

MUSKWA-KECHIKA ADVISORY BOARD

Spring 2010 Meeting

University of Northern British Columbia

March 9th and 10th FINAL MINUTES

March 9th

Attending:	Guests:	Regrets:
Tom Briggs (Chair) Bill Lux Wayne Sawchuk Tim Trapp Barry Holland Stephanie Killam Johnny Mikes Roslyn Pokiak Sandra Apsassin Andy Johnson Rhonda Cage ILMB (M-KAB Liaison)	Jim Hesse BC Parks Peter Goetz BC Parks (Omineca) Kathy Parker UNBC Krista Sittler UNBC grad student Dr Ken Otter UNBC Dr Patrick Maher UNBC	Corrine Porter Laureen Whyte Peter Stone Jason Lee Darrell Regimbald Leif Olson Bill Poole Eamon O'Donoghue Brian Fuhr

Tom Briggs, Chair of M-KAB - Welcome and introductions:

Review agenda call for additions or changes:

- Stone's sheep Board member, need to determine who will replace Andy Johnson
- Grizzly bear article from Calgary Herald and response from BCWF (tabled with Board members)
- Update on G2G and letters (ILMB and Brian Fuhr to bring forward)
- Aeolis Wind presentation deferred until possible meeting in Dawson Ck

Review draft October Board meeting Minutes--- one change noted, Corrine Porter is listed twice in the "regrets" column, after making this change, October 2009 meeting *MINUTES APPROVED AS FINAL*.

Review Correspondence: All correspondence since October meeting in meeting binders, tabled for comments or review - NBCTA letter requires a response from the Board and will be brought forward on Wednesday for discussion and decision for a response.

Committee Reports: As tabled in meeting package

ACTIONS:

Executive Report:

Secretariat to post Strategic plan on public web site and distribute to government manager groups

Monitoring and Reporting – at this time no need to undertake another “State of the MK report, will be considered in the future

G2G – update to be provided later in meeting

CAD

Decision to send back to committee for recommendation on future use Secretariat to discuss the CAD with MK Assessment project and if possible to be used.

It was noted that it would be Important to capture and track all actions, decisions, recommendations on flip chart for finalization on Wednesday. Secretariat posted all these on flip chart as meeting progressed.

9:50 Refreshment break

10:15 ILMB report out to M-KAB - (power point presentation to be posted on member secure page, meeting section)

Comments questions on presentation:

Wayne: The vision of a more sector based group for the M-KAB, has this idea been shelved?

Rhonda: has been deferred, government does not have the time and the process has not been defined, government has not given up on this model but will be interest based for now and this will be brought forward in the future.

Wayne: structural issues around that point, clearly felt that representing groups on the Board was essentially unworkable in the past, needs significant discussion before that ever went ahead with

Rhonda: confirmed there is a lot of work to do to advance this, government needs time to figure this out and present back to the Advisory Board in the future

Tom: I certainly see some concern about sector representation,

Rhonda: There is pro's and con's for both sides and everyone has their own perception on this, government is looking at this sector based model but in the future.

Johnny: understand rationale behind this, helpful to have a conversation down the road, but if it “isn't broke don't fix it”--- so is it broke in gov't mind? and if not, then why try to fix it?

Rhonda; There have been some comments and observations about significant gaps in the board and how it operates, government has been asking, what is in the future for the Board? So not necessarily broken, gov't doesn't feel the utility of the Board at this time, take time to figure it out and you can let government know your ideas on this. We have ministers and Senior Executive that doesn't have the history of the M-KAB and the M-KMA; you need to make it known to them.

Barry: I find this very interesting that government has the legislation for the M-K but doesn't know about it!

Johnny: I would like to know - -how does government see a change in the Board that it would allow it to work better or be better? What would those changes be?

Rhonda: This comes back from feeling from government that sector based would have greater accountability back to sectors and communities.

Andy: But government goes to news release to crisis to news release, big flashy has been left behind, there is no crisis in the M-KMA and it doesn't register with Ministers and Executive.

Rhonda: so important for this Board to work to strengthen relationship with gov't, stop in and discuss with managers, invites to committee meetings etc.

Tom: This is hard to do when I'm not in Fort St John, it also goes back to Minister Bell telling this Advisory Board they were doing too much that government should be doing.

Bill: I would recommend to bring this forward to tomorrows session, it is something the Board needs to discuss to see how and where it can move ahead, I will provide some of my thoughts at the end of this day for this discussion.

BC Government Reports:

Regarding the OGC report in meeting binder: there is still the requirement of having the Upper Sikanni Management plan moved to pre tenure plan. How do we get government to do this?

And secondly, how the Sulphur 8 mile research will impact on other areas, will the research and policy coming from Sulphur 8 mile be used for other pre tenure plan areas.

Wayne: This is two separate issues with this, Upper Sikanni and then outcomes of Sulphur 8 mile and how that will be used for other pre tenure plans,

Rhonda: Within ILMB planning, that shops responsibility is to do planning and priority setting thru sub regional management committee. Do up a recommendation letter as priority projects and submit to SRMC.

Johnny: OGC report re: geophysical activity, this report doesn't tell us where that is. Would be good to have this spatially so we can see where activity is in the M-KMA.

ACTION:

- 1) Secretariat to ask for spatial information where geophysical is taking place.
- 2) Pursue advice to Managers to update Upper Sikanni Management Plan to a pre-tenure plan

UNBC Presentation: Dr. Ken Otter - Impacts of Wind Power farms on Birds

About 4 years of work, studies to look at wind development in BC and potential for impact on migratory species.

Direct impacts of hitting tower/turbines, but has indirect in terms of migratory birds in wind movement and direction for migration.

Bats particularly susceptible to wind farms, change in air pressure causes damage/death even if not hit turbine

(Power point presentation will be provided to secretariat and posted on Board member web pages)

Questions to Dr Otter:

Has there been a comprehensive look at all the issues on wind farms?

Ken: Too much to deal with for us, working with others on some concerns etc. road building in alpine; try to dovetail with that work and specific issues.

This should be done at Environmental Assessment level, however, it may not.

12:30 break for lunch

1:05 UNBC Dr Kathy Parker and Krista Sittler Prescribed burning in Besa/Prophet

Kathy provided a brief update on some of the work she is involved in:

- From Predator Prey project, MoE using to update pre tenure plans
- Kathy is on the Science committee for Sulphur 8 Mile research project

Also has project on the effects of prescribed burning in the MK, started a graduate student project on the effects of prescribed burning elk and stone sheep in the Besa/Prophet area of the M-KMA.

(The presentation on the Besa/Prophet research project to be posted for Board members on website.)

Potential UNBC/MK course: Dr. Patrick Maher

Discussion on potential course, (1 Page handout) outline is based on a field course, not at UNBC

Tim: Would this be open to FN youth not just UNBC students? Yes

Johnny: Would UNBC salary for Pat would cover course content?

Pat: any cost comes to course logistics and course costs –

Johnny,: would be general public? If not who would be target for course:

Pat: My background is with tourism students, but this is a wide variety of students from wide variety of disciplines as high as 50 50 split students and community.

M-KAB thanked Dr Maher for his presentations and advised they would be discussing this and coming to a decision at tomorrow's session.

General discussion on UNBC Partnership:

Kathy reported that the endowment funds were to hit \$1 million before expenditures would be approved. This endowment rests with UNBC and under their policy and procedures.

Kathy noted, MK funds to this endowment were \$650,000, monies were invested and amount went up to a peak of \$854,000 in 2007 but with economic downturn, went to \$689,000. As March 2010, endowment sits at \$834,000 almost back to its peak in 2007. Anticipated that it would take another 4-5 years to hit \$1m.

UNBC policy was that 5% could be expended annually, this has been changed to 3% now.

Partnership agreement is in place until August 2012, an annual meeting between the Advisory Board (Knowledge and Understanding committee) is to take place to determine if other aspects of this partnership agreement can be undertaken.

2:30 pm G2G update B Lux

Oct 8/9 2009 leadership meeting in FSJ, to explore a G2G process, outcome was a letter and accord signed by FN leadership. Both documents went out in October to BC. A response was sent by BC (Feb 8th) to leadership.

Mistakes made by BC in the response letter to FN, this wasn't done properly, attempt by BC to provide an invite letter for all First Nations to have a member on M-KAB. This has presented concerns from those First Nations who have members on the Board. What is the intent with this letter?

Bill outlined the high points of this response letter from BC, (Kaska leadership just received this letter and has not responded)

- BC support ILMB to be lead, Brian Fuhr, Sr negotiator
- BC arbitrarily set out timelines in this letter, April 30th a final model. Done without FN consultation and agreement to this timeline.
- FN leadership to have access to MK trust funds

A second letter from Brian Fuhr, was sent out to FN to be on MK Advisory Board

Our Leadership needs time to respond to these letters and BC.

Operational Budget Review and discussion:

Do we need to review to see where it could be trimmed even further?

Yes bring forward to tomorrow's session

2009-2010 Expenditure Plan Project Review:

Secretariat referred to the one page status sheet in meeting binders to review the current project list and status of each.

MK Conservation Assessment: (Y2Y Project Manager)

Johnny Mikes:

How to engage FN with this project - \$13,000 from CPAWS plus matching from MK funds \$26,000 to engage FN with this project. Work to engage FN at least twice during this project to get their input.

Bill: one way to move forward, talk to those who sit on Board and how this can be taken back to communities. There is an opportunity to set up meeting with leadership such as Lower Post and inform them of the project etc.

Map out a strategy on how to scope this out and how it will work.

ACTION:

- Secretariat to ensure all update and report outs are provided to each FN member on the Advisory Board
- Have individual calls with FN to determine how the funding could be utilized –
- Set up conference call with FN reps and follow up from them on what they would like to see

Impacted sites Project, unable to move to RFP as there is a challenge in building the contaminated site aspect into this project. Government has stated their concern with this.

Recommend to make this into two projects, one to follow through on Rod Backmeyers work to date (objectives clearly stated in the Northern Regional Managers report on the MK) and initiate a contract for this.

Some board members were concerned that this would mean the Board is once again supporting work that government should be doing. However it was noted that Rod addressed this at a previous Board meeting in Mackenzie that his time and funds wouldn't allow him to finish this project. If it is important for the Advisory Board to see that reclamation of sites is done to a high level in the MKMA, then this aspect of the work needs to be done.

With Jason Lee unable to attend this discussion, it was recommended to defer this discussion until Wednesday and have him present for the discussion and decision for this project to move ahead.

4:10 PM Setting the stage for Wednesday Morning Board member session: W Sawchuk/B Lux

Wayne Sawchuk took a brief look back at the M-K, idea and concepts to where we are today.

Bill Lux- He requested that each Board member to think about why they are on the Board and what they want to see 5 years down the road. We have taken on “baggage” over the years, legislation and regulation review, strategic plans, business plans, budgets, committee meetings etc. on and on and its wearing Board members down.

Bill made an illustration for all to consider: We are in a canoe, crossing a large lake, paddling and paddling, our goal is to cross the lake, but it is time to pull our paddles out of the water and drift and look around, take time, etc. think about our goal to cross the lake and what we need to do this. Re group to focus on the priorities for this Board.

Rhonda Cage: Would take off her government hat and facilitate this session tomorrow. She as to set up objectives for the discussion based on what Wayne and Bill spoke to and come to terms on what the Board wants to accomplish.

March 10th

Attending:	Guests:	Regrets:
Tom Briggs (Chair) Bill Lux Wayne Sawchuk Tim Trapp Barry Holland Stephanie Killam Johnny Mikes Roslyn Pokiak Sandra Apsassin Andy Johnson Jason Lee Rhonda Cage ILMB (M-KAB Liaison)		Corrine Porter Laureen Whyte Peter Stone Darrell Regimbald Leif Olson

7:30am – 9:00 am M-KAB Breakfast meeting - “in camera” Board members only

9:15 am M-KAB focus for next 4-5 years (R Cage facilitate this discussion)

Tom confirmed from breakfast meeting, that the focus was to ensure Trust Account funds are expended and to keep the status quo until then. Critical to develop a good Expenditure Plan for the remaining funds in the Trust Account.

M-KAB Future priorities and direction: (R Cage to facilitate)

What are the confirmed outcomes from this discussion?:

Key objective is to “demonstrate value to government”

Rhonda noted that some Advisory Board members feel they represent their sector interests and groups, even though the disclaimer on letter says otherwise. This creates an unbalance Board.

One of the key challenges for each member, do they bring the interests of their communities/groups or are they on the board for the best interests of the M-KMA?

It is not consultation forum nor is it government to government. All on Board are clear with this but is government staff clear?

There is a need to make a request to government to clarify this and entrench it for all to understand.

Roslyn spoke about FN values in terms of wildlife and habitat and that these need to be “protected” in the MK, wildlife and habitat and ensuring it is there in perpetuity is the key for her and her community.

Bill Lux - For me, it will be recognition of the values and intent of this area, if it is still there 5 years down the road, by BC government and FN government and resource users then we have done our job, we can fight budgets etc but our responsibilities is to keep the values and intent in place and in tact for future generations.

Wayne S: There is a need to meet MK Act and regulations, the vision and objectives is codified in legislation, but unless Board members read and understand the Act etc, then it is a challenge in what we are trying to accomplish as an Advisory Board.

It was noted that the Wilderness Vision has never adopted by BC government, should be in the background to the Act, needs to be formalized and applied to MK Act

Question:

What are the assumptions you are making and how is that impacting ability to add value to government?

Actions (from flip chart notes)

- Define mission, goals and roles (suggestion to re visit vision and rewrite)
- Define the role of the Advisory Board in monitoring in the M-KMA
- Clarifying for each other and government what/who members represent
- Define the link to government

(Note that much has been written previously in terms of mission, goals, etc. this will be pulled together and the starting point in terms of further defining these as noted above. Stephanie, Wayne Bill, Secretariat -- will provide this information for members)

The immediate focus is expending Trust account funds by March 2011- requirement to develop an Expenditure Plan for Minister sign off and implementation. It was suggested to have some members of Executive along with MKAB Chair to go to Victoria with this and discuss/sign off with Minister Thomson.

Short term: Over the next 6 months to a year:

Determine what actions items need to be addressed at that time, not all at once, schedule accordingly.

There is a need for a commitment on ALL members to advance the "action" plan from this session.

- Executive to set up fall meeting with SRMC (logistical details with Omineca attending etc.) possible video conferencing.
- Determine if wind farm visit at Dawson or Dokie could be added on to this fall meeting.
- Board/Exec needs to know new members and invite to committee meetings prior to full Board meeting.

Actions and Decisions:

Decision: There will NO June Board meeting

Action: Secretariat to find out when Karilyn is having gov't tour of wind farm and advise Board members who want to tie into this.

Decision: There will be a Fall 2010 meeting, set up SRMC meeting, explore options to lengthen meeting to meet all objectives including wind visit, manager and the action from this session.

Development of the 2010-11 Expenditure Plan Finalization:

Secretariat went through expenditure plan from the \$568,000 and what has been committed to.

ACTION:

Impacted sites discussion deferred back to Resource Committee – meeting set for March 16th at 1 pm to finalize this.

Secretariat to follow through on this discussion and develop a draft Expenditure Plan and present to the Executive for their March 25th meeting.

Secretariat will set up meeting with Minister Thomson to take the approved Expenditure Plan to Victoria for discussion and sign off.

2:10 PM: Tom Briggs M-KAB Chair brought this meeting to a close. He had some closing comments and then asked each Board member for their closing remarks.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.