

BV Community Resource Board – Final Minutes

Oct. 4^h, 2021 – Virtual Meeting

In attendance: Matt S., Bob M., Christoph D., Eric Becker, John F., Ted V., Jeff M., Rod Link, Tracey M., Cheryl B., Julia H., Scott A.

Guest: Minister of State for Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Honourable Nathan Cullen

Next Meeting: Oct. 18th, 7pm, ZOOM likely

Introductions:

- everyone introduced themselves

Background:

- brief background provided by Matt concerning the BVCRB and reference to the letter drafted to the Minister June 21, 21

Nathan Cullen, MLA

- as MLA and minister of state he wears 2 hats.
- Nathan spoke at length about land use planning and how it become devalued over time. He refers to 2017 and how land use planning at that time was instructive and inspiring. He mentions the Caribou agreement and how difficult it was reaching consensus.
- Nathan doesn't have some answers with respect to some questions in the letter.
- there has been extensive consultative among First Nations and other governments of late, ESI / ESF tables and so on. In an effort to find out about best practices and lessons learned Nathan is currently trying to bring back community level planning but balance this with First Nations Rights and titles, MOU's and one off land use agreements.
 - A Director asks "how to value non indigenous input and contribution of civil groups."
- Nathan indicates this is a challenge, it's a work in progress, I don't know. Can the PIC and Board join a community advisory group that is involved in First Nation strategic planning? Can the Province still engage with us as a portal to the public?
- The challenge is making durable agreements that are still unique enough to each locality.
 - A Director reminds the Minister of the BVCRB Board being a model for Gitanyow planning. They did adopt this model. The leadership of the Gitanyow is what made it work.
- If Nathan is talking to other Ministers he wants to say this is what we need but he struggles with how to do that. How do we support a leadership structure that will encourage this?
 - A Director mentions that as a licensee getting feedback from the board means you know you have broader acceptance from the community. There is credibility in Forestry circles.
 - Directors mention government support for the Board is variable over the years. Also getting support from various community groups is also difficult.

- Clear cut logging was an original stimulus or catalyst for the formation of the board.
- Nathan thinks its just harder to get people out. He wants a script or description of the board an operations and how to engage at the community level in today's world. Nathan is also looking at community land use solutions for Marine planning. He wants a model for planning asap!
 - A Director mentions there is responsiveness from industry but not the Ministry of Forests. It seems
 - Another Director mentions the downfall of the LRMP is that there is no legal standing. Without the meaningful dialogue in these groups there will be other issues arise.
- Nathan mentions we will never get the response a First Nations government will get. He hears these voices will manifest somewhere if not in these groups, and they will be much more political or controversial.
 - A Director mentions that the Kalum PIC's \$5000 funding has been stopped by a Smithers regional agent. This was on the coattails of a request to make recommendations on how to modernize the LRMP. This is a sign of total lack of provincial respect for the work of this group.
- Nathan agrees and would support the payout and will talk to her and her staff, **upon receipt of a letter of request for reinstatement.**
 - A Director mentions that when the PIC first begun it was validated, its terms of reference say it has credibility as seen by the Province. In 2008 the attitude changed for the worst. The Ministry of Forests just hesitates to engage with us and at a depth that could bring big results.
- He hears we need agreements that will renew our social contracts.
 - Our boards have the social licence that validates our work but the province questions whether we have credibility to carry on. The government has to demonstrate a level of respect that validates the will of the community stakeholders.
 - Another comment is that individuals in position of power don't seem to have the same political will as Ministers or other 'leaders'.
- Nathan acknowledges this can happen top down or bottom up, agreement thru the strata of bureaucracy is a problem.
- In regard to timing: he is still looking for a perfect 'Provincial' planning model to recommend to government.

Guests and Matt sign off 8pm.

Bob, Ted, Sue, John, Christof and Eric remain.

Serb Drainage Review

- the OW is interested in the opinion of the Board
- it's agreed we should try to reach consensus around controlled access

- its also agreed to only consider the Serb Drainage and not Passby though there maybe similarities.
- some discussion around what other values to protect
- what case can be made for protection of the old growth for instance. The case for old growth protection here is still in the air. It's not known what old growth is in parks or landscape corridors, is there a lack thereof? We might be able to say the Serb is key but we don't have a full idea.
- if we compromise then we could ask to enlarge the CORE but still permit logging in half the SERB. This will help us to reach consensus though may not meet the goal of certain Directors.
- *****Action Item** in summary it's agreed Christoph, Eric, ted and Ron will draft a letter to request a gate, a legal requirement for non motorized, a larger core and permanent de-activation after 5 years.

Meeting ended – 8:57 PM