

BV Community Resource Board

Oct. 18^h, 2021 – Virtual Meeting

Present: Bob Mitchell, Matt Sear, John Fisher, Eric Becker, Sue Brookes, Christof Dietzfelbinger, Jeff McKay, Ron Vanderstar
Absent: Ted
Chair: Matt
Recording: Sue

Next Meeting: Nov. 15, 2021
Matt called the meeting to order at 7:05pm

Organizational

Motion: all in favour of adoption of the Sept 20 and Oct 10th, 2021 minutes.

Agenda items were reviewed.

Financial Report

- there is about \$14.5 in the bank
- there are no big bills expected until spring
- all funds are in the general kitty, none are reserved

Organizational

Our Terms of Reference, addressing values:

- There are historical instances of values being changed in BVCRB
- Karen Price did a survey of the community in 2018 at the Trade Show. She determined current LRMP values haven't really changed.
- Board members discussed further consideration of today's values by:
 - consulting the public from a booth at the fair. Someone knowledgeable could be accompanied by another to conduct a survey.
 - undertaking the Winter RAMP
 - conducting on line surveys via facebook and the web
- **AI**** Sue request the 2018 survey from Karen and forward to Bob to post to facebook.

- One Director would like to see further development of the Tourism value.
- Zonation is important.
- There are no stakeholders. We govern by consensus so there is no benefit to a 'someone' in particular.

Discussion of October 4th Meeting with the Minister of State for Lands and Natural Resource Operations, the Honourable Nathan Cullen:

- Making changes to forestry legislation and consulting with First Nations government on marine and land management is the priority of the government.
- We discussed how to work with communities, civil associations, and governments.
 - Perhaps we need a trilateral Terms of Reference, Government to Government to Public.
 - We can be a great tool in conveying public concern in broad discussions. We just need a seat at the table. A positive response from the board is a good indicator of a positive response from the public - this is a great time management strategy. Though we are without clout, we are certainly a good sounding board. As an advisory board we are available to industry, government, recreation and other groups to make use of. How do we sell ourselves?
 - We are happy to share with the Office of the Wet'suwet'en.
 - We considered all correspondence should could have a line of reference: we are happy to act as a sounding board at any time.
- We need a more practical answer for the Province on why and how they can model our terms of reference for the purpose of community consultation.
- It was agreed we should table this discussion for now.

Correspondence:

- related to WHMA's and responses: [http://bvcrb.ca/land-use-topics/wildlife/wildlife-habitat-management- areas/](http://bvcrb.ca/land-use-topics/wildlife/wildlife-habitat-management-areas/)

- Directors referred to the previous letter signed by Geoff Recknell earlier this year. Administrative burden is not an excuse to not do

something. We need the provincial departments for their administrative functions.

- The Skeena is the only region in BC where the WHMA deletions from Tantalous have happened. If you open the SRMP you find out where they are.
- Sean Sharpe did some field work on habitat values in the WHMA's and wrote a report on values.
- Currently Victoria is reviewing the WHMA's.TBD!
- UREP's? we have no idea what's happening. This was brought to the attention of Nathan. Without a secure home or designation WHMA's and UREP's will slowly be forgotten.

Serb Creek Drainage

Starting with Glenn McIntosh, RPF response to the board dated Oct. 18, 21

- **AI**** Sue post Glenn's response on line
- Use the ToolBox analogy. BCTS needs to hear from us before its too late. They can provide us a great view and summary of plans.
- What is our consensus?
 - the board has different opinions, it is working hard to achieve consensus
 - our letter was originally penned so as to get consensus as to what the goals of the SMZ2 are. Perhaps if we want to see these values protected we can't log. Some directors think we can log - just differently.
 - Reiserer Creek is also a SMZ2 and yet it is getting clear cut. Reiserer Crk is evidence the Province cannot manage for the values.
 - This summer the gate was left open by Canfor many times, it's a tragedy of volume based licences. PIR respected the values, Canfor is flattening the SMZ2.
 - Apparently the Serb has a few more details specified in the FSP. We want to know the Province can deliver on what is actually planned.

- No logging in the Serb is a complete change in the 'reserve' status.
- When it comes to management of access you have to demonstrate you can prevent access. We could propose - No logging until we see a concept on paper as to how you will and can regulate access. We believe you can log so long as you are creditable and responsible.
 - Timber Supply valuation costs the government lots yearly and yet no other value's planning or management s get this budget.
 - The Morrison is another SMZ2 - the road deactivation is an example of good management.
 - LRMP was only agreed to if logging volumes would be impacted no more than 10%, why not consider lowering logging volumes? When is this going to happen? Timber supply has been going up and yet ten 10% limit has remain unchanged. As an increase in supply there should have been an increase in reserves for protection of values, ecosystems or habitats or corridors, etc.. These things are diminishing yet logging volumes don't go down.
 - members discuss that 40 - 50% of the harvest will be low quality logs or worse and therefore used for pellets.
 - FYI - There is more carbon on the ground than standing in the forest.
- **Action:** a rewrite of the Letter to the District Manager and BCTS with a CC to the OW:
 - include a preamble to the letter to the government agents giving our trepidations based on other SMZ2 management zones. Then mention that if development does happen you better follow these specific mandates. Also try to define what we think these things mean - like restricted access...
 - our group feels we can accept logging of a portion as long as certain SMZ2 objectives are met.
 - Visual quality - protect the views from Serb Creek up to the mountain. Words like - use 1.5 hectare openings up one side of the Serb...
 - Carbon storage and old growth - worded such as "a portion of the board strongly feels"
 - Curtis Paul is motivated to do partial logging, he did a bit in Canyon Creek.

- ask BCTS for their process or next steps, are they going to present? Do they want an invitation? Where are they going from here?
- **AI**** Matt will finalize the letter to the BCTS and run it by the board.

Organizational

- As individuals we need to participate in other groups to make change. We can't do everything from within the CRB. The government doesn't even want us to know if we've met our LRMP objectives. We are at a deficit of knowledge. We don't have the knowledge of science to know whether our recommendations are appropriate!
- We referred to our purpose of the board 2. a). where there are different interpretations of this statement.
- **Should the board endorse making pellet fuel out of old growth forests?** This debate was tabled.

Website Development

It is ok to allow the Kalum group to use our web model, if need be.

Motion: To accept the quote of \$1180 - \$1500 for website upgrading. The range is dependent on certain licence fees and web development hours. The quote was provided by Coffee Web Development Oct. 8, 21.

Motion Approved: all in favour.

AI Ron to contact Phil with deposit for work.**

Timber GAR

- DM's are considering the approval of some small changes but nothing has been brought to our attention

Review any outstanding Action Items

Meeting ended – 9:57 PM