

BVCRB-Bulkley Valley Community Resource Board

Draft Minutes

Date: Mon. Apr. 19, 2021, Zoom
Present: Bob Mitchell, Matt Sear, Ron Vanderstar, John Fisher, Eric Becker, Ted VanderWart, Sue Brookes, Christof Dietzfelbinger, Curtis Paul
Absent: Jeff sends regrets
Chair: Matt
Recording: Sue

Next Meeting: May 17, 2021

Matt called the meeting to order at 7:05pm

Organizational

Motion: all in favour and approval of the Mar. 15, 2021 minutes. Please fix Matt's highlights on the GAR Order, TSA timber supply area, etc.

FYI: a TSA is not the same as a forest district. The old Bulkley District is the old Telkwa Timber Supply Area, TSA's are what AAC are calculated on, district boundaries have moved over time.

Meeting space at Smithers Town Hall still a possibility post Covid.

Financial Report

- \$15 400 in the bank,
- Wetzin'kwa funds, reserved for public liaison, is now used up by email, web hosting, news ad's, trade show expenses and more.
- the Interior News has a 2019 bill possibly outstanding, Ron is investigating.

The Kalum RMP meet the 3rd Wed of the month and want us to participate to discuss the issues and reluctance of the government to make any comments. Volunteers?

Action Item:** Ron to contact them and get back to us as to a May 19th, 7pm collaboration, possibly cancelling our Monday, May meeting.

Action Item:** Sue find out about a new website maintenance service and costs.

Curtis Paul, RPF Planning Forester Babine Business Area Serb Creek, Special Management Zone 2, Development

Curtis provided a presentation with plans to develop a timber harvest in the Serb Creek Basin. Brief intro, overview of the creek then the nitty gritty of the LRMP values of Water Quality, Fish habitat, Visual Quality and Grizzly Bear Habitat. The slide show has further details.

- BCTS are government employees. They auction timber on the free market on the web at BCBid. They have roughly 20% of the cut in each TSA, they use an on line market algorithm to calculate prices, buyers can be from anywhere, there is a deposit requirement and some buyer conditions. They do the planning up front, plant the block and manage the silviculture obligation.
- A license is a block or group of blocks, the contractor takes on the road building, harvesting and deactivation.
- BCTS budget for 2021 is 210000 cubic meters, 85000 cubes are marginal saw logs: being balsam leading less than 20m tall or stands over 1100m elevation and balsam lead - see slide.

The Serb Drainage is essentially logging between the core and the alpine, BCTS is hoping for 500000 cubic meters over the rotation but it will likely be less.

- In the HLPO tourism and recreation didn't make it as a distinct value, its tied into visual quality. The Board says: It seems these interests are ignored.
- Curtis' response :They have been taken into account in HLPO's and LRMP but as this is **timber** land base, it needs harvesting.
- Directors say: (some) its unacceptable that logging overrides these other interests. And you don't need to log 100%.

Recreational focal points: Are they identified? N, this is part of the consultative process, if you know of these points can you identify them pls.

- apparently from the air you can see the whole drainage in one view
- interest in skiing is further south, some discussion on associated views
- from the google view there is heavy snowmobiling
- road access will allow for ATV access

- the entrance is on the East side

Directors say:

- the CRB would like to restrict access, Curtis mentions it would be District Management decision
- prior to 2005 (1997) there was a resource plan by Gary Lloyd, there was lots of effort into establishing road location and bloc sizes of 15 ha, this plan should have valuable info. (it should be in the District office) look it up!
- how do you manage for low intensity, low impact recreation? Restricted access from the start of the project and the start of the road. Otherwise you lose the impact of that value.

Water: would the objective be better served by moving the creek more?

Directors ask: will there be a watershed assessment? - talk to DFO, MOE, they would know better about what watersheds are healthy or at risk, Glen Bhur could help

- another note is that glacial flow will diminish quite quickly now
- maintaining a cold water temp. is important

Curtis is taking this away, during a hot summer he wants to ensure the value is not at risk.

Visual Quality: Curtis refers to Deep Creek an open road and pulling out from various areas over a period of years. Partial retention VQO doesn't impact harvest so much as timing of the staggered cuttings - ie waiting for visual green up, considered to be 20 years. Any input?

Directors ask: go to each summit over the headwaters of the Serb and manage the VQO for partial retention from those summits, there are few watersheds where we are not looking at cut blocks, this is one. Curtis' reply is that VQO is not managed from mountain peaks.

- Directors mention the Reiserer Creek SM2 and after 3 years there is still no response from the district office concerning the meeting of VQO. How can we have confidence in this process?
- Scenic view points were something used in the past, why not continue with this technique? Curtis says now its up to the professional forester to choose those viewpoints.

- Directors ask for more detailed modelling of the proposal. Using Lidar Curtis can identify visual lines of sight and impacts from points on a map.
- What about VQO from the creek and looking out? there are users that ski up to the meadows.

Professional Reliance: Directors ask how can the public rely on professional reliance when it seems foresters have their hands tied in making recommendations in an FSP. This issue has come up a few times, there is lack of communication to the public, as well as lack of monitoring and enforcement on the back end of the process. If we have professional reliance than we are relying on the input of the forester or BCTS to put obligations into an FSP, not the lawyers.

Grizzly bears: Curtis says the timber sale document is a license to cut while adhering to the FSP, Directors say you write the contract so specify how you want the contractor to meet these obligations. Curtis is saying that BCTS cannot make obligations too difficult to measure and instead use vague clauses in contracts approved by lawyers. Other licensees have more control over harvesting and can be more flexible. Directors mention Clause 7? can be more specific on boundaries.

BCTS is moving to a system where they can add a bit more complexity to contracts and there is a pilot of this model going on in the Tyee area for wildlife habitat management and Goshawks.

Another process of consultation is the ESI (Environmental Stewardship Initiatives), its First Nation based. BCTS is hoping to map griz habitat in the Serb Drainage and consult with a biologist about cluster planting and so on.

Curtis thanks us and says he will take away our comments and stay in touch. By the way the RAMP does designate the area non motorized but there's no legal recourse. The only way to manage these wilderness areas with long term success is to make the access difficult.

Further discussion: opposition to the gate idea isn't necessarily about restriction of access but a gate is a recommendation that should come only after thorough consideration of all values and options. We recommend restricting access, the District Manager will propose ideas on how. The board has drawn on its first hand experience when recommending a gate but there is agreement that the Board's objective is restricting access, not putting up a gate.

Tyee WHMA

There is difficulty trying to get a forest professional to sign off on anything other than hard boundaries. There is Goshawk work with Anne in the area. There is a proposal to use a partial cutting framework to maintain partial integrity of wildlife habitat. BCTS is also using specific biologist driven boundaries. Right now WHMA's are included in TSR's as full clear cut areas. They hope using this collaboration as passable through the TSR.

Landscape corridors only require 30% retention over a rotation. Meeting the TSR modelling assumption you manage WHMA's with a full clear cut, no constraints. Directors suggest try cutting over a 100 year rotation but cut 25% at a time.

Lets hope for a primary wildlife protection success. This will meet SRMP objectives.

Telkwa Coal

No updates.

Telkwa Caribou GAR Order - Timber Supply Impact Offsets

No updates.

State of the Forests

...see correspondence

Wildlife Habitat Management Areas

In lieu of the removal of the WHMA's, UREPS's and other Section 16's and 17's now BC Conservation of Lands is getting some sort of reinstatement in place. The Province is now open to a reapplication process and this is happening within multiple levels and departments of government. Ron will keep us posted as to what's coming down the pipe. What comes back will depend on public pressure. They even mention the possibility of legal status.

Directors learn there was a FOI Request that came through the Ombudsman and there is a full blown investigation into the 1600 Section 16 and 17 deletions. There is a lot of work yet to be done.

Canfor/Reiseter Crk FOI

The response Christof got was they still think this is not in the public interest. What do we do here when we continue to get ignored? Perhaps we can invite them to speak to it in session? Does the board still want to submit a letter for the same request?

Correspondence

1. State of the Forest: we have reviewed the draft and have a signatory but it hasn't been sent.

Discussion: There hasn't been any responses from the District Manager on former requests and there is no open communication on other outstanding issues. Going to the Minister seems futile. What should we do? Bob is going to send it.

Sharing personal interests among board members is fine. Topics up for discussion are always welcome.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.

1	Send letter requesting an update to the 2004 State of the Forest report	Bob	Apr
2	Contact Kalum KLRMP for joint meeting in May, Cheryl Brown, browntc22@gmail.com	Ron	Apr
3	Look up website development platform and prices	Sue	Apr

Action Items:

Acronyms

AAC: Annual Allowable Cut
ADA: a Ministry of Agriculture designation, agricultural development areas
AWZ: Agricultural Wildlife Zones
AWZ: Agricultural Wildlife Zones
BCTS: BC Timber Sales
CFLB: Crown Forest Land Base
CLWRR: Crown land wildfire risk reduction
CRI: Community Resiliency Investment
ESI: Environmental Stewardship Initiatives
FLTC: Forestry Licence to Cut
FLU: Forest level planning
FOI: Freedom of Information Request
FPB: Forest Practices Board
FSP: Forest Stewardship Plan
GAR: Government Actions Regulation
HLPO: Higher Level Plan Objectives
IMAP: a Provincial mapping application that displays various information or “layers”
IMAP: a Provincial mapping layer based on Tantalus data
LUOR: Land Use Order Regulation
LUP: Landscape Unit Plan
OW: Office of the Wet’suwet’en
SRMP: Sustainable Resource Management Plan
TANTALIS: Name of government database that houses official versions of spatial data, the “layers” IMAP uses.
THLB: Timber Harvesting Land Base
TSA: Timber Supply Area
TSR: Timber Supply Review
UREP: Use, Recreation and Enjoyment of the Public Reserve
WHMA: Wildlife Habitat Management Area
WMA: Wildlife Management Area
WUI: Wildland Urban Interface