAMP is all voluntary.</p> <p>Listing of private land trails should be left to the landowner, it should be changeable so they can be removed or added to the database. Forest features and rec. sites might be points of interest.</p> <p>An airstrip in Alberta is a rec. site but never mapped because it will be used in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>Is the summer RAMP complete? Answer: not exactly</p> <p>Counter costs are debatable but the larger costs to measuring use is collecting data, fixing and transmitting the data.</p> <p>Bottom Line: Eric to continue to work with Brandi. Ron to contact Brandi about funding requirements.</p>

Item	Discussion
8:30pm	<p>Continue the discussion on an Integrated Silviculture Strategy re: Balsam (Sub Alpine Fir). :Led by Bob.</p> <p>Bob is trying to write an internal letter with the integrated silviculture people (in Victoria), perhaps he should speak to the chief forester but most agreed going with the silviculture group is a better approach.</p> <p>Background: Even if you plant today you won't be able to harvest for 90 years. Your going to have to force licensees to plant these species.</p> <p>Why do we want this planted? Answer: to diversify timber yield, biodiversity and reduction of risk of crop failure. There's pushback on biodiversity because where you haven't logged it balsam does come in naturally, it'll be an understory species and do well but grow slow. Also foresters don't want to plant because there is no incentive to plant slow species and currently mills don't take it. At this rate of growth there will be no harvesting of balsam after 60 years. Balsam saw log's do have some rot but the larger cants are awesome to build with, store and ship.</p> <p>State of the art is the natural tree right now.</p> <p>Hemlock is in the same situation as this Balsam, we don't have much in the TSA though. There's a replant suggestion of 5% for cedar. Larch plantings have larch soft fly - a pest problem and so not preferred.</p> <p>Tree farming versus natural regrowth. Balsam can manage under itself.</p> <p>Clearcut silviculture system will work. If we plant by site series (wet, moist sub zones) and if these were modelled you could find out how many zones are suitable for fast growing balsam.. You need a line in the code - foresters need to plant out larch, douglas fir or balsam in cut blocks. How much - 25 %? It must be in pure stands and can't be mixed unless its in groups or islands. Some licensees do plant - on higher ground these species withstand snow loads. You can order %ages. from the nursery.</p> <p>What about aspen and cottonwood? Answer: a 300m wide stretch around Williams Lake is being planted, aspen stands are adapted to fire so they propagate fire, grass is another species which uses fire to outpace its competition, they'll sprout after a burn, aspen will also seed in if there's root damage but it's less likely to burn than a pine stand. Cottonwood is more fire proof, aspen bark is volatile - the pellet mill takes aspen, otherwise it's left or burnt, there's a 100km range for hauling costs to the pellet plant. Cottonwood usage includes bridge or decking, Aspen makes fine paper, cores of plywood, toothpicks and so on.</p> <p>note from email: has the Board seen the Integrated Stewardship Strategy for Bulkley? It directly assess species mix issues.</p> <p>Bottom Line:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Province needs a better portfolio than just 2 species - site series selection processes should use the 'acceptable not the preferred' - everyone supports Bob's initiative - biodiversity is an important part of the LRMP

Item	Discussion
9:03pm	<p>Discussion of Telkwa Coal meeting and need for more information. approx.</p> <p>The meetings are daytime - Thursdays and Ted can't make them. It seems to be government agencies. EAO will cover off much of the hydrology, caribou impacts and more.</p> <p>Visual quality will be impacted but there is a report of some planning to keep small stands to prevent eyesores from a distance.</p> <p>FN has requested all data be publicly released or accessible and Telkwa Coal has agreed they can do that. Perhaps we can come up with another guest suggestion.</p> <p>The mining is a no brainer, no biological impacts and env'tal consequences are well known.</p> <p>Bottom Line:</p> <p>T will leave off attending meetings. Eric will attend when possible - sue to confirm this.</p>
9:20pm	End

task	due dte	who
Draft letter of support for research and development of Balsam in Forest practices. Maintaining scientific research & citing the portfolio analysis regarding the impact of climate change.	Feb 16	Bob
Compile all feedback and recommendations for Ryan and Kevin	Feb 24	Karen and Bob
To contact Brandi Hughes to see what she needs to fund 1) the implementation of the summer RAMP and 2) the trail mapping database.	Mar 11	Ron
Contact Kaaren Soby and let her know we're still investigating.	Mar 11	Ron
To ask Shuffert for a map of crown land lease tenures. Perhaps even invite him to present practices, explain the act. to the board.	Mar 11	Eric