

Bulkley Valley Community Resources Board (BVCRB) Minutes

Meeting Date: May 11, 2010. Meeting convened at 7:00 PM, Alpenhorn meeting room, Smithers, B. C.

Board Members Present: Greg Storie (Chair), Dave Stevens, , Rob Boyce, Don Goalder, Jack Hagen, Taylor Bachrach, Eugene Wittwer, Ben Heemskerck, Jill Dunbar (Executive Assistant)

Visitors/Presenters: Jim Easterday (ORS), Liz Williamson (ILMB), Fred Oliemans (ILMB), Conan Peturrson

Regrets/absent: Anne Harfenist, Mike Murray, Jeff Anderson

Item	Discussion	Action	By Whom	By When
<p>Peturrson Application, Referral 6405671</p>	<p>Greg: BVCRB position on this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board comments are not personal - they relate only to the LRMP. • Board did make a mistake when commenting on the 2008 application, regarding zoning. • Board’s main concern is the erosion of the ecosystem network which is a key component of the LRMP. • Additionally the Board is concerned with ILMB comments that the LRMP is based on commercial forestry. • A more engaged process might have alleviated some of the many concerns expressed so far. • MoE has a process for amending Core Ecosystems (CE); the process for compensation is outlined in the LRMP. <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Fred: Establishing the ecosystem network required balancing and trade-offs. There needs to be interpretation on a case-by-case basis, since not all situations can be predicted. The LRMP is legally established under FRPA, which applies to commercial activities.</p> <p>Don: The original Hilltop Agreement was never intended to be limited to forestry.</p> <p>Conan: The LRMP always refers to timber/forestry as the dominant activity.</p> <p>Taylor: The reason for CE’s is to protect contiguous habitat and therefore protect biodiversity. It feels like the purpose of the LRMP is being lost when splitting hairs over</p>			

Item	Discussion	Action	By Whom	By When
	<p>terminology – e.g. driveway vs. road. Conan: What about compensation? Taylor: The CE’s are not meant to be permanent – boundaries should be flexible. Fred: Mineral exploration could occur in a CE. Don: Mineral exploration has historically superseded all other activities in many areas anyway. Taylor: In such a case compensation would be invoked. Greg: There is opportunity to be flexible with boundaries and maybe a more engaged process would have been helpful. Conan: What is the purpose of CE’s around private land? There are properties that could have been purchased back by government. Fred: What does the Board mean by precedent? Greg: There are two applications that have been approved for development in CE’s – and we wonder where this is leading. Fred: We have to look at each application on its own merit. Liz: An applicant can’t make an argument based on precedent. Conan: What would constitute compensation? Taylor: It would depend on the values you want to maintain. Greg: The compensation requirement could have come from government. Taylor: The LRMP recognizes that land status will change over time. That is why the Board was created. But we feel sometimes that our interpretation is different from government’s. That puts us in a difficult position because it feels like the LRMP isn’t respected. None of the mechanisms which would allow changes have been used in this case. Ben: The decision over this area in 2005 was to disallow a similar application. The Community Forest Society Steering Committee did not support it. The Steering Committee still</p>			

Item	Discussion	Action	By Whom	By When
	<p>exists and still has a vested interest in the area but their comments did not have weight this time.</p> <p>Conan: There are more groups involved and Wetzin’Kwa has the management responsibility now.</p> <p>Fred: There is quite a bit of pressure on that CE now. Government priority for land use planning is dropping. We need to work on keeping the Board functioning.</p> <p>Greg: Perhaps this is a CE that should be amended.</p> <p>Conan: What will be done with the dead pine in the CE?</p> <p>Greg: It would be hard to get approval for logging in the CE.</p> <p>Conan: There was no consultation with landowners in setting up the CE and many may not be aware of it.</p> <p>Greg: At the time they tried to select areas that were somewhat intact.</p> <p>Eugene: Agencies don’t seem too serious about upholding the LRMP. Economic pressures add to erosion of the plan.</p> <p>Greg: It is difficult to monitor the LRMP when we don’t get monitoring reports.</p> <p>Liz: Liz is available to attend and provide updates at any time.</p> <p>Greg: It would be good to amend some things in the LRMP, e.g. government commitments to submitting yearly monitoring reports</p> <p>Fred: The Board letter re: LRMP amendments will go to the Skeena Regional Managers’ Committee on Thursday (May 13/10).</p> <p>Ben: Clarification of when we consider compensation and when we don’t would be good.</p> <p>Taylor: Looks like we have two choices: Amend the LRMP, or try to uphold an irrelevant document. Clarifying the CE’s would be a good place to start with amendments.</p> <p>Conan: Private property has to be considered and owners consulted if a CE would impact the property.</p> <p>Greg: Agencies should address planning in CE’s e.g. if there is mountain pine beetle. It is not up to the Board to do</p>			

Item	Discussion	Action	By Whom	By When
	<p>the planning. Fred: The path forward would be to consult with the Board in a meaningful way. Further discussion by the Board, following the departure of Fred, Liz, and Conan: Points of view of all parties were heard. Contentious issues will be brought before the Board in future. Eugene: Political pressure will bring on change. Perhaps Doug Donaldson (MLA) should be invited to a meeting. Greg: Board letter regarding this application was cc'd to Doug. We need to redefine some of the content of the LRMP. Ben: We should have a meeting for new members about the LRMP, and include Doug then. Historical perspective would be good as well.</p>	<p>Prepare a follow-up letter to ILMB summarizing the discussion.</p> <p>Prepare an outline for an “LRMP 101” meeting.</p>	<p>Ben</p> <p>Ben and Eugene</p>	<p>Next Meeting</p>
<p>Agenda review</p>	<p>Agenda for balance of this meeting was reviewed.</p>	<p>Accept agenda.</p>	<p>Board Members</p>	<p>This meeting</p>
<p>Subcommittee Reports/Issues/ Correspondence</p>	<p>1. Recreation RAMP update: Anne submitted an application for funding to Wetzin’Kwa Community Forest Corp.</p> <p>2. Mining and Energy Development Rob: Exploration work is planned for this summer for Telkwa Pass area and the Zymo property (upper Zymoetz River).</p> <p>3. Forestry, Range and Agriculture Greg: PIR logging is moving further north, following the MPB. Main activity will be in Babine, Harold Price, Blunt, and Reiser Creek areas.</p> <p>4. LWBC Referrals and Land Tenures Mountain Bike referral 135416: BVCRB response letter needs to be cc'd to all parties mentioned in the letter.</p>	<p>Finalize letter.</p>	<p>Ben/Jill</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action	By Whom	By When
	<p>5. Water and Fish: No news.</p> <p>6. Monitoring and Land Use Plans Glen Buhr is working on an agenda for a workshop about the LRMP, focusing on the 10% budget. The Board would like to review the agenda before it is finalized. This is an opportunity to engage the public. We could also communicate with past members. Anne noted in an e-mail that the Board needs to keep better track of possible amendments as they are discussed. Taylor: An area on the website could be created to collect these ideas.</p>	<p>Contact Glen about the draft agenda.</p> <p>Review the draft agenda when available.</p>	<p>Ben</p> <p>Dave</p>	
Administration	<p>Trusts and Societies: Taylor circulated notes on the pro's and cons of BVCRB establishing itself as a Trust vs. as a Society. Discussion: Is Trust status adequate for applying for the type of grant that we might be interested in?</p>	<p>Review Taylor's notes on Trusts vs. Societies; discuss next meeting.</p>	<p>Board Members</p>	
Other business	<p>Membership: Rob, Greg, and Anne are not applying to renew Board membership. Dave, Taylor, and Jeff have reapplied. As well, some nomination forms for new Board members have been submitted. Selection committee will meet May 19, 2010.</p>			
Meeting adjourned 10:00 PM	June 8, 2010, 7:00 PM, Alpenhorn Meeting Room.			