

**Southern Rocky Mountain Advisory Committee  
Meeting #5 Minutes  
February 9, 2005, 4:00 – 9:00 pm  
Senior's Drop-In Centre, Sparwood BC**

**Committee Attendance:**

Pam Cowtan, MSRM (Chair)	Ken Streloff, Tembec
Sangita Sudan, MSRM	Kent Petovello, Recreational Hunting
Bob Jamieson, MSRM	Mike Sosnowski, Motorized Commercial
Kelly Lode, (Recorder)	Pat Gilmar, Non-motorized Winter Rec
Dave Grieve, MEM	Roger Berdusco, Elk Valley Coal
Al Pollard, BCTS	Ross Stanfield, Exploration/Mining
Bill Hanlon, Wildlands	Bev Bellina, Dist. of Sparwood
Craig Robinson, Dist. of Elkford	Casey Brennan, Ecosystems (Alt)
Gordon Galloway, Summer Motorized	Doug Dean, Motorized Winter Rec (Alt)
Jim Lant, Heritage	Ray Myles, RDEK
Jim Thorner, MOT Winter Rec	Rex Holley, EKRLUC (Alt)
John Bergenske, Ecosystems	John Birrell, Front Country Tourism
Harry Leuenberger, Guide Outfitters (Alt)	Randal McNair, City of Fernie
Paul Kramer, Chamber of Commerce	Kevin Podrasky, Recreational Hunting (Alt)

**Members of the Public:**

Anna Fontana, (Observer)	Dave Thomas, (Observer)
--------------------------	-------------------------

.....  
**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Pam introduced Bob Jamieson as MSRM's new planner. Bob is working on the implementation strategy, particularly the recreation chapter, for the SRMMP. Introductions were made around the table. It was noted that Min. of Energy and Mines will have a representative (Dave Grieve) attending meetings.

Additions to agenda:

Mike Sosnowski: road access and maintenance (e.g. roads being ploughed without public and tenure holders being notified). Discussion under Item 5.

Rex Holley: addition of an objective to the Recreation chapter that deals with motorized game retrieval. Added as item 4(h).

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes Oct 7, 2004**

It was noted that the minutes from this meeting did not capture all the discussion around the District of Elkford proposal. Concerns were brought up and discussed under agenda item 3 d).

Minutes approved.

**3. Business arising out of Oct 7, 2004 meeting:**

**a) Interim Areas Working Group – report from last meeting (Bob Jamieson)**

Copies of minutes from the November Interim Areas Working Group were distributed to the SRMAC members. Sangita pointed out that several new roads are now shown within the purple zones on the snowfree brochure map. These were agreed to by the working group, and based on WLAP recommendations. Several areas within these zones need to be discussed and

agreed to by the SRMAC before they can be incorporated into the next addition of the brochure and into the new edition of SRMMP map.

Bob J summarized the minutes from the November meeting with the working group. Casey expressed concerns about Storm Creek road and recommended that it be rehabilitated. He also recommended closure on Upper Howell creek road (zone 10), identified by another biologist as a contentious ungulate migration route. No disagreement was expressed on these recommendations.

On the brochure map John B pointed out that within both the RA1 and RA2 zones, the black roads are motorized and use is restricted to hard surfaces only. In the RA1 zones, all roads are non-motorized except those shown in black.

#### **b) Signs and Brochure Working Group – (Sangita Sudan)**

Samples of the final version of the brochure map, signs and decals were displayed. The decals will be used on signs where a road designation is for specific times, as shown on the brochure maps. Sangita reviewed the process for how signs are to be distributed and posted. Anyone posting signs must have a GPS unit to record the UTM's for where the sign is located.

Spreadsheets are available through the working group and Sangita, to record who has signs, how many and where they are placed. The UTM's will then be plotted on a SRMMP map.

Some suggestions on where to post signs are at a road junction or at a point where the road designation changes. To pick up signs, contact Kevin Podrasky in Sparwood, Pat Gilmar and Jim Thorner in Fernie and Douglas Dean in Elkford.

In order to keep track of brochure distribution Sangita would like everyone taking brochures to record this on the sheets provided. Clubs can participate in distributing the brochures. If BC clubs have contact with Alberta clubs then they should pass them on. We need to ensure these maps get out to all backcountry users.

**Action: SRMAC to please flag any errors noted on the brochure map and report them to Sangita.** These will be changed for the next edition.

The website ([www.srmmp.com](http://www.srmmp.com)) is running. A PDF version of the brochure maps will be posted on the website. Pam and Sangita thanked the working group for all their hard work on this project.

The next step is to develop external communications with media to inform the public of the signs and brochures. Some have suggested Snow West magazine and Kooacanusa Publishing as an avenue to place an information story. It was also suggested that clubs/individuals place the information on their own websites.

Apparently there is still some old CAMP signage in the Flathead that needs to be removed. Pat G spoke with Glenn Campbell from the Parks branch about placing non-motorized signs on roads that lead into the park. Signs will need to be placed in a number of areas along park boundaries within the SRMMP area. Glenn did not seem to think this would be a problem as long as the signs have the government logo on them.

Rocky Ridge needs more discussion. The RMS West table is asking for changes to motorized use in the Galton Range. It was pointed out that the West table should not be making recommendations for the entire Galton Range. Many felt the East side recreation users should be consulted with on these matters including AMAs. Rex stated that there was only one road in the Wigwam Flats that the West table suggested "no mountain bikes". Pat said that most of the activity in this area occurs during the one month that they are suggesting it should be closed. The wildlife branch suggested this closure due to lambing season. The SRMAC needs to be informed of these decisions.

**c) Recreation Chapter-implementation, monitoring and enforcement strategy (Bob Jamieson)**

Bob J explained that to date provincially, there are 3 plans that are ready for an implementation, monitoring and enforcement strategy. These are in Valemout, Golden and the Elk Valley. The Golden advisory committee has opted to not legalize any part of the plan and implement only through voluntary compliance. The Valemout agreement separates snowmobile/heli-ski areas and has approximately 1/3 non-motorized due to caribou issues.

There has been discussion around licensing of ATVs and snowmobiles but this is unlikely to happen until after the provincial election in May.

Bob J said the SRMMP needs an education strategy. The RMS West Recreation Planning group had the idea to put out a brochure that looks similar to the hunting and fishing regulations. We need a longer-term strategy that presents the plan in a positive manner, e.g. "Here's where you can go" instead of stating where you can't and by implementing a compliance strategy of observe, record and report. One of the major issues is to find what legal tools are best for making this plan happen on the ground. The *Land Act* is not a very good tool even though it has been used in the past. There is no penalty section in the *Land Act*. *Controlled Recreation Area* is aimed at managing tenured areas only. This is probably not the best legislation. Valemout has used the *Wildlife Act* (AMA's) where areas of concern are primary Caribou habitat. *Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA)* can designate road closures. Both Acts have penalties attached to them. Bob thinks a mix of these two would work best. It would be cooperative enforcement between MOF and the CO Service. Bob made the suggestion that we initiate work on enforcement in the Flathead area first with education, legalization, compliance and enforcement. Not all were in favour of that suggestion. Some feel there is not enough government staff to enforce. Bob said that Bill Bennett has fought for more bodies to help enforce this plan. Some options for compliance and enforcement are: voluntary compliance, Forest Service driven approach, Wildlife branch/WLAP driven approach and a cooperative inter-agency approach. There will be costs for equipment for CO's, brochures, etc. Need community involvement to help with funding.

Jim L says the committee can make it work; they want to see a critical path of implementation. Bob J says that is his task.

The majority of the table would prefer to see the entire plan legislated at one time. Pam pointed out that the downside to that would be that the entire map needs detail work to be done and metes and bounds descriptions need to be written in order to make it legal. The Flathead/Wigwam area is easy to describe and the rest of the area can be worked on while they are legislated and enforced. Pam feels it would be beneficial to move forward first with something that can be done in the short term while the rest of the chapter is being worked on. Bob's guess is that it will be post-election before anything is legislated. It was suggested that government put together a total implementation package instead of having it discussed at this table. Government needs to do the planning. Concerns were noted that in the past this dragged out, and it seems like we are still at the same point.

John B suggests that methodology is needed for describing the alpine. It was suggested a working group be set up and empowered with developing methodology.

Kent P suggested moving the implementation strategy forward by making all the pink zones AMAs.

Bob J suggested that the pink zones on summer map be legislated under the *Wildlife Act*, while the yellow zones under FRPA. We need a commitment to enforce those caught with penalties, and be charged in court if necessary.

Randall suggested that if legislation was to occur in phases, the table should decide on which areas should be completed first. Perhaps set up a working group to work on issues and make recommendations (i.e., non-motorized areas first; Flathead, Elkford, Fernie, Sparwood).

**Action: It was agreed that a working group be set up and that it be made up of a diverse group that is confident with making informed decisions.** It would be beneficial for this group to have a CO present for the discussion. It was also suggested that anyone who wants to participate in this working group should let Bob J know.

One stakeholder was told that WLAP and MOF could not enforce without *Land Act* designation. Bob J is not aware of this.

It was asked if there could be some sort of cross border permitting for recreationists, similar to non-resident hunting and fishing permits. This could aid in the cost of implementing the plan.

#### **d) District of Elkford Proposal - (Pam Cowtan)**

Public comment period ended Nov 12<sup>th</sup>. Comments received were split fairly evenly, for and against the proposal. The information has been sent to Victoria and we are waiting for a response from Minister Abbott and Minister Barisoff.

At the last meeting some felt there was consensus in favour of what WLAP had proposed. There were very few negative comments after the presentation was made. However John B recalls that after WLAP gave their recommendations, it was asked if the table supported these and there were no objections raised.

Mike disagreed with John and said he spoke up in favour of Elkford's proposal. It was suggested that in the future there should be a vote for contentious issues. An alternative non-voting approach would be for the chair to expressly ask each person at the table if they are in agreement to ensure there was complete consensus on the proposal.

Bill H reminded everyone that the committee wanted science based decisions and asked for WLAP's opinion. Once it was provided some still did not support it. He feels this issue is the only one outstanding in this process. The proponent was provided with the opportunity to bring this proposal to SRMAC and when requested by the District, an extension of timeline was granted. They then proceeded to circulate a petition outside of this process. Our process is to provide advice to government. It was clear that SRMAC supported WLAP's advice. Whose decision is it and what recommendations were put forward to the Ministers? Was the petition included?

Pam advised that the following information went forward to the Ministers for their decision: public review comments, WLAP report, petition and minutes from SRMAC. The SRMAC's recommendations are only one piece of the information. Options are put forward to Victoria, along with staff recommendations. Decision note recommendations were also put forward, however these are internal and confidential. It was pointed out that the SRMAC can only advise on the area within the plan while those areas outside the plan may be discussed at the option of the Committee.

Stan Hagen as Minister of SRM, had promised he would consider motorized recreation opportunities for the Elkford area. The North Elk AMA is one large piece and a small part of it falls within the plan area. Some feel that there are those who have gone outside the process and it has become political. It was pointed out that there was strong SRMAC support for the WLAP recommendations i.e. summer opening of the Weigert Creek lookout access road, and that this was not adequately reflected in the previous minutes. Many feel that the proposal will negatively affect wildlife habitat in the Elk Valley. Coal companies were approached to see if they were on-board with the proposal. Roger said they were not opposed, as it was compatible with Elk Valley Coal operations. He mentioned some of the proposal areas covered their coal licences in Aldridge Creek area and Burnt Ridge. However they would find ways to work with those proposed areas. Bill H pointed out that Burnt Ridge was an exception and questioned why Elk Valley Coal did not support the Trans Canada Trail.

Anna asked, "If government says no to this proposal, will this be the end of it or will the person/people keep bringing it forward until they get their way?" The SRMAC was set up to provide recommendations on the plan area. Groups or individuals can approach the SRMAC to discuss changes to the plan. Some of the proposal is outside the plan area but the Committee chose to discuss this area and asked WLAP for their recommendation. Anna suggested there should be timeframes for review.

Anna also mentioned that LU 21 & 22 need to be brought back into this process. Pam pointed out that the SRMAC could not agree on expanding the plan area. She reminded the committee that an option was to bring in these LUs by chapter. OGMAs and UWR are ready to be added. The East Elk and West Bull recreation chapters can also be added. Bill H said that according to Steve Flett and Gord McAdams the recreation planning for these LU's has been done. Mike felt that there are outstanding issues on the recreation part and to bring that portion in would require looking at maps and comments that came out of the RMS process.

Roger sees merit to having these landscape units included. There were a lot of unknowns at the beginning and he felt it would complicate the process more by expanding the plan area. Things have changed and progress has been made so we should consider expanding. There was reference made to Al Pollard's letter from last year – how can you manage the plan area without including entire drainages? There seems to be a sense that most of the committee would like to see the East Elk and West Bull included in the SRMMP. Bill feels that WLAP AMAs should remain non-negotiable. Galloway Lumber has also expressed concerns about plan expansion. Roger suggested that the coal industry wants to see how the implementation plan for the SRMMP is developed before supporting an expansion plan. One of the table members recalled the Minister saying there wouldn't be any expansion and that he wanted to see the plan work for a while before expanding. **Action: Pam will get clarification.**

It was suggested that everyone go back to their sector and see if they support expansion or if they just want the Recreation chapter expanded **Action: SRMAC members will consult with their sector and report back at the next meeting respecting plan expansion.**

#### **e) Wigwam Access**

Neil Shuttleworth (MOF) has sent a letter to the Guide Outfitter (GO) in the area, which has not been signed off as yet. A copy of the letter can be sent out to table members if requested. The letter states the Wigwam road can only be used for emergencies to supply the camp for a two-week period in August each year. The issue will be resolved once the letter has been signed. **An E-mail will be sent out to the committee when the letter is signed.**

WLAP contacted Kent about a trapper in the area, who has caused some concern. The trapper would like to build cabins and use the west side of the road for motorized travel. **Staff will talk to WLAP and put this issue on the Agenda for next meeting.**

Neil Caldwell has applied for tenure for guide fishing, snowshoeing, etc. Will this letter apply to those tenure activities as well? **MSRM will follow up.**

#### **4. New Business**

##### **a) Old Growth Management Areas – (Al Pollard)**

Al provided copies of 2 new proposals totalling 3 hectares of OGMA (south of Elkford). Maps and letters are available from Al. There were two new OGMA's identified last year and they offset the 3 hectares they are logging this year. The nearest drainage is Weigert Creek. Most of the pine will come out and spruce will be left. Roger is not opposed but does ask small business to notify all tenure holders in the area so they can make adjustments as necessary.

There are areas with major infestation where the pine beetle is simply running out of food. Populations are rising in the Rocky Mountain trench. Models show pine beetle will increase by 2008.

Ken S informed the table that Tembec is keeping track of minor changes to OGMA's. They let MSRM staff know of changes, consistent with plan direction. John B assumed OGMA budgets are being balanced.

Bev B reported on a conference she attended where pine beetle infestation was discussed. She said that the spread of infestation is a huge concern and has reached epidemic scale, "We are not getting the cold snaps we need." Ken S pointed out that the provincial bark beetle strategy is very aggressive in central BC while in the East Kootenay they are implementing suppression strategies. The disease is not likely to spread to other tree species although has been known to attack balsam but not on a sustained basis.

##### **b) Ungulate Winter Range Guidelines (Bob Jamieson)**

New UWR Guidelines have been developed by an inter-ministry working group, in partnership with the major forest companies over the last four years. This is basically a refinement of the ungulate winter range guidelines developed as part of the Southern Rockies Plan. Bob J discussed the implications of these new guidelines. There are significant changes that will affect stand densities in open range, open forest and managed forest dry types. However these landscape types are not extensive in the Elk and Flathead drainages. (Open range and open forest do occur on the Wigwam Flats but are on private conservation lands and thus were not considered in this plan). In the wet, mesic, transitional and dry managed forest types, no more than 33% of each landscape unit will be less than 20 years old, at any one time. This will allow for the maintenance of early seral over the entire forest rotation. In addition, 10-30% of forests in each LU will be left in older age stands to provide cover, especially in the wetter systems. There is also a 50m buffer with no harvesting around avalanche paths. These guidelines will give direction to foresters and other managers.

The guidelines have been signed and made law as a Section 7 notice under FRPA. Several questions were asked.

*What effect does this have on allowable cut?* Bob estimated 1 or 2 %.

Ken Stroloff of Tembec said that he felt it is a great improvement for managing true winter habitat. There is true science behind what has been identified.

*Does this affect recreational access?* No, it is just guidance for foresters.

Ken Stroloff asked if private land was affected. Private land and protected areas are excluded from the calculation of targets.

Jim Lant asked: *Will this affect mining exploration, etc?* No. There is a specific section saying that mining and oil and gas activities are not affected by the guidelines.

John B. indicated that the biggest issues were in the trench around previous stocking standards that limit habitat.

*What impact does it have on the higher elevation?* Minimal, since this only affects commercial forests.

*Where did the linework come from?* The mapping is based on BEC units, using various “algorithms” or computer formulas to define potential winter range.

*Were the previous studies used to help define the UWR guidelines?* Yes. And there is more work being done. The work was done as a Forest Inventory Account contract and information is in the appendix of SRMMP plan (Appendix # 8). There has been valuable information gained in the past that should not be wasted, we should use it, especially for work done in the east Elk area by the coal companies and their consultants, dating back to the 1970’s.

Bob J directed that the endorsement of the committee is required so that we can bring the UWR guidelines into the plan and amend the SRMMP (Chapter B.9.6 & Appendix 8). Some members would like to look at the information before endorsing it.

**Action: Further information will be sent to table members.**

### **c) Mineral exploration – Bingay Creek and Lodgepole (Dave Grieve)**

#### **Bingay Creek**

The status of exploration for coal in this area was reported. Dave indicated that Hillsborough Resources has applied for a small mine permit. Slides were shown to provide information on the 2004 exploration permit in this area, maps of the proposed site, the drilling program and a cross section showing the coal seams. The company drilled 4 sites from existing access trails. A total of 1300 meters drilled between 6 holes. The project is located between the Elk River Forest Service Road and the Elk River. The Bingay Creek project is a much smaller project than the Lodgepole project.

Steve Gardner, Hillsborough, phone number – 250-286-3224 ext 235.

**Action: Dave will send out the website location.**

Questions:

*What about processing the coal?* There will be a small plant on the west side of the road.

*Referrals* – Tembec should be on the referral list.

*When is the comment period ending?* –It was advertised this week and it is a 30 day process from when advertised.

*If this started June 9, 2004 why is it the first we’ve heard of this project?* An email should have been sent to all of us. Dave: this table was asked if they wanted to be a sounding board for such projects and the table said no. Consultation is now taking place on a small mine permit application. He notes that it is appropriate that an application at this stage be presented to the table at this point in time.

Casey requested that Dave’s presentation be emailed to all those interested. He would like to see MEM sharing more information with members through email about proposals. He would appreciate it if this level of detail could be brought forward to this table.

Dave G points out that exploration usually does not go anywhere. If we bring every notice of work to the committee’s attention it would be very cumbersome. SRMAC had agreed that they did not want all that information unless there was something that was very significant. Input

from SRMAC is helpful but the plan says that in areas that are outside of protected areas, regulatory and permitting processes under the *Mines Act* will decide activity.

Al Pollard asked could the SRMAC be added to the referral list. Dave can recommend it to the proponents to contact the SRMAC on their own. He noted that most drilling projects don't produce mines and we should look at it only if it comes to the mine proposal phase. We wouldn't want to hear about every project prior to development.

*Is this a foot in the door if the project were to grow to a larger size?* No, there are many environmental impact studies to go through.

### **Lodgepole/Foisey Creek Exploration Program**

Dave Grieve indicated that there are 2 coal licences held for the area that have been in place for several years. Access to the property is up north Lodgepole Creek and over the mountain east of Foisey Creek in the Upper Flathead drainage. A total of 51 drill holes and two adits have been approved.

Questions:

*Somebody saw a copy of the permit that said 2,067 tonnes of material would be removed.* The actual sample size of coal for testing is 30 tonnes. Dave does not know where this 2,067 number comes from but will check.

Kent P. *What is the timeline to deactivate road if the project is not feasible?* The permit is usually for the year.

Mike S. *The access road is a sheet of ice. As a winter tourism user of the road, would you put a condition on the permit that the permit holder must maintain safe road access? Mike can't use the road for his business this winter. Public safety is also an issue. There is no consideration for safety, they should maintain road with a sand truck. If they plough the road they have to keep it to a standard that is safe to the public.* Pam let Mike know that his concerns were forwarded to MOF when he brought up similar issues before, she will bring it up again. Mike felt that people impacted by mine/mineral exploration should have the ability to comment on proposals. MEM will write a letter to Cline mining saying they are not happy with them for not following their recommendation to contact the GO. LWBC does not want to be on the referral list therefore the tenure holder is not informed of the impact.

John B suggested that the process is flawed when tenure holders and public recreationists are not informed and their concerns not addressed. Referrals for Cranbrook District should be forwarded to this table and public. Dave G said that it is unlikely that public input will be asked for every permit that comes through MEM. Every small project cannot be sent out for referral. John B says that in this case public access is being changed in the project area and that is different than smaller projects. It was noted that most mineral exploration takes place in the summer.

Randall pointed out, as tourism, mining and forestry sectors evolve, and we are trying to extract more and more wealth from the same landscape. These changes to our landscape will require adaptation by MEM and other ministries and sectors. Consultation processes will have to change in order to allow us to get more value out of all of our resources in the Elk and Flathead valleys. Mike S says that tenure holders need to be given notice. To MEM these activities may not seem important, but to tenure holders it does. That is why it is significant that these come to the SRMAC. A mass email could go out. Dave G responded that there are too many small mineral exploration projects. He is not sure that everyone would want to be notified for all of these. Rex pointed out that this coal interest should have had dialogue with Tembec.

Discussions will continue at the next meeting to which Steve Gardner of Hillsborough, and Gord Gormley of Cline were invited. Casey wanted it noted that the discussion was cut off. He asked that the tables (table 1 and 2) provided by Dave G in the presentation be included in the minutes and sent out for discussion before the next meeting.



	Recreation Development Proposals	approved which are supported by this plan. LWBC will recommend that proponents consult with the SRMAC where their proposals are not supported by the plan			<b>with LWBC</b>
	Review Recreation Development Proposals	At the discretion of the SRMAC, assess public and commercial recreation proposals which do not comply with the plan	Mod.	SRMAC and MSRM	<b>Ongoing (example: heli-skiing proposals)</b>
	Establish Priority Areas for Operational Control (of recreational use)	Identify and recommend priority areas requiring immediate signing requirements	High	SRMAC and Government Agencies	<b>Done by signs and brochures working group</b>
	Develop Sign Standards	Design sign standards to establish consistency in sign appearance	High	SRMAC and Government Agencies	<b>Done</b>
	Access Management	Install signage in priority areas and conduct access control operations in priority areas	High	SRMAC and Government Agencies	<b>Signage being installed</b>
		Ensure that forest licensee deactivation of access roads should, where feasible, is conducted to facilitate the type of road access desired in the plan	High	Forest Service	<b>Ongoing</b>
	Interim designation	Review and assess individual roads in the Interim Motorized area (Map B.7.1.1- Recreation Access Snowfree), and determine specific designations	High	SRMAC and Government Agencies	<b>Complete, except McDermit Creek</b>
		Ensure that forest licensee deactivation of access roads, where feasible, is conducted to facilitate the type of road access desired in the plan	High	MOF	<b>Ongoing</b>
		Review existing legislation and identify appropriate or potential regulation to implement recreation access zoning	High	SRMAC and MSRM	<b>First stage complete.</b>
		Initiate / maintain legislative or other closures to areas which are supported by this plan for wildlife reasons	High	WLAP	<b>Discussions initiated</b>
		Initiate / maintain legislative or other closures to areas which are supported by this plan for non-wildlife reasons		MSRM	<b>Discussions initiated</b>
Riparian	Enhanced riparian zone mapping	Complete mapping for Bull, Elk and Wigwam rivers.	High	MSRM or forest licensees	<b>Completed for Flathead.</b>
Biodiversity	Refinement of OGMA and Mature seral spatial locations	Adjustment, where required, of OGMA and mature seral spatial polygons to better manage for these and other values (e.g. to ameliorate isolation of timber).	High	SRMAC and MSRM	<b>Ongoing</b>
	Operational Plan Compliance	Ensure that forest licensees have provision in their harvest plans to comply with applicable plan old growth, riparian, visual and other guidelines	High	MOF	<b>Ongoing</b>
Working Forest and	Review ERDZ-T areas in the	Apply Working Forest policy and regulations to the SRMMP area and use	High	SRMAC and MSRM	

ERDZ-T	context of Working Forest	to review/revise/refine ERDZ-T areas and concomitant objectives			
Various		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct sensitivity and cumulative impact assessment analysis initiatives</li> </ul>		Responsibility needs to be assigned	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase habitat effectiveness and the opportunity for genetic dispersal, seasonal and daily movement, foraging and reproduction of wildlife species (Appendix 24.0) at the landscape and stand level</li> </ul>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop benchmarks for habitat effectiveness and proper functioning condition for WRC, Ungulates, ID wildlife, fish</li> </ul>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake projects to assess environmental and social carrying capacity, environmental sensitivity and compatibility analysis and cumulative impact assessments</li> </ul>			<b>Original carrying capacity paper completed in 02, further work required.</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the results of Water Use Plans, when completed, for the Aberfeldie and Elk River dams</li> </ul>			<b>Plan referred to by BC Hydro</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish measures and procedures to protect and maintain those habitats and species at risk which are not officially approved</li> </ul>			<b>Working group work on interim areas re: Tailed Frog habitat</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional detailed work may be required beyond these objectives to address specific issues, including indicators and standards of acceptable change</li> </ul>			
<b>Tourism</b>	Planning	Develop a tourism opportunity strategy to define the specific new products that can be supported and are compatible with the strategic direction of the SRMMP			<b>Completed in 2002.</b>

**e) Heli-skiing proposal (Bob Jamieson)**

Bob J informed the group that a Proponent from Utah is interested in setting up a heli-ski operation out of Fernie in LU 24, 25 & 26. The direction in the SRMMP provides opportunity to look for specific heli landing sites.

Kent recalls the table agreed to only 3 sites identified with the help of Pat G. Pat G suggested that the wording in the plan needs to be amended, and made more explicit to reflect stakeholder recommendations. All were in favour of doing this. Bob will work with Pat, Kent, John and

Randall to come up with new wording that will be sent out to table. **Action: The proponent will be so advised.**

**f) Status of Flathead park proposal (C. Brennan)**

This agenda item was requested at the previous meeting by Kent P and Casey. Kent P advised that the item be dropped as there was confusion as to where the request for information came from. This item can be addressed at the June meeting if deemed necessary by the SRMAC committee members.

**g) Elk River Angling Management Plan**

WLAP's Quality Waters Strategy is in the final stages. The purpose is to manage fishing on the Elk, St. Mary, Wigwam, Bull, Skookumchuck, White and Upper Kootenay rivers. The Classified Waters Strategy has been used on the coast. 5000 fishing days will be allocated to the guided fishing sector. There will be additional fees for fishing these rivers - \$15/year for residents, \$20/day for non-residents per river. The money collected will be managed by the Habitat Conservation Trust Fund. Provincial and regional teams are being developed to decide how that money will be spent. One idea is to use the money towards better enforcement (river guardians). Alberta guides have the right to apply to guide here, Americans do not. The Wigwam River is a special case because of US fishing use. There are implications on how we can manage access. Discussions at the Cranbrook RMS west recreation planning table indicate that recreational users would be willing to pay fees as long as money went back into habitat restoration in the Trench. Present guides will be allocated rod days and new guides will have to buy from present guides, including Albertans. Each guide will have certain amount of hours allocated to him and once they are used they are finished. The system should be computerized by next year.

John B – *Will out of province guiding occur on those rivers?*

Ray – The process will allocate rod days to current guides. New entrants will have to purchase these days from these guides. This process does include Alberta guides.

Rex – has witnessed illegal guiding.

**h) Game Retrieval:**

**MOTORIZED GAME RETRIEVAL**

Rex suggested that motorized game retrieval be added to the agenda. This statement is being included in the RMS West plan and is intended for people who shoot an animal and require the use of a motorized vehicle to retrieve the dead animal. Kent has spoken with the Sparwood club but hasn't talked to Fernie and Elkford clubs yet. Kent would like to invite Rex to meet with the Sparwood club because they have some concerns. Kent won't make any comment until he has spoken to all the clubs.

The wording below is shown in the draft Cranbrook West Recreation Plan.

*Objective 1-1: Manage recreation access and development to ensure that the current distribution of fish and wildlife, the sustainability of their populations and the integrity of habitats, including water quality, are not compromised.*

*Point c.*

*Permit motorized game retrieval (not pursuit) in motorized restricted areas provided hunters act responsibly to minimize impacts. Specifically there will be no live tree cutting, and wetlands, meadows and other sensitive areas will be avoided. (This does not mean that closures on VAHCs, AMAs and sensitive areas can be ignored.)*

Bill H suggested that this proposal would be hard to police. Rex answered that they must have a cancelled tag in their possession and a dead animal on the ground if caught. One comment was that it has always been the obligation of a hunter to retrieve the dead animal once shot. Concerns were expressed about how the damage to these areas is accessed.

Mike feels the west table dissected this process a lot finer than the east side did and agrees with Rex's request. We should try and make the east and west table consistent. Hunter's should have time to talk about it and decide what they think.

**Action: This item will be put on the agenda for next meeting.**

## **5. Feedback and issues from sectors**

Dave will send an email to Pam with the contact information for Stephen Gardner and Gordon Gormley.

**Action: MSRM will email this information to the SRMAC.**

Mike would like to know how to rectify the problem about not being notified re: road maintenance. *What ministry should he complain to?* **Action: Pam will look into it.** Suggest referrals to LWBC. Harry expressed disagreement with Mike's standards on road maintenance. Ken spoke of road use agreements. If Tembec operates on a road that other user access then they must maintain the road, even though Tembec is the primary user. John asked if public safety was a requirement for maintaining those roads. Ken S said there is no set standard for maintaining roads. Tembec ploughs the roads with a turn-around point and some are even sanded. When a proposal goes forward, access issues come up. It is up to agencies handling the referrals to get in touch with tenure holders and commercial operators. Always consider the access (who has control of that road). Recommendation were made that all involved tenure holders be contacted. John B wants notice of works for mine proposals. Dave G said this will likely resolve over time. You will be able to access information on tenure holders from a website, in a specific area. However there is no system in place as yet. Jim L would like to see an overall tenure map.

**6. Next Meeting:** A date will be selected in the first 2 weeks of June, dependent on the availability of Cline & Hillsborough staff who will be asked to make presentations at this meeting.