

NORTHEAST ROUNDTABLE MEETING NOTES

Date: May 5th, 2021
Time: 9:00 AM – 12 PM
Location: Virtual MS Teams

Meeting Reference Materials Available Online at [NE Roundtable website](#):

- Petroleum and Natural Gas Legacy Sites Restoration Program
- Resource Stewardship Team Update
- Land and Resource Management Plan Update Presentation

Welcome, Agenda, Minutes

- Jason Lawson as facilitator welcomed, territorial acknowledgement, and MS Teams info
- No requested revisions to the agenda; no comments on previous meeting notes
- Materials provided on website for review by roundtable members

1. Northeast Roundtable Participant Introductions

Attendees:

FLNRORD:

- Jason Lawson
- Shayla Blue
- Katherine Buckingham
- Angela White
- Sanjay Tewari
- Carmela Arevalo
- Naomi Saukila
- Aviva Jones
- Katie Connah
- Ian Curtis

Other Government:

- Tara Forest (MIRR)
- Sue Campbell
- Kai Elmauer
- Chris Pazstor

Municipal:

- Carol Newsom (District of Chetwynd)
- Dan Rose (PRRD)

First Nations:

- Jim Webb (WMFN)
- Clarence Apsassin (BRFN member)

Stakeholders (Industry, Environment, Recreation, Public):

- Andy Ackerman (NE Stakeholders - ackerman@telus.net)
- Gerry Paille (BC Wildlife)
- Barry Holland
- Mike Whalley
- Andrew Tyrrell (Canfor)
- Don Rosen (Canfor)
- Jim Little (NE Stakeholders)
- Tanya Goertzen (Shell Canada)
- Darryl Kroeker (Fort St. John Trappers Association – dkroeker@pris.ca)
- Stephanie Killam (Muskwa Kechika Advisory Board)
- Kathleen Connolly (Concerned Citizens for Caribou Recovery and Dawson Creek Chamber of Commerce)
- Wade Pruett
- Wayne Sawchuk
- Derry Sorgen (Louisiana Pacific)
- Josh Hamilton
- Cheryl
- Helen Gilbert
- Tim Burkhart
- Jennifer Blaney (Ovintiv)
- Moira Green
- Krista Phillips
- Kim Cimini (Blackbird Environmental)

2. Follow up on Quarries

- Jason Lawson delivered an update on both limestone and frac sand quarries in the NE Region as requested in the March NE Roundtable meeting.
- Homegold Resources submitted the original application – NOW and Mining leases were issues summer of 2020, LOO issued in November 2020, and OLTC followed.

- Assigned in Feb 2021 to Sukunka Lime Resources Ltd
- Question: How close is this to the actual Hole in the Wall formation? Was this part of CRC review? Has it been approved by Nations?
 - Answer: About 1 km from Hole in the Wall Park, less than 1 km from the feature. **Jason to follow up about CRC review and Nations' approval – has this been addressed with Jim Webb's response?**
- Question: Was this part of CRC review? Has it been approved by Nations?
 - Jim Webb – The proposals are not within critical caribou habitat as defined by the Province. They have not been reviewed by CRC.
 - Follow up: Confirmed application was not within the zones defined in the Caribou Partnership Agreement and as a result wasn't not referred to the CRC. First Nations consultation was completed on this application.
- Question: Has Groundwater and Geotech analysis been completed for the project and is it available?
 - Answer: Yes, Geotech work was completed as part of the application for Ministry of Energy, Mines, Low Carbon Initiatives (MEMLCI) and FLNRORD approvals. Information provided indicates there is no connection to the actual Hole in the Wall site. Homegold Resources Ltd state the area is a localized Karst System with separate parallel faults. Hole-in-the-Wall is a separate drainage basin than the mine site.
 - Management Plan can be viewed @ [Applications, Comments & Reasons for Decision \(gov.bc.ca\)](#)
 - **Action: follow up with more detailed information and availability.**
- Comment: This area has a lot of grizzlies. This quarry project seems to have lots of visual disturbance; there is a need to be cautious of continued activity in this area.
- Frac sand quarrying – Application for Investigative Licence to continue investigative program submitted in Sept 2020, consultation and referrals initiated shortly after. Groundbirch Livestock Association submitted comments, proponent instructed to contact them. Application currently on hold so that concerns can be addressed.
- Question: Would there be an expected start date for investigative work to begin? Cumulative impacts concern as CGL is currently on that piece of land – Has there been consideration of dust, traffic in the area?
 - Answer: The proponent would not be allowed to start investigative works until an approval is issued. Other activities in the area would be considered in the review of the application.
- Question: Have any comments come in regarding traffic in the area (Braden Road)?
 - Answer: Details around access will be part of a Management Plan that is required for the application.
 - [Applications, Comments & Reasons for Decision \(gov.bc.ca\) / https://comment.nrs.gov.bc.ca/applications#splash](https://comment.nrs.gov.bc.ca/applications#splash)

3. Petroleum and Natural Gas Legacy Sites Restoration Program

- Chris Pasztor presented on launch of new Petroleum and Natural Gas Legacy Sites Restoration Program. Presentation uploaded to [NE Roundtable website](#).
- Question: Funding – Is there funding from individual oil and gas companies who constructed the seismic lines, etc.? Did they have to provide bonds to fund restoration?
 - Answer – Historically: No, this has not been a historic requirement. Currently: Yes, companies are required to have bonds for restoration works.
- Comment: Might be a better plan to work in previously disturbed areas if activities need to occur in the future. By securing the site after restoration it might drive disturbance elsewhere. May be better to disturb a recently restored site than to disturb an older, more established area.
 - Response: We will take this into consideration.
- Question: Who is the Principle for Blackbird Environmental?
 - Answer: Matthias
- Question: Will this be funded by HCTF fees? Will there be more funds going to HCTF?
 - Answer: This project is focusing on legacy oil and gas sites. Eventually maybe could co-fund a project with HCTF. This program has a separate funding stream. Could complement HCTF projects/funding.
- Comment: Consideration for impacts to current access

4. MIRR Treaty Land Entitlement Update

- Tara Forest provided an update on TLE negotiations.
- Today's update is not specific to any of the land transfer parcels. Would like to revisit last meeting's presentation and a request to follow up on what has been heard during engagement. The MIRR team is working to pull together information and report out about what has been heard from stakeholders (public). Tenure holders are a separate piece. We are looking to bring that information forward in next couple of months, possibly by June. Any report will be posted on the Gov Together website.
- Question: SFN parcels: Has the most current parcel information been shared?
 - Answer: Renee updated at a previous NE Roundtable meeting and has also posted materials on the Gov Together website.
- Question: Are there any updates on changes to land quantity or parcels?
 - Answer: Working towards agreed quantum, may be some adjustments along the way.
- Question: Prefer having another public session about each of the First Nations land packages so people have full understanding of what is going on. This can offer an opportunity for discussion. Preferable to looking on website – doesn't generate discussion.
 - Answer: Thank you for sharing the interest for specific TLE package sessions, will take this request back to the team and come back to NE roundtable to determine next steps.
- Question: Concern for Hole in the Wall site – Under the impression that SFN had indicated interest in a selection at Hole in the Wall.
 - Jim Webb: WMFN and SFN have both selected parcels in that area.
 - Follow up: Cumulative impacts concern – Hole in the Wall is a significant place for people in the NE – concern that there is no clarity on what is happening in that area.

- Answer: Will take that away and come back with some further information.
- Question: When will MIRR will be coming back with the update on the lands package / when will there be an update on BRFN's selections? There are still concerns within that First Nations on parcel selections:
 - Answer: Working on this in the background together with putting together what we've heard. Don't have an update today, but hopefully in the next couple of months.
- Comment: BRFN member: BRFN has not had a band meeting yet to discuss land selection and TLE process. Do not support moving forward until band members have been involved. BRFN needs to work on governance system before votes are to take place. Government needs to come to Blueberry to discuss areas of significance to BRFN members.
- Question: Are there any set time frames for TLE completion? Public concern is that this will be rushed to completion.
 - Answer: Settling the historic, outstanding Treaty Land Entitlement commitment is very important for the relationship between Treaty 8 First Nations, the Province and Canada and to fulfill obligations. We are working to move ahead as quickly as possible with complex land transfer work. Although we do not have a specific time frame to share just now, we are moving towards finalization as quickly as possible.

5. Resource Stewardship Team Update

- Aviva Jones provided a presentation on Ecosystem Restoration. Presentation uploaded to this link on the [NE Roundtable website](#).
- Comment: There is ecosystem work in the Kootenays, Okanagan, and Skeena and other parts of the province.
- Comment: When processes and maps are developed, they need to be simple and clear. When processes are too complicated, they are doomed to failure.
- Comment: WMFN - Strong connections between Together for Wildlife (T4W) and RSEA, Caribou Recovery efforts. Principles are grounded in an acceptable limit of change. Peaceful enjoyment of Treaty Rights to practice way of life is being disrupted. First Nations Wildlife Forum working with T4W at a provincial level. WMFN and SFN participate in forums at regional level and provincial level.
- Comment: The Minister's Wildlife Advisory Council is about 50% First Nations.
- Question: Who is the T4W lead in the NE?
 - Answer: Elissa

6. Fort St John Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) Update

- Ian Curtis and Shayla Blue provided an update about the Land and Resource Management Plan Update project. LRMP presentation uploaded to this link on the [NE Roundtable website](#).
- Question: Two Worlds Consulting – Are they local?
 - Answer: Based in Victoria with local experience such as previously facilitating the NE Roundtable.
- Question: Why using south based consulting company to make decisions around land use planning in the NE?

- Answer: The competition was run through the BCBid and opened to the entire Province. Two Worlds Consulting had the strongest proposal submitted in the procurement process. Although the company is based in Victoria, there are members on their team who have experience in the NE such as supporting the development of a Terms of Reference for the NE roundtable.
- Comment: Companies should be coming out of areas that they are doing the work in to represent residents of the region. This is an ongoing concern.
- Question: Timelines for release of Draft Terms of Reference for LRMP update?
 - Answer: Planning on having it available by end of May or early June.
- Comment: Important for reconciliation when we look at LRMP and T4W – lots of reliance on FLNRORD, consultation comes back out to stakeholders, etc. when comments are requested. Need to look at regional basis, need to give back to the region, balance impacts on the land base.
 - Response: The LRMP update should seek to bring balance and unify communities around shared interests and increased understanding.
- Comment: Importance of inclusion, getting people involved. Who gets to vote on this? Who gets the final say and who is involved in consensus decision-making?
 - Answer: The LRMP update will apply government-to-government consensus-seeking between Province and First Nations that is informed by stakeholders, local governments, and the public. The Province is partnering with First Nations governments as a form of proactive, deep consultation to better understand and avoid adverse impacts of resource use on Treaty Rights that are protected under constitution.
 - Follow up comment: Would like to remind Province that their role is to represent everyone. Need to ensure that a large number of people feel like they haven't been ignored or not engaged.
 - Comment: It will be absolutely key for this project to reach a consensus with all stakeholders, not just the Partners. Limiting consensus to the "Partners" only will create a plan flawed at root.
- Comment: WMFN: This process reflects the emerging partnership b/w FNs and provincial government. The LRMP decision will be a partnership b/w First Nations and Province. Local gov and stakeholders will have opportunity for input, but the Government to Government table is where decisions are made.
- Comment: There are two kinds of reconciliation – reconciliation by locals (residents, stakeholders) and Government to Government. The Northeast Region is relatively new to development and impacts of colonial history are still being felt in this region. Diversity overall (regional scale) should be the key objective of the LRMP, not pockets of diversity.
 - Response: Ecosystem based management is a key piece of the LRMP and seeks to improve ecological integrity at the regional scale as a foundation for human wellbeing.
- Comment: Who gets the final say? There is concern that we are being represented by Provincial Government and that government is more representative of Lower Mainland and Vancouver Island residents. Would like to have local votes cast to represent local residents.

7. Other Business/Suggested Topics

- Future meetings dates: **June 23**
- Request for update on government reorganization (potential FLNRORD reorg) and potential schedule moving forward.
- Who represents the Ministries in the NE?
- Road decommissioning - What are the government's future plans in the NE?

8. Next Meeting

- Next meeting: **June 23, 2021**