

BV Community Resource Board – Final Minutes

Nov. 18, 2024

Present:

Directors: John, Anne, Ted, Ron Secretary: Sue
Guests: none
Public: Len Vanderstar, Eric Klasson (Silviculture background)
Regrets: Garth Blabey

Next Meeting: Dec. 16, 7pm, Smithers Council Chambers, 2024

Meeting convened at 7:05pm

Chair: Ted Vanderwart

Everyone in the room introduced themselves.

Organizational:

Motions

1. Motion to approve September 16, 2024
Motion to approve by Ted, Anne seconded.

Treasurer's Report: There was roughly \$7500 at the end of September. We may need to think about fundraising in a years time. Grant funding would need to be project specific, for example our last grant from Wetzinkwa Community Forest was for public consultation at the Smithers Trade Show and Fall Fair.

Other Business:

Acronyms: FN: First Nations

1. Silvicultural Innovations Program (SIP) proposal for adapting the Morice TSA spatialized timber-supply modelling to the Bulkley TSA.

Mike Buirs worked with Frank Doyle and Anne to find solutions for preventing the long term regional extirpation of goshawks. A SIP proposal went in Nov. 1st from Mike. He wants to expand the MoriceTSA Pilot (2020) to the Bulkley, as a timber supply model for District Management support. PATCHWORKS scenarios use a spatial model aligned with timber harvest values which will expand biodiversity strategic management. Modelling allows you to see the outcomes of different strategies for partial harvesting, thinning and management for multiple forest values eg. maintain old growth structure etc. It also allows for targeting the restoration of second growth plantations and estimations of carbon. It is means for communities to prioritize values and see trade offs. It's SOLVER function can suggest changes to blocks and tenure to get closer to objectives while minimizing timber impacts and balancing timber supply over time.

Loading the database with accurate ground and other data makes it a useful support tool that could help mitigate forest impacts using balanced, innovative harvesting

techniques and multiple resource values. FN's and other groups have been asked to support it as a Forest Landscape Planning Tool by both Anne and Nickolas, a Ministry FN liaison. We would need roughly \$50 000 (roughly the same value as a coastal tree's stumpage) to do the project.

We need a letter of support from the CRB and the FN's.

We need a spatial silviculture strategy. The current model allows for contractual obligations to remove the wood, even though the wood may be in riparian, old growth deferral areas etc. The model is TSA bounded and everyone can use the info.

Motion for the CRB to submit a letter in support of the project put forward by Ron, all in favour.

Action Items ** Anne to draft, Ron to be signatory.

Action Items** Anne will look at the program to try a demo and Sue can help coordinate a demo from Patchworks, if we want a group session.

2. Bulkley Morice Forest Landscape Plan - Community Resources Board Engagement

Anne provided some background on the process and Sept 6th there was a meeting between the Witset Band, the OW and the LBN, coordinated by Nickolas. There was an invitation to the CRB to discuss how we could work together. There is an email from Nickolas to post (from Anne).

3 requests came from the meeting:

- 1) that the CRB be part of the group along with government, licensees and FN's
- 2) the CRB reach out to the wider community and work with people with other skills
 - as a sort of hub for FN's
- 3) support for the Silviculture program grant app - see above topic

Dave Hooper was noted as saying we need a CRB rep at this table.

Historically - there was 9 members on the Board each with 3 values on their radar. There would be non biased, diverse perspectives represented.

Action Item** we need to respond to Nick as a Board, thank him and echo the sentiment. Anne can send this response.

Action Item**

- 1) Invite Nick - Dec. 16th as a guest
- 2) Can the Science Alliance group make some recommendations on any of the following? - Brainstorm the process?!
 - Where can we make contributions for the Forests of the Future?
 - Where else would we get licensees, forestry values and other values involved?
- 3) ask Cam Bentley to present or supply some information about outcomes of the pilot FLP process.

The Morice part of the project is using 2 biologists - we should ask them to present what their plans are. Let's start some communications with those 2 about biodiversity. We need to know specific indicators and rationale:

- What is their rehabilitation plan?

- how are they monitoring?
- what is the silviculture objective and how will they address process implementation and compliance with the LRMP and HLP?
- what are they doing with second growth restoration?
- What are the outcomes so far? Ask for more than just biodiversity. Laurie Kremstader is one bio but ask Cam instead to delegate the guest presentation.

3. Community Energy Discussion. This request came from students of UVIC and UNBC.

After some discussion we are to send our regrets as facilitators as we are too invested in other projects to be able to coordinate.

4. Interpretations of the LRMP by the SMBA

The concerned community group referred to in this process includes the BV Stewardship Coalition, BV Backpackers and BV Naturalists and Jim Pojar. These folks want no more bike trail extensions beyond the CRA and the CRB to facilitate collaboration with all groups. It's also desired to map the options to reduce impacts and include the management of the original hiking trail.

- we will soon get a chronology in email
- we could apply for a court injunction if necessary - unless we could come to consensus with HBM and SMBA. The law is embedded in the HBM master agreement - they would recognize that we would need an amendment to the SM2 designation and that the SM2 states no motorized vehicles will be accessing the western ski boundary. The controlled rec. area in the 1988 Master Plan reflected the current ski hill boundaries. In 2008 against broad public opinion, HBM expanded their control area to take up most of the prairie. They decided they could go ahead with development the trail based on their interpretation that a mountain bike trail is not a facility. This isn't the case, it can be argued the SMBA Trail is a facility. The master plan says that if they build a facility there should be a government accountable body assessing community input etc. As a result of this development HBM will expand its seasonal use of the Mountain eventually monetizing access to the Prairie in all seasons.

Summary of discussion: Damage in the Alpine has already occurred. Our letter is too late for many noted next steps. Aquatic lichen, North West Water Fan, these are red listed plants and there was no EA conducted on their impact, nor the marmot etc.. Already there is irreplaceable damage.

Community groups need agreement from HBMR to the terms and conditions we need to meet now or there could be a court injunction. The Province's Mountain Resorts Branch granted approval after the fact and after issues raised by this community. We have to recognize what was agreed to in previous planning processes. The LRMP has four sub zones. This project is in non compliance with the LRMP. It specifically says this prairie needs to be maintained. There should have been community discussion and likely an amendment to the Plan would have been proposed. The LRMP is above the CRA master Plan.

Other development notes: the trail goes 3 times the length because of the grade. 7km is in the CRA, 1.5 km outside. SMBA was given \$350 000 by the Province to do this work yet did not do EA's nor community consultation. Despite 3 requests from the concerned community group HBMR and SMBA declined the offer to consult. The

groups request a chance to consult to avoid further action and request it be organized through the CRB.

Noted: Discussion on ebikes. Tech has changed since the original plan. Traffic regulation interpretations do not replace LRMP recreational access interpretation. It is not appropriate for each level of government or user group to interpret the LRMP and determine whether it should guide planning and development.

5. Rebutting personal opinion:

In reference to comments made in the October meeting, the CRB is set up as a value based approach to land use planning. This includes all perspectives. Directors are there to consult with their counterparts and present a balance of values. Values are not biased they are perspectives.

With regard to the SMBA there were more than environmental considerations. If you follow the process you need to amend the SM2 management zone for construction to occur. There is a Land Use Plan that acknowledged that prairie needs to be protected.

Rebuttal - A lot of what the CRB Board does is around process. If perspectives are lacking the Board needs to clarify that its a non perspectives model. We share community viewpoints and build consensus from personal points of view. We are supposed to represent the values that are important to us.

Action Item** Sue send out a copy of the importance of respect for the LRMP to HBM Resorts and copy Mountain Resorts BC - Cassandra Enns and Terri.

6. Social Media Outreach:

- 1 regret from Garth Blabey who would have come in person if he were available
- in the last month the Facebook content was displayed 34 times on screens, one person could look up a post several times and views counts each display as unique.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:00pm