

## BV Community Resource Board Final Minutes

Dec. 16, 2024

### Present:

Directors: Anne Hetherington, Ted Vander Wart, Ron Vanderstar  
Secretary: Sue Brookes  
Guests: Nicolas Dormaar, Mike Buirs, Cam Bentley and Tara Dunphy  
Public: Len Vanderstar, Eric Klasson, Kevin Tyler, Dave Hooper, Daphne Hart, Jay Gilden, Bob Mitchell  
Regrets: Garth Blabey

Next Meeting: Jan 20, 7pm, Smithers Council Chambers 2025

Meeting convened at 7:05pm

**Chair: Anne Hetherington**

**Everyone in the room introduced themselves.**

### Agenda Items:

1. Treasurer's Report
2. Bulkley Morice FLP  
Guest Nick Dormaar  
Guests Tara Dunphy and Cam Bentley
3. Guest Mike Buirs on Patchworks
4. Defining Terms
5. SERN, Society of Ecosystem Restoration of BC
6. CRB Priorities
7. Motions

#### 1. Treasurer's Report

No changes from November. Operating budget of \$6500.00

#### 2. Bulkley Morice FLP

Directors referenced the Babine Forest Landscape Planning process (FLP) and a meeting between the between the Cheslatta, Gitksan, Wet'suwet'en, Wet'suwet'en First Nation and the Witset First Nation where the CRB was encouraged to engage.

#### Guest Nick Dormaar

- Nick would like to work with the Board and bring the discussion of forestry planning to this table
- regarding FLP planning and any recommendations the First Nations have final approval
- the highest table in the process is the BC Nations Table
- we discussed coordinating technical working group, a sub committee, that would meet between quarterly meetings of the FLP proponents
- Nick mentions specific First Nation values near human populations - berry, non timber related resource harvesting, etc. Nick says there are good intentions and those values protect other values.

## **Guests Tara Dunphy and Cam Bentley**

Both are regulators for the Skeena District

There are 2 active Forestry Landscape Planning processes nearby.

The Directors want to hear about the biological observations In the Lakes District. Tara and Cam advise us there are no ecological or biological assessments complete as yet.

### **A summary of the BuMo FLP**

- the FLP table has been active about a year, there have been 12 meetings roughly
- so far achieved:
  - develop principles and goals
  - launch of the [website](#)
  - a plan developed on how they are going to do the Timber Supply Review
    - to account for a drop in the AAC, they will assess the current condition of the values, then revisit the AAC within the next 2 years. Once recommendations are made in this reassessment, they will continue with the FLP, and then revisit the AAC at the end of the FLP process a second time.

### **Question from the Board/Gallery:**

- on block size and implementing some change that is meaningful in the forest:
  - Cam responded: modelling will be influenced by the desired future state. The Lake Babine Nation has asked for different riparian buffers than now for instance. There is still going to be social licence at the end of the day. There will be opportunity for incorporating these concerns in the next 2 years.
  - Cam is optimistic they can remove some CORE (Serb Creek) areas from AAC zoning and development until the full planning process is complete.
- historically there was no plan but to put the blocks in close to the mills. This was heartbreaking because the objectives were discarded in order to log nearby. Directors advise:
  - know your objectives first, then make the AAC yields and locations fit those. Use the modelling to guide your choices for the AAC.
- the Province's technical review has begun and includes:
  - hiring of a district planner - decided, not hired.
  - hiring of a plan writer, the same as the Lakes Resiliency Project - Pat Bryant.
  - Bulkley Morice Wildfire Resiliency Project - a private/separate project that looks at knowledge gaps, using local knowledge. Lead Kevin Kriese, Don Morgan, Dinell Moore, Shannon Irvine - looking at best available info on fire weather and behaviour. Tara is trying to also link in and share their knowledge.
  - expect black out periods due to government to government processes.
  - 3 open houses are announced. Topics will be: what is FLP planning. The BC Wilfire Service will also be there along with someone else.
  - there is still debate on how to reporting out on results, effectiveness and implementation.

### **Question from the Board/Gallery:**

- Will this be measured on the ground or modelled? There is no better way to do this then verification of what is in physical reality. Ground truth.
- Implementation and monitoring should follow evaluation, review and improvement.
  - Cam responds - it will be in depth and eventually everyone will be monitoring and they will apply adaptive management schemes.
- The Province has not been very good at monitoring.

- Cam responds - community volunteer groups are working on trying to improve this element before launching this plan.
- Effectiveness monitoring needs defining. Knowing the depth and breadth is important so there is no room for interpretation of what this means. Is this in the plan? In Europe effectiveness management is called the Guild Process here it is called Lifeforms. You look at the health of a culture or community as a whole.
- Measuring timber outcomes is easier and more well known than disappearing ecological outcomes.
- There are 6 Pillars of Biodiversity that can help structure this planning process.
  - Cam responds - there are 80 objectives existing now in the Lakes Project, and the majority are not timber centric, they want to get this number down.
  - Cam notes - the Province is still bound by the HLPO. The BuMo FLP will be secondary to the LRMP thus ensuring the maintenance of LRMP values
- A socio economic environmental assessment is recommended (a socio economic impact analysis is not the same thing!) this term is used interchangeably by the members of the gallery.
  - Cam responds - the analysis will be created a result of the Lakes process but not the BuMo FLP. They are not there yet in the BuMo planning process
  - Nick gets this - this is not a timber exercise actually, the process is based on the 80 First Nation values, and 50, 100 year and 200 year time frames. Caution here\*\* the further out the timing the less accurate the modelling.
  - Cam also mentions using an event disturbance approach under consideration. This is new to the Province.
- What are the values of interest?
  - Cam responds these are identified by land base, ie landscape corridors, CORE ecosystems. This is unique to the BuMo FLP.
- Community stability (what is this defined as?) and how many man days of work are required to do get there? Is this in the FLP scope?
- There is a Goshawk spatial modelling project being done in the Kispiox now. This is using in house Provincial software and technology.

**Action Item\*\*** get the website link from Tara, same site as questionnaire -this will list the open houses and how to address individual values, the table will use all this info and create the technical panels

**Action Item\*\*** Directors request a technical working group update from the Lakes project so we can consider questions for the open houses and applying this to a BuMo FLP.

**Action Item\*\*** new paper on Metlakala SFU work on FN and community based valuing of components, just released. See [bvcrb.ca/minutes](http://bvcrb.ca/minutes) to find the link.

### 3. Guest Mike Buirs on Patchworks

- all agree the application is only as good as its inputs
- it provides an opportunity to try these things differently and also align the strategy with the timber supply review
- [bvcrb.ca/minutes](http://bvcrb.ca/minutes) has a one page summary and the recording of the TEAMS demo (14 attended)
- A couple years ago Frank Doyle and Canfor (who paid for all the Patchworks analysis) used a 'net down' process in Patchworks to discover the model was 300 cubic meters short of their manual determination of Annual Allowable Cut. This was very close to the Provincial scenarios as per the Canfor Chief Forester.
- Goshawk models - zonations were defined by a regular spacing matrix of 6000 ha
  - this species cannot live without Old Growth, this is where it hunts. Goshawks are year round perch hunters. 25m width is ideal for a Goshawk habitat. With 30 patches of 6000ha you can still have no impact on the timber cut. The impact would be to the silviculture system. So they added partial cutting

and colocation as mitigation factors. Commercial thinning and other cutting helps with diversity in these 6000 ha. Cut once in 140 years out of a block and you still have no impact on timber cut. more than 20% clearcutting there is a 75% probability you will lose the goshawk in these 6000 ha. By retaining half of these areas in Old Growth forever than you can monitor and keep the Goshawks for ever. The age of trees is only an indicator of the age of the block.

- Windfirm believes small tiny clear cuts help keep biodiversity churning. Too much of a cut will only show up 5-6 years later. Effectiveness monitoring simplified: if you can keep your Goshawks you can measure that indicator only and know you have a sufficient ecosystem to support other values.
- Patchworks will generate a spatial plan for timber harvests based on values. This kind of approach helps you understand choices. Good quality vegetative inventories as input, help you forecast stand characteristics in the future. We can grow different parts of habitat back quicker than other areas.
  - the process includes Q&A:
    - What if we just used existing roadworks and did a plan around that?
    - What if we put a couple more roads in?
    - We can do cumulative effects, rather than 30 Goshawk territories in the Bulkley; let's do 10 and see the impact on timber cut.

#### **Question from the Board/Gallery:**

- Many of us know the land, physically, why do we need another inventory? We need its protection now. More science isn't going to help with the protection of values.
- BC used to thin forests originally before it started clear cutting, the Province does not learn from its own past.
- Forestry is not mimicking natural regeneration like the result of fire.
- Why are we seeing mills shut down now? How long and how many jobs do we have lose? We need the socio eco impact assessments and analysis mentioned above.

## **4. Defining Terms**

### **Community Stability or Structured decision making:**

Primer posted at [bvcrb.ca/minutes](http://bvcrb.ca/minutes).

Instead of how much volume we cut, or how many jobs are lost, we measure how many man days of work are we losing. Patchworks can play some of the scenarios using the category called "community stability. Earnings for one person on a feller buncher means the earnings stay in communities versus large logging contracts, who's earnings go to private Boards, heavy machinery financing, etc.. Patchworks can provide further data based on who is doing the earning. Its thought that for every 10 dollars you earn, you keep 1 in the community based on the type of job.

**Action item\*\*** Draft of letters to First Nations regarding CRB contributions and technical working group contributions. Anne to draft.

## **5. SERN, Society of Ecosystem Restoration of BC**

Dave Hooper mentions a SERN matrix needs to be part of the technical working assessment and/or workshop. Erin Halls found that taking a forest all the way down to the ground and growing it back, you get faster re-growth, a surprising result - ask her. Increasing annual ring growth on trees gets you more money per pole than regrowth of smaller trees. It's a qualitative discussion.

## **6. CRB Priorities**

- effectiveness: what monitoring works, what doesn't
- development applications following the LRMP
- inadequacies in monitoring, planning ie. the grizzly bear management plan was good
- landscape connectivity corridors:

- the interpretation is maintain 70%, the intent was to do this on more
- the matrix was designed but never followed
- no monitoring for effectiveness, is this keeping old forest in a connection wildlife can use?
- small operators can go through whole networks and use existing roads and landings and pull out certain diameter trees
- the new business model requires small operator tenures not large block by block tenures, the process we work under has so many barriers, valuations, timber licence sales...
- the 'process precludes meeting objectives'

## 7. Motions

1. The BVCRB create a technical working group dedicated to Forest Landscape Planning and it's review. The motion was made by Anne and seconded by Ron. All were in favour.

Motion passed.

2. A **Motion was also put** forward to have a workshop to identify the components we want to measure in the LRMP.

Discussion and consensus was to do this as a technical working group of the FLP process. At that point we will already have First Nation values funnelled down to the technical working group.

Motion withdrawn.

3. A **Motion** to approve Nov. 18, 2024 minutes was put forward. Ron made the motion, Anne seconded, All were in favour. Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:50pm