

BV Community Resource Board

Nov. 15, 2021 – Virtual Meeting

Present: Bob Mitchell, Matt Sear, John Fisher, Eric Becker, Sue Brookes, Christoph Dietzfelbinger, Jeff McKay, Ron Vanderstar, Ted Vanderwart
Guests: Len Vanderstar, Jay Gilden, Rob Stewart FLNRO, Cam Bentley, FLNRO
Absent: none
Chairs: Matt, Jeff
Recording: Sue

Next Meeting: Dec. 20, 2021

Matt called the meeting to order at 7:05pm

Agenda items were reviewed.

Guests:

Rob Stewart FLNRO, Cam Bentley, FLNRO

Topic: The Old Growth Deferral Strategy and it's impact on the Bulkley LRMP.

Rob and Cam begin with some background...

- in 2019 the old growth report came out by Gorely and Merkel, this set the stage
- this report had 14 recommendations, 1 being recommendation #6: which recognized the 'irrevocable loss of the old growth' and tried to address long time recovery systems.

The High level take from the Province is....

- based on a Nov 2 cabinet announcement that 'proper rights holders' are now monitoring, reviewing and stopping logging, when old growth status or stands are not protected, to the standard of their values
- ****what/whose set of values to use is under discussion**
- there are 6 proper right holders in the Bulkley TSA
- proper rights holders are defined as groups of nations that share common culture and practices
- how we expect the deferral process to role out to industry is unknown
- if a proper rights holder agrees there is a probability of irrevocable loss and they align with the deferrals then the Province's responsibility as far as sales manager go:
 - o consider the holder's recommendations
 - o consider cut blocks and overlap with old growth
 - o give the direction to the licensee
- Directions to the licensee are:
 - o A voluntarily stop of logging or
 - o The enforcement of a blanket or partial moratorium on logging

- there are 3 type of old growth, ancient, rare (being less than 10% of the biogeoclimatic zone in the area) and large tree
- the Bulkley TSA has approx. 75000h of old growth, some is in the THLB (timber harvesting land base), some in parks, some overlap with the CORE's
- none of the estimations of old growth classifications have been verified by walking the ground
- the panels assessment is professional only, discussion is ongoing
- the map of Old Growth is prioritized - ancient and remnant titles are on the map in their totality in red flakes, the remnant area is mostly big trees.
- Directors ask?

Question and Answer:

What if the area doesn't meet the delineated area definitions? Poor map data can dictate loss of these landscape units.

No answer.

What is BCTS doing?

BCTS prior to nov 1 sales were secured as is. Nov 2 plus sale options will not include the red flake polygons (for 2 years).

How does this apply to the LRMP?

The analysis shows that the amount of old growth that could be retained will go up. There will be more pressure on the remaining areas to log. AAC has not been adjusted.

Given that the Serb SMZ2 has old-growth identified as part of the deferral process, does this change the timeline of BCTS's aspiration to develop the Serb?

Maybe - it's not the same plan as 2 weeks ago but what it means is unknown.

Can licensees put pressure on FN groups?

Not likely - there should be consultation.

How does it affect volume based zones?

Is Lowell Johnson's interpretation of SMZ2 the same as West Fraser's?

Who and what values do holder's use, can we use our own in interpretation?

FSP's are not enforced is that true?

Can't answer, arms length from his department.

When a deferral is issued what happens?

Deferrals in timber sales are instructions to BCTS to cease development and defer sales - this clause is present in a BCTS document of some kind.

The FRPA (FRPA2) amendment proposed dropping FSP's and moving to a Forest Landscape Plan revisiting, modernizing land use plans - what have you heard internally?

There is a transition, it doesn't seem the Bulkley will be the first place this is implemented.

The CRB was a local solution preceding Forest Landscape Planning and the FPB process. How do we set the stage for more of this in our TSA?

Has anyone looked to see what and where the remaining merchantable forest is? And what is it's value at today's market values?

No answer.

Action Item*:** Cam can send the spatial data link tonight. This might help discern an answer.

The outer boundaries of intact watersheds are not on the priority deferral maps. It might be referred to in another recommendation. Intact watersheds were mapped for the fundamental reason of retaining forest resiliency of primary forests. There is potential to consider their value using Forest Landscape Planning or an alternate forum.

Brief discussion:

- o the intensity of compliance and enforcement
- o the unknown marketable value
- o the difference in old growth definitions

Organizational

Approval of the Oct. 18th minutes is pending the review of final revisions by Directors.

Financial Report

- today's bank statement shows \$15340 in the checking account; a little more than expected, so our Treasurer will take a second look
- small discussion about what to use the money for
 - state of the forests report
 - how does the deferral process impact on our values
 - what is the overlap of old growth with WHMA's, let's watch the numbers on the GIS exercises.

Our Terms of Reference

1. We should table adding values to the LRMP at this point. An example: Air Quality.
2. Consider revising Section 3c) to provide an appropriate wording to recognize that First Nations Governments are not stakeholders. We deferred this discussion.

- we would have to address Lake Babine Nation, Gitksan, OW
 - do we also now refer to First Nations as Proper Rights Holders - who is in and out on this list? What is the contact information?
 - who do we contact at every nation?
- Dave DeWit, Natural Resource Manager, Office of the W'etsuwet'en is the first hit, he's a local.

Action Item*:** Christof will ask in writing, Matt will raise the topic if he sees DeWit but we still need to ask all Nations

Correspondence:

- o related to WHMA's and responses: nothing new
- o State of the Forest, the Province says they have no time

State of the Forest

We know the LRMP is implemented but is it effective? Are these values maintained? If we scratch the surface we should put irregularities forward. This could require some ground truthing, the Babine Monitoring Trust and Industry all have subsets of this data. This could alternately be a GIS exercise.

Action Item*:** All Directors should look at how this could be parsed out or broken down into smaller costing segments.

Serb Creek Drainage

- The area has not been purchased so there is likely now application of the deferral process.
- The letter has not been sent, we will hold back on sending the letter for now.
- It seems Glenn McIntosh agreed to present a new plan.

Timber GAR

- Fewer Caribou, larger reserve.
- Timber offsets not locked down as yet.

Seymour Ridge Trail

- wildfire risk reduction strategies will be released soon

Call Lake Snowmobiling Survey

- Shouldn't this have come to the CRB?
Only what occurs outside the park applies to the CRB, the LRMP doesn't apply to what is within Park boundaries.

Website Development

- keep Treasurer in the loop as things develop
- Sue is the main point of contact with Phil

Clarification of the 10%

Regarding whether the Cores and Landscape corridors were in the Timber Harvesting Land Base. (THLB). If they weren't in the THLB there would probably not be an LRMP or a CRB. Simply put those who valued timber gave up 100% of the timber in cores and 70% of the timber in the LRCs for a total of 10% of the THLB in exchange for Old Growth and biodiversity and a 'consensus' LRMP.

Any timber that is 'permanently' deferred outside will add to the 10% unless an exchange is made with timber in Cores or LRCs.

Review any outstanding Action Items

Meeting ended – 9:10 PM