




TWO WORLDS
CONSULTING

Northeast Roundtable Session 3

January 30, 2019
Meeting Notes

info@twoworldsconsulting.com

 (250) 900-6602

www.twoworldsconsulting.com

PREPARED FOR

The Government of British
Columbia

PREPARED BY

Jennifer Campbell, PMP
Two Worlds Consulting Ltd.
300-722 Cormorant St
Victoria, BC V8W 1P8

File Number:
206-100-20190214

February 19, 2019



Northeast Roundtable Session 3 – Meeting Notes

Type of Meeting: In-person

Date: Wednesday January 30th, 2019

Time: 10:00 am – 3:30 pm

Location: BC Oil and Gas Commission, Fort St. John

Handouts: Agenda

1. Northeast Stakeholder Roundtable – Meeting Presentation
2. Halfway River First Nation’s Treaty Land Entitlement (TLE) and Site C Land Agreement Selections: What We Heard
3. Doig River First Nation (Doig) Treaty Land Entitlement (TLE) Selections
4. Blueberry River First Nations (BRFN) Treaty Land Entitlement (TLE) Selections
5. Parcel Feedback Form
6. Meeting Feedback Form

Attachments: Appendix A – Attendees
Appendix B – Parcel Feedback Verbatim Comments

The doors opened at 9:00 am and registration commenced. Participants were welcome to view the printed parcel maps in an open-house style fashion until the meeting commenced at 10:00 am.

1.0 Introductions

Two Worlds Consulting (TWC) commenced the meeting welcoming participants and providing an overview of the facilitation process and meeting handouts.

Participants introduced themselves and the group or organization they represent, as well as their interests and expectations for the meeting. The following interests and expectations for success were noted:

- transparent and meaningful consultation with full access to all information and regular updates;
- changes in access and rights to land use;
- land transfer process and the role of stakeholders and public engagement;
- understand impact of process at municipal, provincial, and federal level and the interactions between these levels;
- discuss site-specific concerns for areas regarding conservation or protection;
- goal to gather information on other stakeholder groups and the process in general; and,
- understand effects and engagement on caribou, grazing, forestry, recreation and trapping.

TWC summarized the participants' interests and expectations and highlighted continual improvement for the engagement process.

2.0 Opening Comments

The Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (MIRR), the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (FLNRORD), and the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources (EMPR), thanked participants for their attendance and stated that they wanted to provide the best space for discussion regarding land use changes and transfers. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that Doig River First Nation (DRFN) and Blueberry River First Nation (BRFN) Treaty Land Entitlement (TLE) land selections would be the focus of the meeting. As concerns around transparency were raised at the previous meeting and through the preceding introductions, MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR provided an update from the last meeting in November 2018.

Caribou Management

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR acknowledged the concerns that participants had raised regarding caribou management in the region and noted that it was not the key focus of the current meeting; but would be discussed in future meetings with topic experts present. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR advised that they would be hosting these discussions in the near future, with updates to follow in mid-February. Below is a list of interests and concerns expressed by participants about caribou.

- A participant suggested hosting a separate series of Roundtable meetings solely to discuss caribou, due to the complexity, importance, and breadth of content to cover.
- Concern was expressed that the government may be moving forward with caribou management decisions without proper consultation. It was stated that tenure holders should be engaged first. Participants asked if processes regarding caribou could be slowed or stopped until all input from the public is received, and for the public and community members to receive information on these issues in a timely manner before decisions are made.
- Concern was raised by a participant regarding a letter which a trapper received restricting trap line usage due to caribou management in the area. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated they would let the public know as soon as they receive more information on caribou management, in an effort to make the process as transparent as possible.
- Participants re-emphasized the need for engagement with the public on the issue and asked for coordination between government ministries to conduct proper consultation for this species at risk. A lack of available information was highlighted.
- The connection between caribou and the TLE process was discussed, highlighting the need for a broader joint dialogue on the two processes. It was stated that the cumulative impact of land use changes from the TLE process would need to be assessed.
- In response to concerns around government action in the past concerning caribou management, MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR emphasized the need to carve a new path forward, and that negotiation is a dynamic and iterative process.

Roundtable Agenda

Participants commented that a barrier to proper consultation is insufficient time. Concern was raised around the agenda for the current meeting and the large number of parcels for consideration. The previous meeting which reviewed only the Halfway River First Nation (HRFN) selections was considered an appropriate amount of content to be addressed in a single Roundtable meeting. TWC provided an overview of the planned facilitation process for the day and stated that the original agenda could be changed to prioritize BRFN and DRFN parcels for review. TWC highlighted the commitment to identify discussions that will need to be continued at future meetings.

Access

Concern was raised with respect to continued access to all lands of interest for recreational and non-industrial purposes. The current land use system allows users to move freely across lands. A need to identify all existing uses on selected lands was highlighted. Access from a Treaty 8 perspective was discussed, in terms of attitudes towards land ownership and equity. Through discussion on the topic, a need for definitions and categories of access (i.e. informal, formal, legal, etc.) was identified.

4.0 Land Use Planning in the Northeast Update

FLNRORD provided an update since the previous Roundtable meeting. FLNRORD spoke to the Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) update process that will begin in June 2019. The update is a revitalization of the 1997 LRMP. FLNRORD stated that they have been working on the scoping phase since November 2018 to determine how to undertake the LRMP update. FLNRORD is determining which parties to engage, and what topics will be of discussion for the new LRMP process. Below is a list of the questions posed, common themes, priorities, recommendations, and actions from the dialogue.

- Various participants representing local government stated that FLNRORD had not yet contacted them regarding the LRMP update process. FLNRORD indicated that interested stakeholders should contact FLNRORD and provided their contact information. In early February, Urban Systems would be hosting focused engagement sessions in an open house format in Fort St John and elsewhere in the region. A report will be compiled and used to develop the Terms of Reference for the LRMP process.
- Participants stated that they had a higher expectation for the new LRMP in comparison to the 1997 LRMP, specifically its legislative power. Additionally, concern was raised around adequate First Nation participation and consultation in the LRMP process, and that the new plan must properly incorporate Treaty rights in the region through a lens of reconciliation.
- It was asked when FLNRORD would be presenting to the regional districts on the LRMP. Participants also stated that in-person meetings were preferred over open house formats for stakeholder engagement. FLNRORD provided a timeline, stating engagement and information gathering will occur in February 2019, followed by the Terms of Reference being developed by April or May 2019. LRMP Updates will continue to be provided at future Roundtable meetings.

3.0 Past Business and Updates

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR provided an update on parcel comments received at the previous Roundtable meeting on HRFN land selections.

Halfway River First Nation TLE and Site C Land Agreement Selections: What We Heard

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR presented an overview of the feedback received from the previous Roundtable meeting on November 21, 2018 when HRFN land selections were reviewed. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR provided a summary of comments and interests for the two areas of selection, Chowade and Tsaa Nuna, and how they are considering those comments moving forward.

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR provided context for the comments received. At the end of November 2018, MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR provided materials on land selections and requested comment by mid-January. In mid-January, a community meeting for HRFN was held to discuss land selections and to enable community members to learn more about TLE in general. Overall, the feedback received was supportive of the chosen HRFN selections. Site-specific concerns identified by stakeholders and the public were: access to the proposed Tsaa Nuna conservancy; maintaining the existing access to Crown lands beyond parcels; increased traffic to the Tsaa Nuna area if, and when, lands are transferred; and, resolution of existing tenure, lease and licence holders' concerns on lands proposed for transfer.

Issues raised have been noted, and discussions are taking place with overlapping tenure and licence holders to resolve encumbrances, while considering the incoming comments with HRFN. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that they will continue these discussions and respond to, and consider, additional site-specific interests submitted from stakeholders and members of the public. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR requested all comments to be received by February 8th, 2019 and outlined efforts and next steps to address concerns raised. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR commented that they did not currently have answers regarding how the considerations presented would result in changes to the parcels, but that would come later in discussion with HRFN. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that land selection feedback updates would continue to be presented at the Roundtable meetings. A summary of the interests and concerns will be compiled and captured in a report to be shared publicly.

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR outlined HRFN's plans for the parcels. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR noted that HRFN has worked with the province to ensure certain features (i.e., roads) were not included in certain parcels. Further, no development is currently planned for the parcels, as HRFN seeks to preserve certain lands as a natural cultural conservation resource.

The land transfer process was briefly discussed. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR commented that the engagement for the Site C land selections would occur simultaneously with TLE selection engagement. It was highlighted that the process is iterative and can return to previous stages as necessary.

6.0 Doig River First Nation – Land Transfer Parcel Overview and Review Process

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR presented on the DRFN TLE selections. After providing a brief backgrounder on TLE history, the First Nations involved, and the types of land transfers, MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR presented on DRFN history and the land transfer process more generally. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR then outlined the status of engagement on the DRFN TLE land selections with: First Nations, tenure holders, local government, interest groups and the public. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR informed participants that local governments could contact MIRR to become engaged in these discussions. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR noted that consultation with First Nations is near completion, while consultation with tenure holders is ongoing. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR spoke to each land selection, some of which will be Shortfall parcels, and other ones will be Additional parcels. It was noted that DRFN will also have a Site C Land Agreement selection of 3000 ha.

No guide outfitting, recreational sites and trails, nor known mineral occurrences were identified in the parcels. Two traplines exist, one vacant, one held by DRFN. There are existing forestry and surface and subsurface oil and gas operations in the area. In addition, MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR is in conversation with Canfor on potential proposals. There are three range overlaps, existing roads, and BC hydro lines through some parcels.

Big Camp

The Big Camp area of interest consists of 405 ha, selected for protection of a cultural use area with a traditional camping site and cabins.

Petersen's Crossing

The Petersen's Crossing area of interest consists of two parcels, totaling approximately 350 ha selected for potential community growth in the existing residential area. The area also holds important cultural sites for protection.

Doig East, Doig Northwest, and Doig West Parcels

The Doig East, Northwest, and West parcels total approximately 3,400 ha, selected for future community residential growth and protection of important cultural sites. These parcels border DRFN's existing reserve land.

Doig South

The Doig South area of interest consists of 131 ha, located adjacent to the DRFN existing reserve land. The area was selected for future community residential growth and protection of important cultural sites.

MyGosh

The MyGosh area of interest consists of 815 ha, located within K'ih tsaa?dze (the broader area of interest for DRFN), selected for protection of areas of spiritual and cultural significance. In addition, traditional use activities take place in this area.

KTP 2, KTP 3 and Broomfield

The KTP 2, KTP 3 and Broomfield areas of interest total approximately 430 ha located within K'ih tsaa?dze. These parcels were selected for protection of spiritually and culturally significant areas, and for traditional use activities undertaken in the area. A 300-meter gap exists between these parcels. It was noted that the parcels may be connected or re-configured in the future.

KTP 1

The KTP 1 area of interest consists of 713 ha located within K'ih tsaa?dze, and is directly adjacent to the Alberta border. The area is selected for protection of areas of spiritual and cultural significance, and where traditional use activities take place. The selection contains Milligan Creek Road which was identified by participants as an important road for access.

Lunch Break – 12:30 – 1:00

7.0 Blueberry River First Nation – Land Transfer Parcel Overview and Review Process

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR presented on the BRFN TLE selections. For context, MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR provided a summary of previous engagement activities on Section 16 Applications, followed by a parcel-by-parcel review. Notations of Interests (NOIs) were discussed, and upcoming stages of the land transfer process. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR then outlined the status of engagement for the DRFN TLE land selections with: First Nations, tenure holders, local government, interest groups and the public.

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that the Section 16 Applications were posted online for public comment. The comments collected are being considered and carried forward to engagement on land transfers. BRFN Section 16 classifications were pursued to hold lands in their current state while negotiations are underway. In response to comments from stakeholders shared with BRFN, the Nation provided concept maps for certain land selections, which MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR presented to participants.

Many licences of occupation exist in the selected areas. All parcels are encumbered by traplines, some owned by other First Nations in the area. One guide outfitter occurrence, one recreational trail, and four range tenures exist in the area. There are no known mineral occurrences, some existing oil and gas activities, and few existing forestry operations.

South of IR 205

The South of IR 205 area of interest is approximately 1190 ha, south of the existing BRFN reserve. It was noted that BRFN has already acquired some of the land in this area. BRFN selected this area due to its proximity to their current reserve, to expand community amenities such as additional residential housing, and to develop agricultural and grazing activities. No site-specific interests were submitted during engagement on the Section 16 application of the area.

Red Creek

The Red Creek area of interest is approximately 1480 ha, selected to develop additional housing and for community development due to proximity to town. In addition, the area was historically a traditional camping and meeting place for BRFN. One range tenure exists in this area. During previous engagement, various interests were raised including public and road access with increased traffic; water supply; habitat protection and wildlife corridors; maintaining provincial jurisdiction in the area; and, maintaining the rural setting of the area. BRFN has presented a concept map for discussion regarding the Red Creek area outlining proposed access roads and residential development.

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that BRFN has been adamant about the stewardship of natural areas within the land selections. In addition, participants stated that any development in the area should be done in partnership with the community, and to plan access to minimize any disruptions. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR also commented that they are reaching out to the federal government to learn more about environmental regulations for federal reserve land. It was noted that existing roads must be addressed prior to the transfer of lands. It was suggested that a register be created to identify risks at the federal and provincial level, and to identify and close these gaps which would inform negotiations.

Dancing Grounds

The Dancing Grounds area of interest is approximately 611 ha, selected for its significant cultural and historical importance, and as a place for historical summer gatherings. No site-specific interests were submitted during engagement on the Section 16 application for the area.

Charlie Lake

The Charlie Lake area of interest is approximately 270 ha, selected for its ancestral, cultural, spiritual and economic connection to the lake. Evidence in the area indicates Dane-zaa presence 10,000 to 12,000 years ago. BRFN looks to use the area as a quiet place for Elders to live as the land is near town which enables access to amenities. During previous engagement, various interests were raised including public and road access with increased traffic; habitat protection and wildlife corridors; maintaining provincial jurisdiction in the area; adherence to the lakeshore development guidelines to ensure water quality; loss of tax revenue; maintaining visual quality; and, maintaining the integrity of the lake's fish population. BRFN has presented a concept map for discussion of the Charlie Lake area outlining proposed access roads and residential development for the area.

Participants expressed a desire to place a Section 16 over Charlie Lake due to concern over water quality and environmental protection. It was also stated that all development in the area should follow existing regional development guidelines and community plans which were put in place to protect water quality.

MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR clarified that no matter what issues arise with negotiations, there is still a commitment to carry forward the land transfers and TLE.

Pink Mountain

The Pink Mountain area of interest is approximately 5,600 ha, selected for BRFN to practice their traditional ways of life. The area is critical for teaching BRFN traditional practices and supports traditional activities such as hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering. The area has been described as critical for community health as it provides a healthy environment with clean air and water. Three range tenures exist in the area, along with one guide outfitter and one recreational trail. During previous engagement, public access and access to lands beyond the parcels was the main issue raised. Historical roads and trails in the area are of interest. A feasibility study has been conducted on trails in the area and will be publicly available.

Discussion

Below is a list of the questions posed, common themes, priorities, recommendations, and actions from dialogue following the presentation.

- Participants asked if MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR had heard anything from decision-makers concerning the BRFN parcels. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that there were Section 16 decisions made for three of the parcels.
- MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR clarified that each time an amendment to a Section 16 is to be made, it would need to be reviewed again. The Section 16 for Charlie Lake had been amended eight times to date. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR also commented that tenure holders would be contacted as changes to parcels and Section 16s are made.
- Development on Charlie Lake and its effect on water quality was a prominent concern for participants. Participants asked how it would be ensured that future development would be consistent with the conceptual plan presented. While BRFN stated they did not have a land code or comprehensive strategy in place for development, a set of guiding principles or mandate will most likely be created to guide land development in the coming years. BRFN highlighted that stewardship is key to their approach to development, and with certain systems in place to hopefully mitigate all issues raised to zero. The importance of working together and being respectful of one another's interests and concerns was emphasized.
- Some land selections overlap with ALR lands. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that these overlaps will entail consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture. Land transfers for overlapping ALR lands will have different processes.

- It was asked if the professional biologist reports related to components of concern for the land selections would be made public. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR replied that the information gathered would be presented as soon it becomes available.
- A participant asked what happens when there is not agreement between multiple First Nations concerning a land parcel. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR responded that there is hopefully a solution which all parties can support, and if not, the information provided will be presented to a decision-maker who will ultimately decide the best use of the land.
- Concern was expressed around potential high-density development in the Red Creek area, and participants asked what assurances were in place to make sure the development was satisfactory for everyone. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that for private land, usage is at the discretion of the owner and would, for example, be subject to private zoning laws. Concern was raised that laws and regulations would not be followed with new development. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR commented that they would investigate the legal framework for this, and the uncertainty around federal land transfers and regulations. A representative of the BC OGC stated that their legal department is working to formalize what the regulations will ultimately look like for permitting. It was agreed that further discussions would need to take place to flesh out regulation and enforcement.
- It was asked how the absence of changes to tax revenues would be mitigated with the new proposed developments. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR replied that they would gather more information on the topic.
- It was stated that the City of Fort St. John is working with communities to come to an agreement which would determine which services (i.e., water, sewer, RCMP, fire) would be provided to areas with potential new development. With the service agreement between First Nations and Fort St. John, the City would not receive the taxes.
- A participant inquired about taxes for areas which could potentially have pipelines intersect the parcel. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated they would gather more information on the topic.
- A need was identified to discuss what federal legislation applies on federal lands (Indian Reserve lands) to guide environmental management and community planning activities. Are there parallel processes to manage lands in the same manner as Provincial regulations or municipal bylaws to protect key features? MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR stated that more information would be provided to Roundtable participants. A matrix and a workshop on jurisdiction at the federal, provincial and municipal level was proposed. The workshop would provide information, consider on the ground success stories, and involve community forums.
- Participants asked how stakeholders and First Nations would work together moving forward. MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR acknowledged that this is a complicated legal question for the province to consider. BRFN stated that relationship building will be of the highest importance moving forward.
It was indicated that the regional district is working to host community-to-community forums to hold these discussions. Emphasis was placed on creating partnerships and collaboration to ease concerns on water quality and sewer systems.
- It was highlighted that there needs to be trust that First Nation governments will carry out development in a good way under applicable federal laws when developing on federal lands (Indian Reserve lands). Regarding other fee-simple property development, the provincial

regulations apply, and examples were provided of successful collaboration between Nations and municipal governments.

- Participants commented that Pink Mountain residents were unaware of Pink Mountain being selected as part of the land transfer process, and that the community needs be better informed.

8.0 Plenary Discussion - Summary of Doig River First Nation and Blueberry River First Nation Land Selections

Following the presentation, participants were asked if their organizations had a site-specific interest in the land selections presented for DRFN and BRFN parcels, what the interest was, and how it may be impacted through the TLE transfer process. Participants were also asked if there are ways in which negative impacts could be avoided, mitigated or accommodated. Parcel feedback forms were provided for participants to record their individual interests with respect to the parcels. Feedback compiled from the submitted feedback forms is presented in Appendix B.

After participants had viewed the maps and provided comments, the group reconvened for TWC to provide a plenary discussion of the maps and interests. A participant inquired about jurisdiction on forest health and potential spillovers from parcel areas into proximal areas. It was determined that forest health concerns will be part of the potential jurisdiction matrix, and for Forest Canada to participate in the accompanying workshop.

9.0 Feedback from Roundtable

Participants were provided with forms to provide feedback on the meeting content and operations. It was determined face-to-face meetings were preferred over voice or video teleconferencing. Participants stated they appreciated the update presentation on compiled comments and considerations presented on HRFN land selections and hope to see this again in future meetings. Parcel feedback forms were going to be participants electronically to submit comments. Participants noted the following issues they would like to be discussed or provided at the next meeting: Site C Land Entitlement parcels in general, maps showing existing roads and infrastructure, and caribou recovery planning.

10.0 Next Meeting and Adjournment

A follow-up presentation on what MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR heard for DRFN and BRFN land selections will be presented at the next meeting. Updates would be provided on the meetings and open houses to be held between the current and the following Roundtable meeting. The next meeting will be held on March 6th, 2019 in Fort St. John.

Action Items:

| Item | Responsible | Status |
|---|------------------------------|----------|
| Caribou management planning “Answers” to questions collected at Jan 30 meeting. | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR | Underway |
| Define Access types, how they are defined in various legislation, and approach in negotiations. | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR | Underway |
| Federal-provincial-municipal Planning and Environmental regulation applicability “Matrix” and a workshop to review them. | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR | Underway |
| Update mid-February on TLE land parcels (Confirm which parcels) | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR | Underway |
| Information on tax implications for local governments (when taxable infrastructure is removed from tax base when transferred) | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR | Underway |
| LRMP engagement, update on regional consultation and website | FLNRORD | Underway |
| LRMP update to Roundtable participants | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR /TWC | Underway |
| Determine remaining number of Roundtable sessions | MIRR, FLNRORD, and EMPR | Underway |
| Provide participants with electronic copies of parcel feedback forms | TWC | Complete |

APPENDIX A – ATTENDEES

Northeast Roundtable Session No. 3 – Attendees

| Name | Organization | E-Mail |
|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Ackerman, Andy | Myriad Consulting Inc. | andy@myriadconsulting.ca |
| Ackerman, Lori | City of Fort St. John | LAckerman@fortstjohn.ca |
| Bueckert, Peter | Northland Trail Blazers Snowmobile Club | bueckert@bluenova.ca |
| Burkhart, Tim | Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative | Tim@y2y.net |
| Connolly, Kathleen | Concerned Citizens for Caribou Recovery | kathleen@dawsoncreekchamber.ca |
| Cvik, Chris | District of Hudson's Hope | cao@hudsonshope.ca |
| Dominic, Sherry | Blueberry River First Nations | sdominic@blueberryfn.ca |
| Ensz, Ray | Fort St. John Trapper's Association | rensz@districtoftaylor.com |
| Fraser, Rob | District of Taylor | MayorFraser@districtoftaylor.com |
| Goodings, Karen | Peace River Regional District | kgooding@pris.bc.ca |
| Gould, Clinton | LP Building Products | Clinton.Gould@LPCorp.com |
| Hewitt, Steve | BCWF Wildlife Committee | steve@backcountryfsj.com |
| Hiebert, Leonard | Peace River Regional District | leonard.hiebert@prrd.bc.ca |
| Holland, Barry | North Peace Rod and Gun Club | wbholland394@gmail.com |
| Lawson, Jason | Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development | Jason.Lawson@gov.bc.ca |
| Little, Jim | NE Stakeholders Group | mackeno@xplornet.ca |
| Long, Ron | UBC Botanical Gardens | rlphoto@shaw.ca |
| Maudrell, Glynnis | Charlie Lake Conservation Society | glynmaun@gmail.com |
| McConnell, Mike | Regional Cattlemen | mmccconnell@pris.ca |
| Michetti, Lorraine | Village of Pouce Coupe | michetti@shaw.ca |
| Miedzinski, Curtis | District of Tumbler Ridge | cmiedzinski@dtr.ca |
| Miller, Kelly | District of Hudson's Hope | kelly@hudsonshope.ca |
| Mulholland, Christy | BC Oil and Gas Commission | Christy.Mulholland@BCOGC.ca |
| Preprost, Matt | Alaska Highway News | mpreprost@gmail.com |
| Regimbald, Darrell | Canadian Forest Products Ltd. | darrell.regimbald@canfor.com |
| Rose, Dan | Peace River Regional District | dan.rose@prrd.bc.ca |
| Smith, David | Smith Fuel Services Ltd. | davidsmith@smithfuelservices.ca |
| Sperling, Brad | Peace River Regional District | brad.sperling@prrd.bc.ca |
| Stratuliak, Brian | Peace River Regional Cattlemen | kiskgelb@pris.ca |
| Strongitharm, Deane | Blueberry River First Nations | dstrongitharm@cityspaces.ca |
| Turner, Simon | Blueberry River First Nations | sturner@ratcliff.com |
| Webb, Jim | Western Moberly First Nation | jwebb@incentre.net |
| Whalley, Michael | Resource Municipalities Coalition | ed@rmcoalition.com |
| Wolfe, Ken | Chetwynd Forest Industries | Ken.Wolfe@westfraser.com |
| Zabinsky, Tony | City of Fort St. John | tzabinsky@fortstjohn.ca |

APPENDIX B – PARCEL FEEDBACK VERBATIM COMMENTS

Northeast Roundtable Session No. 3 – Parcel Feedback

Verbatim Comments

The following is a compilation of comments from the Parcel Feedback Forms completed by participants at the January 30, 2019 Northeast Roundtable meeting. Comments also include typed form submissions received via e-mail after the meeting.

Each individual map is listed with the verbatim comments below. When comments applied to multiple maps, or a group of maps in general, a separate section lists comments for these grouped areas. Quotations (“ ”) are used where interpretation of handwriting was unclear. Details that would personally identify the participant placing the comment have been removed. Abbreviations and acronyms have been expanded and clarified where appropriate.

Doig River First Nation

Big Camp (TLE)

- Road access.
- Range Tenure for cattle grazing/licenses issues are being engaged/consulted. Rainbow Holdings.
- Grazing licence?
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Acknowledges existing roads and O&G structures (pipelines etc.).
- Access, other land and tenure holder’s rights, usage and compensation.

Peterson's Crossing and Peterson's Crossing Top (TLE)

- Historically significant area for First Nations.
- Grazing lease maintained by current lease holder?
- River in or out?
- Main Milligan road and bridge through valley. Maintained by province?
- Road access.
- Range tenure holders being consulted. Doig Pasture.
- NW corner of “Beatton”-Doig pasture possibly little impact – need to contact.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Maintain existing road access through.
- Access to farmland to east/south needs to be maintained.
- Road maintenance concerns.
- Agree site has been used longer than I have been there. In the early years there was actually a church alongside the West access. Two accesses have to be retained, Milligan Creek Access Road. The road will require special designation as a portion “of” it will require significant maintenance to retain access through this parcel. Access that exists to the Pugh parcel SE of this will have to be retained. This access has existed for a long time. It is noted that the Doig First Nation has a tenure over the area of this date.

- Access, other land and tenure holder's rights, usage and compensation (Milligan Creek Road, other Camps and Property in area).

Doig East, West, and Northwest (TLE)

- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Doig East and Doig West have road access that needs to be protected and existing O&G facilities. In the long term the Oil and Gas Company will need to restore the areas once their requirements of the sites are no longer required. There is a MOTI Gravel Reserve within Doig NW.
- Access, other land and tenure holder's rights, usage and compensation (Doig Road, access and open travel).

Doig South (TLE)

- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Need to identify permanent access to this site.
- Access, other land and tenure holder's rights, usage and compensation (Doig Road, access and open travel).

My Gosh (TLE)

- Road crossings.
- Maintain existing road access through to crown.
- Cecil Lake Community Pasture to be consulted and engaged.
- NE corner of Cecil Lake pasture possibly little impact on grazing, need to contact Cecil Lake pasture.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Access issues. These have been discussed with Jason Lawson and his GIS crew.
- Great choice. Access, other land and tenure holder's rights, usage and compensation.

KTP 2, 3 and Broomfield (TLE)

- "Lagarde"/"Lagande" Road continued access.
- Maintain existing access through.
- Need to retain access through parcel.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Maintain continuity between parcels of land.
- Maintain access to existing roads.
- Access issues. These have been discussed with Jason Lawson and his GIS crew.
- Access, other land and tenure holder's rights, usage and compensation.

KTP 1 (TLE)

- Maintain existing access through.
- Need to retain access through parcel.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Access issues. These have been discussed with Jason Lawson and his GIS crew.

- Access, other land and tenure holder's rights, usage and compensation.

Big Camp (TLE) & Peterson's Crossing and Peterson's Crossing Top (TLE) & My Gosh (TLE)

- Consult about fence lines, cattle grazing, the amount the impacts on effected users.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.

Blueberry River First Nation

Charlie Lake 1 (TLE)

- Environmentally sensitive parcel with several watersheds and riparian features. Known to locals as sensitive moose calving and rearing area. This area is part of the Charlie Lake Watershed reserve (#0288651) which was designated in the late 60's to protect the back up water supply to FSJ and region as well as protect wildlife and critical riparian features. Developing roads, sewer, power, and gas lines to multi-resident facilities will have a very detrimental affect on wildlife, and on water quality. This is one of the few treed areas remaining on west side of lake without development.
- Impacts to water quality.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Development concerns near lake; water; sewer.
- Lake shore set back.
- Existing Section 16 for water quality.
- This is a crucial watershed land, important flora and fauna protection area.
- There is no access from the Golf Course road as is indicated.
- How can they be held accountable to the concept map or any other idea that they may put forward – now or long term.

Charlie Lake 2 (TLE)

- Charlie Lake Watershed Reserve.
- Impacts to water quality.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Development concerns near lake; water; sewer.
- Environmental concerns.
- This is a crucial watershed land, important flora and fauna protection area.
- How can they be held accountable to the concept map or any other idea that they may put forward – now or long term.

Red Creek (TLE)

- Concerns about free and unfettered access to lands beyond.
- Residential development will have a negative affect on wildlife.
- Respect North Peace Fringe Area Official Community Plan.
- Development in partnership with existing community.
- Plan access to minimize any disruption - traffic study.

- Range Terrence “Weibe Creek boundary” consult and make him aware of possible issues.
- Crown subdivision.
- 1 range tenure, possibly little impact – need to contact.
- Impact on grazing tenure likely minimal. More important is feasibility and future relationships between existing rural comments which will find itself surrounded by a FN Reserve and the FN members.
- Mature timber values – forest health management.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Access through proposed TLE along Red Creek Road.
- Red Creek has been used by the adjacent residents for a long period of time. A portion of the area was logged as a part of the Empire Valley Land Trade along with other parcels of land in the North Peace Area. The logged area was returned to the province after being logged but was to have been reclaimed from the logging but in fact no work was done. This area has naturally come back to a new forest but with the assistance of the local residents. This area is used by the residents of Fort St. John as a near wilderness area for recreation. It is noted that the residents of Red Creek have been refused the opportunity to apply for any of the land for expansion of their existing holdings. A high voltage powerline crosses the area and also a number of sour gas wells exist with supporting roads and pipelines. Again, it is doubtful that the area will be developed as suggested in the plan presented. It mentions the potential for agriculture. Under the current agricultural policy of the Provincial Government the land would not be suitable for agriculture development. Climate, excessive slopes, poor soil limits the area to the growing of forest crops and for grazing. Recommend against this area being included in this TLE.
- Access to other lands and usages.
- How can they be held accountable to the concept map or any other idea that they may put forward – now or long term.
- Other interested parties had expressed interest in this land before Blueberry expressed interest and had the Section 16 placed on it and they were turned down. What happened to their requests and why?
- Lot 4048 was previously titled to Vesco to allow the timber to be removed as part of a government transaction to purchase the Empire Valley Ranch. There were a number of parcels involved in this transaction and the parcels West of the Alaska Highway were returned to the Crown and the Parcels East remained titled with some of them being eventually transferred to the Blueberry First Nations. Lot 4048 was completely logged and the land was returned to the Crown without reclamation of the land after logging. It is an area that is used by the public for recreation and in particular by the Red Creek Residents.
- The lands within the Red Creek area were developed as a subdivision and the existing road was used for the access to the area. The main road is government maintained. The roads that tie into the area are for access to oilfield infrastructure and are also used for access by the public and Red Creek residents to access the Crown Lands.
- Realtors used the vacant Crown Land adjacent to the Red Creek subdivision as a sales incentive to prospective buyers for existing titled lands.
- Current logging operations in the area.

- First Nations plan for this area has not been disclosed. There is no constructed legal access to most of the area. Existing residents use the trails that remain from logging and oil and gas operations for access.
- A number of other tenures from government exist over the area including traplines, logging, petroleum tenures including pipeline R/Ws and a communication tower.
- BC Hydro has a substantial powerline through the area and any residential use in proximity of the R/W is not recommended.
- Red Creek residents have been restricted from adding to their existing holdings with some exceptions.

Charlie Lake 1 (TLE) & Charlie Lake 2 (TLE)

- Any development along the lake needs to be done to highest development standards.
- Steep slopes and high drainage into lake occurs on this parcel.
- Sewage disposal system critical (e.g. access to Charlie Lake sewer system).
- High density development would be detrimental to this site both in terms of wildlife and lake water quality.
- Setbacks for lakeshore development should be honoured. Maintenance of shoreline reserve on both parcels - Charlie Lake Reserve.
- Bring in environmental, water agreements with FSJ Services (RCMP, water systems to agree with federal and provincial regulations along with Regional District (Section 16).
- Closed water and sewer systems to prevent contamination of Charlie Lake.
- Confirm water license for community discussion with and around the NP OCP regarding the future development.
- Closed water and sewer systems to ensure no contamination of the lake.
- Follow the PRRD's Lakeshore Development Guidelines.
- Respect NPFAOCP (North Peace Fringe Area Official Community Plan).
- Plan access to minimize any disruption - traffic study.
- Not appropriate for TLE. Should remain Crown Land for benefit of all; FN and non-FN.
- MIRR should consider purchasing private land around Lake instead.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Major concerns with this parcel. A Section 16 Watershed reserve was placed on this area in 1968 partly as a request from Fort St John council of the day. Until a few years ago Charlie Lake was the main source of water for Fort St John. Remaining uncleared and especially Crown Land is important to the integrity of the condition of Charlie Lake as a lake and as the backup water supply for Fort St. John. A significant number of the public are against anyone purchasing the remaining Crown Land within the Watershed and strongly support the retention of these two parcels for the general public which includes the First Nations. The former Liberal Government removed these requests from potential TLE (April 2017 see attachment). Currently there are some private parcels of land with Charlie Lake frontage which could provide the BBFN with land for their plans near Charlie Lake. Even a Conservatory like the Halfway River First Nations have applied for near their reserve might be acceptable if limited development was to occur. If these lands are titled there is no guarantee that the proposed development plan will be followed in the future. Remaining Crown Land would protect both the lake and the watershed for the

future. It is also noted that the PRRD identify these parcels in their official plans and in addition have significant restrictions on private lands near Charlie Lake. It is noted that under Federal Jurisdiction none of these would apply. There is also a no shooting zone of 91 metres around Charlie Lake.

Charlie Lake 1 (TLE) & Charlie Lake 2 (TLE) & Red Creek (TLE)

- Provide all environmental reports.
- Consult or discuss with Regional OCP for development.
- Section 16 protection of the lake.
- We learned today that there are federal criteria for land development on federal (IR) lands. There may be some misunderstanding about the different requirements between fed, province and PRRD. To inform the process and ultimately the provincial negotiators, a "risk register" could be developed that identifies the various requirements, similarities, differences and gaps. This can assist us to understand future development requirements and what may need to be negotiated into contractual agreements for land transfer.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- In 2017, the government cancelled both the Charlie Lake Reserve and Red Creek Reserve applications. The cancellation was based on public opposition.

Dancing Ground (TLE)

- Need to confirm access to the area and through the area.
- Mature timber values? Forest health management.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- No apparent access.
- Main concern is that there is no defined access to this parcel. Provincial lands policy requires access to be defined for lands that are titled.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

IR205 (TLE)

- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- This parcel will require the retention of access for adjacent land owners to be maintained and should be deleted from the title. In addition, the CN Railway crosses the area and will also have a R/W deleted from the title to retain the existing improvements. In the initial application for lands here an additional parcel immediately adjacent was considered. This would make good sense if it was again included.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

Pink Mountain 1 (TLE)

- Need access. Need unrestricted access through these parcels to access lands in the Halfway River and Two Bit Creek Valleys.
- Range Blueberry First Nation.

- Access concerns up Halfway River Valley. Lost access mature timber and forest health management.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Remove portion of M/K.
- Maintain Halfway Trail.
- Maintain access for trapline.
- The recreation trail to Rob Lake is required to be deleted from these applications. A larger part at the trail head needs to be left for the development of a parking lot to prevent trespass use of First Nations land in the future. A reserve was placed on the area for the eventual development of a trail to join the Halfway trail just past the existing titled lands. There also needs to be R/W left that will allow access to the North along the base of Pink Mountain. There is a former road to an abandoned wellsite at the base of Pink Mountain. In addition, a road that has been developed from Cypress Creek to the south of the Halfway trail also needs to be deleted from these applications.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

Pink Mountain 2 (TLE)

- “Anne Tompter” Grazing Lease consult and mitigate issues Blueberry grazing lease with tenure holder.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Boundary of West should follow Halfway River.
- Maintain halfway access trail.
- Maintain trail staging area.
- Remove portion in M/K.
- The West parcel’s North boundary should be the Halfway Trail as the land immediately above it is for the most part relatively steep and best left as Crown Land.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

Pink Mountain 3 (TLE)

- Range.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Maintain river access.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

Pink Mountain 4 (TLE)

- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Maintain Halfway access trail.
- It is noted that the Halfway River First Nations have concerns over these 5 parcels in particular the retention of public access.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

Pink Mountain 5 (TLE)

- Access up Halfway River valley. Mature timber lost to harvest, reduction in timber harvest land base. Forest health management?
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- Access for other land owners or users in the area?

Pink Mountain 4 (TLE) & Pink Mountain 5 (TLE)

- Need unrestricted access through these parcels to access lands in the Halfway River and Two Bit Creek valleys.
- Some land is in the MKMA.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.

Pink Mountain 4 (TLE) & Pink Mountain 1 (TLE)

- M/K in under provincial legislation. Removing M/K and transfer to TLE would probably require change to M/K legislation.

Pink Mountain 2 (TLE) & Red Creek (TLE)

- Consult about fence lines, cattle grazing, the amount the impacts on effected users.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.

Pink Mountain 1 (TLE) & Pink Mountain 2 (TLE) & Pink Mountain 3 (TLE) & Pink Mountain 4 (TLE) & Pink Mountain 5 (TLE)

- Care taken to maintain rare and unique biodiversity of this area - this is an area that needs protection.
- Consultation with Pink Mountain "ros"/"res" for all parcels".
- Possibly slight impact on one grazing tenure – need to contact. Remaining have grazing tenures are held by Blueberry FN. 3 range tenures.
- Unfettered access as not to impede normal trapping operation.
- The West parcel's North boundary should be the Halfway Trail as the land immediately above it is for the most part relatively steep and best left as Crown Land.
- The recreation trail to Rob Lake is required to be deleted from these applications. A larger part at the trail head needs to be left for the development of a parking lot to prevent trespass use of First Nations land in the future. A reserve was placed on the area for the eventual development of a trail to join the Halfway trail just past the existing titled lands. There also needs to be R/W left that will allow access to the North along the base of Pink Mountain. There is a former road to an abandoned wellsite at the base of Pink Mountain. In addition, a road that has been developed from Cypress Creek to the south of the Halfway trail also needs to be deleted from these applications.
- FLNRO has been provided a copy of the original map for the reserve for a trail around the titled lands now held by Blueberry First Nations. It is noted that when this reserve was placed the owner of the day was Lynn Ross and subsequently a Mr. Jack Massey and third party that did not complete his purchase but leased the land from Jack Massey for several years.

Additional Notes

The following notes were additional comments (non-specific to maps, or general process) provided by participants on the Parcel Feedback Forms:

- Several times in the presentation reference to a qualified provincial biologist is reviewing on Potential impacts. Will those reviews be made public?
- General concerns expressed: Concerns are to maintain water quality, protect forest health, and where possible, maintain existing motorized (vehicular) access routes. Support moving forward with settling the TLE claims and providing certainty to industry respecting areas available and not available for resource extraction.
- Need a discussion around potable water. Water supply study should be done with the city.
- My other big concern is – what else is coming down the “pipe”? – The old saying of death by a thousand cuts – where else will they be requesting for the other claims/settlements? It is hard to understand the big picture with only part of the information. Conversely as we saw with the Halfway proposals it was all set out and easy to understand.



TWO WORLDS
CONSULTING

info@twoworldsconsulting.com

 (250) 900-6602

www.twoworldsconsulting.com